

and one that has the capacity to transmit or activate knowledge(s) through its operations. The artworks in question here have the ability to register shifts in relationships between media in our digital age, the nature and articulations of cultural memory, and in the many, varied practices to which we put our cinematic images to use. This capacity derives, in part, from how a slate of contemporary artistic practices encourage coproduction, of meaning and, significantly, of analysis. As noted in the introduction, this idea, as articulated by Mieke Bal (and pursued by Bennett), opens the door to thinking about how the art object can play a key role, when activated by a viewer in the generation of analyses. This coproduction, according to Bennett, can take place at a number of levels and across a number of different discourses. Returning to her example of the intermedial constitution of the portraits generated by Orozco, this coproduction happens “between artist and subject (both with a particular relationship to the medium); between artist and art theorist; between the art work and the interdisciplinary knowledge nexus in which it is created.”²¹

I want to turn now to two further case studies in order to pursue how this coproduction of analysis can happen between the artwork and the interdisciplinary knowledge nexus in which it was created and, I would add, to which it contributes. To do so, I will consider Cindy Bernard and Pelle Torsson’s generation of film stills from *Vertigo* and *Psycho* (1960), respectively, the act of (digital) remediation performed by these artists, and the modifications they make to the cinematic image. Both remediation and intermediality in Bennett’s and, also, Jens Schroetner’s sense, will be called upon to investigate the aesthetic operations at work in Bernard and Torsson’s practices and to assess the means by which these artists engage the broader themes of time, memory, medial relationships, fan practices, and cinephilia itself.

Cindy Bernard’s *Location Proposal #2* (1997) involves a series of 18 rear-projected still images that “recreate” *Vertigo*’s redwoods sequence (see figure 3.2). In many ways, this project extends the theoretical concerns about cinematic mediations of place that underpin *Ask the Dust*. *Location Proposal #2* also explores how films have structured our experience of landscape and what results from the appropriation of spaces already deeply embedded in our collective memories. These conceptual affinities with *Ask the Dust* end, however, with Bernard’s eschewal of photography in favor of the digital image. *Location Proposal #2* involved creating a 3-D digital model of a space that combined the floor plan of the Muir Woods trail with the scene in *Vertigo* that was actually filmed in Big Basin Redwoods State Park. She then used the camera function within the model-making program



Figure 3.2 Cindy Bernard, *Location Proposal #2: Shot 17, 1997*, installation view (courtesy of the artist).

to reconstruct—through still images—the 18-shot sequence from the film.²² Selections of these images have been projected on large screens as part of multiroom installations and in a variety of public spaces in the United States and Europe.

This shift from photography to the digital in Bernard’s practice has complicated even further her engagements with time and space. In *Ask the Dust*, the photographic image functions as the site where different registers of time come into contact with each other: the historical period represented in the film, the time of its inscription on celluloid, the cultural time of its release, the time of our reception of the film, and the time of the inscription of the photographic image. In *Location Proposal #2*, these registers, though alluded to, are much more difficult to access and differentiate. They must be imagined and reconstituted in the mind of the viewer, primarily because the digital image has all but lost its specificity in relation to both time and space. The images that comprise *Location Proposal #2* lack indexicality; their referent is wholly indeterminate and thus virtual in every sense.²³ They represent neither Muir Woods, nor Big Basin. They hail neither from the cinema, nor reality, neither from the past, nor the present. Instead, they exist as representational spaces that accommodate the merger of allusions to all these things. As such, they enact collisions

between multiple media practices, traditions, technologies, and languages that, as Bennett argues, bring the nature of medial relationships themselves to the fore. Indeed, *Location Proposal #2*'s images are at a far aesthetic remove from both the cinema and photography. They bear the hallmarks of a low-resolution digital image, ones that create an impasse to the precise content of the image, though not necessarily to its affective resonances. Cinema, photography, computer modeling, and film stills are all evoked in a general sense as media here and as media defined by varying degrees of indexicality. In this act of remediation and the staging of intermedial relations around indexicality, we are left to wonder what indexicality actually accomplishes and whether or not it ever even could describe *Vertigo*'s celluloid origins.

More precisely, this work shows us the difficulties of making sense of indexicality with respect to *Vertigo*. It is a film that toys with what is real and fabricated. It is a film in which images (and people) continually deceive. *Location Proposal #2* aims to grant us access to these complexities and to create the conditions necessary to think about the *Vertigo*'s relationship to place. For instance, Bernard's digital projections highlight the virtuality of Hitchcockian spaces, themselves often painted, rear projected, and teeming with unapologetic artifice. The exhibition of *Location Proposal #2* in spaces like the Schindler House or at impromptu spaces within the public realm—in other words, places where inherent histories are permitted to penetrate Bernard's digital work (as opposed to “white cubes” and “black boxes” that aim to decontextualize their objects)—allow for an oscillation between reality and fiction, the real and the virtual.²⁴ This recalls Hitchcock's own practice of blending the real and the virtual, of injecting manifestly fake visual constructions into ostensibly “real” settings. The painted tower atop the Mission San Juan Bautista is perhaps the most famous example from *Vertigo*. However, we might also consider the shots of Scottie driving through San Francisco in pursuit of Madeleine. In this sequence, the rear-projected image outside the rear window of Scottie's car offers us a view of the city that looks entirely different from the one we are afforded when the camera looks ahead through the front windshield. For the former looks distinctly fake, while the latter, by comparison, appears very real. However, this oscillation is further complicated by the spatial geography of the city revealed by Scottie's driving. No matter which way he turns, he seems to be driving downhill toward the water. He is enacting that Bassian spiral downward, not toward a

real, physical endpoint, but toward the psychological abyss of obsession and madness.

Bernard explains that what *Location Proposal #2* offers us is not an experience of the film or of the Muir Woods sequence in particular. Instead, it provides us with the tools to analyze practices of representation and looking and to consider the relationships between images and their referents, images and the spaces they designate, and images and the technologies out of which they are created. In their digital remediation of *Vertigo*, they prompt the self-reflexivity and medial awareness that marks the logic of hypermediacy. *Location Proposal #2* is thus a work charged by a potent epistemophilia. Bernard's own desire to interrogate the nature of images and their effects structures her work in a way that orients our experience of it in a conceptual direction.²⁵ This is not to suggest that epistemophilia overwhelms the cinephilia with which it was initially aligned. Bernard's cinephilic motivations remain present and accessible in *Location Proposal #2*. So, too, does the work's potential to satisfy visitors in search of an affective experience. As works that speak to what is past, lost, or never was, to the legacy of myths both within and around *Vertigo*, *Location Proposal #2*, like *Ask the Dust: Vertigo 1958/1990*, taps into our memories and collective fantasies about the film and its sites.

A somewhat different kind of remediation and engagement with intermediality structures the work of Palle Torsson, though in way that also results in a reflection on collective memories and fantasies. Torsson uses video games as the medium through which to remediate images from the cinema (as well as art and its institutions). This approach has earned him a place among the pioneers of Game Art, a genre defined by John Sharp as art created using video game technology that emerged in the mid-1990s contemporary with the cinematic turn but has since gone into decline.²⁶ Torsson, in collaboration with Tobias Bernstrup, created one of the early iconic works of the genre, *Museum Meltdown* (1996), an interactive computer work tailor-made for each institution in which it was exhibited. *Museum Meltdown* was created using the level editor “Worldcraft” from the first-person shooter video game *Half Life*. Level editors like “Worldcraft” are often sold with the game and permit players to create their own levels, thus extending the world and playing possibilities of the game. Torsson and Bernstrup used *Half Life*'s level editor to meticulously recreate the interior space and the artworks displayed in the museums in which this work was installed. However, they preserved the artificial intelligence of the monsters of the game, requiring those who played