



FILM
CULTURE

IN TRANSITION

THE CINEMA OF
ATTRACTIONS
RELOADED

EDITED BY

WANDA STRAUVEN

AMSTERDAM UNIVERSITY PRESS

The Hollywood Cobweb: New Laws of Attraction

(The Spectacular Mechanics of Blockbusters)

Dick Tomasovic

The metaphor is not new: the cinema, like a cobweb, traps the spectator's gaze. This quasi-hypnotic preoccupation of the image rules nowadays contemporary Hollywood production, and more specifically what forms today a type of film as precise as large, the blockbuster. If the analysis of these extremely popular, very big budget entertainment films, produced in the heart of new intermediality, can be based mainly on questions of intertextuality,¹ it can also, far from any definitive definition, be fuelled by a rich and complex network of notions which carries along in its modern rush the term of attraction.

The Spider Spins Its Web

During the 1980s, while the concept of the "cinema of attractions" entered the academic world to redefine early cinema, a series of young contemporary film directors forgot about film history and created their own style of visually aggressive films, eager to quickly surpass their models, Steven Spielberg and George Lucas, godfathers of new Hollywood, and to propose a purely playful, almost fairground cinema, entirely devoted to the only pleasure of the shocking images.

Twenty years later, three of them established themselves as new kings of Hollywood, and some film critics, at times poorly informed about film theory,² inscribed them in a long cinema of attractions history: James Cameron, Peter Jackson and Sam Raimi. In spite of the obvious differences of their cinematic writing and their sensibility, these three film directors share numerous common points. All three began in the 1980s with small and limited budget genre films, in a parodic, nonconformist, and school kid spirit (Cameron signed³ *PIRANHA 2* in 1981, Sam Raimi realized his first *EVIL DEAD* in 1981 as well, and Peter Jackson finished his good named *BAD TASTE* in 1987). These works, overtly intended for a teenager public, suffer a lack of scenario, and turn out to be only fed by some insults to the good taste and, especially, a crafty profusion of funny visual tricks.

These small productions allowed them to play a "one-man band" and sharpen their sense of the spectacular. The creation of funny images and breathtaking sequences – to borrow the vocabulary from the circus which suits them well – will determine just as much their trademark as their business. In this way, they are the heirs, distant but real, of Georges Méliès's cinema. They will sign several gigantic hits during the 1990s and 2000s, joining Lucas and Spielberg in the little circle of American Top Ten box-office.⁴

Each one of them achieves such an exploit by importing into cinema a marginal universe he knows well (the catastrophic imagination of romanticism, mixed with anticipation for Cameron,⁵ heroic fantasy for Peter Jackson⁶ and comic-books for Sam Raimi⁷). Above all, these three filmmakers, unlike Jan de Bont or Michael Bay for example, abandoned the cinema of permanent spectacular, of all attraction, in order to find, in the style of Spielberg and Lucas, some attachment to the narrative, the characters, and the serial writing. But despite of what has often been written, the exhibition (or *monstration*) does no longer help revitalize the narration as it was the case with Spielberg and Lucas, on the contrary it uses the story as a springboard allowing to spring at the right time, strengthening its brilliant power. Consequently, the history of cinema and particularly the concept of the "cinema of the attractions" can help enlighten certain characteristics of this new type of blockbuster.

The success of the "cinema of attractions" concept, notably among the new generation of young researchers, could probably be explained by its paradoxical qualities: it seems precise and misty at the same time. Coined with rigor on the basis of a clearly defined historical corpus of film practices until 1908, identifying a *dispositif* that is radically different from, or even opposite to,⁸ the well known one of classical narrative cinema (mainly in its mode of address to the spectator), the concept very quickly knew uncountable changes, deformations and corruptions, offering a new tool of approach, sometimes a little bit hazy, that allowed to simply evoke the superiority of exhibition over narration in the most various film practices. These exercises of distortion reached such proportions that some people ended up writing that there simply never existed a cinema of attractions, or, at least, not as a homogeneous, historically bounded, object.⁹ The expression itself knows, at least in French, different appearances, such as "cinéma-attraction,"¹⁰ "cinématographie-attraction,"¹¹ "image-attraction,"¹² or simply "attraction."

In brief, the concept seems to have something malleable, which makes it extremely problematic. This particular nature invites, of course, film theorists and historians to seize the concept and enlarge its definition, corrupt it in other corpora and widen its field of application. The cinema of attractions becomes itself an attraction, whose swallowing power has nothing to envy to the character of Williamson's famous *THE BIG SWALLOW* (1901). It is not necessary to remind

that Tom Gunning himself, ventured to widen the concept's reach by asserting that the attractions constitute a visual mode of address to the spectator not only in early cinema but also in other periods of film history. Gunning quotes pornography, the musical, newsreels, and even, in a more general way, classical cinema in which attractions would survive, allowing interaction between spectacle and narration.¹³ Since then, similar propositions, by different scholars, grew in numbers.¹⁴

Using the case study of *SPIDER-MAN*, this article will also contribute to widen a little more the notion of attraction. The two episodes of this film, recently realized by Sam Raimi for Sony Pictures and dedicated to the adventures of the popular hero of the comics firm Marvel, update very literally the analogy of attraction force between cinema and cobweb, captivating and capturing millions of spectators throughout the world. The analysis of *SPIDER-MAN 1* (SM1, 2002) and *SPIDER-MAN 2* (SM2, 2004) will allow understanding how the history of concepts can make a return and how early films can help us to watch contemporary Hollywood cinema...¹⁵

The Spectacular in Question

"Spectacular" was surely the adjective most used not only by film critics but also by the studio to qualify the two episodes of *SPIDER-MAN*. The film is in line with the profound definition of Hollywood cinema.

As everyone knows, the consumption culture took a decisive turn at the end of the 1970s to triumph in the 1980s. It came along with a visual aggressiveness carried out by a new generation of filmmakers, heirs of a long lineage of American directors that possibly goes back to Cecil B. de Mille. These filmmakers rediscovered the taste of the spectacular, which was somewhat forgotten by Hollywood. If we look into the etymology of the French word *spectaculaire*, we find an ancestor less neutral, coined around 1770 in the field of the theater: *spectaculeux*. This term indicates a surplus of spectacle, an excess, an ostentatious sign of spectacle as machine, as apparatus.¹⁶ And, indeed, it is this exhibitionist and megalomaniac determination that characterized, about two centuries later, the films of Steven Spielberg and George Lucas, unbeatable filmmakers of the spectacular.

If *JAWS* (1975) and *STAR WARS* (1977) signal the return of great narration in Hollywood,¹⁷ they also aspire to visual shocks that unmistakably produce grandiloquent images in a story full of new developments and repetitions (the serial mode favoring, in fact, the prominence of attractions). The most exemplary sequence of this cinema remains, for a whole generation, the attack of the Death

Star by the small star fighters of the Rebel Alliance in *STAR WARS*, a sequence of pure demonstration of the subjective camera's power and fast forward tracking, indefatigably repeated since in Hollywood as a magic formula which allows to fasten the spectator in his seat and hypnotize him by reproducing visual sensations very close to those offered by spectacles of pyrotechnics and speed.¹⁸

Lucas himself declared that his films are more closely related to amusement park rides than a play or a novel.¹⁹ In the 1980s, the link between Hollywood and amusement parks became more and more vivid. In the line of the Disney project, films provided inspiration for fairground attractions (a tendency that today seems to be reversed²⁰), and the first interactions between cinema and video games began to take shape (see, for example, the physical treatment of the main character or the astonishing narration in *DIE HARD* [John McTiernan, 1988]) before becoming a rule these days (the *Matrix* project incorporates the plot of a video game into the story of the brothers Wachowski's trilogy, the numberless licenses of the *Star Wars* games, the attempts to impose on movies characters from games such as Lara Croft, etc.). The teenage audience becomes gradually the main target of an entertainment which wants to dazzle the gaze, with an audiovisual inflation as working principle. The audience wants to get his money's worth. The art of screenwriting loses its rights to the advantage of the creation of stunning images...

"Striking," "surprising," "stunning," "awesome" were some of the epithets given to Raimi's films whose hero is generally qualified this way (the most popular comics series dedicated to his adventures is entitled "Amazing Spider-Man"). It is true that *SM1* and *SM2* can be seen as results of the new Hollywood policy, devoted to the project of the ultimate blockbuster. The attraction is the golden rule. It concerns the gaze (vertiginous effects, shocks of colors, speed of camera movements and editing, grandiloquence of special effects) and the body in exhibition (after all the film is about a boy and a girl and maybe, more exactly, about what happens to the body of a young boy when he is attracted by another body²¹).

Besides, the crowd scenes (the parade of Thanksgiving Day in Time Square in *SM1*, the permanent heavy traffic in the main avenues, the swarming streets of hurried pedestrians, etc.), the aerial shots of an excessive metropolis (New York City, idealized, is reconstructed using its most famous administrative centers, but also other city fragments, real²² or imaginary), the images of acrobatic exploits between vertiginous buildings and gigantic billboards, the apocalyptic battles scenes in the subway, cafés or banks, insist on the modern experience of urban life, its unpredictable irruption of aggressiveness, which distracts the *flâneur*, and which attractions have to compete with, as we know.²³

Moreover and, in a certain way, like the films of Georges Méliès, the surprise is the operating mode of the film (when Peter and his aunt ask for a loan to the

bank, Octopus brutally appears to rob it; when Peter reconciles with M.J. in a café, the promise of a kiss is pulverized by a car thrown in the window of the building, etc.). The film's nervous rhythm and its scopic impulses (in particular the gripping editing effects, such as the stunning cross-cutting, seen through the eye of the protagonists, between the birth of the Green Goblin and the waking up of the teenager) are other syndromes of a certain conception of the spectacular here envisaged.

The Mechanics of Attraction

But what is really amazing in SM1 and SM2, is the presence of some notions inherited from the historiography of early cinema, or the theory of its history, and comes under the concept of the cinema of attractions. Far from willing to make up an exhaustive list of inherited elements, I suggest here some possible connections between early cinema and contemporary blockbusters.

1. *Moving Image Machine*. SPIDER-MAN, like all films recently adapted from Marvel comics, begins with the logo of the film production company of the famous publishing house. We see a lightning-fast succession of drawings, often in extreme close-up, that come from the adapted comic book. The tonality of the images and the set of colors refer to the film hero's outfit (red in SPIDER-MAN, green in THE HULK [Ang Lee, 2003], black in THE PUNISHER [Jonathan Heinisleigh, 2004], etc.). The sequence of the images is so fast that it is practically impossible to recognize the drawings. Like a disordered flipbook, the sequence shows an order of pages completely mixed up, preventing any animation of the superheroes. Inevitably, the gaze gets lost: the saturation of images is so intense, the effect of explosion and fragmentation so powerful, the graphics and the colors so lightning that the spectator is condemned to run after these images without being able to catch up with them. There is only the continuity of strong, dynamic and colorful images, really attractive images,²⁴ shown without any concern of narrative or chronological organization. These images tell nothing, their dazzling flashes bewilder the eye. Before finding the way of the early cinema (or maybe in order to find it), these sequences replay the attractions of the pre-cinema optical amusements.

Furthermore, in SPIDER-MAN, very strange title credits follow, in a 3D movement simulation, recalling the thrill ride of amusement parks²⁵ and announcing clearly its belonging to the cinema of attractions. The spectator is taken through cobwebs, rising scenery and the letters of the credits. The ride will be repeated right in the heart of the film, during the mutation of Parker in Spider-Man, and

will show obvious disruptions of his DNA. Ride sequences, like new impressive and autonomous visual prostheses, use effects of acceleration and losses of spatial marks. Their real purpose is to disturb the spectator's perceptions, to give him the sensation of a vertiginous mobility. Their sole legitimacy in the film is to impress the spectator, sometimes to his discomfort.²⁶ The sequence gives the tone: the gaze is not allowed to linger: it is excited, provoked, exhausted even before the beginning of the film.

2. *Exhibitionism*. Raimi's mise-en-scène seems to alternate spectacular actions sequences of titanic fights and stunning acrobatics (the Spider-Man aspect) with a love intrigue complicated by the agonies and vicissitudes of adolescent age (the Peter Parker aspect). Nevertheless, we must note that the opposition between the "system of monstrative attractions" and the "system of narrative integration" is not valid any longer here. According to the tradition of comics, the supernatural is attached to the character ("The Amazing Spider-Man"). Without the character, there is no attraction. The dichotomy narration/attraction becomes actually the condition of the attraction.

SM1 stages the transition from narration to attraction (the progressive discovery by the teenager of his power goes hand in hand with the progressive capacity of the cinema to dazzle in a long crescendo), whereas SM2 stages the crisis of the spectacular (the first scene, showing Peter Parker who delivers pizzas, is a parody of the spectacular moments of the first episode; later, the character doubts and loses his power: spectacular announced scenes lose then their magnificence for instance when Parker falls pitifully in an alley). The spectacular becomes then the catalyst of the emotion. As a matter of fact, the attraction becomes itself a suspense issue, and subject of this new cinema of attractions. The repetition of sequences from one film to the other (a building on fire, for example) and the serial aspect of all these new Hollywood films, telling incessantly the same history (the various versions of Terminator, the numberless wars in the LORD OF THE RINGS trilogy, etc.), fully participate in the expectation of the attraction sequence, as if it were some kind of a ritual.

Like early films, SPIDER-MAN proposes hence a profoundly exhibitionist system of the *image-attraction*,²⁷ because, after all, it is always a question of giving to see rather than of telling; moreover, the stories do not have much to tell (the story of Spider-Man has been told thousand times in the comics, just like everybody knows the history of TITANIC). Thus, these films appear as challenges to Hollywood who must manage to make spectacular and credible a young man walking on the wall in a ridiculous leotard. All in all, that's what it is about: giving a demonstration of know-how, while succeeding in amazing the public with visual spectacle.

This kind of cinema attracts the spectator to the spectacle of its technology, but, at the same time, aims at the fantastic element and transfers the attraction of the technology toward the diegetic. This is particularly evident in the sequences shot with the so-called "spider-cam"²⁸ which is constantly showing its own virtuosity while being completely subjected to the recording of the extraordinary acrobatics of the hero. The technological device exhibits itself while highlighting, above all, the extraordinary action of the diegesis offering throughout these bewildering moments a double attraction (the attraction of the film and the attraction of the *dispositif*).

3. *Phantom Rides*. The first films by Lumière, Gaumont, Edison or Biograph subjected the spectators of the turn of the century to a series of unusual visual experiments by taking as main topic and shooting device the railway vehicles, the trains or the subways. Early cinema fascination for fast space and vision modifications which shooting aboard allowed, powerful sensations of movement and speed, constructions of viewpoints which intensify the impressions of the locomotives' impetuosity, and exasperated visual pleasure of the *mobile* are well known today. In his work on early cinema, Livio Belloi lists under the term of "vues attentatoires"²⁹ (assailing views) attacks on the spectator: machines, locomotives, characters, landscapes charge at them. It is a cinema of effect and reaction.

In SM2, it seems that Raimi wants to re-conquer the fetish of these assailing views by proposing a complete catalogue of extreme visual possibilities provided by an elevated railway. The long scene is a fight between the hero and Octopus in and around the subway. To the mobility of the vehicle and the camera, Raimi adds the mobility of the protagonists who spin around the railway, and exploits all the places and available viewpoints (the roof of the subway, the inside, the left side, the right side, the head of the locomotive, etc.). Everything is in perpetual motion, until Spider-Man succeeds in slowing down the crazy race of the vehicle by stopping it with his own body in front of the train. This sequence presents some striking subjective viewpoints which show the end of the railway getting closer at full speed.

More generally, Raimi exaggerates the visual power of the assailing views by massively using the subjective camera and fast forward tracking, or amazing computer-generated rides which plunge the spectator into the meanders of improbable images. The *image-projectile* is a permanent feature of his cinema.

4. *The Emblematic Shot*. By the notion of "emblematic shot," of which the most known is still today the scene with the outlaw leader firing at the spectator in THE GREAT TRAIN ROBBERY (Edwin S. Porter, 1903), Noël Burch intended to define a sort of portrait appearing most of the times at the extremities of the film

(beginning or end) and whose semantic function consists in introducing or summarizing the chief element of the film.³⁰ The presentational function of the emblematic shot was frequent between, roughly speaking, 1903 and 1910.

I am tempted to write that SM1 and SM2 re-use a certain conception of the emblematic shot. It is a strong attraction, a limited moment of visual fascination, appearing at the extreme end of both films, and transforming the spectator into a distanced observer. It is an autonomous sequence that constitutes itself as a pure moment of visual happiness, unmotivated, dedicated to the acrobatics of Spider-Man. A very mobile camera hesitates between long shot, medium shot and big close-up of the hero's face, making of its mask the main motif.³¹ Autonomous, placed at the end of the film, like the emblematic shot in early films, this scene acts as last scopic bait, a last attraction. This very strong visual sequence is offered in a variety of forms, such as trailers, posters and animations on the DVD, becoming the emblem of the film.³²

5. *Addressing/Assailing the Spectator*. As a devil brutally taken out of its bag of tricks, Spider-Man appears towards the spectator, and stares him in the face. We cannot keep count of the shots where the characters, heroes or bad guys, are suddenly grimacing, in close-up towards the camera, even if this means going off screen rushing into the camera (the motif of the eye, the one of Green Goblin or Spider-man, swallowing the spectator is recurrent). Neither can we keep count of the sequences where projectiles (cobwebs, tentacles, explosive grenades, cornice fragments, cars, gorgeous young girls or defenseless old ladies) are thrown at top speed to the head of the spectator.

The screen seems to be ready to burst permanently in the direction of the spectator, as in the sequence of the missed fusion experiment in SM2: all the metallic elements of Dr. Octavius's laboratory are attracted by an unstable mass energy; screws are extracted of the walls, steel sheets snatch away from the ceiling, and windows blow up. A myriad of glass fragments assaults Octavius's wife, whose viewpoint the spectator takes up for some time. In slow motion, the woman's screaming face is reflected in the flying windows which get ready to slash her lethally. This reflection could be that of the frightened – or at least fascinated – spectator, who is directly aimed at by these threatening glass fragments. Unsurprisingly, the visual aggression comes along with a thundering soundtrack which participates in this particular mode of addressing the spectator. The camera's movements, moreover, contribute to interrupt the process of identification of classical narration. In SM2, strangely furious and vertiginous tracking shots (the director's specialty) go through buildings and window to be reflected, eventually, in the glasses of Octopus before bouncing all the more...

If the address of the spectator uses little the look at camera by actors, the narrative break and the reminder of the spectator's status is revealed by the

hyperbolic camera's movements, but also, among other things, by a series of referential shots (the surgical scene of Octopus's tentacles amputation, a wink at Raimi's faithful spectators in the direction of his previous films), and the recourse to the burlesque close-up (the insert of the spider which bites Peter into SM₁, a real visual moment, autonomous, striking and comic).

We also notice the hilarious intensification of the soundtrack which drags, at times, the film towards the side of animated cartoons. A series of sounds effects reminds the practices of figuralism and Mickey-Mousing rather than classic sound effects, as is shown by the curious noise of strong lashes that grotesquely emphasizes the camera's fast movements, or the way the heavy and threatening steps of Dr. Octopus organize the rhythm of the editing (a series of close-ups on the frightened faces of his next victims).

Caught in the Cobweb

In the continuation of the early cinema of attractions, Raimi's films take part in a vast culture of the consumer society. The gaze is even more fragmented than at the beginning of the last century, and the interactions between the different types of entertainment have multiplied. SPIDER-MAN incorporates some entertaining media and perpetually refers to them: comics (not only the story and the characters, but also the quotation of famous covers, striking drawings or logos of the publishing house³³), movies (quotations and different borrowings, such as the scene where the hero runs and opens his shirt to uncover his costume, a tribute to another adaptation of superhero: SUPERMAN [Richard Donner, 1978]), video games (the setup of cameras on moving bodies, alternating between the establishment shot from the ceiling and the subjective view of the characters; the unusual animations of the bodies of hero and villains), music videos (the fragmentation of editing, the concert of pop singer Macy Gray in SM₁), licensed products (the stereotyped positions of the characters for T-shirts and action figures, the reification of the bodies), etc. The film integrates them into its writing by referring to them. It is a perfect object of consumption because it creates the appeal of other products while synthesizing them. As we can see, SPIDER-MAN inherits and fully claims the tradition of spectacular entertainment, born with modernity and unmistakably connected to the urban mode of consumption. SPIDER-MAN, following the example of other recent big Hollywood successes, appropriates a series of elements enlightened by the concept of cinema of attractions. It builds itself in an effective perceptive trap and tries by all possible means to suspend the gaze, and maintain it in a perpetual state of fascination and subjugation.

In the center of the complex phenomena of intermediality and intertextuality, the blockbuster, as integral part of an economic and ideological system of extreme consumption of possessions and signs, has to reinvent its relation to the spectator. It is probably mostly in this sense that it re-encounters and renews the cinema of attractions. However, at the same time, the blockbuster, by integrating such a huge economic system, participates in replacing the spectator in a consumer, distancing itself, in such a degree that it would be useful to study, from the cinema of attractions such as it was defined for early cinema. Hollywood production, being too referential, does not propose a real break in terms of attraction and replays with enjoyment numerous artifices of the cinema of attractions. Nevertheless, it constitutes itself, blockbuster after blockbuster, in an aesthetics differentiated from the early cinema of attractions: its current mode of functioning is an overstatement with which it sentences itself to a logic of self-consuming and incessant hybridization, to a perpetual crisis of aesthetics.

Until Hollywood frees itself from this crisis, popular cinema, never forgetting its fairground origins, continues to appear as a gigantic cobweb which keeps the captive spectator in its center, eyes wide open.

Notes

1. See my work on the connections between contemporary blockbuster, film noir and gothic novel: *Le Palimpseste Noir. Notes sur l'impétigo, la terreur et le cinéma américain contemporain* (Crisnée: Yellow Now, 2002).
2. See, for example, the use of the term in José Arroyo, ed., *Action/Spectacle Cinema* (London: British Film Institute, 2000).
3. If James Cameron is credited, the producer Ovidio G. Assonitis edited the film without the director. Cameron will assume all the responsibilities on his following film: *THE TERMINATOR* (1984).
4. At the moment of writing this article, the films of the American top ten box-office are, in decreasing order: *TITANIC* (1997), *STAR WARS* (1977), *SHREK 2* (2004), *E.T. THE EXTRA-TERRESTRIAL* (1982), *STAR WARS I: THE PHANTOM MENACE* (1999), *SPIDER-MAN* (2002), *STAR WARS III: REVENGE OF THE SITH* (2005), *THE LORD OF THE RINGS: THE RETURN OF THE KING* (2003), *SPIDER-MAN 2* (2004), *THE PASSION OF THE CHRIST* (2004) (source IMDb).
5. *TITANIC* (1997) and *TERMINATOR 2: JUDGMENT DAY* (1991). *TERMINATOR 3: RISE OF THE MACHINES* (2003) was directed by Jonathan Mostow but produced by Cameron.
6. The trilogy of *THE LORD OF THE RINGS* (2001, 2002 and 2003).
7. *DARKMAN* (1990) allowed Raimi to work on *SPIDER-MAN 1* (2002) and, then, on *SPIDER-MAN 2* (2004). As for Cameron and Jackson, the critics and the audience approved by a large majority the "fidelity" to the original subject.

8. See Frank Kessler, "La cinématographie comme dispositif (du) spectaculaire," *CiNéMAS* 14.1 (Fall 2003): 21-34.
9. See Livio Belloï, *Le Regard retourné. Aspects du cinéma des premiers temps* (Québec/Paris: Nota Bene/Méridiens Klincksieck, 2001) 85.
10. Common in French newspapers and film reviews.
11. "Cinématographie-attraction" was first used by G.-Michel Coissac in 1925 (*Histoire du Cinématographe. De ses origines à nos jours* [Paris: Editions du Cinéopse/Librairie Gauthier-Villars, 1925] 359) and adopted by André Gaudreault in the 1990s. See André Gaudreault, "Les vues cinématographiques selon Georges Méliès, ou: comment Mitry et Sadoul avaient peut-être raison d'avoir tort (même si c'est surtout Deslandes qu'il faut lire et relire)," *Georges Méliès, l'illusionniste du fin de siècle?*, ed. Jacques Malthête and Michel Marie (Paris: Sorbonne Nouvelle/Colloque de Cerisy, 1997) 111-31. See also André Gaudreault, "From 'Primitive Cinema' to 'Kine-Attractionography,'" in the present volume.
12. According to Belloï, the *image-attraction* is a double exhibition: it says at the same time "Here I am" and "This is what I show." Belloï 84.
13. Tom Gunning, "Cinéma des attractions et modernité," *Cinémathèque* 5 (Spring 1994): 131. [English version: "The Whole Town's Gawking: Early Cinema and the Visual Experience of Modernity," *Yale Journal of Criticism* 7.2 (Fall 1994): 189-201.]
14. Questions often come from the development of the digital technology (digital special effects and new possibilities of interaction between film and spectator). See, for example, Bruno Cornellier, "Le sublime technologique et son spectateur dans le parc d'attraction. Nouvelles technologies et artefacts numériques dans JURASSIC PARK," *Cadrage* (2001): <http://www.cadrage.net/films/jurassik/jurassik.html>; or Viva Paci, "Cinéma de synthèse et cinéma des premiers temps: des correspondances examinées à la loupe du système des attractions," *Cinéma et Cie* 5 (Fall 2004): 112-14.
15. If we only use the example here of Raimi's SPIDER-MAN, a similar work could be done for the films by Cameron and Jackson, among others.
16. Philippe Roger, "Spectaculaire, histoire d'un mot," *Le Spectaculaire*, ed. Christine Hamon-Sirejols and André Gardies (Lyon: Aléas, 1997) 9-10. The term *spectaculaire* that replaces *spectaculeux* at the beginning of the 20th century means a weakening of its meaning. I will retain the idea of excess of the term *spectaculeux*.
17. See Pierre Berthomieu, *Le Cinéma Hollywoodien. Le temps du renouveau* (Paris: Nathan, 2003) 29.
18. Lucas will frequently reproduce this type of sequence, sometimes until the exhaustion of the gaze. See for example the endless sequence of the pod race on Tatooine in THE PHANTOM MENACE (1999).
19. *Time* 15 June 15 1981. Quoted by Laurent Jullier in *L'Ecran post-moderne. Un cinéma de l'allusion et du feu d'artifice* (Paris: L'Harmattan, 1997) 37.
20. See, for instance, THE HAUNTED MANSION (Rob Minkoff, 2003) or PIRATES OF THE CARIBBEAN (Gore Verbinsky, 2003).
21. It is difficult to make a distinction between the syndromes of the mutation of the superhero and those of a teenager (new muscle structure, uncontrollable organic jets, etc.).
22. San Francisco or Chicago, particularly for the elevated railway, which is non-existent in New York and nevertheless in the center of a spectacular scene in SM2.
23. Gunning 133.

24. Their function is also advertising: it is the illustration of the trademark of the firm.
25. One of the most famous rides is probably the "Star Tour" in the various Disneyland's. The simulator proposes to relive again the attack of the Death Star in STAR WARS from an unexpected angle.
26. Recently, rides became frequent in the credits of blockbusters. See, for example, David Fincher's FIGHT CLUB (1999) or Bryan Singer's X-MEN (2000) and X2 (2003), other comics adaptations. In THE LORD OF THE RINGS, they appear within the story, transforming an establishment shot in a moment of attraction (see for example the discovery of the Saruman's army in THE FELLOWSHIP OF THE RING).
27. See note 12.
28. Finalized by Earl Wiggins and John Dykstra, this computer-controlled camera, suspended on a cable from a height of thirty floors, risks some extreme movements of pendulum between buildings and above the streets.
29. Belloï 77-159.
30. Noël Burch, *La lucarne de l'infini* (Paris: Nathan, 1990) 186-88.
31. Spider-Man's face has often been used as logo by Marvel. Besides, we recall the mediatization of the images of the film's mask that reflected the Twin Towers.
32. However, in SM2, the last shot of the film is dedicated to Mary-Jane Watson, the girl-friend of the hero, who is watching him leaving through a window. The anxiety can be read on her face. It promises the beginnings of a new story...
33. We can also mention the references to comics in the story. In SM1, Peter sketches the costume that he is going to make, trying to find the postures and drawings of famous artists who followed one another in the comic strip. In SM2, after the title sequence which summarizes the intrigue of the first episode by means of the drawings by celebrated artist Alex Ross, Peter Parker worries about the disappearance of his comic books during the move of his aunt.