

# From Performance to Recording: Assumptions of the Aesthetics of Rock Debate

Jorge Cardoso Filho

## Abstract

Based on a review of representative theories about a unique aesthetics of rock music, this article problematizes assumptions about performance and/or recording as aesthetic objects and suggests shifting the debate to our understanding of the elements involved in the experience of rock in different contexts. In conclusion, it posits the possibility of identifying prevalent poetic patterns in musical experience that could become the subjects of future communications studies.

## Keywords

Rock . Aesthetics. Communications.

## 1 Rock as a subject of Aesthetics

Bruce Baugh, in an essay published in 1993 in *The Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism* entitled “Prolegomena to Any Aesthetics of Rock Music,” posed the question of whether we need to think about the aesthetic criticism of rock in association with the unique expressive characteristics of that type of music, instead of being based on characteristics imported from other musical genres. He aimed to introduce elements that should be taken into account to assess the musical beauty of rock, differentiating it from classical music, which the author believes to be primarily concerned with formal aspects.

His discussion of the parameters for building an “aesthetics of rock music” underscores three main elements: rhythm, which inspires the body to dance; performance, which gives that genre standards that “have to do with the amount of feeling conveyed, and with the nuances of feeling expressed”; and loudness, which is used as a vehicle of expression. Roughly speaking, one can say that Baugh believes that because rock is linked to a different musical tradition, it

Jorge Cardoso Filho | jcunha@fafich.ufmg.br

Journalist. MA in Contemporary Communications and Culture - UFBA and doctoral candidate in Communications - UFMG. Professor at the Department of Philosophy and Human Science - UESB, Vitória da Conquista.

is impossible to use traditional aesthetics to assess its beauty.

Rock music involves a set of practices and a history quite different from those of the European concert hall tradition upon which traditional musical aesthetics have been based. That being so, any attempt to evaluate or understand rock music using traditional aesthetics of music is bound to result in a misunderstanding (BAUGH, 1993, p. 23).

The author infers the need to understand that the purpose of rock is far removed from abstract forms of enjoyment (and formalist aesthetics) and closer to the effect that the material aspect of the music has on the listener (and therefore to an aesthetics of expression). Baugh views the material aspect of music as including broad elements that do not allow for precise identification or description, but differ markedly from formal aspects. He proposes that performance is the main aesthetic focus of rock, in contrast with the musical score, which he views as the aesthetic focus of classical music.

Baugh's proposal has reverberated in the world of academic criticism and the listening community, as it serves as the basis for stating that rock has its own standards of beauty, a factor of paramount importance for critics. Many have engaged in the debate to contribute or set limits to the author's suggestions. One of the first was James Young, who entered into the debate with Baugh in the subsequent issue of the same journal that published "Prolegomena."

For Young, the elements that Baugh singles out as being characteristic of the aesthetics of rock (rhythm, performance and loudness) are the same factors taken into consideration in other musical genres, including what Baugh has mistakenly called classical music. In short, Young observes that "Each of the standards of excellence in rock music performance which Baugh identifies applies as well to performances of classical music" (YOUNG, 1995, p. 81).

Another point that Young attacks is the lack of a clear definition of what Baugh means by rock and classical music. Because he has not described or charted the tradition that he claims to have given rise to rock music, Young believes Baugh has developed a flimsy argument that only reflects the standards of some rock groups (it is not true that all groups focus on performance, as some are geared specifically toward recording). Nor can it be said that classical music is concerned mainly with formal aspects (the musical dramas of Richard Wagner, such as *Die Walküre* and *Rienzi*, actually seem to make use of the material aspects of music).

Stephen Davies has also developed highly convincing arguments and addressed the positions established in the debate between Baugh and Young to demonstrate that rock is part of the same tonal tradition as classical music, and therefore should be assessed according to the same aesthetic standards as any form of tonal music (DAVIES, 1999). According to Davies, one

of the main problems with Baugh's proposal is that he makes too strong a distinction between formalism and expressiveness, which ultimately undermines the validity of his argument.

The fact of having focused on the "nonformal" elements of rock, such as the appeal to the somatic aspect and the physiological response that the music provokes in the listener does not mean that this appeal is not found in classical music (people danced to the waltzes and minuets of Haydn, Mozart, etc.). Similarly, although the techniques for playing classical and rock music may differ, this is not due to the greater naturalness of learning rock technique, which is just as conventional as classical music technique.

According to Davies, the best way to establish the difference between these techniques is to demonstrate the sonic ideals to which these genres aspire. Rock prefers dirty timbres and bent pitches, and classical music does not. With a provocative and highly convincing argument, the author concludes that if the idea Baugh proposed for an "Aesthetics of Rock" was correct, it would be necessary to formulate different aesthetics for every sub-genre of rock and for classical music itself, which would not be a very reasonable outcome.

Theodore Gracyk took a different track from the one Baugh proposed, while still defending an Aesthetics of Rock in *Rhythm and Noise: An Aesthetics of Rock*. Unlike Baugh, the unique nature of rock music is not concerned with the

performance of sounds and an aesthetics of expressiveness. Focusing on the process of the emergence of rock as a cultural object, Gracyk believes that recording is the main aesthetic aim.

Rock's most distinctive characteristic within popular music may lie in the realm of ontology, in *what* a musical work *is* in rock music as opposed to what it is, for instance, in jazz or country or folk. Rock is a tradition of popular music whose creation and dissemination centers on recording technology (GRACYK, 1996, p. 1).

Thus, Gracyk seeks to legitimize his position by examining how rock emerged genealogically on the basis of studies by authors who perceive the uniqueness of the musical genre that emerged in the 1950s. "Rock 'n' Roll differed from previous forms of music in that records were its initial medium," because "technology exists as an element of the music itself" (GAROFALO, 1992 in GRACYK, 1996, p. 37) and:

Although jazz and other types of folk music exist on records, they did not originate in that medium. For the most part they originated and developed through live performances. Rock, it seems to me, has generally done the opposite. Records were the music's initial medium (BELZ, 1972, in GRACYK, 1996, p. 37).

As he focuses on the central object of aesthetic criticism of rock in a more precise and clearly bounded context (the 50s) than Baugh, taking care to show the technical and cultural elements, and even the economic factors that influenced the emergence of rock, Gracyk's argument is stronger than the proposition of making the

performance of sounds the main element to be evaluated. Seeming to respond to Young's criticism of Baugh's vague characterization of rock, Gracyk establishes a clearer outline for the thesis of an Aesthetics of Rock and offers new paths to follow.

This does not mean, however, that live performance loses all its value. It can also be, have been or become the main element for evaluating rock's musical value. That depends on social and cultural configurations, as well as the musical appropriation of a past, present or even future context. Having observed these configurations, Gracyk bases his proposal on a recognizable and identifiable standard of excellence. According to him, Elvis Presley himself had to record two albums before learning to perform live before an audience (GRACYK, 1996).

One of the main consequences of Gracyk's position is the rejection of the "realist" principle in the experience of rock. In other words, because the aesthetic aim is recording, there is no need to represent the live event within it. In fact, it is the recording that will inform/give rise to live performances. "Studio recording is not only a recording of a prior and equal sound [to live performances] but also a process of musical creation per se, with its own aesthetics, values and references" (SÁ, 2006, p. 08, our translation).

Thus, as a decisive element for the establishment of rock, the practice of recording is limited as a

privileged aesthetic object of study, since these objects explore cultural configurations (musical practices, production techniques, distribution and consumption, listeners' expectations, etc.) in order to induce the listeners' engagement in a communicative situation that depends on the mediatic aspects. Viewed in this sense, rock is an expression of mediatized reproduction, and only later an expression of co-presence.

However, this productive process is rarely made public, so what prevails is an erasure of the recording (just as there was an attempt to erase the camera from the cinema of a certain period). Few photos of the history of rock show musicians in the studio. The images that document the rock experience do so on the basis of photos of concerts and performances, totems that contribute to a sense of belonging among fans. At any rate, the first consequence of Gracyk's proposal directs the scholar's attention to thinking about rock as an expression that is the result of methods of reproducibility.

The second interest aspect of Gracyk's reflections is the identification of two basic strategies for romanticizing rock music. The first of these strategies, which he identifies in the thinking of Camille Paglia, criticizes certain characteristics of rock, such as the loss of authenticity, loss of the importance of live performances, and exploitation by managers and moguls. It is a subjective form of romanticization, to the extent that it views rock as an expression of uniqueness

(lyricism) that is lost after being exploited by capitalism. The solution, in Paglia's view, is for rock to return to the universities and a system of artistic patronage that would restore its independence: "rock music should not be left to the Darwinian laws of the marketplace ... for rock to move forward as an art form, our musicians must be given the opportunity for spiritual development" (PAGLIA, 1992 in GRACYK, 1996, p. 194).

Gracyk identifies the second strategy for romanticizing rock in the formulations of Cohn and Belz, who suggest that the genre be viewed exclusively as the vocal expression of a group that has traditionally been marginalized in the systems of representation of the major arts. In this sense, rock would be closer to the folk art tradition.

For Cohn and Belz, rock's decline started when The Beatles and others turned to self expression and music experimentation for its own sake. In short, rock lost its special identity when the musicians began to speak for themselves instead of speaking for their audiences (GRACYK, 1996, p. 188).

Gracyk concludes that we must accept the tradition of mediatic consumption of rock music in order to avoid excessive romanticization of the potential for cultural resistance or Dionysian power of that genre. But he does not deny that, as a program, Romanticism emphasized values that are important to rock music, particularly values that reacted to the classic objects of art, intellectualism and rigid artistic structures.

Finally, he takes a skeptical view of the validity of traditional aesthetics for the study of rock by saying that aesthetics usually neglects the historical context of art and views works of art as embodiments of the immutable, universal and transcendental.

However, these points merit more careful discussion, both because of the need to understand a bit more about the musical tradition that is being discussed (theme) and the position given to aesthetic reflection when formulating proposals (form).

## 2 Rock as a musical tradition

By insisting on a kind of continuity between classical and rock music (both of which are tonal), Stephen Davies and James Young actually seem to disregard the historical and social context in which rock emerged. It stands out in the most varied aspects of the emergence of classical music, which is a position that both Baugh and Gracyk view as problematic. The problem lies in the supposition that, because they are linked to the same musical system, rock and classical music follow the same path of appropriation and listening. The immediate objection is that the fact of being associated with a specific system does not prevent musical elements from being differently organized within that system – a given element might be highly valued in one tradition and completely worthless in another.

Viewing rock as a subject of aesthetics does not just mean applying aesthetic concepts to the study of rock but also understanding the social and musical contexts that allowed rock to emerge as a musical and cultural genre. Based on the study of the social use of media, Martín-Barbero (1991) offers a highly valuable paradigmatic key to understanding processes of this nature, particularly with the proposal of his “nocturnal map of mediations.” Roughly speaking, the Colombian theorist presents a kind of map composed of two axes (one synchronic and the other diachronic) which are tensioned by the logic of production and competencies of reception in the first axis and cultural sources and industrial formats in the second. There are several forms of mediation between these points: institutional, social, technical and ritual.

Based on the map proposed by Martín-Barbero, observing the context from which rock emerged allows us to identify it as the United States of America in the 1950s, where blacks and whites were still segregated. It is a kind of music that is rooted in the blues and rhythm and blues, engages in dialogue with country and folk music, and developed during a time when the agrarian culture was being replaced with a young, urban culture that celebrated technological advances such as television and saw the beginning of the baby boom.

Rock was born during the post-war period, recorded in small studios and distributed on acetate (vinyl) records in the form of EP (extended play) discs by (still) small specialized labels that would later establish the record industry. Some of the rock legends in this context were Chuck Berry, Elvis Presley, Buddy Holly, Jerry Lee Lewis, Johnny Cash, Fats Domino, Little Richard, and Bill Haley and the Comets, among others. Movies like *Blackboard Jungle* (1955) made a significant contribution to popularizing that musical genre by giving greater visibility to rebellion as an aspect of the recently formed youth culture.

Rock was viewed as a symptom of a new kind of musical experience, and was the target of criticism from the beginning. One of the most famous critiques is that of American theoretician Allan Bloom, whose *The Closing of the American Mind* recounts the failure of American culture to cultivate values of interest to youth. Among other things, he cites the huge success of rock music among young college students, as evidence of this.<sup>1</sup> The subtitle of Bloom’s book – *How Higher Education has Failed Democracy and Impoverished the Souls of Today’s Students* – indicates that he viewed the cultivation of rock music as a mere symptom of a greater malaise, the weakening of America’s national democratic project. For him, American youth had replaced

<sup>1</sup> Although he does not specify which kind of youth he is referring to, the examples he uses, such as MTV, Michael Jackson and Mick Jagger point to the early 1980s, a period when rock was reconfigured in its relationship with television and became the symbol of an era.

books and classical music with LPs and rock, where there is “one appeal only, a barbaric appeal, to sexual desire – not love, not Eros, but sexual desire undeveloped and untutored” (BLOOM, 1987, p. 73).

Regarding the elements of music, rock is characterized by electrified sound, incorporating electro-acoustic resources in its poetic dimension – both in live performance and the process of recording – and forms a habit of listening in line with the uses of such resources. Whether the reference is to a live performance by a rock band or to listening to a song that was recorded and played back, the electro-acoustic elements (such as the electric guitar and, later, synthesizers) are key.

Certainly, microphones, amplifiers and loudspeakers have been important to virtually all recorded music; classical, folk, jazz or popular. But it is only in popular music and in rock that these technologies can be regarded as truly essential to the process of both musical expression and experience (THÉBERGE, 2001, p. 08).

Within the elements of musical language, Arnold Shaw observes that rock focuses on a 4/4 beat and the 12-bar blues standard (while pop music may have developed from the eight- or 16-bar standards). Also, according to the author, rock is rhythmically patterned by the parameters of boogie-woogie, tends to focus on modal aspects in relation to the diatonic aspects, and tends to emphasize energy and sensory overload through the use of feedback, reverb and wah-wah pedals (SHAW, 1982).

These elements allow us to understand, in general, the ideological, cultural and technical aspects that both made rock possible and constrained it in the 50s. In other words, they describe the points on the map of mediations that shaped their emergence in that context. The difficulty scholars have encountered in providing a precise definition of rock music, such as Robins (2008), Friedlander (2004) and Gracyk himself (1996), indicates that the genre reconstructs itself dynamically, and that the role of the scholar is to reconstruct it from the traces it has left in the space of experience – the organization of the map of the mediations that shaped that period.

Thus, Jeder Janotti Júnior lucidly proposes viewing rock music as a map that is constantly reconstructed due to market forces, changes in sensibility and spatiality (JANOTTI JÚNIOR, 2003). For him, the study of the products of rock should never be separated from the context in which these objects make sense, since the same values, tastes and feelings are present in both the poetics of making music and in the process of enjoyment. Furthermore, Keir Keightly, when revisiting “chapters” of rock history, demonstrates how the genre becomes a true culture, undergoing frequent mutations (KEIGHTLY, 2001). Finally, Andrew Kania suggests that the ontological dimension of rock lies in the tracks (recorded constructions) that express songs (performances) (KANIA, 2006). Kania reviews Gracyk’s proposition on recording as an aesthetic object and contrasts it with the

new theories posited by Stephen Davies (2001) in *Musical Works and Performances* in order to create an alternative to the opposition of performance vs. recording, a frequently recurring assumption in the debate.

Based on the map of mediations, the investigation to determine the true object of criticism for an aesthetics of rock takes on more precise outlines and enables us to speak of forms of organization of the complex network of mediations that permeates the experience of rock music. One of the most recognized and utilized forms of organization used by musicians, fans and critics is musical genres, which are also considered to be organizers and/or revealing of the dynamic elements of the musical experience.

Franco Fabbri provides some rules that shape the genre, such as formal technical, semiotic, behavioral, social and ideological rules and legal and economic rules (FABBRI, 1981). Felipe Trotta, in a concept very similar to Fabbri's, points out that musical genres introduce "affective, aesthetic and social environments" on the basis of which relations with the music will be regulated (TROTTA, 2008). Simon Frith believes that listeners, whether they be fans, critics or occasional listeners, judge the music they listen to on the basis of the genre's characteristics, the relationship established between what has been built up as an expectation and what takes shape in the music (FRITH, 1996).

Each of these authors' arguments reveal concepts on how a given song should sound and the characteristics it should have – in other words, they display a set of shared values that are both ethical and technical, and technically the result of mediations that act on the shaping of the musical genre in a specific context. According to Robert Walser, musical genres

Come to function as horizons of expectation for readers (or listeners) and modes of composition for authors (or musicians). Most important, Todorov argues that genres exist because societies collectively choose and codify the acts that correspond most closely to their ideologies. A society's discourse depends upon its linguistic (or musical) raw materials and upon historically circumscribed ideologies. Discourses are formed, maintained, and transformed through dialogue; speakers learn from and respond to others, and the meanings of their utterances are never permanently fixed, cannot be found in a dictionary (WALSER, 1993, p. 29).

Because they are not permanently fixed, the genres are being reinvented and resist the dogmatic definitions that view them as systems with a determining force that eliminates possibilities of escape, variation and the unique contribution of musical experiences, basically the aesthetic experience. As Martin Seel rightly points out, the apprehension of the phenomenon's aesthetic singularity can only take place on the basis of good knowledge of the general area with which the experience is related (SEEL, 2005), a generality that is also present in the organization of musical genres. In this sense, the definition of a musical genre is the

explanation of the conformation of the shape of the map of mediations in a particular temporal context and how this situation made a certain kind of experience of the music prevail.

The emergence of a cultural practice, or more specifically a musical tradition, does not occur causally, but rather through a reorganization of the mediations that act on experience with the music that makes certain programs of production and reception predominate. The growing number of reflections and proposals interested in verifying the existence of a specific aesthetics for rock music is due to the fact that scholars are observing that new configurations of the map of mediations require new ways of apprehending the aesthetic.<sup>2</sup> This movement resonates with philosophers, sociologists, musicologists, and even literary scholars.

I refuse to predict, as some have done, the death of literature. I want it to endure; but what must change is the type of mediation with the poetic. I would cite as significant in this respect the invasion of our cultural universe, some 30 years ago, by art forms for which the rock seems to me to be emblematic. Despite the textual mediocrity (but this is not the question) of singing in rock music, what we witness here is an irreversible “corporization” of poetic pleasure, requiring (after centuries of writing) the use of a less hard, more clearly biological medium (ZUMTHOR, 2007, p. 70, our translation).

By viewing changes in the “type of mediation with the poetic,” in other words, the conformations on the map of mediations, as an indication of the need to think of a new way to deal with poetic pleasure, Zumthor observes the need to take a form that is “more clearly biological” that has not been the focus of traditional Aesthetic theory. It does not mean the death of one kind of experience (the literary) but we must be aware of the birth of other types of experiences that emerge from what he calls the “corporization” of pleasure.

As a critical analyst of the tradition of the Aesthetic of Reception, Zumthor goes beyond the proposal of viewing the aesthetic experience as a mode of literary hermeneutics, and brings the corporality that shapes experiences of aesthetic objects to the fore in order to take this new configuration into account, with rock as its emblematic expression. Specific behavior takes place in line with this pattern of experience, and based on the study of this behavior (of what is called in question within it) is possible to identify the predominant program of production and reception.

Consequently, determining the object of aesthetic appreciation of rock is only legitimate when it respects the points on the map of mediations configured in that pattern of experience.

<sup>2</sup> This debate is found in Cardoso Filho (2009), based on the discussion of the positions of Richard Shusterman and Bruce Baugh, who tend to characterize rock and funk as entirely new genres, expressions of a post-modern experience that, therefore, cannot be studied by a discipline forged in the conception of the modern philosophical project, such as Aesthetics. For the reasons already pointed out, however, I do not trust that argument.

Otherwise the performance, recording or track will be dubious assumptions in a discourse that aims to determine the ontological and unchanged essence of rock, and from there, to extract the object of aesthetic appreciation. Curiously enough, the same authors who accuse aesthetics of being a discourse on the immutable and universal aspects of works of art end up constructing theories about the essence of rock and overlooking the important transformations in the interplay of experience and singularities. Fortunately, aesthetics has more to say about experience with the singular.

### 3 Turnaround for Philosophical Aesthetics

It is precisely because of the vastly different ways in which each of the authors who have proposed/queried an Aesthetics of Rock characterize aesthetics as a whole – referring to a philosophical discipline that emerged in the mid-eighteenth century and aims to reflect on the beautiful and sensory knowledge – that we can answer some old questions and present new ones. Whether due to a lack of research into other philosophical traditions or their strategy for building their arguments, both Baugh and Gracyk (despite the latter being a philosopher) present a caricature of aesthetics that gives the discipline little power to explain these phenomena.

Baugh, for example, reduces aesthetic theory to a formalist aesthetics and views figures like Edward Hanslick and Immanuel Kant as representatives of that tradition (BAUGH,

1993). Curiously enough, he disregards any consideration of the subjective nature and at the same time the universal taste in the German philosopher's work – which would make it impossible to conclude that Kant's aesthetics had a formalistic inspiration.

Gracyk makes two questionable assertions about aesthetics: the first is that it approaches its subjects with the assumption that art is an autonomous sphere, and immutable criteria should be used to evaluate it; second, since aesthetics contrasts that art with commerce (better yet, the arts industry), the configuration of the map of mediations from which rock music emerges prevents it from being regarded as an object of aesthetic reflection. After all, it could not be called art, but rather a phenomenon linked to the entertainment industry. Although it can be said that many philosophers have taken the paths that Gracyk criticizes, it is wrong to think that there was no resistance to such movements in the field of philosophy (American pragmatist aesthetics and the Aesthetics of Reception in Germany are good examples).

In general, it could be said that a concern with the aspects related to experience, rather than to art, led these authors to reflect on a repositioning of aesthetics in the field of philosophy. It was a question of perceiving the aesthetic components present in varied human experiences, and not just specific objects, to distinguish those experiences on the basis of degree, a position

that concedes a much more comprehensive scale to aesthetics.

Clearly, that breadth of scope has also been criticized. Since the 1960s, philosophers from the analytic tradition have formulated strong critiques of the idea that we can distinguish one specific type of experience from within the varied range of other experiences that exists in the world, and that that difference resides in the aesthetic nature of the relationship between those experiences. Dickie (1965) has even proposed abandoning the concept of aesthetic experience in favor of questions about the social and cultural constraints that enable us to recognize art objects as such, thereby formulating his institutional theory of art. Thus, aesthetic theory is once again limited by the social conditions of the enjoyment and determination of art.

The debate has unfolded with interesting arguments on both sides and, while recognizing that generalizing enlargements or stereotypical reductions were common stances in contemporary thinking on aesthetics, Martin Seel seeks to relocate the discipline in a prominent position of philosophical thought to construct his thesis on the *aesthetics of appearing*. According to Seel, aesthetic encounters are those in which there is an apprehension of sensory aspects (image, sound or touch) in a form that is more or less different from the conceptually determined one (SEEL, 2005). This phenomenon can occur

with everyday objects as well as the objects of modern art. Accordingly, while recognizing the strength of the contextual and historical tradition in which that object is contained, its aesthetic theory is open to incorporate the uniqueness of each encounter.

One could say that to grasp the uniqueness of aesthetic experience and describe established patterns (which form the habit of perception), it is necessary to respect the points on the map of mediations that have been set in that context. This is a starting point that is sufficiently broad to incorporate the various mediations that act on experience with rock in its respective contexts – it is a crucial prerequisite; otherwise an overly prescriptive thesis about musical expression will be built, losing sight of the nuances that develop the dynamic process of transformation of the genre.

The musicologist Ralf von Appen (2007), who applies Seel's aesthetic proposition to music, interprets the values listeners use to judge rock music on the basis of empirical surveys and reviews published by listeners on the *amazon.de* website. By identifying which aspects of music are valued, Appen has access to elements of the experience that listeners stress as being more or less important, and thus can apprehend the new standards through which rock is experienced.

This means that the need to construct an aesthetic theory specific to rock music can only be based on the type of experience in question.

If the conformation of the map of mediations is completely new, to the point that description and understanding are impossible with the already constructed parameters, it is essential to recognize Baugh's and Gracyk's original proposition and demand the construction of an Aesthetics of Rock – based on performance or recording. However, the construction of an Aesthetics of Rock is only required if the elements in question during the listener's experience of rock music supports the need to formulate a new aesthetic theory.

If, however, what the authors call the “Aesthetics of Rock” is a special case of expression that can be dealt with by aesthetics, we must ask about the elements that are rearranged on the map of mediation and bring about “innovations” or “breaks” with the earlier tradition, so that the research reorganizes the map of mediations of experience of rock music and the standards introduced by those new configurations. Both performance and recording may have been crucial to defining what rock was a specific context, but, as I have attempted to demonstrate, these factors simply do not establish a universal value for the genre.

Therefore, I propose investigating the different listening habits for rock music, based on the objects or phenomena that have marked diverse contexts in order to understand how the map of mediation has contributed to the shaping of experience and the establishment of distinct

poetic programs instead of an “Aesthetics of Rock.” Thus, the debate is restored to the dimension of experience with objects in their respective contexts and avoids the assumption that a particular characteristic is, in and of itself, different from the rock tradition to which it is linked.

## Bibliography

- APPEN, Ralf von. On the Aesthetics of Popular Music. **Music Therapy Today**, Witten, v. 08, n. 01, pp. 05 – 25, 2007.
- BAUGH, Bruce. Prolegomena to any Aesthetics of Rock Music. **The Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism**, Philadelphia, v. 51, n. 01, pp. 23 – 29, 1993.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Music for the Young at Heart. **The Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism**, volume 53/01, pp. 81 – 83, 1995.
- BLOOM, Allan. **The Closing of the American Mind**. New York: Simon and Schuster Publishers, 1987.
- CARDOSO FILHO, Jorge. As materialidades da canção midiática: contribuições metodológicas. **Revista Fronteiras**, São Leopoldo, v. 11, n. 02, pp. 80 – 88, 2009.
- \_\_\_\_\_. A incidência dos conceitos de mediações e experiência no estudo da música popular massiva. In: OLIVEIRA, Ana Cláudia et al. (orgs.). **Comunicação e interações**. Porto Alegre: Sulina, pp. 131 – 146, 2008.
- DAVIES, Stephen. Rock versus Classical Music. **The Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism**, Philadelphia, v. 57, n. 02, pp. 193 – 204, 1999.
- \_\_\_\_\_. **Musical Works and Performances: A Philosophical Exploration**. New York: Oxford University Press, 2001.

DICKIE, George. Beardsley's Phantom Aesthetic Experience. **The Journal of Philosophy**, New York, v. 62, n. 05, pp. 129 – 136, 1965.

FABBRI, Franco. **A Theory of Musical Genres: Two Applications**. [N.p.]: [N.n.], 1981. Available at: <[http://www.francofabbri.net/files/Testi\\_per\\_Studenti/ffabbri81a.pdf](http://www.francofabbri.net/files/Testi_per_Studenti/ffabbri81a.pdf)>. Accessed on Oct 31, 2009.

FRIEDLANDER, Paul. **Rock and roll: uma história social**. 3rd ed. Rio de Janeiro: Record, 2004.

FRITH, Simon. **Performing Rites: On the Value of Popular Music**. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1996.

GRACYK, Theodore. **Rhythm and Noise: An Aesthetics of Rock**. London: Duke University Press, 1996.

JANOTTI JÚNIOR, Jeder. **Aumenta que isso aí é Rock and Roll**. Rio de Janeiro: E-papers, 2003.

KANIA, Andrew. Making Tracks: The Ontology of Rock. **The Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism**, Philadelphia, v. 64, n. 04, pp. 401 – 414, 2006.

KEIGHTLEY, Keir. Reconsidering Rock. In: FRITH, Simon; STRAW, Will; STREET, John. **The Cambridge Companion to Pop and Rock**. Edinburgh: Cambridge University Press, 2001.

MARTIN-BARBERO, Jesús. **Dos meios às mediações**. 2nd ed. Rio de Janeiro: UFRJ, 2001.

ROBINS, Wayne. **A Brief History of Rock, Off the Record**. New York: Routledge, 2008.

SÁ, Simone. A música na era de suas tecnologias de reprodução. **E-Compós**, Brasília, v. 06, pp. 01-15, 2006.

SEEL, Martin. **Aesthetics of Appearing**. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2005.

SHAW, Arnold. **Dictionary of American Pop/Rock**. New York: Schirmer Books; London: Collier-Macmillan Publishers, 1982.

THÉBERGE, Paul. "Plugged in": Technology and Popular Music. In: FRITH, Simon; STRAW, Will; STREET, John. **The Cambridge Companion to Pop and Rock**. Edinburgh: Cambridge University Press, 2001.

TROTTA, Felipe. Gêneros musicais e sonoridades: construindo uma ferramenta de análise. **Revista Ícone**, Recife, vol. 10, n. 02, pp. 1 – 12, 2008.

WALSER, Robert. **Running with the Devil**. New York: Wesleyan University Press, 1993.

YOUNG, James. Between Rock and a Harp Place. **The Journal of Aesthetics and Art criticism**, Philadelphia, v. 53, n. 01, pp. 78 – 81, 1995.

ZUMTHOR, Paul. **Performance, recepção e leitura**. São Paulo: Cosac Naify, 2007.

### Da performance à gravação: pressupostos do debate sobre a estética do rock

#### Resumo

A partir da revisão de teses representativas sobre uma estética particular do Rock, o artigo problematiza os pressupostos sobre performance e/ou gravação como objetos estéticos e sugere deslocar o debate para o entendimento sobre os elementos chamados em causa na experiência com Rock, em diferentes contextos. Como conclusão, apresenta a possibilidade de identificação de padrões poéticos predominantes na experiência musical que podem ser objetos de estudo da comunicação.

#### Palavras-chave

Rock. Estética. Comunicação.

### De la performance a la grabación: presupuestos del debate sobre la estética del Rock

#### Resumen

Partiendo de la revisión de taces representativas sobre una estética particular del Rock, el artículo problematiza los presupuestos sobre performance y/o grabación como objetos estéticos y sugiere dislocar el debate para el entendimiento sobre los elementos llamados en causa en la experiencia con el Rock, en distintos contextos. Como conclusión, presenta la posibilidad de identificación de padrones poéticos predominantes en la experiencia musical que pueden ser objetos de estudio de la comunicación.

#### Palabras clave

Rock. Estética. Comunicación.

## Expediente

A revista E-Compós é a publicação científica em formato eletrônico da Associação Nacional dos Programas de Pós-Graduação em Comunicação (Compós). Lançada em 2004, tem como principal finalidade difundir a produção acadêmica de pesquisadores da área de Comunicação, inseridos em instituições do Brasil e do exterior.

E-COMPÓS | [www.e-compos.org.br](http://www.e-compos.org.br) | E-ISSN 1808-2599

Revista da Associação Nacional dos Programas de Pós-Graduação em Comunicação. Brasília, v.13, n.2, maio/ago. 2010.

A identificação das edições, a partir de 2008, passa a ser volume anual com três números.

### CONSELHO EDITORIAL

#### Afonso Albuquerque

Universidade Federal Fluminense, Brasil

#### Alberto Carlos Augusto Klein

Universidade Estadual de Londrina, Brasil

#### Alex Fernando Teixeira Primo

Universidade Federal do Rio Grande do Sul, Brasil

#### Alfredo Vizeu

Universidade Federal de Pernambuco, Brasil

#### Ana Carolina Damboriarena Escosteguy

Pontifícia Universidade Católica do Rio Grande do Sul, Brasil

#### Ana Sílvia Lopes Davi Médola

Universidade Estadual Paulista, Brasil

#### André Luiz Martins Lemos

Universidade Federal da Bahia, Brasil

#### Ângela Freire Prysthon

Universidade Federal de Pernambuco, Brasil

#### Antônio Fausto Neto

Universidade do Vale do Rio dos Sinos, Brasil

#### Antonio Carlos Hohlfeldt

Pontifícia Universidade Católica do Rio Grande do Sul, Brasil

#### Arlindo Ribeiro Machado

Universidade de São Paulo, Brasil

#### César Geraldo Guimarães

Universidade Federal de Minas Gerais, Brasil

#### Cristiane Freitas Gutfreind

Pontifícia Universidade Católica do Rio Grande do Sul, Brasil

#### Denilson Lopes

Universidade Federal do Rio de Janeiro, Brasil

#### Eduardo Peñuela Cañizal

Universidade Paulista, Brasil

#### Erick Felinto de Oliveira

Universidade do Estado do Rio de Janeiro, Brasil

#### Francisco Menezes Martins

Universidade Tuiuti do Paraná, Brasil

#### Gelson Santana

Universidade Anhembí/Morumbi, Brasil

#### Goiamérico Felício

Universidade Federal de Goiás, Brasil

#### Hector Ospina

Universidad de Manizales, Colômbia

#### Herom Vargas

Universidade Municipal de São Caetano do Sul, Brasil

#### Ieda Tucherman

Universidade Federal do Rio de Janeiro, Brasil

#### Itania Maria Mota Gomes

Universidade Federal da Bahia, Brasil

#### Janice Caiafa

Universidade Federal do Rio de Janeiro, Brasil

#### Jeder Silveira Janotti Junior

Universidade Federal da Bahia, Brasil

#### João Freire Filho

Universidade Federal do Rio de Janeiro, Brasil

#### John DH Downing

University of Texas at Austin, Estados Unidos

#### José Luiz Aidar Prado

Pontifícia Universidade Católica de São Paulo, Brasil

#### José Luiz Warren Jardim Gomes Braga

Universidade do Vale do Rio dos Sinos, Brasil

#### Juremir Machado da Silva

Pontifícia Universidade Católica do Rio Grande do Sul, Brasil

#### Lorraine Leu

University of Bristol, Grã-Bretanha

#### Luiz Claudio Martino

Universidade de Brasília, Brasil

#### Maria Immacolata Vassallo de Lopes

Universidade de São Paulo, Brasil

#### Maria Lucia Santaella

Pontifícia Universidade Católica de São Paulo, Brasil

#### Mauro Pereira Porto

Tulane University, Estados Unidos

#### Muniz Sodre de Araujo Cabral

Universidade Federal do Rio de Janeiro, Brasil

#### Nilda Aparecida Jacks

Universidade Federal do Rio Grande do Sul, Brasil

#### Paulo Roberto Gibaldi Vaz

Universidade Federal do Rio de Janeiro, Brasil

#### Renato Cordeiro Gomes

Pontifícia Universidade Católica do Rio de Janeiro, Brasil

#### Ronaldo George Helal

Universidade do Estado do Rio de Janeiro, Brasil

#### Rosana de Lima Soares

Universidade de São Paulo, Brasil

#### Rossana Reguillo

Instituto Tecnológico y de Estudios Superiores do Occidente, México

#### Rousiley Celi Moreira Maia

Universidade Federal de Minas Gerais, Brasil

#### Samuel Paiva

Universidade Federal de São Carlos, Brasil

#### Sebastião Albano

Universidade Federal do Rio Grande do Norte, Brasil

#### Sebastião Carlos de Moraes Squirra

Universidade Metodista de São Paulo, Brasil

#### Simone Maria Andrade Pereira de Sá

Universidade Federal Fluminense, Brasil

#### Suzete Venturrelli

Universidade de Brasília, Brasil

#### Valério Cruz Brittos

Universidade do Vale do Rio dos Sinos, Brasil

#### Veneza Mayora Ronsini

Universidade Federal de Santa Maria, Brasil

#### Vera Regina Veiga França

Universidade Federal de Minas Gerais, Brasil

### COMISSÃO EDITORIAL

**Felipe da Costa Trotta** | Universidade Federal de Pernambuco, Brasil

**Rose Melo Rocha** | Escola Superior de Propaganda e Marketing, Brasil

**Adriana Braga** | Pontifícia Universidade Católica do Rio de Janeiro, Brasil

### CONSULTORES AD HOC

**Roseli Figaro** | Universidade de São Paulo, Brasil

**Miguel Serpa Pereira** | Pontifícia Universidade Católica do Rio de Janeiro, Brasil

**João Maia** | Universidade do Estado do Rio de Janeiro, Brasil

**Paulo Cunha Filho** | Universidade Federal de Pernambuco, Brasil

**Benjamim Picado** | Universidade Federal Fluminense, Brasil

**Josimey Silva** | Universidade Federal do Rio Grande do Norte, Brasil

### EDIÇÃO DE TEXTO E RESUMOS | Everton Cardoso

TRADUÇÕES PARA O INGLÊS | Lisa Earl Castillo e Sabrina Gledhill

EDITORIAÇÃO ELETRÔNICA | Roka Estúdio

### COMPÓS | [www.compos.org.br](http://www.compos.org.br)

Associação Nacional dos Programas de Pós-Graduação em Comunicação

#### Presidente

#### Itania Maria Mota Gomes

Universidade Federal da Bahia, Brasil

[itania@ufba.br](mailto:itania@ufba.br)

#### Vice-presidente

#### Julio Pinto

Pontifícia Universidade Católica de Minas Gerais, Brasil

[julio Pinto@pucminas.br](mailto:julio Pinto@pucminas.br)

#### Secretária-Geral

#### Ana Carolina Escosteguy

Pontifícia Universidade Católica do Rio Grande do Sul, Brasil

[carolad@puccrs.br](mailto:carolad@puccrs.br)