

Ouvir/escutar: diferenças e contribuições para o pensar humano

Hearing/listening: differences and contributions to human thinking

Oír/escuchar: diferencias y aportaciones al pensar humano

Marcos Sobral 

Federal University of Sergipe, São Cristóvão - SE, Brazil.

marcosantoniocardososobral@gmail.com

Danielle de Gois 

Federal University of Rio Grande do Norte, Natal - RN, Brazil.

danielledegois.psi@gmail.com

Received: May 16, 2025

Accepted: May 28, 2025

Published: January 10, 2026

RESUMO

O objetivo deste artigo é elucidar a significativa diferença entre as palavras ditas sinônimas ouvir e escutar em contextos de ensino de música em escola de música. Encontra-se aplicações errôneas no uso delas no cotidiano que geram a necessidade de esclarecimento que conduza à compreensões mais acertadas. A pesquisa é de natureza bibliográfica onde analisa-se o uso e as diferenças das palavras ouvir e escutar e busca-se fundamento compreensivo nos textos do filósofo alemão Martin Heidegger. Observa-se o robustecimento e profundidade de significados para a palavra escuta, em contraposição ao ouvir, que enriquece o diálogo teórico nas aulas de música e amplia os sentidos de percepção do que é proposto em aula. Apontamos diversas formas de exercer a escuta mas que são desconsideradas, tais como a escuta como ausculta, como observação, como disposição. As formas apontadas especificam melhor e conduzem a contextos de compreensão afastados da dúvida quanto aos seus significados.

Palavras-chave: Linguagem; Escuta; Heidegger.

ABSTRACT

The objective of this article is to elucidate the significant difference between the so-called synonymous words *hear* and *listen* in music teaching contexts in music schools. Erroneous applications in their everyday use are found, generating the need for clarification that may lead to more accurate understandings. The research is bibliographical in nature, in which the use and differences of the words *hear* and

listen are analyzed, and a comprehensive foundation is sought in the texts of the German philosopher Martin Heidegger. A strengthening and deepening of meanings is observed for the word listening, in contrast to hearing, which enriches the theoretical dialogue in music classes and broadens the senses of perception of what is proposed in class. We point out several ways of exercising listening that are disregarded, such as listening as auscultation, as observation, and as dis-position. The forms indicated provide greater specificity and lead to contexts of understanding removed from doubt regarding their meanings.

Keywords: Language; Listening; Heidegger.

RESUMEN

El objetivo de este artículo es dilucidar la diferencia significativa entre las llamadas palabras sinónimas *oír* y *escuchar* en los contextos de enseñanza musical en las escuelas de música. Existen aplicaciones erróneas en su uso en la vida cotidiana que generan la necesidad de aclaraciones que conduzcan a comprensiones más precisas. La investigación es de carácter bibliográfico donde se analiza el uso y las diferencias de las palabras *oír* y *escuchar* y se busca una fundamentación integral en los textos del filósofo alemán Martin Heidegger. Podemos observar el fortalecimiento y profundidad de significados de la palabra escuchar, en contraposición a oír, lo que enriquece el diálogo teórico en las clases de música y amplía los sentidos de percepción de lo que se propone en clase. Señalamos varias formas de ejercitar la escucha que son desconsideradas, como la escucha como auscultación, como observación, como disposición. Las formas señaladas especifican mejor y conducen a contextos de comprensión alejados de la duda sobre sus significados.

Palabras clave: Lenguaje; Escuchando; Heidegger.

1.1 Introduction

Man speaks. We speak when awake and in dreams. We speak continuously. We speak even when we allow no word to sound. We speak when we hear and read. We likewise speak when we do not hear and do not read and, instead, carry out a task or remain idle. We always speak in one way or another. We speak because speaking is natural to us (Heidegger, 1959, p. 7 *apud* Oliveira, 2014, pp. 39-40).

The most ordinary mode of human communication occurs through speech. It is by means of it that we externalize our understanding of the world as we construct ideas. Ideas that are produced through the connection of words that direct us toward

determined meanings. It is speech that raises the being-human, in a continuous process permeated by hearing/listening¹.

Speech^{II} arises from a dedication of the human being to hearing/listening, when one positions oneself in the world in order to understand the relations that surround one. Where there is understanding, there is hearing/listening as precursors.

Starting from this initial reflection, the present text discusses hearing/listening, two terms characteristic of the musical context and that, recurrently, we observe being misused. Such terms bear great relevance for musical practice in various spheres of music, such as teaching, performance, and music appreciation, and likewise for other areas of the human sciences. It is of our interest to recognize the depth of these terms. Alves (2013, p. 153) mentions the importance of discussing synonyms, and whether they truly are such.

To understand a concept is to contain within it the idea of its opposite; for example, we apprehend the idea of night because we know day, silence because we listen to sound, and vice versa. Hear and listen are not admitted as having opposite meanings at first judgment; however, they are not synonyms as we commonly think.¹

We adopt the form of writing hearing/listening (hear – slash – listen) as a way of establishing a parallel between such terms. We understand that, in order for the meaning of hearing and listening to be apprehended as faithfully as possible, they need to be placed together. The differentiation must be continuous, and thus we see the need for joint writing. The understanding of hearing is subject to the understanding of listening, just as the latter is to the former. Both terms are interconnected; that is, one is not without the other.

Such a mode of writing does not treat the verbs hear and listen as antonyms, but there is in them a substantial difference in meaning. As we will demonstrate, the meanings to which the verb hear refers us are much more limited when compared to

¹ Original: “Compreender um conceito é conter em si a ideia de seu oposto, exemplificando, apreendemos a ideia de noite porque conhecemos o dia, o silêncio porque escutamos o som e vice-versa. Ouvir e escutar não são admitidos com significados opostos a um primeiro julgamento, porém, não são sinônimos como cotidianamente o pensamos ser” (Alves, 2013, p. 153).

listen. Even so, we require its joint presence with listening in order to understand the different directions of meaning.

As a way of better exemplifying the pertinence of hearing/listening, we turn to their English correspondents: *hear/listen to*.^{III} Hear is commonly rendered as *ouvir*, and listen to as *escutar*.² In English, hearing/listening acquires greater precision for what we intend to convey due to the use of the preposition *to* with the verb *listen*. It is this preposition that most clearly elucidates the distinction between *hear* and *listen to*, as it points to the existence of something that must be listened to. Furthermore, the presence of *to* also refers to the infinitive form, since the verb in the infinitive appears in its original form and does not confine us to thinking of it within a single tense — past, present, or future.^{IV} Prepositions serve precisely the function of directing us toward something that may at times go unnoticed by the reader and thus give rise to mistaken understandings.

Next, we will present notes on hearing/listening found in the literature in general.

1.2 NOTIONS OF HEARING/LISTENING

It is quite common to find in the literature and/or in informal texts the delimitation of hearing as bearing a superficial dimension, limited to sound, in contrast to listening, regarded as possessing a profound dimension. In Camargo's work, hearing is "a physiological *phenomenon*"; whereas listening differs by being 'a psychological *act*'" (Barthes, 1982, p. 201 apud Camargo, 2004, p. 15). Given the emphasis present in the cited terms, we are compelled to ask why such words are highlighted, since they appear to be relevant to our context.

A *phenomenon* is an occurrence, an event, something that happens independently of our will. The falling rain, the birds' singing, the car passing in the streets, occur regardless of our desire. An *act*, however, carries within itself a movement toward its realization. Something of our will generates the act. Indeed, the

² Translator's note: In Portuguese, the verbs *ouvir* and *escutar* do not require a preposition to introduce a direct object, unlike the English construction *listen to*. This structural difference is central to the argument developed in this paragraph.

noun act derives from the verb to act. An act occurs through the exercise of the faculty of acting; that is, acting generates the act. For example: giving alms is an act of charity; obeying traffic rules is an act of prudence; maintaining silence in the classroom is an act of respect. We thus perceive hearing as a phenomenon, independent of our desire, and listening as dependent upon human dis-position, that is, a disposition as existential openness, as can be observed in Martin Heidegger's Existential-Phenomenological foundation (2015), which does not close itself to a single mode of perceiving the surroundings but opens itself to observe what more may be apprehended.

Beyond the classification of hearing as a purely physiological phenomenon, we frequently encounter hearing interpreted as identifying or detecting sounds in the environment. If we hear, we carry within us only the sense^V of audition. The act of listening, however, is accompanied by additional classifications. The first and most common is that, for listening to take place, *attention* to what is heard is required. If we identify sounds in any context and establish distinctions among them, we are within the category of listening, for the act of distinguishing entails thinking about the act of distinction. And this thinking that distinguishes, that reflects, that dedicates itself to understanding, is already a form of attending.

The phenomenon of audition is an object of study in Physics, Acoustics, and Physiology, since these fields concern themselves with aspects of sound such as vibration, oscillation, periodicity, and so forth. Listening, however, is immersed in the educational sphere, so to speak, as a promoter of reflections in the fields of Psychology, Psychoanalysis, and Language. In music, there is interest in both dimensions, given the need for understanding at both physiological and psychological levels.

Let us consider the following: the ear is the name given to a constituent member of the human body. As all members are responsible for exercising functions, each according to its possibilities, the ear also bears one. Essentially, the eyes see, the mouth chews, the hands grasp, and the ears hear. Although we know that these members are not limited solely to the functions mentioned, these are their primary designations. With the hands, for example, we may applaud, close a door, wave

goodbye, actions in which grasping is not involved. This demonstrates secondary attributions of that member. In light of this reflection, we understand hearing as a physiological phenomenon proper to the human body for identifying the presence or absence of sound waves.

Listening attains a new meaning when we bring the verb *to auscultate* into the present context, since it derives from the verb to listen. Auscultation is commonly related to bodily matters, such as pulmonary or cardiac auscultation. The professional who auscultates uses a stethoscope to capture sound more deeply. With this instrument, sounds are amplified and recognized by the ear with greater clarity. By perceiving sounds, the professional detects the presence or absence of irregularities in the organ being auscultated. This perception that examines and probes greatly contributes to the conception of listening proposed here. The stethoscope allows such amplification of pulmonary or cardiac sound, and thus the analyst may diagnose abnormalities with greater certainty.

By bringing auscultation into this work, although its primary sphere lies in medicine, we aim to enlarge the field through which listening may be viewed. As it derives from listening – and naturally what is derived does not disregard its origin – auscultation elevates understanding by expanding the sensitivity it allows to those who engage with it. The professional who practices auscultation develops sensitivity through continuous engagement with the perception of sounds, identifying subtle irregularities in bodily activity. Daily sonic probing cultivates in the professional a sense of acuity toward sounds – particularly bodily sounds, but also sound perception in general – enabling one gradually to listen in an efficient and careful manner.

Continuing the discussion, an important interpretation of hearing/listening presents itself: it is possible to hear without listening, as well as to listen without hearing. The first occurs when we merely perceive sound without directing attention to it. The second occurs in the absence of the spoken word, as a listening guided by silence and observation. Consider a classroom with thirty students. The teacher delivers a discourse, and all hear it. The information reaches them. However, if there

is no *dedication* to what is being said, there is no listening, only audition. *Dedication to sound is a requirement for listening.*

The well-known saying “It went in one ear and out the other” is highly useful for our context. It is evident that if there is no – what we here term – dedication, there is no listening, and what is heard does not receive meaning. It is through listening that we are able to interpret what has been said, and in doing so, a filter is created that evaluates the information uttered. Literally, the idea of a filter refers to something that is retained and, consequently, something that is set aside. That is, to listen as a filter is to listen selectively. With audition, there is no such filter. It simply detects sound and allows everything associated with it to pass through, since hearing is limited to the mere detection of sound. The hearing referred to in the saying above points precisely to this absence of a filter.

Listening becomes even more comprehensive when observation operates, for listening is also observing. When vision participates, the possibilities of listening expand. We may illustrate this assertion by considering the performance of a string quartet. In this formation, the first violin and the cello are the most audible instruments because they perform their melodies in extreme registers, higher and lower, respectively. For this reason, the audition of the second violin and the viola is compromised, as they are positioned, sonically, between the first violin and the cello. However, if the audition of the second violin and the viola is accompanied by visualization – by observing the musician or following the score –, listening becomes more efficient. If the listener focuses attention on these instruments, he or she is better able to capture the sound and to listen in a profound manner. Observation, together with listening, allows for greater depth of understanding. What is within – that is, interior – in the example, the second violin and the viola, demands more from perception; for this reason, integrated listening and observation promote comprehensive listening.

We understand listening as bearing greater meaning and profound significance for musical thinking. Therefore, from this point forward, we will concentrate on the study of listening, mentioning hearing when necessary. We choose this path because “listening is fundamental to arriving at true knowledge about music, which in turn is

not simple to grasp in its totality; that is, there is no profound musical thinking without profound listening” (Alves, 2013, p. 164).³

To discuss listening without hearing, we take as reference the work of Oliveira (2014), in which clinical listening in the field of Psychology was studied with a deaf individual. We know that a deaf person does not possess the capacity to hear, to identify sounds through the auditory apparatus; however, he or she may exercise listening, since listening is not limited to sound. In light of this observation, we wish to present some pertinent aspects.

Listening without hearing is a complex mode of listening because it requires the human being to understand what the other intends to reveal – in our context, the deaf individual. The essence of this mode of listening lies in observation, through the perception of expressive movements that allow for meaningful communication. In the study conducted by Oliveira (2014), the patient experienced family conflicts due to the absence of verbal communication, and this deaf person revealed suffering through signs; that is, signaled suffering constituted the channel of contact between the Psychology professional and the patient. Listening here comes to be interpreted through signs – sign-mediated listening – placing upon the professional not only the task of understanding Brazilian Sign Language (Libras – *Língua Brasileira de Sinais*), but also of seeking resources that facilitate communication in accordance with the patient’s reality. The author reports the need to make use of collages, drawings, and other resources to foster communicative bonding (Oliveira, 2014, p. 35). Because there was no communication through words, the author notes the existence of gaps in the process of knowing the patient’s reality, thereby hindering professional intervention in the patient’s progress. Despite the difficulties of understanding, listening as observation remains the primary avenue of access to the deaf patient’s saying.

The inability to communicate through sound – the relating by means of the word – produces a kind of distancing of the deaf individual from family members, excluding

³ Original: “a escuta é fundamental para se chegar aos verdadeiros conhecimentos sobre música, estes por sua vez não muito simples de serem apreendidos em sua totalidade, ou seja, não há um pensar musical profundo sem uma escuta profunda” (Alves, 2013, p. 164).

him or her from social relations even while sharing the same spaces as those with whom he or she lives. Specialists affirm that deafness, in comparison with blindness, causes far greater distress to the individual, since blindness distances one from the visual world, from knowledge of material realities, whereas deafness distances one from the social world, from human relations, from affective bonds, from intimacy. The individual lives in a world entirely disconnected from his or her peers, deprived of establishing a deep bond that might draw him or her closer to others. Fortunately, if the inability to hear sounds is responsible for producing familial distancing, it is listening that at least makes possible the constitution of relationships, inaugurating a new way of looking at the experience of human relating. We might venture to suggest that what keeps individuals with deafness motivated to live is this potential to create some form of human contact sustained by the openness made possible through listening.

It is important to emphasize that listening without hearing is a silent listening, given the absence of sounds. The possibilities of listening are limited by the deprivation of voice, yet they open substantially when considered from the perspective of silence. Because it is not grounded in the conceptualization of the word, the professional/patient relationship, for example, might become more authentic through the “emptiness” established by silence, which provokes the emergence of the word, an emptiness that belongs solely to them: professional and patient. Like a blank sheet that presents itself as available for inscription. In this sense, the professional seeks, in his or her experience, paths that, based on the behavior revealed by the observed individual, lead to helping the patient overcome the problem. As Alonso (1988, n.p.) states, “if silence does not directly say anything, something within it insinuates itself, and whoever listens attentively receives the footprints, the marks that take shape at the moment words begin to germinate”.⁴ We perceive this same reflection in the teacher/student relationship, insofar as the teacher’s guidance often proceeds from the student’s reactions, a mode that is also perceived through the student’s silence.

⁴ Original: “se o silêncio não diz diretamente nada, algo nele se insinua, e quem escuta atentamente recebe as pegadas, as marcas que adquirem forma no momento em que germinam as palavras” Alonso (1988, n.p.).

Nunes (2000, p. 109 apud Marcelo, 2012, p. 53) corroborates our reflection by presenting a thought by Benedito Nunes, a major exponent of Philosophy and Literature in Brazil:

One listens before hearing; one falls silent by going against the current of speech. Listening is a form of perceiving through understanding. One who is deaf can listen without hearing. And one who truly hears does not listen to scattered sounds without connection; one perceives the heavy noise of rain, the prolonged cycle of the wind, etc. To perceive in this manner is to understand, as one understands the other by listening to him or her, and as one listens or auscultates with the hands, by palpating, one who sees nothing. More than my speech, the listening of the one who hears me signals the occurrence of understanding. My silence may also signal it, when I interrupt or suspend my discourse for the one who hears me.⁵

Martin Heidegger devoted himself to the profound study of the question of Being. In this sense, he thematized listening as a foundational mode in the formation of the human being. In his philosophy, listening is commonly understood as a *disposition*⁶, a stepping out of position. In this context, to *de-position* signifies movement, abandoning a position of comfort in search of external understandings. Listening as disposition allows an approach to the essence of what is meant, to the core of the idea. Such listening requires a movement of pausing, of observing, and thus of placing oneself in disposition. With this placing, possibilities emerge for meanings to arise within the intended context.

Let us extend our analysis of *listening as disposition*.

Dis-posing, that is, placing oneself outside. We conceive disposition as a human constituent that enables one to position oneself so as to acquire

⁵ Original: “Escuta-se antes de ouvir, silencia-se indo contra a corrente da fala. Escutar é uma forma de perceber compreendendo. Quem é surdo, pode escutar sem ouvir. E quem ouve verdadeiramente, não escuta sons esparsos, sem conexão; percebe o ruído pesado da chuva, o prolongado ciclo do vento etc. Perceber dessa maneira é compreender, como se compreende o outro escutando-o e como escuta ou ausculta com as mãos, apalpando, aquele que nada vê. Mais do que a minha fala, a escuta de quem me ouve assinala a ocorrência da compreensão. Pode também assinalá-lo o meu silêncio, quando interrompo ou deixo em suspenso o meu discurso para aquele que me ouve” (Nunes, 2000, p. 109 apud Marcelo, 2012, p. 53).

⁶ Translator’s note: The Portuguese term “disposição” (and the reflexive form “dispor-se”) carries a nuance not fully captured by “disposition” in English. Beyond meaning inclination or state, it also conveys the sense of making oneself available to someone, that is, a voluntary readiness to assist, attend to, or be open toward the other.

understandings from perspectives other than those already known. Through disposition, we are cast into the position of the other in order to apprehend that other's mode of understanding, and thus to be with him or her in that understanding. Naturally, if I cast myself into the position of the other, I leave my own position, thereby exercising disposition (Heidegger, 2015, p. 194). We infer that listening conceived as disposition in understanding the position of the other manifests itself by opening oneself to the other, allowing the other to speak and having his or her saying considered. The other's saying is everything that proves meaningful for the construction of a better relationship between the one who listens and the one who speaks. One example of such a relationship is that between teacher and student.

Lima, Yehia, and Morato (2009, p. 180 apud Oliveira, 2014, p. 86), in reference to listening in psychotherapeutic practices, emphasize that listening is “a posture of making oneself available, open to receiving sounds and to something more (meaning) that becomes present in the relationship with the other.” Such authors present a pertinent view, which also applies to music. To be available is to place oneself in service of being present and of welcoming the meaning that emanates from this disposition.

In seeking to broaden the reflections we intend to highlight regarding hearing/listening, we found it necessary to bring in language, the great resource of Heideggerian philosophy, since it “is the mode in which human existence itself is manifested” (Duarte, 2005, p. 2 apud Oliveira, 2014, p. 41). As the proper mode of human existence, in language we find support for thinking about listening, given that listening has unfolded into various modes of perception, and it remains for language to assist us in understanding these modes.

The thinker in question attributed to language the responsibility for the construction of Being – we human beings –, the one who thinks and reflects upon himself. It is language that speaks, that reveals. Through it we manifest ourselves and draw near to the other in the everyday relation between world and human being. The author considers us ourselves to be language, for it is language that constitutes us as thinking beings.

Since we have introduced language, let us discuss it.

Reflecting on the initial quotation of the article, we ask: if man speaks, when, then, does he say? Inwood (2002, p. 44 apud Marcelo, 2012, p. 31) emphasizes that “saying is different from speaking: ‘one can speak [*sprechen*], speak endlessly, without saying anything. [...] ‘Said’ means: to show, to let appear, to be seen and heard.”

Speaking and saying, if properly understood, do not allow listening to be compromised by the imminence of altering understanding. We conceive that the amplitude of meaning in speaking is inferior to that of saying. Its margin of comprehension is shallow, in contrast to saying.

The expression “speaking for the sake of speaking” contributes to the understanding of speaking and saying as presented here. When we utter words that do not lead to the construction of meaning, that is, that do not reveal or clarify ideas, we are speaking for the sake of speaking. Saying occurs *through* speaking, by means of it. The manifestation of the voice is speech, and within speech I find saying when speech is charged with intention so that the latter may truly occur. It is precisely in *intention* that we identify the distinction between speaking and saying, for intention is absent in mere speaking, and thus no tension is established. In this way, saying manifests itself in the presence of intention.

Speaking, in the context discussed, is equivalent to hearing, while saying corresponds to listening. In reasoning similar to that applied to hearing, speaking has a basic purpose, reduced to the mere appearance of the voice. In saying there is a greater openness to signification, for saying contains within itself the potency to reveal. It is when one intends to show that saying manifests itself, bringing forth meaning. In this elucidative interplay, for saying to be unveiled it is more than necessary “[...] to listen to the word, not only to the voice” (Oliveira, 2014, p. 37).

Let us not forget that one of the most complex forms of perceiving saying relates to listening as observation, already addressed, because in this category of listening, saying is manifested in silence and recognized through the gaze. What we aim to demonstrate in this discussion of speaking and saying is that, in order to communicate, it is necessary to speak by saying, and not merely *to speak for the sake of speaking*. We recall Heidegger (2009) (2015) at moments when the author discusses his notion of idle talk (*fatatório*), which occurs when there is no

engagement in communication with the other; it is speaking without communicating, loose speaking, superficial and undirected speaking.

Reyner (2012), in her dissertation entitled *Pierre Schaeffer and Marcel Proust: The Expressions of Listening*, analyzed listening from the perspective of these two authors. Of interest to us here is the listening studied by Pierre Schaeffer, who recognized four functions of listening. His treatment of listening is understood, respectively, as *écouter* (to listen), *ouïr* (to hear), *entendre* (to understand), and *comprendre* (to comprehend), four French verbs^{VI} that refer to the senses of listening.

In similar reasoning, with reference to the context of electroacoustic music, Smalley (1996 apud Aguilar, 2005, p. 41) explains the four functions of listening according to Pierre Schaeffer, based on the four French verbs, addressing an example drawn from everyday life. With a slight distinction, the author refers to the four functions of listening as modes of listening.

Let us imagine a car accelerating toward us. In the *second mode*, the function above designated as hearing, the sound of the car penetrates our consciousness without our being able to avoid it. Through the function of listening, here the *first mode*, we will recognize the type of car, its activity, and may eventually ask what will happen to the pedestrians if the car does not brake, etc. But if we decide to ignore the event in order to consciously direct ourselves to the sound, our attention will turn toward a selective study and eventually toward the enjoyment of the sound's attributes, recognizing, for example, its dynamic profile, the intonation of the acceleration, or changes in pitch level. This attitude would correspond to the *third mode*, or the function of understanding. If the observations resulting from this study call for further deepening, we may, based on the criteria obtained, create a network of signs that confer upon the sound a meaning that may be musical. In this case, we will have put into operation the *fourth mode*, the function of comprehending.

For Schaeffer, listening is an active and non-constant process, in which attention is directed in its favor, in contrast to hearing, which is passive and continuous. The non-constancy of listening is indeed true, for we are not disposed to exercise it unless there is intention. For him, "hearing is incommunicable and intransferable. It is of a concrete nature, for it deals indispensably with sound, with

that which is heard. Sound exists outside the listener, independent of him” (Reyner, 2012, p. 33), whereas listening is

[...] beyond sound. When we say we listen to a given interlocutor, we mean at the same time that we do not listen to the sound of his voice, but to the sound insofar as it refers to his person. At the limit, as Schaeffer says, we even come to forget the passage through audition.⁷

And he adds that “a sound event disturbs silence. Listening is a reaction to this disturbance” (Reyner, 2012, p. 32).

In the twentieth century, in addition to Pierre Schaeffer, various approaches emerged aimed at addressing listening in light of changes occurring in society – new ways of looking at sound production, not solely based on instruments. The approaches that emerged viewed listening as a reading of sonic irregularities. It is a category of listening that arises to broaden the field of its understanding, promoting constructions of sense and meaning from uncommon approaches. As Camargo (2004, pp. 18–19) states,

we could cite innumerable fields in which listening appears as a reading of sonic irregularities. Just as the physician identifies cardiac irregularities through a stethoscope or auscultator, where variation in tempo and rhythm (in repetitions and periodicities) marks an act of signifying cardiopathy and subjectivizing the cardiac patient.⁸

The sonorities that emerged, strongly influenced by the accelerated work rhythm of large cities, gave rise to a generation of composers interested in such novelties, developing their theories about the sonorities of the time and leveraging the field of musical understanding toward perspectives sufficiently distinct from those previously existing. One of the most successful approaches in the musical field is that of the Canadian music educator Murray Schafer^{VII} (1933-2021). He was the creator

⁷ Original: “[...] além do som. Quando dizemos escutar certo interlocutor, queremos dizer ao mesmo tempo que não escutamos o som de sua voz, mas o som enquanto referência à sua pessoa. No limite, como diz Schaeffer, chegamos mesmo a esquecer a passagem pela audição” (Reyner, 2012, p. 32).

⁸ Original: “poderíamos citar inúmeros campos onde a escuta aparece como leitura das irregularidades sonoras. Tal qual o médico que identifica as irregularidades cardíacas através de um estetoscópio ou auscultador, onde a variação do tempo e da rítmica (das repetições e periodicidades) é marca de um ato de significação da cardiopatia e subjetivação do cardiopata” (Camargo, 2004, pp. 18–19).

of the term Soundscape (Paisagem Sonora), which suggests a reflective attention to the sounds existing in society, of any origin. In one of his most important books, *The Thinking Ear (O Ouvido Pensante)*, Schafer proposes observing the sonorities that surround us in any environment. He proposed *perceiving, recognizing, and decoding* existing sounds so that the Soundscape might be created from the analyzed surroundings. In these highlighted words and in the title of Murray Schafer's book, we perceive a clear approximation to the listening discussed here.

Known by a large number of music educators, Murray Schafer is a dedicated author when speaking of Soundscape in contemporary contexts. He developed this expression based on the sonic transformations that occurred in society over time, in the "sounds of the world".^{VIII} Schafer relies on listening as one of the principal means for analyzing sonorities in the twentieth century. Contemporary to him, Sarmento (2010, p. 25) reinforces this idea:

He starts from the principle that the search for the solution to this problem must begin through a work of refining listening to all sounds, capable of assisting people in the perception of sonic details, also aiming at the development of creativity, attention and concentration, and critical sense.⁹

Sarmento (2010), in her master's thesis, analyzed listening with reference to three contemporary thinkers: Theodor Adorno, Jacques Attali, and Murray Schafer. These thinkers affirm listening as an effective mode in their practices.

Adorno states that its absence guarantees the acceptance of standardized musical products similar to one another, configuring what he calls the "regression of listening"; Attali asserts that it is conceived as a form of knowledge and therefore should be present at all times, since its appropriation and control are reflections of power, which by essence is political; Schafer, in turn, considers it the key element for solving the problem of the soundscape. (Sarmento, 2010, p. 25).¹⁰

⁹ Original: "*Ele parte do princípio de que a busca para a solução deste problema deve iniciar-se por meio de um trabalho de refinamento da escuta para todos os sons, capaz de auxiliar as pessoas na percepção de pormenores sonoros com vistas também ao desenvolvimento da criatividade, atenção e concentração e do senso crítico*" (Sarmento, 2010, p. 25).

¹⁰ Original: "*Adorno afirma que sua ausência garante a aceitação dos produtos musicais padronizados e semelhantes entre si, configurando o que denomina de "decadência da audição"; Attali assegura que ela é concebida como uma forma de conhecimento e que, portanto, deveria estar presente a todo o momento, pois*

Thus, the process of listening presented here regards listening as a form of participation, occurring in the moment of attention, of observation, of disposition. To listen is to think, and this takes place through the perception of what is heard. Alves (2013, p. 152) exemplifies the importance of listening when stating that

[...] It is only possible to think music because we listen beyond the natural limits of hearing, and the exercise of listening is what allows thought to know the musical phenomenon in a participatory manner. All musical thinking, from interpretation to composition, its theory and history, originates in listening.¹¹

We do not intend to define that the listening conceived here positions itself as the most effective mode of observation, but as a mode that is relevant to us in the daily practice of the authors of this text. In reasoning analogous to that of Alves (2013, p. 152), “it is not our duty to create or unveil a particular concept of listening to be used as right or wrong; our objective is to know the vigor of what it is to listen and to know how to enter into the paths of the questions raised”.¹²

We close this text by pointing to a reality that is significant to us, the authors: silence. We consider it a unique form of listening that supports all the forms of listening presented throughout the text. If silence is not considered, listening does not take place. It is in not saying that many of the possibilities for revealing the phenomenon one wishes to listen to are embedded. As Alves (2013, p. 162) reports,

Listening takes place in silence, not in the silencing of language, which would be impossible for man to cease his own reason for life, but in the silence of attentively safeguarding what we are listening to. To think of silence is to conceive all its imminence in harboring sound at any instant; silence is the nothing that holds all potentiality.¹³

sua apropriação e controle são reflexos do poder, que por essência, é político; Schafer, por sua vez, considera a peça chave para a solução do problema da paisagem sonora” (Sarmiento, 2010, p. 25).

¹¹ Original: “[...] Somente é possível pensar música porque escutamos além dos limites naturais do ouvir, sendo o exercício da escuta o que permite ao pensamento conhecer o fenômeno musical de forma participativa. Todo pensar musical, desde a interpretação, a composição, sua teoria e história têm origem na escuta” (Alves, 2013, p. 152).

¹² Original: “não é nosso dever criar ou desvendar um determinado conceito de escuta para ser usado como certo ou errado, nosso objetivo é conhecer o vigor do que é escutar e saber como adentrar nos caminhos das questões levantadas” (Alves, 2013, p. 152).

¹³ Original: “A escuta se dá no silêncio, não no silenciar da linguagem, o que seria impossível ao homem cessar o seu próprio motivo de vida, porém, o silêncio de resguardar com atenção o que estamos escutando. Pensar no

FINAL CONSIDERATIONS

The text we have presented establishes parallels and significant differences regarding hearing/listening. Giving attention to the difference in meanings between the two words said to be “synonyms” revealed to us the particularities of each, as well as a great distance from their actual meanings. Hearing is commonly linked to sound, but listening proves to be broad and possibly not limited only to the forms of listening we have presented. To consider the differences between both words is to give due weight to the importance that each has in any context of human relations permeated by hearing/listening, and, moreover, to understand more precisely the meaning of what is being said within these same relations.

References

AGUILAR, Ananay. **Processos de estruturação na escuta de música eletroacústica**. Master’s Thesis (Master’s in Music) – Graduate Program in Music, Institute of Arts, University of Campinas. São Paulo, 2005. São Paulo, 2005.

ALONSO, Silvia Leonor. **A escuta psicanalítica**. 1988. Available at: <http://www2.uol.com.br/percurso/main/pes01/artigo0120.htm>. Accessed on: Feb. 25, 2024.

ALVES, Wagner Geraldo. Linguagem e escuta musical ontológica. In: SIMPÓSIO DE ESTÉTICA E FILOSOFIA DA MÚSICA (SEFIM), 1, 2013. **Anais do I Simpósio de Estética e Filosofia da Música**. Porto Alegre: UFRGS, v. 1, n. 1, 2013, p. 151-165. vol. 1, no. 1, 2013, p. 151-165. Available at: <http://www.ufrgs.br/sefim/ojs/index.php/sm/article/view/37>. Accessed on: Oct. 20, 2024.

OLIVEIRA, Délio Henrique Delfino de. **Escuta clínica e a atitude fenomenológica no atendimento à pessoa surda**: reflexões sobre um processo psicoterapêutico. 2014. Master’s Thesis (Master’s in Psychology) – Graduate Program in Psychology Natal: UFRN, 2014. 111 f.

CAMARGO, Luís Francisco Espíndola. **A escuta do não-sentido**: na linguística, na música e na psicanálise. 2004. Master’s Thesis (Master’s in Linguistics) – Graduate

silêncio é conceber toda sua eminência de abrigar o som a qualquer instante, o silêncio é o nada que guarda toda potencialidade” (Alves, 2013, p. 162).

Program in Linguistics, Center for Communication and Expression, Federal University of Santa Catarina, Florianópolis. Available at: <https://repositorio.ufsc.br/handle/123456789/87994>. Accessed on: Nov. 13, 2024.

HEIDEGGER, Martin. **Seminário de Zollikon**. In: MedardBoss. Translation by Gabriela Arnold and Maria de Fátima de Almeida Prado. EDUC. Petrópolis, Rio de Janeiro: Vozes. 2009.

HEIDEGGER, Martin. **Ser e tempo**. T Revised translation and introduction by Márcia Sá Cavalcante Schuback. 10th ed. – Petrópolis, RJ: Vozes; Bragança Paulista, SP: Editora Universitária São Francisco, 2015.

MARCELO, Guilherme Conti. **Do falar, do ouvir, do calar**: sobre a linguagem no pensamento de Heidegger. 2012. Master's Thesis (Master's in Philosophy) – Graduate Program in Philosophy, Pontifical Catholic University of São Paulo. São Paulo, 2012.

REYNER, Igor Reis. **Pierre Schaeffer e Marcel Proust**: as expressões da escuta. 2012. Master's Thesis (Master's in Music) – Federal University of Minas Gerais, School of Music. Belo Horizonte, 2012.

SARMENTO, Luciana Elena. A escuta na visão de três autores do século XX. In: SARMENTO, Luciana Elena. **A escuta na contemporaneidade**: uma pesquisa de campo em educação musical. 2010. Master's Thesis (Master's in Music) – São Paulo State University, Institute of Arts. São Paulo, 2010. Available at: <http://repositorio.unesp.br/handle/11449/95151>. Accessed on: Jan. 10, 2024.



This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International (CC BY-NC 4.0)

Notes

¹In the following paragraphs, we will explain the reason for the use of these two words together;

²We consider speech to be the sonic manifestation of the words of a language, in contrast to saying, which carries meaning;

³Throughout the text, some foreign words, mainly from the German language, are presented in brackets in certain citations. It is common to find texts in Portuguese in which words are provided in their original language, as a way of indicating to the reader the exact term and thus drawing closer to

the text, understanding it as conceived by the author. Such care with words is rigorously observed in philosophical texts;

^{IV}Martin Heidegger (1889–1976) (2015) addresses the theme of temporality involving these three tenses; likewise, the philosopher demonstrates an articulation among them that constructs being-in-the-world, a terminology proper to and characteristic of his philosophical legacy;

^VIn relation to the five senses (smell, touch, taste, sight, and hearing), a criterion that, for convenience, admits only physiological bases;

^{VI}Pierre Schaeffer (1910–1995) was a French composer, in addition to being a music theorist. Naturally, he grounded his theory of listening in his native language;

^{VII}A Canadian composer who perceived how sounds shape our perception of the world and, based on this, created his own theory that considers every type of sound for his musical work;

^{VIII}An expression coined by the authors of this article, which we believe faithfully represents the musical reading of the world proposed by the thinker Schafer.