

come a ‘life form’ (and thus a reality in its own right)” (Elsaesser, Hagener, 2010: p. 12). In a self-reflective turn (meaning cinema theory as the subject) they proceed with their argument, based on the assumption that film theory “put the body and the senses at the centre” of its interest in the direction, which in the age of ubiquitous digital communication does not seem far-fetched anymore. They point out that the cinema is proposing to us “/.../ besides a new way of knowing the world, also a new way of ‘being in the world’, and thus demanding from film theory, next to a new epistemology also a new ontology” (Ibid.).

Transcending cinema, at first glance runs rather smoothly. It is taking place almost exactly in a manner of the Hegelian *Aufhebung*. The reason for such an appearance should be sought in the fact that we still have to deal with the frame – no matter in what kind of apparatus, which could be a cinema screen or a range of screens of diverse digital devices. “Theorists of new media have made much of the notion of cinema as the dominant language of culture and of the computer desktop as a cinematic space: ‘screen culture’ is posited as the hegemonic cultural interface” (Nakamura, 2008: p. 63). To what extent is virtual reality undermined by the effect of immediacy, such as it has been inaugurated by Walter Benjamin and, just recently, in other terms by Jacques Rancière? The problem now obtains the generational historicised framework, within which, curiously, history itself melts in the presence of a form of always accessible “knowledge” that abolishes “old” hierarchies of relevance of historic narratives about events, institutions, people and periods.

*Key Words:* culture, media, cinema, politics, identity