

sic, however, is that in 1989 musical notation can surely no longer be considered the main mode for art music: although the written score may still enjoy a certain ontological supremacy, in reality many more people experience classical music through recordings than through scores. Sound recording is the great equalizer among musical genres: regardless of a piece of music's original social context, a record is a record, whether on the shelves of a research library or on the home stereo system.

By Tagg's criterion of "theory and aesthetics," Eno's music would seem to be art music, if only because Eno himself has surrounded his music with a glittering halo of theory and aesthetics in dozens of statements ranging from interviews and album liner notes to published articles. But the situation is more complex than that: Tagg's distinguishing between popular and art music on the basis of an absence or presence of a body of theory and aesthetics is an increasingly dubious distinction. Paul Taylor's fine, extensively annotated bibliography *Popular Music Since 1955: A Critical Guide to the Literature*<sup>8</sup> devotes a chapter to "Artistic aspects of popular music," including citations of works concerned specifically with aesthetics, musical criticism and analysis, and songs as poetry. Finally, Eno's music is non-anonymously authored, though a complicating factor is introduced by the double or multiple authorship of many of the pieces Eno has worked on, collective authorship being supposedly more characteristic of folk and popular music than of art music. To sum up, it would be impossible, on the basis of Tagg's axiomatic triangle, to decide whether Eno's music should be classified as "art" or "popular."

So much for this level of abstraction. Everyone knows that at least since the 1920s musicians have been deliberately blurring the distinction between popular, art, and folk music. Charles Ives and Aaron Copland wrote symphonic works incorporating American folk themes. Igor Stravinsky composed pieces like the jazz-inflected *Ebony Concerto*. Many critics consider the music of Duke Ellington, Charlie Parker, and John Coltrane to be art of the highest order. And when we come to the rock music of the 1960s and beyond, the experimentation becomes increasingly intense. There are of course many examples of superficial blendings of pop and classical styles, such as Walter Murphy's "A Fifth of Beethoven" or the Swingle Singers' jazzy renditions of Bach. There is everything from Joshua Rifkin's *Baroque Beatles Book* (actually not so superficial as all that) to Muzak versions of "Yesterday."

Attempts at deeper syntheses of art and pop are sometimes categorized as art rock or classical rock. Such music includes not only the rock operas of the Who, the Kinks, and others, and the massive, virtuosic, grandiose compositions of 1970s groups like Yes and Emerson, Lake & Palmer, but also more restrained, subtle examples of "baroque or classical sound/structure" in rock, such as the Beach Boys' "Surf's Up" or the Beatles' "Eleanor Rigby."<sup>9</sup> Other groups

---

<sup>8</sup> Paul Taylor, *Popular Music Since 1955: A Critical Guide to the Literature* (Boston: G.K. Hall & Co., 1985).

<sup>9</sup> Janell Duxbury, *Rockin' the Classics and Classicizin' the Rock: A Selectively Annotated Discography*, Discographies, Number 14 (Westport, Ct. and London: Greenwood Press, 1985), 117. This extraordinary source provides a useful overview of this field of music. Interestingly, and perhaps inevitably, though, the discography's method, like Tagg's axiomatic triangle, proves unable to catch Eno's unique blend of musical popularism and classicism in its net: he is represented by only two entries, both of them of marginal significance in terms of a total understanding of his work: Eno is cited as rockin' the Pachelbel Canon on *Discreet Music* (though this is not so much a rock arrangement – the only instruments are strings – as a