



Citation: J. Torelló Oliver, J. Swarbrick (2019) The «Musicalised Image»: A Joint Aesthetic of Music and Image in Film. *Aisthesis* 12(2): 165-175. doi: 10.13128/Aisthesis-10733

Copyright: © 2019 J. Torelló Oliver, J. Swarbrick. This is an open access, peer-reviewed article published by Firenze University Press (<http://www.fupress.com/aisthesis>) and distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original author and source are credited.

Data Availability Statement: All relevant data are within the paper and its Supporting Information files.

Competing Interests: The authors have declared that no competing interests exist.

The «Musicalised Image»: A Joint Aesthetic of Music and Image in Film

JOSEP TORELLÓ OLIVER, JOSEPHINE SWARBRICK

Abstract. Despite traditionally having been studied within the field of Musicology, the analysis of music in film should be approached as an aesthetic study of the relationship between «image» and «music» which is central to the cinematographic framework. From this interdisciplinary perspective numerous theoretical and methodological issues emerge. The aim of this article is to investigate, using both a synchronic and diachronic focus, some of the key issues arising from this joint music-image approach, in an attempt to develop a theoretical framework for a joint aesthetic of music and image: a study of «cinematographic expression» that brings together the visual and the sound dimensions and which we call the «musicalised image», a neologism of our own creation.

Keywords. Music, Aesthetic music-image, Film, Musicalised image, Cinematographic analysis, Cinema.

1. INTRODUCTION¹

The study of music in films can be approached from various different academic perspectives. Given the nature of the subject, the proposal adopted by many scholars has been to use theories developed as part of Musicology in their investigations. Studying music in film from this perspective implies the articulation of an analysis of the musical language present in a given film; in other words, to carry out a study of the musical forms present in the audiovisual product. From this standpoint, the object of the analysis can vary; from the study of the score —the formal analysis of musical notation—, to an aesthetic musical study of the pieces analysed. The academic work that gave rise to this trend was *Composing for the Films* (2005) by Theodor W. Adorno and Hanns Eisler, published in 1947.

When considering a purely audiovisual aesthetic, as opposed to a musicological approach, this perspective has one major draw-

¹ All citations taken from sources originally in Catalan, French or Spanish are translated into English by the authors.

back: it puts the focus of the analysis only on the music, instead of analysing the cinematographic whole. In other words, a study is not made of the combination of the music and the image projected simultaneously during the viewing of the film. In the musicological approach, the cinematographic aspect becomes a «context» for analysing a piece of music. Consequently, the epistemological perspective of an investigation based on the aforementioned parameters, does not undergo any substantial variation when: 1) carrying out an analysis of the music that is articulated in film; 2) when analysing musical compositions present in other dramaturgic representations, such as theatre or opera; or 3) when the music that is analysed forms part of the mechanism of a ritual liturgy that does not fall within the ambit of «artistic representation». In short, there are various «contexts» for just one theoretical approach.

Although at a fledgling stage, it is important to mention that the study of music in cinema is increasingly being approached from perspectives that go beyond an analysis of the musical forms present in a film. As a result, the film is not just a «context» from which the music is isolated in order to be studied, but instead the intent is to analyse «the image» and «the music» as a whole. The object of analysis are those signifiers and signifieds of cinematographic or audiovisual language which are articulated through the conjunction music-image; in other words, the «cinematographic sign». Therefore, the cinematographic signifier, which is produced by the union of image and music, must be understood as a unique aesthetic entity.

This perspective, however, faces the complicated challenge of integrating what has mostly been articulated by separate disciplines; it must reconcile, on the one hand, the analysis of the iconographic elements of the audiovisual —the analysis of which has stemmed predominantly from cinematographic theory—, and, on the other hand, the sound and/or musical elements which, in the case of music, have generally been studied from a musicological standpoint.

Of course some of the issues surrounding the relation of the image with sound or music have

previously been subject to academic study. The synchronisation of soundtrack and film, towards the end of the 1920s, led the soviet filmmaker Sergei M. Eisenstein to expand on his theory of cinematographic montage and propose the concept of «vertical montage» (see Eisenstein [1991]). In this work he drew a parallel between the vertical evolution of musical notation on the staff and the movement and rhythm of the image, in an attempt to achieve «the inner synchronicity between picture and music» (see Afra [2015]: 34). Later, the aforementioned Adorno and Eisler criticised Eisenstein's perspective as they claimed it established an arbitrary relationship between music and image (see Adorno and Eisler [2007]: 105). In its place they proposed the concept of «counterpoint» —from musical theory— in order to articulate the aesthetic relationship between music and image within a cinematographic framework. In any case, from our point of view neither of these perspectives approaches the analysis of the binome music-image as an inextricable aesthetic whole —as a unique aesthetic entity—: the analysis of the presence of music in the audiovisual continued to be studied from a musicological standpoint.

Therefore, conceptually, from a Film Studies perspective, what we call the «sign», the «text» or the «cinematographic image» —in order to employ recurrent terminology from the bibliographic canon— is, to paraphrase the philosopher Gilles Deleuze, a flux, a continuum (see Deleuze [1986]: 2). The expression that ultimately captures the movement of the world and allows for the (re)presentation² of a modern and cinematographic space-time (see Duran [2013]: 63) is an iconographical construction that has its own epistemological field. Owing to the synchronous soundtrack of the cinematographic film, it combines at its heart the three dimensions of the representation of iconographic space as well as the sound dimension, a whole that Eisenstein conceived of as «the filmic fourth dimension» (see Eisenstein [1988]).

² (Re)present: present again; present a reality that has already taken place by way of a representation.

Some of these issues have been discussed previously, although we would emphasise that they represent a minority among the bibliography. A few of the difficulties relating to the articulation of this flux —*how are image and music expressed conjointly within the framework of cinematographic language?*— have been defined within what the theorist Michel Chion calls «audio-vision» (see Chion [1994]). The concept *audio-vision* expresses the way in which the two-dimensional image that unites the graphic and the sound dimensions is received, in the spectator's lived experience, when both expressions are presented on a cinema screen.

This article aims to set forth a series of issues that we consider to be fundamental when it comes to deciding the theoretical framework for a study of the combination of music and image from a cinematographic and audiovisual perspective.

2. CONCERNING THE STATE OF THE ART

Although there are some great intellectual precedents, such as the aforementioned *Audio-Vision: Sound on Screen* (1994), this interdisciplinary approach to the study of music in film has a limited heritage.

The bibliographical corpus that refers to the status of music as an element of the theoretical cinematographic device is, quantitatively speaking, relatively easy to narrow down. Having said that, when attempting to conceptually summarise the bibliographical whole and adjust it to the proposals and issues presented by cinematographic theory in general, the discipline begins to demonstrate its great complexity and innumerable peculiarities.

From a Film Studies perspective, the most complex task is to extract relatively paradigmatic conclusions from the bibliography that may answer the question: *what defines the status of cinematic music within the theoretical framework of cinema?* That is to say, the principal question posed by the articulation of the discipline's theoretical framework is that which attempts to define the «contribution of music to the aesthetic of a film».

There is a degree of difficulty and a distinct lack of consensus at the heart of academia, when it comes to examining these issues. The complexity to be found in the interpretation and synthesis of the bibliographical corpus may stem from the fact that the study of music and image, in an audiovisual framework is, to a certain extent, constantly being re-established. When revising the pertinent bibliography, it becomes evident that it is possible to refer to either many or few *roles of music in cinema* depending on the work consulted. Specific phenomenologies can be categorised in various ways and taxonomies seem to be articulated randomly according to criteria adapted in the analysis.

These considerations allow us to extract some initial conclusions as to the theoretical framework of the discipline: 1) the current framework is wide-ranging and disperse, consisting of numerous bibliographical references, and is currently being developed in the academic field; 2) although it is a productive bibliographic corpus —and perhaps somewhat chaotic—, it is relatively accessible; and 3), due to a series of historical issues, as well as the specificity of the subject in question, although the discipline is undergoing an important period of evolution (see Fraile [2008]: 23), the field of study concerning music in film has not yet structured itself around a solid, panoramic and complete theoretical paradigm. A paradigm which would also be academically functional.

3. THEORETICAL FOUNDATIONS FOR A JOINT MUSIC-IMAGE AESTHETIC

In order to begin to articulate a competent theoretical framework, we believe it is important to attempt to answer the following question: what are the theoretical foundations for studying music and image when visualised together on screen? Answering this question would allow for the laying of the epistemological foundations of a joint music-image aesthetic.

We begin with the idea that the musical phenomenon present in any given film is an element

that necessarily forms part of the «sign», the «text» or the «cinematographic image». Or, as we prefer to express it using a term that, in our opinion, is more concise than the aforementioned, *music and image form part of the «cinematographic expression»*³. Image and music, within a contemporary setting, become a flux that is jointly expressed.

From this particular disciplinary approach, the question —*what does music contribute to the aesthetic of cinema?*— necessitates further research into how the formal conjunction of music and image can be categorised and, furthermore, which are the theoretical difficulties involved. It is important to remember that since the birth of cinema both elements have shared the same representational space —the same *proscenium*—, although not initially in a synchronised manner —during the age of live music in cinema—. Latterly —following the introduction of mechanised cinema soundtracks—, both elements were assimilated into the same epistemological field, forming part of the same flux and ultimately belonging, to use philosopher Michel Foucault's term, to the same «episteme»⁴ (see Foucault [1994]: xxii).

As we will see, a genuinely contemporary image is based on the iconographic-sonic duality. The ideas of three prominent academics act

³ We have designed and use the concept «cinematographic expression», in the belief that it correctly expresses the aesthetic and cinematographic duality at the heart of this article. In any case, we believe that *cinematographic expression* is a term that defines the duality of the filmic, and does so in a more delicate manner than other concepts, regularly cited in the bibliography, which express similar ideas, such as «cinematographic texts» and «cinematographic image».

⁴ «Michel Foucault referred to the underlying, and therefore subconscious structure that delimits a field of knowledge, the ways objects are perceived, categorized and defined, as episteme or “epistemological field”» (Ferreter Mora [2012]: 1039). Our proposal makes a much narrower use of the concept «episteme», which we limit to the «cinematographic episteme» or the «cinematographic epistemological field». In other words: the primary epistemological structure from which cinematic discourse arises.

as a basis for focalising and justifying the study of certain foundations of the conceptual theoretical framework of this duality.

1) The academic and musician Michel Chion, in one of his many works dedicated to the analysis of sound and music in cinema, writes that «[...] three notes from a music box, in cinema, form as big a world as a whole tetralogy» (see Chion [1997: 21]). This aphorism underscores the fact that, from an aesthetic perspective, the study of music in cinema must not be circumscribed to the analysis of the musical forms present in an audiovisual text. Instead, it must be situated in the study of the articulation of music-image as a whole. Otherwise, how could we explain why Chion would state that, in cinema, three notes reproduced by a toy can have an equal or superior aesthetic value to the Wagnerian cycle *Der Ring des Nibelungen* —a proposition that could not be accepted in Musicology—? It depends, in any case, on its articulation within the audiovisual skein, and on its relation with the image. Nevertheless, viewed from this perspective, Chion justifies the distancing of academic analysis from musicological approaches. Thereby, he is able to investigate which are the mechanisms used to articulate music together with an image in a film. It is in the relation music-image that we find the aesthetic and significative construction that is unique to the audiovisual⁵.

2) The academic Noël Burch argues that «the fundamental dialectic in film, the one that at least empirically seems to contain every other, is that contrasting and joining sound with image» (see Burch [1981]: 90). That is to say, the conjunction and opposition of the iconographic and sonic dimensions define the nature of the film. Cinematographic art is the fruit of the clash of two elements which, as we will see in the next section, in some

⁵ An example of this can be found in a sequence shot from Nanni Moretti's film *Caro diario* (1993) in which the protagonist takes a walk in Salina, in the Aeolian Islands. The music articulated here is not particularly complex, but in our opinion, cinematographically speaking, it gives the sequence, which is of very little narrative value, a great poetic and audiovisual strength.

of their ontological aspects are essentially opposites. From Burch's perspective, the genuine character of the film —its unique ontology when compared to other art forms— arises from this opposition: the relationship of a confrontational, tense, complementary or any other nature, which plays out between the picture and the sound. Ultimately, Burch locates the essence of cinematographic language in the aesthetic relationship between the iconographic and sonic elements of a film.

3) Béla Balázs, one of the first heavyweight cinema critics of the 20th Century, highlights the ways in which moving images are articulated, as well as the role of music in their construction: «[Music] is organically and structurally as much a part of the film picture, as are light and shadow» (see Balázs [1948]: 279). This is a very interesting perspective as it explains how the cinematographic signifier is constructed using distinct elements that come together to form a whole: iconographic representation and spatial dimensions, image movement, montage, photography, the sonic dimension and music. The author emphasises that graphic audiovisual representation has an intrinsic musical dimension. This perspective, however, brings us to a paradox and one of his theoretical conflicts: the apparent contradiction in claiming that *music forms part of the cinematographic image*. Despite the contradiction, it is evident that music is an element, one among many, that defines, delimits and constructs the «image»: the dual and contemporary «cinematographic expression».

Regarding these authors' ideas, there are three considerations that we consider important to highlight:

A) Following on from Chion's idea, we claim that the aesthetic appreciation of music within a cinematographic framework should not be reduced to its musical or harmonic value, and that instead it should be studied in relation to its significant capacity when articulated along with an image.

B) We argue, in line with Burch's point of view, that the genuine aesthetic of the «cinematographic expression» is defined by the counterpoint of its visual and sound dimensions.

C) Balázs' idea leads us to the conclusion that the study of the presence of music in films must be structured in relation to the cinematographic image, taking music as a *mechanism of image*: understanding image and music as two expressive elements —one of them figurative, iconographic; and the other non-representative, or abstract— coexisting in one episteme, namely cinematography.

The first of these considerations (A) justifies the general perspective of our proposal, which attempts to explain the role of music in cinema as an ontological construction of the film: we believe its analysis must be framed within the academic hypotheses of Film Studies rather than Musicology. As a result of this proposition it becomes necessary to formulate a theoretical proposal that seeks to combine music and image in a joint analysis of the «cinematographic sign», in other words: an aesthetic that explains the role of music as part of a «cinematographic image».

We develop the second consideration (B) thus: the phenomenological particularity of a film must be studied as originating from the opposition music-image. This represents a synchronic approach to the discipline. We assess some of its difficulties with the use of several aesthetic theses put forward by the philosopher Friedrich W. Nietzsche in *The Birth of Tragedy* (1956). This point will be developed further in the following section.

Finally, in section 5 we focus on theoretical questions raised by the third consideration (C) — the genealogy of «cinematographic expression»—. Taking in this instance a diachronic approach to the issue, we analyse the way in which the image has been articulated throughout the evolution of its various epistemes and how it has incorporated music into its structure, how music has become a *mechanism of image*.

4. A SYNCHRONIC APPROACH: A NIETZSCHEAN JOINT AESTHETIC

Now we return to the initial question: upon which theoretical groundwork can a joint aesthet-

ic of cinematography and music be constructed? From an aesthetic point of view, the question is not conceptually simple. The main difficulty when establishing a functional interdisciplinary aesthetic is the fact that the theory must integrate two elements of a contrasting nature and phenomenology —elements of an iconographic character and of a musical character—. Phenomena that belong, ultimately, to two distinct aesthetic dimensions, even representing different ontological categories. We believe that the aforementioned heterogeneity —the conjunction of two elements that emerged from different traditions appearing in one episteme: the film— has given rise to some confusion on a theoretical level.

In order to investigate this duality further, it is pertinent to examine Friedrich W. Nietzsche's work, *The Birth of Tragedy* (1956). In this, the philosopher's first composition, originally published in 1871 under the title *Die Geburt der Tragödie aus dem Geiste der Musik* (The Birth of Tragedy in the Spirit of Music), Nietzsche analyses the genealogy of Greek tragedy. Many of the aesthetic questions that he poses —the combination of ambiguities that, in his opinion, forms the works— can be applied to the cinematographic problem that concerns us here.

In Nietzsche's view, the development of Hellenic tragedy —the most authentic artistic expression of the ancient world—, and even the development of art and its dialectic in general,

owes its continuous evolution to the Apollonian-Dionysiac duality [...]. It is by those two art-sponsoring deities, Apollo and Dionysos, that we are made to recognize the tremendous Split, as regards both origins and objectives, between the plastic, Apollonian arts and the non-visual art of music inspired by Dionysos. The two creative tendencies developed alongside one another, usually in fierce opposition, each by its taunts forcing the other to more energetic production, both perpetuating in a discordant concord that agon which the term art but feebly denominates: until at last, by the thaumaturgy of an Hellenic act of will, the pair accepted the yoke of marriage and, in this condition, begot Attic tragedy, which exhibits the salient features of both parents (Nietzsche [1956]: 19).

From our point of view, there is a clear parallel: the film —fruit of a contemporary «will», to use similar terms to those chosen by Nietzsche— is finally able to articulate the contradiction between figurative art —the moving image, which evidently is indebted to painting and photography— and non-figurative art —music— in a single «cinematic expression», representing «the most emblematic art of modernity» (see Pezzella [2004]:11). The film is a work of art that is, conceptually and technically, both Dionysian and Apollonian —just as Hellenic «will» produced Greek tragedy in those same dichotomous terms—. Film is an expression that brings together the figurative and the non-figurative. Therefore, to a certain extent, the ontology of film repeats many of the issues of the antithetical relationship described by Nietzsche.

It is necessary to analyse in more detail the aesthetic proposal of *The Birth of Tragedy*. On the one hand, Nietzsche presents the issue of iconographic (re)presentation and links it to figurative art. The «image» is an attempt at a mimesis of a physical reality, but it is a construction based on an illusion: the Apollonian is a shadow of the world, not reality itself. The nature of the image is that of a «footprint». The «image», according to Nietzsche's proposal, is, from a phenomenological point of view, closer to dreams than reality; it is an *a posteriori* (re)presentation —and therefore a copy, an interpretation, a representation— of a reality that has already taken place. It is relevant to mention that the film theorist André Bazin understands the cinematographic image in terms which are conceptually similar to those of Nietzsche. Bazin conceives of the mechanical production of analogue photography —and by extension the moving image— «as a molding, the taking of an impression, by the manipulation of light» (see Bazin [1967]: 12).

On the other hand, music is a *Dionysian essence*, which is expressed in Hellenic art as the other face of the god Apollo. The Dionysian is defined by *intoxication*, as opposed to a *dream*. The sublime is not a representation of reality, it is the reality in which man, by means of a musical impulse, dilutes the Schopenhauerian concept of

principium individuationis (see Nietzsche [1956]: 22-23). Music does not have a mimetic or copy-cat relationship with reality in the same way that the image does; Dionysian music does not require mediations in order to interpret reality, since it is an object of the world itself; ultimately, music is not in any way a representation of anything; music simply *is*. As Adorno was to write later: music «does not correspond to a system of signs» (see Adorno [2000]: 25).

The ambiguity expressed by Nietzsche works to explain how a figurative element, articulated along with a non-figurative element, can produce a new form of artistic expression. This approach allows us to contextualise the issue we have put forward concerning image and music within a cinematographic framework. When cinematographic theory claims that *the fundamental dialectic in film is that contrasting and joining sound with image*, it places the emphasis on this complex dichotomy. The Nietzschean perspective provides a theoretical starting point for studying this dialectic: we observe how the Apollonian-Dionysian opposition —«intoxication» and the «dream», the tension between the figurative and non-figurative, the mediate or non-mediate relationship with reality, etcetera— is expressed in epistemological fields that go beyond Greek tragedy. We can find this duality in an expression that is contemporary; an expression that unites image and music in one artistic episteme and which is, ultimately, a strictly cinematographic field: film.

5. A DIACHRONIC APPROACH: THE CONSTRUCTION OF «CINEMATIC EXPRESSION»

We must also pose the question: in what way are music and image articulated in one episteme? How can the union of the moving image and sound or music be explained? How can we substantiate the idea that *music is a mechanism of the image*, as Balász claims?

In order to explain how the two expressions come together in the same epistemological field,

it is necessary first to understand the genealogy of the image —the representation of the world using iconography—, how this has been articulated over time, and how the image has evolved into various typologies that allow for the diversification of visual creation, right up to the contemporary period.

Josep Maria Català has described the current *status quo* of the study of the image from a diachronic approach (see Català [2013]). A summary of his views on the issue allows for research to be conducted into the epistemological characteristics of the various typologies of the image, and for these characteristics to be categorised. His analyses permit us to determine a useful periodisation of the evolution of the «image» episteme, from the Renaissance to the present day, over the course of which we can contextualise the birth of, among others, the «photographic image» and the «cinematographic image».

Català states that: «In broad strokes [...] we can say that there are three phases in the history of the image in the modern era that, at the same time, give way to three very different typologies of the image» (see Català [2013]: 95).

He defines three historical periods that give rise to three epistemes that are, ontologically speaking, completely different from one another: the invention of photography gives rise to an iconographic typology that is categorised as the «solid image»; cinematography transforms this image into what Català describes as a «fluid image»; and, finally, digitalisation converts this last mutation into what he categorises as a «contemporary image»⁶.

To begin with, the Renaissance articulated a visual representation ruled by the techniques of perspective (see Panofsky [1987]); a profound

⁶ We will not evaluate the issues relating to the «contemporary-image», since we believe that, due to the scope of the subject, it should be dealt with independently in other studies. Suffice it to say that, when it comes to the present, for Català digitalisation gives shape to a new typology of the «image», a new stage that belongs to a new state of mind: «we are experiencing a rupture as or more transcendental than that which separated the medieval mentality from that of the Renaissance» (Català [2013]: 95).

change in the way the world was represented visually. With perspective came the endeavour to objectively record a given reality (see Català [2013]: 96). It is around this mimetic attempt at iconographic representation that a feature of iconographic typology categorised as a «technical image» or a «scientific image» is constructed⁷.

The typology of the «technical image» or «scientific image», which characterizes European modernity, undergoes a transcendent transformation with the arrival of photography —the «solid image»—; and, subsequently, a new revolution with the birth of the *cinematographic image* —the «fluid image»—.

Català does not consider the hegemony of the «solid image» —the photographic image— to be, at least initially, an epoch that breaks away from its predecessor —although ontologically speaking of course it does—⁸. On the contrary, he argues that the birth of photography is the end of an aspiration: the photographic image represents a step forward in the formulation of the «technical image» —that scientific struggle to represent reality—, the evolution of which begins with the articulation of perspective in Renaissance painting and evolves further with the invention of photography.

Subsequently, towards the end of the 19th Century, the photographic image, by way of the technological transformation of its episteme, became the «cinematographic image». Although the race to animate and give movement to photography had begun several decades earlier, it was

in the year 1895 that brothers Auguste and Louis Lumière invented the cinematograph —*kinema plus graphia*—: image in movement.

This new image typology, arising from cinematography, engenders a new episteme that Català names «liquid image». In the epistemological field of the «liquid image», the achievement of movement is not, conceptually, a sum of «solid images» —ordered one after the other and transmitting, due to the optical effect produced by persistence of vision, the illusion of the portrayal of movement. Instead it represents a new category: the «image» is, ultimately, a flux; the movement flows from the episteme itself and the image itself is movement. In fact, Deleuze names this category «image-movement» (see Deleuze [1986]).

In a way, the drive toward mimesis of the «technical image» closes an important stage when it captures the world's movement; modernity achieves, through the «liquid image», a reliable (re)presentation of movement. With regards to the space-time dimensions, however, the earliest «liquid image», represents only space. In this historicist vision of the evolution of the «image», the theorist Noël Burch makes a relevant contribution to the previous explanation. He explains that the analytical and descriptive will that can be found in early cinema —as explained in his discussion of the Primitive Mode of Representation— continues to have its origin in a «technical» representation of reality, in the desire for mimesis (see Burch [1990]: 8).

Projecting music and/or sound and image together on a cinema screen —although not in a synchronised manner— is inherent to the invention of the cinematograph, but it is not until the end of the 1920s that a synchronised soundtracking of the episteme «liquid image» is achieved. In other words, a sonic dimension is added to the flux of movement which defines temporality and which becomes, from that moment, an enduring element of its episteme.

The significance of time in the construction of the contemporary image is key. One well-known quote by Andrei Tarkovski illustrates this well: «What is the essence of the director's work? We

⁷ The desire to mimic reality is the principal characteristic governing the modern epoch of the image —pictorial, photographic, audiovisual— that only with the advent of digitalisation is starting to come into question, ontologically speaking.

⁸ As we have mentioned, from an ontological perspective the photographic image is, according to the theorist André Bazin, a «footprint» of reality; it is fixed within a physical support by means of a chemical process (see Bazin [1967]: 12). We cannot say the same of Renaissance painting, even though perspective may have been based on the *camera obscura*, it is not, ontologically speaking, a chemical «footprint» of light.

could define it as sculpting in time» (see Tarkovski [1989]: 63). Here Tarkovski proposes a cinematographic aesthetic in which it is necessary «to take an impression of time» (see Tarkovski [1989]: 62)⁹. When considering the theory of image and time it is also important not to forget Chion: the «soundtracked image», that image which incorporates a temporal dimension into its episteme, transforms itself into a «chronograph» —*krono plus graph*—: the image of time (see Chion [1994]: 13-17). In fact, the addition of sound and/or music causes Deleuze to speculate that «image-movement» evolves into a new and more complex category that he labels «time-image» (see Deleuze [1997]); which incorporates a temporal dimension from physical reality —sound— something that previous images were incapable of articulating.

Seen from the point of view of striving for a mimesis of reality, «cinematographic expression» manages to capture the movement of reality as well as the time in which an image occurs; space is represented, time is reproduced.

Synchronised soundtracking of images is therefore a transcendent moment in 20th Century iconographic construction and evolution; a fact that the bibliography on the issue, in general, does not sufficiently evaluate within the state of the art dealing with the iconographical system (see Aumont *et al.* [1996]: 43). But is there any doubt that this transformation increased the expressive capacity of images as a whole or that it established a new ontology within the visual paradigm? Furthermore, if cinema —as in photography— possessed an «objective character» in the reproduction of the Real (see Bazin [1967]: 13), could it not be that the synchronous articulation of a musical element and an image in movement gives rise to a singular and hitherto unprecedented audiovisual expression, completely different to one which simply produces diegetic sounds? Music,

⁹ There are several examples to support this theoretical perspective in almost all of Tarkovsky's cinematic praxis. To cite just two: one of the final sequences in *Nostalghia* (1983) in which the protagonist Andrei walks slowly holding a candle in a sequence shot lasting almost nine minutes; and the final sequence of *The Sacrifice* (1986).

unlike direct or studio sound, does not have a mimetic aspiration. Music is Dionysian; it does not represent. From a Nietzschean standpoint the cinematographic image becomes a fuller expression, not only mimetic but also expressive and oniric.

For us, it is essential to highlight this moment in the evolution of the construction of «cinematographic expression» and emphasise its study. As Chion writes «music is the most flexible element in film» (see Chion [1997]: 218), and there is no doubt that, in cinematographic language, its articulation is essential, permitting the representation of both ontological and narrative aspects such as flashbacks, ellipses, temporal or historical contextualisation, etcetera¹⁰. For this reason, by way of a conclusion, we propose a new categorisation that defines that iconographic representation that features a sound dimension and musical expression: «the musicalised image».

6. CONCLUSION: THE «MUSICALISED IMAGE»

This article has explored several theoretical issues surrounding the joint analysis of music and image within the framework of the audiovisual. All effort has been made to outline an academic framework centred on two matters: the first; to identify the theoretical issues surrounding the complex dialectic music-image from a synchronous viewpoint; the second, to explain and justify in what way the episteme of the cinematographic image is articulated within the context of modern iconographic construction —a diachronic approach—.

Based on the issues examined here, we believe it would be useful to categorise and study that «image» that combines, in its structure, on the one hand the portrayal of the three iconographic representations typical of modern visual articulation

¹⁰ By way of an example, Chion explains how in the opening credits of the Michael Curtiz film *Casablanca* (1942) music allows the audience to situate itself within a specific geographical and historic narrative framework (see Chion [1997]: 131-132).

and, on the other hand, the sound dimension typical of musical language. We define and introduce this category with the neologism «musicalised image»: an image that incorporates the representation of time and space dimensions through music within one epistemological field; an image that captures the flux of movement and at the same time articulates a musical expression. In this way, we are able to investigate the relationship that forms around image and music as part of the mechanisms for articulating a film.

We define the «musicalised image» in the following way: *it is the flow of vibrations and waves, of sound and light that brings together the iconic and musical dimensions of the «image»* in one episteme. The «musicalised image» is essentially an episteme of modernity, bidimensional; since it is an expressive device that combines elements of a diverse, if not contradictory, nature.

It is a complex task to come up with an adequate terminology to define the aesthetic relationship that comes into being between image and music in just one flux. The use of this term is an original contribution to Film Studies and its vocabulary, distancing itself from the Musicology perspective. We believe that the «musicalised image» can be an interdisciplinary theoretical tool that allows for the development of a joint aesthetic of music and image in «cinematographic expression» and the audiovisual.

Finally, it is important to add that the concept of the «musicalised image» may be used beyond the field of Film Studies. In this case, its use would be to define or study any image combined with music, whether that be in an audiovisual format or something else —pictoric, performative, computing, video games, etcetera—. These and other means of investigation —the definition, using the indicated theoretical framework, of a status for music in relation to an image and a cinematographic narrative, and the «musicalised image» expressed outside of films— remain open as possible fields of investigation for further academic work.

REFERENCES

- Adorno, T.W., 2000: *Sobre la música*, Paidós, Barcelona.
- Adorno, T.W., Eisler, H., 2007: *Composing for the Films*, Continuum, London.
- Afra, K., 2015: “Vertical Montage” and Synaesthesia: Movement, Inner Synchronicity, and Music-Image Correlation in *Alexander Nevsky* (1938), “Music, Sound, and the Moving Image” 9 (1), pp. 33-61.
- Aumont, J., Bergala, A., Marie, M., Vernet, M., 1996: *Estética del cine*, Paidós, Barcelona.
- Balázs, B., 1948: *Theory of the Film: The Character and Growth of a New Art*, Dennis Dobson, London.
- Bazin, A., 1967: *What is cinema?*, University of California Press, Berkeley.
- Burch, N., 1981: *Theory of Film Practice*, Princeton University Press, Princeton.
- Burch, N., 1990: *Life to Those Shadows*, University of California Press, Berkeley.
- Català, J. M., 2013: *A grandes rasgos...*, in A. Mercader and R. Suárez (ed.), *Puntos de encuentro en la iconosfera: interacciones en el audiovisual*, Publicacions i Edicions de la Universitat de Barcelona, pp. 95-113.
- Chion, M., 1994: *Audio-Vision: Sound on Screen*, Columbia University Press, New York.
- Chion, M.: 1995, *La musique au cinéma*, Fayard, Paris, Spanish translation by M. Frau, *La música en el cine*, Paidós, Barcelona, 1997.
- Deleuze, G., 1986: *Cinema 1: The Movement-Image*, University of Minnesota Press, Minneapolis.
- Deleuze, G., 1997: *Cinema 2: The Time-Image*, University of Minnesota Press, Minneapolis.
- Duran, J., 2013: *El tragaluz de lo finito*, in A. Mercader and R. Suárez (ed.), *Puntos de encuentro en la iconosfera: interacciones en el audiovisual*, Publicacions i Edicions de la Universitat de Barcelona, pp. 59-72.
- Eisenstein, S. M., 1988: *The Fourth Dimension in Cinema*, in R. Taylor (ed.), *S. M. Eisenstein Selected Works: 1922-1934, Vol. 1*, BFI Publishing, London, pp. 181-194.

- Eisenstein, S. M., 1991: *Vertical Montage*, in M. Glenny and R. Taylor (ed.), *S. M. Eisenstein Selected Works: Towards a Theory of Montage*, Vol. 2, BFI Publishing, London, pp. 327-399.
- Ferreter Mora, J., 2012: *Diccionario de filosofía*, Ariel, Barcelona.
- Fraile, T., 2008: *La creación musical en el cine español contemporáneo*, Universidad de Salamanca.
- Foucault, M., 1994: *The Order of Things: An Archaeology of the Human Sciences*, Vintage Books, New York.
- Nietzsche, F.W., 1956: *The Birth of Tragedy and The Genealogy of Morals*, Anchor Books, New York.
- Panofsky, E., 1987: *La perspectiva com a «forma simbòlica»*, Edicions 62, Barcelona.
- Pezzella, M., 2004: *Estética del cine*, Antonio Machado Libros, Madrid.
- Tarkovsky, A., 1989: *Sculpting in Time*, University of Texas Press, Austin.