

lem. We can now better understand that the interaction between moving pictures and the changes of the meaning of the concept of memory was an immediate one. As such, it has been uttered in Bergson's discourse. Therefore, Bergson's text still reminds us that a presumably scientific explanation of perceptions of images lacks a grasp of complexity.

In the last twenty years or so of the 20th century cinema as art has become increasingly an object of an expanding interest for philosophers – of course, not only French ones. However, French philosophers are principal references when a wide range of questions concerning film and thinking are discussed. French film theory from its early days on, as it is visible in the case of Epstein, amply borrowed ideas, notions and logics from philosophy and aesthetics. Our contemporary colleague Jacques Rancière is undoubtedly a major thinker, who in his huge *oeuvre* pays an important tribute to cinema and very noticeably intervenes into the field, which recently has been globally identified as *philosophy of film*. In the chapter 11 (The Machine and Its Shadow) of his book *Aisthesis* he comes up with the notion of *immediacy* linked to the notion of cinema: "Immediacy is what the art of projected moving shadows demands. Since this art is deprived of living flesh, of the stage's depth and theatre's words, its instant performance must be identified with the tracing of a writing of forms" (2013). Rancière discovers "immediacy" when he is trying to point out how cinema organises within its capacities a "distribution of the sensible" and he takes Chaplin not just as an example, but also as a decisive figure in the time, when film was becoming art form and defining itself as such. Of course, as a philosopher, who cannot but draw on texts – in this instance on Shklovsky, Meyerhold and, maybe more prominently, on Jean Epstein, Rancière did not miss the question of language in cinema. Therefore, it looks like as if there is an inherent link between thinking through cinema and his notion of *immediacy*.

Although venerable traditional aesthetic considerations on beauty seem mostly obsolete, the concept of beauty cannot be simply discarded considering that it is inscribed in the foundation of the very idea of all aesthetics. The cinematic reality, always one way or the other related to a perception of beauty (or, as it were, its contrast) of images, therefore, cannot be conceived without aesthetics, which in case of cinema transgresses the boundaries of "just" art. Elsaesser and Hagener ascertained and anticipated in their clarification that "/.../ the cinema seems poised to leave behind its function as a 'medium' (for the representation of reality) in order to be-