10.51937/kino.60.2026.Horvat

cc

FILM AND TV STUDIES – PEER-REVIEWED

Who or What Is the *Film Bro*: On Letterboxd, Subcultural Capital and Male Omniscience in Contemporary Film Criticism

Lina Horvat
Translated by Maja Lovrenov

Introduction

Although the word *cinephilia* etymologically derives from the Greek words *kine* (movement) and *philia* (love), cinephilia is by no means merely a "love of cinema",[1] but rather a specific way of organising one's life around the film experience.[2] Susan Sontag poetically describes cinephilia as a specific form of love for film, connected to a sensitivity to cinematic form, atmosphere and the visual experience.[3] However, such an idealised notion of the cinephile can obscure the mechanisms of cultural legitimation that determine who qualifies as a competent film connoisseur and whose taste is recognised as worthy of aesthetic judgment. While cinephilia has taken shape across various historical and institutional contexts, one of the influential models of modern cinephilia was closely tied to film criticism, cinematheque and film-club practices, festivals and other cultural networks where film knowledge acquired social value. In this context, the cinephile was not necessarily a professional

1 Elsaesser, Thomas. 2005: "Cinephilia or the Uses of Disenchantment", in: Marijke de Valck and Malte Hagener (eds.), *Cinephilia: Movies, Love and Memory*. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, p. 30.

2 Shambu, Girish. 2019: "For a New Cinephilia", *Film Quarterly*, vol. 72, no. 3, p. 34.

3 Sontag, Susan. 1996: "The Decay of Cinema", *The New York Times*, 25 February. Accessible at: www.nytimes.com/1996/02/25/magazine/the-decay-of-cinema.html; accessed 30 September 2026.

critic or an individual with formal film education; rather, they could establish their cultural competence through familiarity with the canon, the specific critical language and film history, as well as through affiliation with certain cultural communities. Nevertheless, in numerous influential representations, the figure of the cinephile has historically been distinctly marked as male.

Digital platforms have significantly reshaped the conditions for participation in film discourse. Platforms such as Letterboxd enable users to publicly rate films, write short reviews, create lists, curate their own profiles and follow the activities of other users. In this sense, digital cinephilia is undoubtedly more accessible: a substantially larger and more diverse range of people can participate in film discourse without their participation necessarily being mediated through traditional institutions of film criticism. However, the democratisation of the opportunity to publish opinions does not necessarily entail the democratisation of cultural authority. The platform environment and the ability to publicly express film tastes establish new ways in which cultural competence is displayed, recognised and valued. This is confirmed, in particular, by the research of Aleksandra Maria Brania,[4] who analysed the platform based on interviews with active users and followed their usage of the app and website. Brania notes that cultural capital is not lost on the platform but rather accumulates through platform-specific practices such as writing reviews, rating, creating lists and networked visibility. The present article further develops this analysis by examining its gender dimension.

In this context, the article examines the figure of the so-called film bro, not as a clearly defined social type or an empirically identifiable group of users, but rather as an online label, often used ironically and pejoratively, for a specific mode of performing within film discourse. The film bro is a stereotype of the self-confident male cinephile who performs his film competence through familiarity with a particular canon, confident aesthetic judgments and the public display of cultural capital. It is precisely this stereotypical nature that is analytically significant: the film bro is simultaneously a figure of cultural authority and a caricature of it. He is recognisable because he draws upon pre-existing notions of how a "true" film connoisseur is supposed to look, speak and conduct himself, while his excessive self-confidence is distinct enough to make him a target of irony and ridicule.

This article is conceived as a theoretical-discursive contribution that links theories of cinephilia with concepts of cultural capital, subcultural capital and performativity, employing them to interpret contemporary online discourse surrounding film taste and the figure of the film bro. Letterboxd is treated here not as the subject of

4 Brania, Aleksandra Maria. 2025: *The Death of a Cinephile? Performing Identity and Cultural Capital in the Online Film Community of Letterboxd.* Lund: Lund University, pp. 56–57. Accessible at: lup.lub.lu.se/luur/download?func=downloadFile&recordOId=9188738&fileOId=9188739; accessed 30 September 2026.

empirical research into the entire user population, but rather as a characteristic example of a platform environment in which film taste materialises in publicly visible profiles and other forms of user self-presentation. Consequently, the article does not attempt to determine what proportion of users fits the film bro image, nor does it assume that every self-confident male cinephile is a film bro. Instead, it focuses on what the persistence and recognisability of this discursive figure reveal about broader cultural notions of film competence, authority and gender.

The central research question, therefore, is what the film bro figure reveals about the gendered nature of cinephile cultural authority in the digital environment and to what extent digital cinephilia reproduces or reshapes the older models of cultural legitimation. Here, it is important to distinguish between the historical form of cinephilia and the contemporary internet stereotype: the film bro cannot simply be understood as a new version of the traditional cinephile since the modes of producing and validating cultural authority differ significantly between the two contexts. At the same time, however, the film bro figure allows us to recognise a continuity between them – particularly in the persistent notion that film knowledge can be converted into cultural status and that certain ways of articulating such knowledge have historically been associated with masculinity.

Digital cinephilia by no means represents a simple break with older forms of cinephile culture; rather, it primarily alters the conditions under which film knowledge is presented, valued and legitimised. The article's central thesis is that digital platforms democratise the opportunity for participation in film discourse, though not necessarily cultural authority itself. The film bro figure illustrates how historically gendered modes of cinephile authority are reproduced in the digital environment while simultaneously becoming more apparent as cultural performances due to the new conditions of public visibility, repetition and ironisation.

The cinephile as cultural authority

Although cinephile practices existed prior to World War Two, an influential model of modern cinephilia, which later became canonical, took hold in postwar France. It tightly connected film clubs, cinematheque culture, film criticism and theory. Institutions such as the Cinémathèque française, founded in 1936, and the magazine *Cahiers du cinema*, launched in 1951, represented distinct yet interconnected spaces in which film established itself as a subject of serious cultural and intellectual engagement. Cinephilia thus developed as a specific way of living with film that transcended the act of viewing alone; it encompassed the accumulation of knowledge, remembering, discussing, making recommendations and building communities. Thomas Elsaesser[5] understands cinephilia precisely through this interplay of cinematic experience, memory, ritual and identity, while Girish

5 Elsaesser 2005, pp. 28–30.

Shambu[6] emphasises its broader social and cultural dimensions. Film is thus no longer merely an object of consumption but becomes a medium through which individuals establish relationships with themselves, others and the world.

This shift is significant primarily because it situates cinephilia in relation to cultural authority. Pierre Bourdieu understands cultural taste as a socially acquired competence that enables distinction and, thereby, the reproduction of symbolic hierarchies.[7] Knowledge of film history, the canon, directors, aesthetic traditions and the like is therefore not merely an accumulation of information but a form of cultural capital, whose value depends on social recognition. Within cinephile communities, film competence could be transformed into symbolic authority. Certain ways of discussing film were considered more legitimate than others and certain films more significant than others; while individuals with greater knowledge of the canon could act as more competent arbiters of cinematic value. In this sense, a cinephile is not necessarily a professional film critic or an individual with formal film education.

Their authority stems primarily from recognised competence – from knowing films, mastering their cultural contexts and being able to articulate their taste in a language that a specific community recognises as legitimate. It is, therefore, a matter of a cultural position established through specific practices, knowledge and forms of belonging. It is precisely through this process that the image of the cinephile as a particularly competent viewer takes shape – an image that, in her critique of "total cinephilia", Jenna Ng connects to the ideal of the film lover whose identity is grounded in an intense knowledge and mastery of the world of film.[8] Entering the cinephile community required mastering a specific cultural language, knowing canonical filmmakers and commanding modes of interpretation that had already been established as legitimate.[9] Thus, cinephilia simultaneously expanded the possibilities for a more intense relationship with film and created distinctions between those who supposedly "truly" understood film and those who supposedly merely watched it. This raises the question of who, at a given historical moment, could figure as a competent viewer and which forms of knowledge were recognised as legitimate.

In this regard, the gender dimension of cinephile authority is significant. Cinephilia did not emerge in a cultural vacuum but rather within the film industry, film criticism and other institutions of film culture – spheres that were historically dominated by men. Although women were important contributors to the film

6 Shambu 2019, pp. 33–34.

7 Bourdieu, Pierre. 1984: *Distinction: A Social Critique of the Judgement of Taste*, trans. Richard Nice. London: Routledge, pp. 56–66.

8 Ng, Jenna. 2010: "The Myth of Total Cinephilia". *Cinema Journal*, p. 147.

9 De Valck, Marijke and Hagener, Malte. 2005: "Down with Cinephilia? Long Live Cinephilia? And Other Videosyncratic Pleasures". In: De Valck, Marijke and Hagener, Malte, ed. *Cinephilia: Movies, Love and Memory*. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, p. 11.

industry and culture from the very beginning, they gradually became (increasingly) marginalised as the film industry underwent institutionalisation. Studies of the history of film labour have shown that, with the establishment of the studio system in the 1930s, the film industry was transformed from a more gender-mixed field into an overwhelmingly male-dominated environment.[10] Cinephilia was therefore gendered not necessarily (only) because its actual participants were predominantly male, but because the normative figure of the cinephile emerged within a cultural environment where the knowledge, interpretation and evaluation of film were connected to forms of intellectual authority historically more often attributed to men. This is also significant for understanding how the cinephile presented himself as a subject of knowledge. The "traditional"[11] cinephile was not merely someone who watched a lot of films but also someone capable of translating his love of cinema into the language of competence. He was familiar with the canon, directors, film history and legitimate modes of interpretation and could position himself as an arbiter of cinematic value. The traditional cinephile framed his passion as knowledge, whereas other forms of devotion to film were more readily perceived merely as consumption, adoration or fandom.

This historical framework is important for understanding digital cinephilia. Digitisation has fundamentally altered the conditions of access, visibility and the presentation of film knowledge. As Elsaesser notes, the transition to digital culture did not entail the simple disappearance of cinephilia but rather its transformation. The accessibility of films, their reproducibility and the possibilities for archiving them have changed the conditions of cinephile engagement.[12]

Letterboxd and digital cinephilia

Letterboxd, a website and app launched in 2011, combines a film database, a personal viewing diary and a social network. In April 2026, it had over 28 million users across nearly 200 countries, with more than half of the user base under the age of 35.[13] Letterboxd allows the user profile itself to become a space for performing a cinephile identity. Users do not merely log the films they have watched; rather, through ratings, reviews, lists and the selection of four favourite films, they curate an image of themselves as viewers. The latter, in particular, serves not only as information about personal taste but as a condensed public emblem of it. They reveal which films an individual values while simultaneously signalling the type of cinephile they wish to be recognised as. For this reason, we describe three user

10 Bielby, Denise D. and Bielby, William T. 1996: "Women and Men in Film". *Gender & Society*, vol. 10, no. 3, pp. 252–253.

11 Quotation marks signal that this is a retrospective designation for a specific historical form of film culture that established itself over time as a cultural norm.

12 Elsaesser 2005, pp. 35–36.

13 Dockterman, Eliana. 2026: "Letterboxd". 30 April 2026.

profiles with anonymised identities. The profiles were selected at the end of August 2026 from among users I follow or who are part of my user network on Letterboxd. Approximately 15 profiles were reviewed, from which I selected three that appeared the most diverse in terms of their choice of favourite films and how that selection constructs a specific image of cinephile identity. One of the selected profiles aligns more closely with the stereotypical notion of the film bro, whereas the other two differ significantly from it. Consequently, the selection is not random in a statistical sense nor intended to provide a representative analysis of Letterboxd users; rather, it serves merely to illustrate the various ways in which a limited selection of films can function as a condensed representation of cinephile identity.

The first profile builds its *Top 4* around *Trainspotting* (1996), *Paris, Texas* (1984), *Interstellar* (2014) and *Koyaanisqatsi* (1982). It projects the image of a cinephile whose taste is rooted in highly canonised or culturally legitimised works, while also connecting them through strong visual and atmospheric qualities. This combination of diversity and, above all, recognisability is characteristic of the stereotypical film bro mode of self-presentation: through this selection, the user signals familiarity with various cinematic traditions while relying on titles that already hold an established status within popular or cinephile culture, but more on this later. The profile's selection thus serves to demonstrate a broad cinematic outlook and knowledge of diverse film traditions.

The second profile offers a far more heterogeneous picture of film taste. Its *Top 4* comprises *Pitch Perfect* (2012), *Anatomy of a Fall* (2023), *Paddington 2* (2017) and *The Handmaiden* (2016). Here, commercial, popular and genre films stand alongside acclaimed contemporary auteur cinema and Korean cinema. Such a selection places less emphasis on adherence to a single canon and instead presents a viewer capable of recognising value in vastly different forms of film experience. At the same time, it is precisely this combination of seemingly incompatible titles that allows personal taste in itself to become part of an identity statement. Here, a cinephile identity – or its rejection – is constructed not so much through the coherence of the selection as through its diversity.

The third profile conceives its *Top 4* around *Four Lions* (2010), *Midnight Cowboy* (1969), *Creep* (2014) and *Snatch* (2000). This selection combines dark humour, cult cinema, psychological horror and crime comedy, thereby creating a somewhat more distinctively subcultural image of the cinephile. Compared to the first profile, there is less emphasis on a broad spectrum of canonised cinematic traditions and more on a specific type of genre, cult and provocative film taste. Such a selection portrays a viewer drawn to unusual, dark and somewhat marginal film perspectives, while also seeking recognition as someone who appreciates dark humour, distinctive characters and unconventional narratives. This is a viewer who does not present their taste as neutral or universal, but rather as more personal, subcultural and somewhat rebellious.

Brania – who analysed Letterboxd based on eleven interviews with active users and the media go-along method[14] – considers the platform a space in which cinephilia is established primarily through daily engagement in platform-specific practices.[15] She finds that users shape and negotiate their cinephile identities by logging viewings, rating films, writing reviews and creating lists. These practices become ways of self-definition and of signalling belonging to the film community.[16] Film taste is no longer merely something an individual possesses, but something that can be continuously materialised in public traces. Public ratings and lists, along with the number of likes or followers, transform an individual's taste into visible and comparable elements of their profile.

Cultural capital on the platform thus accumulates through participation in its specific practices and is validated by the reactions of other users. Thereby, part of the function of cultural mediation, performed by institutionalised criticism within the traditional film landscape, shifts to the realm of peer recognition. Brania therefore views cultural legitimacy on Letterboxd as something largely co-created within the community: the value of an individual's contribution depends not merely on its content, but also on whether other users perceive it as interesting, relevant, witty or otherwise affective.[17]

Brania also points out that, on Letterboxd, certain genres and modes of viewing are valued more highly than others and that users may actively distance themselves from films that are mainstream or commercially successful.[18] This reproduces one of the fundamental characteristics of traditional cinephilia: film taste can serve as a means of distinguishing between those who supposedly possess more legitimate or refined cultural competence and the general audience.

This is crucial for understanding (modern) cinephile authority. While the traditional cinephile had to demonstrate their competence through knowledge of the canon, critical language and affiliation with specific cultural networks, the digital cinephile or the serious Letterboxd user must repeatedly perform their identity in public. Their profile serves as a permanent, ever-expanding archive of taste that other users can follow, evaluate and compare with their own. Digital cinephilia, therefore, does not simply mean the end of the old model of cultural authority, but rather its shift into an environment where taste has become visible and measurable. It is within these new conditions of visibility that figures such as the film bro can emerge.

14 It is a method where the researcher observes the participants in real-time as they engage with media.

15 Brania 2025, pp. 56–57.

16 *Ibid.*

17 *Ibid.*, p. 57.

18 *Ibid.*, p. 58.

Gender performativity and film bros

The concept of the film bro denotes an online-generated stereotype of the cinephile whose film knowledge is linked to a specific form of masculinity. The term is not a self-designation but a label typically applied from the outside, often carrying an ironic or derisive tone. It is not an empirical category with predefined boundaries but rather a discursive figure through which online culture recognises and comments on a particular way of enacting cinephile knowledge. Alyssa Miller[19] describes the film bro as a type of male film enthusiast who often establishes his relationship to cinema through confident posturing and familiarity with a recognisable canon.

In this regard, the broader usage of the suffix "-bro", which appears in derisive terms such as techbro, financebro and gymbro, is also of interest. These terms do not denote merely men active in a particular field but often refer to a specific mode of publicly performing competence. Drawing on the concept of "brothos", Dag Øivind Madsen and Terje Berg[20] point to the rhetorical style in which confident, masculinised self-presentation becomes a substitute for professional judgment or actual knowledge. Such figures are characterised primarily by an emphasis on toughness, discipline, hyper-individualism and visible self-mastery, all of which serve as signs of credibility.[21] What distinguishes the "film bro" is that the object of this display is film taste and knowledge grounded in a relatively limited repertoire of references and marked by pronounced interpretive confidence.

Films that appear most frequently in the discourse about the film bro include works by Quentin Tarantino, David Fincher and Christopher Nolan, as well as *Goodfellas* (1990), *Scarface* (1983), *American Psycho* (2000), *Taxi Driver* (1976), *A Clockwork Orange* (1971) and *The Godfather* (1972). This canon is established as characteristic of the figure through online discourse, which is verifiable via a concrete corpus of online posts simply by typing "film bro" into the Letterboxd search bar. For comparison, as a kind of counterpoint, I also examined the lists of films that appear when searching for the term "girly", so more *feminine* or even *girlish* films.[22] This comparison is not intended to suggest the existence of a monolithic "male" or "female" taste in film, but rather to illustrate two online-recognised and gender-coded aesthetics. Furthermore, film bro lists denote a stereotype of the subject, whereas "girly" lists represent a more aesthetic or affective category.

19 Miller, Alyssa. 2022: "What Is a 'Film Bro,' and How Can You Help Them?". Accessible at: nofilmschool.com/film-bro-and-how-can-you-help-them; accessed 30 September 2026.

20 Madsen, Dag Øivind and Berg, Terje. 2026: "Bro frameworks and the changing logics of managerial knowledge". *Frontiers in Communication*, vol. 11, 30 June, p. 2.

21 *Ibid.*

22 I am aware that this opposition is heavily gendered. The cultural representation of femininity through youth, cuteness, tenderness and "girlishness" can reproduce the notion of femininity as a position that is less mature, less authoritative or less competent.

Alongside films often associated with the film bro canon, titles and formulations frequently appear that present film taste as a sign of a specific identity. Such lists do not prove that all their creators possess the same form of male cinephile subjectivity; rather, they allow for the observation of recurring aesthetic codes through which this subjectivity can be established. In contrast to lists that organise film choices around terms like "girly", other emotional states or affective categories, film bro lists often emphasise the recognisability of the canon, the director's name, genre competence or a specific aestheticised notion of masculinity. The contrast between these modes of classification demonstrates, above all, that gendered coding is not an inherent quality of a specific film but emerges from the way a film selection is culturally encoded and utilised for self-positioning.

It therefore makes sense to understand the film bro as a distinctly performative position. Judith Butler[23] points out that the subject is not simply a pre-existing identity that an individual then expresses; rather, identity is constituted through the repetition of socially recognisable norms and practices. In the case of the film bro, this means that "masculinity" is not simply the cause of a particular taste in film. Instead, a specific form of male cinephile subjectivity is produced through repeated choices, modes of evaluation, citation of the canon and the confident articulation of film knowledge. The film bro is thus not merely a man who likes certain films but also a figure who establishes himself as a male film connoisseur through the repetition of specific cultural practices.

This goes hand in hand with the aforementioned Bourdieuian concept of cultural capital. Film knowledge can enable an individual to distinguish themselves from others and gain recognition within a specific community; once this knowledge is recognised as legitimate, it can be converted into symbolic capital or a recognised form of cultural authority.[24] Sarah Thornton further illuminates the question of the value of cultural knowledge within concrete communities through her concept of subcultural capital. Thornton applies Bourdieu's understanding of cultural capital to the context of specific cultural scenes, where certain forms of knowledge, taste, style and familiarity with internal rules acquire value primarily because they are recognised by members of that community.[25] She explains that status and competence can also be established within more limited cultural environments.[26] Familiarity with a particular scene, its references and the distinctions between what is considered "appealing", "authentic" or "mainstream" can confer status upon an individual, even if such knowledge holds no equivalent value outside that scene.

23 Butler, Judith. 1993: *Bodies That Matter: On the Discursive Limits of Sex*. New York: Routledge, p. 95.

24 Bourdieu 1984, pp. 56–57.

25 Thornton, Sarah. 1995: *Club Cultures: Music, Media and Subcultural Capital*. Cambridge: Polity Press, pp. 11–14.

26 *Ibid.*

One cannot claim that Letterboxd constitutes a single, unified subculture, as the platform brings together diverse taste communities, modes of engagement and forms of film discourse. It is more appropriate, therefore, to speak of subcultural practices within the platform. Consequently, Thornton's concept is useful for the present analysis primarily as a means of understanding the specific communities and practices found on the platform. Certain film repertoires, references, styles of writing about film or familiarity with specific cinematic contexts can function as subcultural capital within a given community, as their status derives precisely from recognition among users who share specific norms of taste. The distinction from Bourdieu's general model lies not in the capital suddenly becoming exclusively relational, a characteristic that already applies to cultural capital, but rather in the emphasis on the more specific cultural environment where certain competencies are valued, recognised and converted into status. While Bourdieu and Thornton thus facilitate an understanding of how such competence acquires symbolic value, Butler shows why this value must be constantly reaffirmed: the subject is not established as competent and male through a single act, but rather through repetition.

While the classic cinephile's legitimacy stemmed from institutional validation of their knowledge, the digital film bro relies on the community's public response. Consequently, this authority is both more accessible and more precarious. A profile, list or review might garner visibility, likes and followers, yet due to that same platform logic, it can just as easily become an object of ridicule. The film bro's self-confidence can be a source of cultural status, but its very excessiveness has also turned it into fodder for memes and ironisation. The film bro is thus a figure who simultaneously constructs and reveals their authority as a performance. Although the digital film bro continues the fundamental cinephile practice of distinction, where knowledge of specific films still establishes a cultural hierarchy, authority is now more directly tied to public performance and responsiveness. More importantly, the very process that generates this authority can also demystify it. A meme, a parody or even the derisive label film bro reveals that a confident demeanour is not necessarily a transparent expression of knowledge but rather a cultural form that can be recognised, imitated and undermined.

The film bro is thus interesting precisely as a figure straddling the line between cinephile knowledge and its performative image. He continues the older logic of cinephilia, in which film knowledge serves as a means of distinction and a source of authority, yet simultaneously transplants it into an environment where that authority must be constantly visible, validated and reiterated. At the same time, this figure is, for the first time, so clearly exposed to the possibility of being unmasked: the very cultural code that allows an individual to present themselves as a connoisseur can also become the hallmark of a stereotype that the community identifies as the film bro.

Conclusion

Returning to the initial thesis, the analysis shows that cinephilia was historically linked to forms of cultural authority that were often gendered, with canonisation, the distinction between "good" and "bad" films and the confident positioning of the individual as a connoisseur playing significant roles. The figure of the film bro continues this legacy in certain respects while simultaneously transforming it into a specific online discourse. Thus, the film bro is not simply a new type of cinephile but a stereotypical figure through which one can observe how film knowledge, taste and masculinised competence coalesce into a publicly recognisable form of authority.

A presentation of selected Letterboxd lists and other online representations of the film bro shows that this position is established primarily through the repetition of specific film references, aesthetic codes and modes of evaluation. Important here is also the broader "-bro" logic, which links competence with self-confidence, certainty and their public display. In the case of the film bro, this logic extends to the realm of film taste: familiarity with a specific repertoire of films and directors can become a means of establishing oneself as a cultural connoisseur. Judith Butler's concept of performativity allows us to understand this position not as a stable trait of the individual, but rather as the effect of repetitive practices through which the cinephile subject is constituted.

In this respect, the digital environment does not represent a simple break with earlier forms of cinephilia. The fundamental connection between knowledge, taste, distinction and cultural authority remains, although the conditions of its expression change. Today, authority can be established through publicly visible profiles, lists, ratings, reviews and the reactions of other users, thereby becoming more directly tied to the repetition and recognition of specific cultural practices. It is precisely this platform-based visibility that allows the figure of the film bro to emerge as a recognisable online stereotype while simultaneously becoming a subject of memes, irony and caricature. However, this does not mean that hierarchies of cinephile taste have been eliminated; rather, they become the subject of different forms of negotiation and public recognition.

The scope of the present analysis does not allow for conclusions regarding the behaviour of Letterboxd users as a whole, nor does it suggest that digital cinephilia is exclusively male or that digital culture inherently dismantles traditional forms of cultural authority. It does, however, allow for a more precise definition of the film bro as a gendered, performative figure of cinephile authority. His distinctiveness lies not merely in the film repertoire he champions but in the way that repertoire is used to publicly perform competence. In this sense, the film bro reveals a continuity between older forms of cinephile distinction and new modes of their online performance: it is not a matter of the disappearance of cinephile authority but rather a change in the conditions under which it can become visible, recognised and a subject of response.

Bibliography

Bielby, Denise D. and Bielby, William T. 1996: "Women and Men in Film". In: *Gender & Society*, vol. 10, no. 3, pp. 248–270. www.researchgate.net/publication/240696341_WOMEN_AND_MEN_IN_FILM_Gender_Inequality_Among_Writers_in_a_Culture_Industry.

Bourdieu, Pierre. 1984: *Distinction: A Social Critique of the Judgement of Taste*. Trans. Richard Nice. London: Routledge.

Brania, Aleksandra Maria. 2025: *The Death of a Cinephile? Performing Identity and Cultural Capital in the Online Film Community of Letterboxd.* Lund: Lund University. Accessible at: lup.lub.lu.se/luur/download?func=downloadFile&recordOId=9188738&fileOId=9188739.

Butler, Judith. 1993: *Bodies That Matter: On the Discursive Limits of Sex*. New York: Routledge.

De Valck, Marijke and Hagener, Malte. 2005: "Down with Cinephilia? Long Live Cinephilia? And Other Videosyncratic Pleasures". In: De Valck, Marijke and Hagener, Malte, ed. *Cinephilia: Movies, Love and Memory*. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, pp. 11–24.

Dockterman, Eliana. 2026: "Letterboxd". 30 April 2026. Accessible at: time.com/collection/time100-most-influential-companies/2026/letterboxd/.

Elsaesser, Thomas. 2005: "Cinephilia or the Uses of Disenchantment". In: De Valck, Marijke and Hagener, Malte, ed. *Cinephilia: Movies, Love and Memory*. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, pp. 27–43.

Madsen, Dag Øivind and Berg, Terje. 2026: "Bro frameworks and the changing logics of managerial knowledge". *Frontiers in Communication*, vol. 11, 30 June. Accessible at: www.frontiersin.org/journals/communication/articles/10.3389/fcomm.2026.1801034/full.

Miller, Alyssa. 2022: "What Is a 'Film Bro,' and How Can You Help Them?". Accessible at: nofilmschool.com/film-bro-and-how-can-you-help-them.

Ng, Jenna. 2010: "The Myth of Total Cinephilia". *Cinema Journal*, vol. 49, no. 2, pp. 146–151.

Shambu, Girish. 2019: "For a New Cinephilia". *Film Quarterly*, vol. 72, no. 3, pp. 32–34.

Sontag, Susan. 1996: "The Decay of Cinema". *The New York Times*, 25 February. Accessible at: www.nytimes.com/1996/02/25/magazine/the-decay-of-cinema.html.

Thornton, Sarah. 1995: *Club Cultures: Music, Media and Subcultural Capital*. Cambridge: Polity Press.