

Cinephilia in the Digital Age

Laurent Jullier and Jean-Marc Leveratto

This chapter aims to identify and make explicit the characteristics of contemporary cinephilia in Western societies. In a context of increasing globalization – culturally conveyed by cinema, among other media – cinephilia is not an exclusive characteristic of Western societies. It is a behavior that has been facilitated by growing urbanization (Morin, 1953; Bourdieu, 1979), by a higher standard of living (Bakker, 2006), and by the normalization of leisure. It thus develops, in parallel with a national film production, as cities grow and huge megalopolises flourish in what were, until recently, non-industrialized countries. A cogent illustration is the way cinephiles now associate Hong Kong with a world-famous film genre (martial arts), and with whole communities of amateurs eagerly collecting its products.

Exploring the contemporary evolution of cinephilia, however, requires taking its technical and social foundations into account, as well as the different types of resistance expressed by some religious traditions – hence the need to relativize our approach.

Looking for Quality

In the second half of the 20th century, three factors contributed to an evolution in the means of cultivating cinematographic pleasure, by providing easier access both to past films and to information on their authors and actors.

1. The improvement of our cinema skills brought about by virtual film discussions; the sharing of our tastes with both initiated and uninitiated strangers; and the opportunities we now have to publicize our individual opinions on the web, either on a specific movie or on cinema as a whole;
2. The creation and development of information tools on films and artists, as well as of various frameworks to assess the quality of films, helping us to select which films to watch, but also to develop our cinematographic taste.
3. The widening of our cinema experience, through increased peer-to-peer access to the mass of films inherited from the various national film and television industries, and of our ability to express and share our tastes, brought about by the democratization of the professional tools of filmmaking.

The systematic use of the Internet, both as communication tool and public space, thus allows cinema lovers to:

1. develop their critical skills, as posting their opinions in forums encourages them to develop their argumentation;
2. widen and diversify the range of films they watch, by mixing the (re)discovery of classics and new commercial releases, and by specializing in a specific genre or collecting curiosa (kung-fu movies, weird psychotronic films);
3. deepen their mastery of film technique and even produce themselves, thanks to easily accessible software and other web users' advice, and the use of new audio-visual story forms (*fanfictions*, *mashups*, *machinimas*...)

All in all, we would contend, with increasingly accessible films on a range of new supports, and increased opportunities to discuss them, both face-to-face and virtually, contemporary forms of cinephilia are quite different from the "historical" or classical cinephilia associated with the theater, as well as from the modern cinephilia born with the emergence of television.

Along with the general increase in the duration of studies and the democratization of artistic culture this entails, the current situation leads us to a better understanding of film enthusiasts' expertise and of their contribution to the evolution of cinema as an art. This rehabilitation of the audience's judgment, long rejected by professional artists and critics, stressing the superiority of their own judgment in the artistic field, can be observed in all artistic fields (Leveratto, 2006). In France, the consecration of amateur culture has been obvious for years, although this does not imply that the technical superiority of professionals is rejected. Rather, it challenges any deterministic or elitist vision of cinephilia, as something reserved for the new middle classes and the intellectual fringes of the upper classes, as opposed to "popular" consumption, namely the allegedly blind consumption, by popular spectators, of the latest commercial releases exploiting celebrity worship. The Internet, as a public space, made the "actions" of anonymous consumers visible, thus allowing for a break with the elitist definition of cinephilia, which was – perhaps unexpectedly – legitimized by Pierre Bourdieu in *La Distinction*, when he stated that cinephilia is "linked to one's cultural capital rather than to simple cinema attendance," and then also situated it "beyond direct film experience."¹ Bourdieu thus contributed to misconceptions about the common expertise (Leveratto, 2006) that regular cinema attendance and discussions with other "cinema enthusiasts" bring about.

When cinephiles are asked today to give a list of their favorite films, they are very likely to produce quite a heterogeneous list, often based on "an eclectic mix of art, popular and experimental films, including one or two titles you have never heard of."² The time of "guilty pleasures," linked with the risk of automatically compromising yourself should you personally enjoy films – whether "commer-

cial” or “intellectual” – that do not fit with current consumption norms in your social group, is now over. The normalization of this kind of “omnivorousness” has also been made possible by the commercial success of directors who dared to promote in their films the eclectic dimension of their own cinematographic tastes. D. Cozzalio cites, for instance, the example of young Paul Schrader, who hid from his friends that he loved watching Bresson, or of John Waters, who confessed that he delighted in watching Marguerite Duras’s films. The fact that world-famous New Hollywood directors should be able to admire both French art cinema and Hollywood blockbusters thus contributed to a new assessment of the expertise of the average film enthusiast concerned about quality.

As with any aesthetic behavior, cinephilia obviously implies a concern for cinematographic quality. This concern, which is at the root of the expertise of the cinephile, an experienced individual both involved in film consumption and keen on cinema, should not be mistaken for the longing for social distinction that Bourdieu rightly denounced, since it implies a refusal to acknowledge the aesthetic expertise, and thus to deny the humanity, of others. Concern about cinematographic quality justifies a certain type of normativity and leads to defining ethical limits for the individual and for the collective admiration of cinematographic objects.³ For instance, François Truffaut satirized the morbid dimension of the addictive behavior of some spectators by ironically transforming the slogan of the French Centre National du Cinéma, “Quand on aime la vie, on va au cinéma” (“Life lovers are also cinema lovers”) into “Quand on n’aime pas la vie, on va au cinéma” (“Cinema lovers are also life haters”).

Respecting the practical meaning (Bourdieu, 1980) of cinema culture also implies not forgetting the reality which, according to John Lyden, makes cinema offer us “like religion, ways of negotiating suffering and injustice” through the behaviors it stages, which explains why it may sometimes “affect the way we act once back in real life.”⁴ The equivalence between the capacity of both artistic representation and religious ceremony to acknowledge the collective importance of some values – which has been systematically established since Durkheim (1917) and Mauss (1902-1903) – justifies the comparison between cinema and religion. Stressing cinema’s “life lessons,” interestingly, does not address the efficiency of cinematographic technique as a way of distinguishing between the initiated behavior of the cinephile – mastering the intricacies of artistic technique – and the uninitiated behavior of the average film consumer who falls victim to appearances. Insofar as the word “religion” is often used today to underline the social dignity of the cinematographic art and to perpetuate an elitist vision of it, it seems that Marcel Mauss’s definition of magic as an individual practice based on an incorporated knowledge – as opposed to religion as an institution sustained by professionals – is the one which currently best fits a true understanding of cinephilia (Leveratto, 2006).

The individualization that we have witnessed of cinematographic taste, namely the process of constructing one's own personal preferences and systematically asserting them, perfectly illustrates the way all consumers strive to master the technique (the first meaning, according to Mauss, of the word "magic") of cinema for their own purposes and according to their needs and those of their close circle of friends and relatives. Facilitated by the development of new technologies, magic retrospectively appears as an inherent trend in cinema consumption as soon as cinema becomes a "universal" type of leisure, potentially encompassing all types of societies and social classes. It further participates in the diversification of film genres, and then of distribution channels, due to the sharpening of the spectator's judgment – through criticism, censorship, film-clubs, school, and the like – which has been operating since the birth of feature films.

Of course, if considered in its sociological dimension as the impossibility of inferring an individual's tastes *a priori* from his/her belonging to a given social group, this individualization of cinematographic taste does not erase the impact of social differences on cinema consumption. Yet, when dealing with actual people, we have to acknowledge the many instances when this consumption goes beyond social differences, since taste, as Antoine Hennion states, is a "way of acting" that we do not entirely control and that transports us from one to another aesthetic object, regardless of tradition or reason.⁵ The public space of the Internet allows us to observe this "way of acting," together with the spectator and film networks it may lead us to join if we devote some of our time to it.

"Reception as Activity"

The type of cinephilia described and idealized by Antoine De Baecque (2003) is often the basis of both French and Anglo-Saxon researchers' definition of cinephilia. We would argue that this encourages a misunderstanding. The type of cinephilia it defines is localized (essentially Parisian), emerged during a specific period of cinema consumption (the 1950s and 1960s), was translated into a critical discourse (by cinema critics, later by directors), and has since become the vulgate of the official institutions of French cinema. The act of consumption was then based on the act of *movie going*. In this type of discourse, the screen is localized – in the theater. This discourse is based on systematic consumption of the latest film releases and on their careful analysis, but it also values the sacrifice, both in terms of time and money, needed to track down rare films and be ready to travel long distances to see them, in either geographically or culturally remote theaters. For someone who is not a specialist in cinema, or does not own a private projection room, this is the only way to be able to watch such films. It is difficult to find information about them (the first problem being to find the programs of all cinemas); there are physical limitations (sometimes, even when you get the information, the theater is so remote that you cannot go there), which favor peo-

ple living in the wealthiest countries and, within these countries, in big metropolises – above all Paris, famous as the capital city offering the widest range of different films to watch in the world.⁶ This is what creates the value of such actions. Beyond the pleasure of being part of the lucky few who could watch this rare film, you enjoy being able to discuss it in small groups, either in a film club or in the pages of specialized reviews; and the lists, classifications and filmographies you produce are passed around and slowly corrected. Watching a film on TV or on any other small screen is systematically considered *less rewarding*.

This form of sociability based on watching films in theaters – and the cinema culture it entails – has not completely disappeared in France. On the contrary, it has been normalized through support for a network of art houses offering, alongside the latest releases accessible throughout the country, recent films that are shown in only a limited range of specialized theaters, as well as old films regarded as masterpieces. Yet today, this represents only one way of loving cinema, as it did at the time it first emerged. Since the 1920s, in parallel with these regular consumers and their culture of cinematographic quality, generated by the regular watching of new releases, there has been an ordinary type of cinephilia that the cinephiles of the Nouvelle Vague enjoyed mocking (Jullier and Leveratto, 2010). This anonymous form of cinephilia could not be expressed publically at the time, as distinct from the cinephilia of cinema critics – except, marginally, in some magazines and reviews, as well as in readers' letters.

The normalization of the Internet has changed this, by giving anonymous cinephiles the opportunity to express themselves and convey another vision of the cinephile, more contemporary and more complex than the one promoted by the cinephiles of the Nouvelle Vague. This is what Jonathan Buchsbaum and Elena Gorfinkel point to, in a recent article, when they use the expression “cinephilia (s).”⁷ The Internet has prolonged and emphasized the diversification of different forms of film consumption. There are now many ways of regularly watching films outside theaters. Cinephilia may depend exclusively on the act of *home-viewing*. It flourishes in the opportunity to watch more films, and to be able to have easy access to rare films in their computerized version, on cable TV, DVDs or the Internet (*p2p, streaming, pay-per-view*). Screens of various sizes can be found everywhere: the film is re-localized. Information is easy to get: the problem is no longer to be unable to access it, but to have enough time to watch / read everything.

This diversification of the modes of film consumption has been accompanied by an unprecedented evolution of film discussion as a means of comparing opinions, exchanging information, and sharing knowledge. The Internet gives anonymous cinephiles the opportunity to post their opinion and to have virtual exchanges with others, thus making visible the cinephilia of “simple” film enthusiasts.

Exploring what is somewhat ineptly called “cinephilia 2.0” (the expression wrongly superimposes the filmic sociability made possible by the Internet and

the skills this sociability allows spectators to gain) has for us a double interest. First, it allows us to understand better ordinary cinephiles, as well as the efforts of informed consumers to develop the quality of their cinematographic leisure time – what may be termed film enthusiasts’ *agency*. The Internet gives them a visibility by keeping track of what cinema addiction leads them to do (such as look for information, discuss or argue with other film enthusiasts, write testimonies, and such like). Second, this exploration informs us about how the Internet strengthens the spectator’s *agency* and may thus contribute to the cinema consumer’s *empowerment*, four dimensions of which may be defined in terms of: information, access to films, publishing of one’s own judgment and archiving:

(1) Increasing information quantity and ways to manage this.

With the increasing number of films available on small screens (web and cable television), both for browsing and viewing purposes, selection tools have multiplied on the Internet. The main three examples are the databases organized according to the classical pattern of the “film information sheet”; the websites hosting user comments; and those hosting movie trailers and film excerpts, such as YouTube and DailyMotion. These three types of sites often include hyperlinks to each other. When reading about a film on IMDb, for instance, you may either choose to return to “user comments” or “external reviews,” even if the film is very marginal. Should you wonder whether it is really advisable to buy a copy of *BATWOMAN*, a 1978 Mexican exploitation flick, the seller’s website, *Video Search Of Miami*, will link you directly to a four-minute excerpt on YouTube.



Fig. 1: Example of a specialist on-line supplier catering for contemporary cinephiles.

All this information is more reliable than film information in the past, because of its *visibility*. Any information, description, or classification sheet on the web is likely to be read by a specialist, who is likely to find any mistake in it and to report this to the site’s web master.

The question at stake is how to find what we are really looking for, and suspect may be hiding somewhere. On IMDb, the number of possible keywords associated with scripts has become gigantic, as has the number of marginal sub-genres – for instance, *Video Search Of Miami* offers the following sub-categories: *Ameritrash*, *Blaxploitation*, *Female/Vixens!*, *Giallo*, *Mondo*, *Weird/Bizarre*, *Deranged Porn*, etc. Using search engines with a selection of keywords is the main activity of “cinephiles 2.0.”

Sometimes this browsing turns into a game, as databases may be used more as a form of play than to find a film. Many daily games based on identifying film pictures or quotes, each more obscure than the others, are offered to web users keen on cinema.⁸

The activity of checking information after viewing a film is also worth mentioning. Any quotation, allusion or double-entendre in the film can be checked later on the web, which entails a democratization of decoding – accordingly the concept of the “happy few” has largely disappeared. When you enter a film’s title in a search engine, you know that at least one fan has already listed all the references it includes. IMDb, the largest Internet database, has even permanently added an intertextual section to each of its film information sheets, “quoted in/quoted by.” This expertise also works in a developmental way, as a kind of collective intelligence. On the web, the significance of a film is more than the sum total of its different interpretations: what matters most is the link between them, which creates a cluster of interwoven significances made up of “all that the film may mean.” This blurred cluster is completely opposed to the clear and definite significance favored by academic cinephilia, whose aim is to point to “all that the film does mean.”⁹ There is no such thing as a unity of meaning on the web, only a cloud of more or less reliable opinions and pieces of information, whose coexistence creates something new... It is up to anyone to build his/her own interpretation, like the model cinephile represented by the one-time critic of *Cahiers du Cinéma*, Serge Daney, who declared late in his life: “This is all I can do now, find common points between the few films I watch” – drawing on the stimulation and the interpretative tools offered by the comments on the film posted by other users.¹⁰

(2) Access to films and “transmediality.”

The digital age allows us to choose the technical support on which we want to watch a film. Among the many possibilities, you may decide on watching it in a theater, buying it on DVD or Blu-ray, renting a video, or downloading an illegal copy. All these options are different, and you have to make your choice according to various criteria (time, money, technical requirements...). Speaking of “the” film is also simplistic in the case of “transmedial stories,” which come in a variety of forms, which may include being transformed into television series, video games, books, or comics. And even if the film is not part of a transmedial universe, it will

still be available in several versions, whether the latter impact on its very substance (“uncut versions”) or its official paratext (bonuses including exclusive interviews, deleted scenes and bloopers).

(3) Posting and comparing opinions.

If the two above-mentioned forms of activity can be somewhat minimal (sometimes just a few mouse clicks), posting and comparing opinions require more energy. Following the logic of the DIY spirit,¹¹ the web-surfing film enthusiast can compare, in written form, his/her judgment with that of a professional critic. He can post what formerly was only an oral opinion expressed in discussions with friends or relatives (apart from those fans who previously published their opinions in fanzines or film-club bulletins). The exercise attracts a vast number of people, who are thus able to browse a huge amount of criticism very easily.¹²

Online publishing is not fixed or definitive, due to the interactivity allowed by many websites. Any web surfer giving his/her opinion is likely to be proved false by the next user and will thus be led, if s/he wants to discuss the issue, to specify his/her argument. Reading this verbal ping-pong game, we can have a better idea of the film, than when we read a single professional review, which leaves us no choice but to accept its literary interpretation. And even if we may “read between the lines” of a review written by a journalist of a magazine that we are familiar with, the same does not hold for a professional review randomly found on the Internet, and published in a magazine we have never encountered before.

Posting opinions on the Internet also entails a change related to the decreasing importance of geographical localization. Place no longer matters as long as you are connected to the “network.” Whether you live in the Latin Quarter in Paris or the suburbs of Vladivostok does not really change anything: you will still be able to watch the same quantity of films on the Internet. Whatever your tastes, you will be a few mouse clicks away from “a soul mate in a remote place,” which means that fandom develops more easily.

(4) Production and online availability of User-Generated Content about the film (audio-visual DIY).

For the contemporary cinephile, a potential form of activity consists of producing and publishing on-line User-Generated Content (UGC) “about” a film, whether to prolong its existence, mock / pay homage to / or criticize it. Re-appropriation and poaching have long been processes for many spectators, as Richard Hoggart had already noted in the 1950s in his observation of the British working-class audience.¹³ The subsequent decades have simply accelerated this tendency, aided by technical progress and the decreasing price of digital audio-visual equipment. This technological boom has entailed an increase in *meta-spectators* sensitive to the “mak-

ing of” mode (to quote Roger Odin), that is to say, less interested in the storyline than in the details typically given in the “making of” section of the DVD edition of a film (both as a source of information on how the film was made, and on the film as a model to imitate).¹⁴ There has thus been an increase in the number of spectators involved in what is now commonly referred to as *self-medias*. Home-movies, fan-films, mashups, machinimas, parodies, false trailers, etc.¹⁵ These are very common today on the Internet and on “collaborative remix zones.”¹⁶ These products may also be seen as reified ways of looking at works of art, views of an original work of art that are reified in a satellite work of art. This is how we can consider “consumption as another form of production.”¹⁷ You may express your “way of taking a look at a film” without having to produce one. Any researcher aiming to prove that this situation is more crucial than the film as text, may turn to public expressions of creative involvement and re-appropriation through a simple look at a film.



Fig. 2: *Emergency Broadcast Zone*: a “collaborative remix zone” where consumption is another form of production.

(5) Archiving and online availability.

Last but not least, the institutionalization of cinema (with museums, universities, schools, state funding...) has been paralleled by a privatization of the history of

cinema. Agency also means *conservation*: archiving and personal collections, personal subtitles, circulating a copy as a proselytizing mode of celebrating a film you love. Allard identifies some sites, based on user comments, as offering “a cinematographic goldmine of rare, exotic, forgotten or little known films, which may be referred to as a *kinoscape*,” to quote anthropologist Arjun Appadurai. According to her, this network of “film-men,” far from having a negative impact on the cinema industry it pirates, “has a patrimonial function” through “the sharing of a mass of memories.”¹⁸

Conclusion: Transmitting Cinema Culture

The usual confusion between cinephilia and the transmission of cinema heritage, originated by the directors of the Nouvelle Vague posing as model cinephiles, has been cogently epitomized by Christian Keathley in his celebration of cinephilia. This advocates the necessity to reactivate “the spirit and the theory of the beginnings,” to bring back the spirit of the *Cahiers du Cinéma*, which he regards as “pure cinephilia,” so as to “reconstruct or reinvent the sense of the sacred, of the immortal” that spectators of the past had.¹⁹ This type of discourse stressing the spirit – namely the reverence and loyalty to cinema as an art – and the science of the cinephiles of the Nouvelle Vague, contributes to making the cinephile a quite distinct character (the cinema connoisseur) from the simple regular spectator. Cinephilia thus refers here to the cultural heritage kept by a few independent directors and a community of demanding spectators, who feel threatened by the “violence of the cultural industry” and the cynicism of a system in which the “visibility of a film” is inversely proportional to its “actual importance,” were it not for the resistance organized by critics, festival and film library programmers and directors, and cinema web sites.

This vision of the cinephile’s behavior raises a problem, since it claims a monopoly of the transmission of cinema culture. It is especially contradicted by the behavior of the very cinephiles it takes as its models, who admired not only the rare films they rediscovered with such emotion, but also highly commercial films which had seduced them, like all the spectators of the time, except that *they* were able to discern their artistic dimension. Unless you deny the inherent uncertainty in cinema and decide on the quality of a film even before watching it, the idea according to which “all films are born free and equal in rights” is, as André Bazin liked to emphasize, the very principle, both ethical and aesthetic, of this type of cinema expertise.

Identifying cinema culture with academic cinephilia, namely the type of expertise conveyed by the educational system, from school to university, should not lead us to forget that the life, reproduction and the evolution of cinema as an art depends, as Erwin Panofsky noted, on the film market, namely on the regular and renewed consumption of film releases by successive generations (Panofsky,

1934). Taking into account the effect of schooling on consumer behavior, and parents' recognition of the necessity to give their children an artistic educational background requires one to recognize the effect of consumption on users, and the way it allows to train and develop their judgment, outside of school.

Diagnosing the decline or disappearance of cinephilia amounts to forgetting the way each generation has learned to love cinema, and to mistaking cinephilia for some historical form of cinema consumption. Cinema culture thus refers successively to the culture of consumers dependent on theaters and only able to watch the year's releases, and to that of consumers who enjoy the diversification of modes of screening and the opportunity to watch the masterpieces of the past very regularly, as well as of consumers who can, with new domestic digital equipment, organize their own screenings themselves, and are thus free from the temporal and spatial frameworks of traditional commercial distribution and programming. This process, which ended with the domestication of film, implies taking into account not only the uses of films, but also the uses of oneself as a spectator, which may vary for the same individual according to the leisure moment concerned, as well as to his/her age. Reducing the behavior of the cinephile to regular contact with a collection of specific objects, or to participation in a single community of interpretation is thus extremely problematic in this context. It would be equivalent to underestimating the diversity of the forms of cinematographic sociability – on one's own, with one's spouse, family, or friends – through which cinema pleasure is cultivated and transmitted. It would also be equivalent to underestimating the dimension of personal culture, which forbids one to reduce film culture to a mere technical culture since it entails the idea that filmic pleasure is rooted in a specific temporal and spatial framework. At the most, we may recognize the sophistication of the legitimate cinematographic pleasure resulting from the multiplication of exchange spaces and of the proto-professionalization of judgment that allows some cinephiles today to literally make their own cinema for themselves, by relying on the most singular filmic objects. The different ages of cinephilia (Jullier and Leveratto, 2010) may thus be identified through the diversification of the ways to legitimately express one's love for cinema:

The three ages of cinema consumption: diversification of film consumption practices and film culture evolution

	1910-1950	1950-1980	1980-2010
Stages	<i>Generalization of cinema experience</i>	<i>Privatization of experience</i>	<i>Re-localization of experience</i>
Consumption means accessible to all	<i>Commercial theaters</i>	<i>Theaters/film clubs/ home-viewing (TV, video recorder)</i>	<i>Theaters/ Art houses/ individual screens</i>
Cinephile's discourse	Classical <i>Knowledge of quality and experienced consumer's expertise</i>	Modern <i>Knowledge of quality, love of art and film culture</i>	Post-modern <i>Knowledge of quality, film culture and screen culture (singular experience)</i>

It is this very evolution which explains the contemporary phenomenon of the “consecration of amateur culture,” of the recognition of the fan’s empowerment, and of the possibility of basing a historical study of cinephilia on one’s teenage memories; this discourse expressing both a love for the cinema of the past and a quest for new filmic ventures – a characteristic feature of any type of cinephilia.

To quote this paper : Laurent Jullier and Jean-Marc Leveratto, "Cinephilia in the Digital Age", Audiences, Ian Christie dir., coll. “The Key Debates. Mutations and Appropriations in European Film Studies”, Vol. III, Amsterdam, Amsterdam University Press, 2012, p. 143-154 + 262-265.

10. Pascal Boyer, *Religion Explained: The Human Instincts That Fashion Gods, Spirits and Ancestors* (London: William Heinemann, 2001).
11. For the relation between body disgust and delimitation from out groups like casteless and other ethnicities see Valerie Curtis, and Adam Biran, "Dirt, Disgust, and Disease: Is Hygiene in Our Genes?" *Perspectives in Biology and Medicine* 44, no. 1. (2001): 17-31.
12. Konrad Lorenz, *On Aggression* (Orlando, FL.: Harcourt Brace, 1966); James B. Averill, "Grief: Its Nature and Significance," *Psychological Bulletin* 70, no. 6 (1968): 721-748; Irenäus Eibl-Eibesfeldt, *The Biology of Peace and War* (Great Britain: Thames and Hudson, 1979); Eibl-Eibesfeldt, *Human Ethology* (New York: Aldine de Gruyter, 1989); and Grodal, *Embodied Visions*.
13. Jaak Panksepp, and Günther Bernatzky, "Emotional Sounds and the Brain: The Neuro-affective Foundations of Musical Appreciation," *Behavioural Processes* 60 (2002): 133-155.
14. Jonathan Haidt, and Selin Kasebir, "Morality," in *Handbook of Social Psychology*, eds. S. Fiske, D. Gilbert, and G. Lindzey (Hoboken, N.J.: Wiley, 2010), 797-832.
15. Alexandra Marayanski, and Jonathan Turner, *The Social Cage: Human Nature and the Evolution of Society* (Palo Alto: Stanford University Press, 1992).
16. Candace S. Alcorta, and Richard Sosis, "Ritual, Emotion, and Sacred Symbols: The Evolution of Religion as an Adaptive Complex," *Human Nature* 16, no. 4 (2005): 323-359.
17. Robert Boyd, and Peter Richerson, "The Evolution of Human Ultrasociality," in *In-doctrinability, Ideology and Warfare*, eds. Irenäus Eibl-Eibesfeldt and Frank Kemp Salter (New York: Berghahn Books, 1998), 71-93.
18. Pascal Boyer, *Religion Explained: The Human Instincts That Fashion Gods, Spirits and Ancestors* (London: William Heinemann, 2001).
19. David Sloan Wilson, *Darwin's Cathedral: Evolution, Religion, and the Nature of Society* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2002).
20. Pascal Boyer, and Pierre Liénard, "Why Ritualized Behavior? Precaution Systems and Action Parsing in Developmental, Pathological and Cultural Rituals," *Behavioral and Brain Sciences* 29, no. 6 (2006): 1-56.
21. Tzvetan Todorov, *The Fantastic: A Structural Approach to Literary Genre* (Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1975).
22. For an analysis of the salience of paradoxes and counterintuitive elements see Boyer, *Religion Explained*, and Ara Norenzayan et al., "Memory and Mystery: The Cultural Selection of Minimally Counterintuitive Narratives," *Cognitive Science* 30 (2006): 531-553.
23. See Boyer, and Pierre Liénard, "Why Ritualized Behavior?"

Cinephilia in the Digital Age

1. David Bordwell, "Games Cinephiles Play," 3 August 2008, last modified 23 July 2010, <http://www.davidbordwell.net/blog/2008/08/03/games-cinephiles-play>.
2. Pierre Bourdieu, *Distinction: A Social Critique of the Judgment of Taste* [1979], trans. Richard Nice (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1984), 26-27.

3. See Laurent Jullier, and Jean-Marc Leveratto, "The Consumer as an Expert. French Cinephilia Now," in *The French Cinema Book*, 2nd ed., eds. M. Temple and M. Witt (London: BFI Publishing, in press).
4. John Lyden, *Film as Religion: Myths, Morals, and Rituals* (New York: NYU Press, 2003), 4.
5. See Antoine Hennion, "Réflexivités. L'activité de l'amateur," *Réseaux* 1, no. 153 (2009).
6. Theo Panayides, who "lives and works in Cyprus and cyberspace" tells in his autobiographical article for *Senses of Cinema* that he is a "film-buff shaped almost entirely by the VCR. The reasons are geographical rather than aesthetic, yet I suspect my experience would be broadly similar even if I lived in the US or a big European city." For him, nostalgia for the movie theaters, to his eyes, typically reflects the taste of those who used to live (and still live) in these big cities ("Permanent Ghosts: Cinephilia in the Age of the Internet and Video, Essay 2," *Senses of Cinema* 4 (March 2000); available at <http://archive.sensesofcinema.com>).
7. Jonathan Buchsbaum, and Elena Gorfinkel, eds., "Cinephilia Dossier: What Is Being Fought for by Today's Cinephilia(s)?" *Framework* 50 (fall 2009): 176-270.
8. Among the numerous websites are "Name That Film" (on <http://www.flickr.com>), and this one specialized in memorable quotes, <http://twitter.com/dvdquotes>. The most well known in France is (note the very "distinguished" allusion in the title) "Le Rosebud de Xanadu 2 – RDX" (on Facebook). Its official tagline: "Tell whose movie these stills belong to! so you can both play and learn': this is the concept of our modest but, shall we say, marvellous group." One can even find a dedicated iPhone app: "What Movie Is This From?" (<http://wmitf.com>).
9. "Is able to express/must express...": Ludwig Wittgenstein's dichotomy brought into the framework of cultural appreciation by Michel de Certeau (Michel De Certeau, *The Practice of Everyday Life*, trans. Steven F. Rendall (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1984), 212, when he quotes Wittgenstein's slogan: "Don't ask for the meaning, ask for the use").
10. According to Girish Shambu, this is the bedrock of cinephilia on the internet: to be able to find links and bridges between movies that would have been considered totally unmatchable years ago ("What Is Being Fought for by Today's Cinephilia (s)," *Framework* 50:1-2 (spring-summer 2009): 219.
11. *Do It Yourself*. The term appears in the mid-1950s in the semantic field of home improvement projects, which could be seen as originating from the anti-industrial Arts and Crafts movement. It then moved into the punk rock scene and the indie-media networks, and today defines an ethic of self-sufficiency in any field.
12. Old-fashioned cinephilia remains reluctant to acknowledge this rush of personal reviews and appreciations: "Not surprisingly, contemporary cinephilia finds its strongest expression in the blogs and online magazines written by indiscriminating fans, would-be critics, serious scholars and the usual malcontents, along with review sites like DVDBeaver, run by geeks whose fetishistic attention to technical detail mirrors that of hard-core audiophiles. [...] Much of what is online originates with entertainment companies, and many independent sites do rely on commercial links for support." This apocalyptic portrayal was offered by Manohla Dargis, chief

film critic of the *New York Times*. Her article ("The Way We Live Now: The 21st-Century Cinephile," November 14, 2004) was intended to prove the continuing usefulness and validity of Susan Sontag's notoriously bitter essay "The Decay of Cinema" ("You hardly find anymore, at least among the young, the distinctive cinephilic love of movies that is not simply love of but a certain taste in films...," *New York Times*, February 25, 1996. The same melancholia is evident in Camille Paglia's "Art Movies: R.I.P.," *Salon*, 8 August, 2007). The counter-argument can be found within Dargis's article: the ordinary web surfer is like her, that is to say, she knows how to distinguish between the variety of addresses, rhetorical devices and forms of enunciation found on websites, and is able to classify the kind of information she finds in them. And for the "certain taste," this is still present, although one needs to be skilful to discover it on the web, due to the quantity of available information.

13. Richard Hoggart, *The Uses of Literacy* [1957] (London: Penguin, 2007).
14. Roger Odin, "The Distrustful Citizen and the Crisis of Communication" (paper presented at the XXIV Congreso Internacional de Comunicación "IMAGEing Reality," Navarra, Spain, in press).
15. Here are a few examples, drawn only from American sci-fi works: numerous fan films, building the "Extended Universe" of Lucas' STAR WARS saga, can be found at <http://www.theforce.net> (for an insight and a taxonomy, see L. Jullier, "Le cinéma comme matière première. L'exemple des fan-films Star Wars," in *Proceedings of the XVI International Film Studies Conference-Permanent Seminar on History of Film Theories. In the Very Beginning, at the Very End*, 2009. *Film Theories in Perspective*, eds. F. Casetti, J. Gaines, V. Re. (Udine: Forum, 2010), 381-387; machinimas are short home-made videos derived from videogames cinematics. Sophisticated examples can be found at <http://www.labo-nt2.uqam.ca> (Laboratoire de Recherche sur les Techniques Hypermédiatiques de l'UQAM, Montréal, Canada); mashups are made after re-cutting already existing feature films. A good example is the crossover trailer TERMINATOR vs. ROBOCOP, by AMDS (<http://spiritsnodeal.canalblog.com>); parodies are countless. Among hundreds of thousands, see this astonishing fake trailer of THE MATRIX RELOADED (<http://www.cigogne.net/Intro-Maytrix.html>), mixing the original trailer with a fake soundtrack displaying gimmicks of a very peculiar subculture (car-tuning fans living in Elsass, East of France); on the contrary, home-made fake trailers can be very respectful of the original work. See another French example at <http://dsarrio.free.fr>: DAREDEVIL, the teaser, shot in professional super-35mm by David Sarrio before the original Hollywood blockbuster of the same name was released. "I didn't own any copyright, but I tried. I kept thinking they wouldn't send the lawyers to fight a pure fanship attitude," remembers the young director (<http://ombhailum.canalblog.com>).
16. "Collaborative remix zones move away from immobilized and apolitical fetishistic image worship into the construction of collaborative communities where new knowledges and new connections can be actualized within a radical historiographic practice." (Patricia Zimmerman and Dale Hudson, "Cinephilia, Technophilia and Collaborative Remix Zones," *Screen* 50:1 (spring 2009): 145). In these real or virtual places whose names speak for themselves (*Emergency Broadcast Network*, *Trafficking in the Archives*, *Cinema Salvaje...*), veejays mix audiovisual objects from a huge range of

cultures. For example, *Cinema Salvaje* uses “fragments of the telenovelas that circulate as part of transnational bootlegged ‘clip culture’ on YouTube before they are removed at the request of copyright owners” (*ibid.*). This is no longer a cinephilia which mourns for a fetishized past of lost unique objects, but a practical cinephilia ignoring or contesting the institutionalized artistic tastes.

17. De Certeau, *The Practice of Everyday Life*, 31.
18. Laurence Allard, “Y a-t-il encore un spectateur dans le salon? Plaidoyer pour le spectacle télévisuel à l’heure des médias numériques,” *Quaderni*, no. 31 (1997): 7-18. Available at <http://www.persee.fr/web/revues/home/prescript/revue/quad>.
19. Christian Keathley, *Cinephilia and History, or the Wind in the Trees* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2006), 28.

~~Spectator, Film and the Mobile Phone~~

1. ~~Mobile phones are known by different terms in almost every language: portable (French), Handy (German), telefonino (Italian), and within the Anglo-American world, as either cell-phones (US) or mobiles (UK). Portable has been translated throughout this chapter as “mobile,” to preserve the sense of the cameraphone’s mobility.~~
2. ~~This thesis is defended by Sean Cubitt in “The Cut,” in *The Cinema Effect* (Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 2004).~~
3. ~~See for example, Dudley Andrew, “A Film Aesthetic to Discover,” *CiNeMAS* 17, no. 2-3 (autumn 2007): 47-72.~~
4. ~~The answers to this question vary: in face of those who think that the digital blocks indexicality [Lev Manovitch, “Cinema and Digital Media,” in *Perspektiven der Medienkunst / Perspectives of Media Art*, ed. Jeffrey Shaw and Hans Peter Schwarz (Osfieldern: Cantz Verlag, 1996)], there are more nuanced positions [D. N. Rodowick, *The Virtual Life of Film* (Cambridge & London Harvard University Press, 2007)], while others emphasize the significance of context [Lawrence Jullier, “Theories of Cinema and Common Sense: The Mimetic Question,” in *The Theory of Cinema Finally in Crisis*, ed. R. Odin, *CiNeMAS* 17, no. 2-3 (autumn 2007): 109-116].~~
5. ~~Siegfried Zielinski, *Audiovisions: Cinema and Television as Entr’actes in History* (Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 1999). Paolo Cherchi Usai, *The Death of Cinema: History, Cultural Memory, and the Digital Dark Age* (London: BFI Publishing, 2001).~~
6. ~~For example, Maxime Scheinfeigel, ed., *Le Cinéma et après?* (Rennes: Presses Universitaires de Rennes, 2010) not only has no article on the mobile phone, but makes scarcely any reference to it. “This deals with a completely unexplored territory,” writes Elena Marcheschi, introducing one of the few books on this subject: *I film in tasca. Videofonino, e televisione cinema*, eds. Maurizio Ambrosini, Giovanna Maina, Elena Marcheschi (Pisa: Felici Editore, 2009), 29.~~
7. ~~Roger Odin, “Pour une sémio-pragmatique du cinéma,” *Iris* 1, no. 1 (1983): 67-82. English translation in *The Film Spectator, From Sign to Mind*, ed. Warren Buckland (Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 1995), 213-227, reprinted in R. Stam and T. Miller, eds., *Film and Theory. An Anthology* (Malden & Oxford: Blackwell, 2000), 54-67.~~