

Indexing of Musical Genres. An Epistemological Perspective

Knut Tore Abrahamsen

Åsengata 8 B, 0480 OSLO, NORGE, E-mail: knuttore@hotmail.com



Knut Tore Abrahamsen graduated as a librarian from *Høgskolen i Oslo* [Academy of Oslo] and has a Master degree in library and information science from the *Royal School of Library and Information Science*, Copenhagen. In addition, he has studied music for one year and has formerly been engaged in a local radio program and a magazine dedicated to experimental music.

Abrahamsen, Knut Tore. (2003). **Indexing of Musical Genres. An Epistemological Perspective.** *Knowledge Organization*, 30(3/4). 144-169. 58 refs.

ABSTRACT: This article sets out to investigate genre as a basic criterion in subject indexing of music in libraries and bibliographical databases. The concept of genre is examined in relation to epistemology and to different values and views in both musicology and libraries. The point of departure is to regard music as a domain of actors, institutions and processes. A comprehensive definition of this domain is suggested, which includes several subdomains and discourses. The classical music subdomain and the popular music subdomain are introduced and related to libraries. The article further investigates the concept of “paradigm” in relation to musicology. It demonstrates how two different paradigms influence the way music is defined, described, classified and indexed and how they are part of a historical context. The fourth part of the article focuses on the concept of genre and the analysis of music and the relation between analytical methods and values/paradigms. In addition, this part focuses on the actors that are responsible for the verbalization of genres in music. The fifth part examines indexing of musical genres with a view to their function as subject access points in databases. The unsatisfactory state of today’s practice, as well as the need of a better theoretical foundation of the concept of genre, is documented. The unsatisfactory differentiation in the organising of popular music is exemplified by Danish and Norwegian libraries, including the DK5 system and the *Indeksering af musik* guidelines. Finally, arguments are put forward for developing an anthropological paradigm in relation to organizing music in libraries.

1. Introduction

Genre indexing of popular music is limited in most phonographic library databases and needs to be improved because it causes limited accessibility of recorded music for the users. This accessibility can be increased if genre indications are used more actively as subject headings. This claim is associated with the view that central aspects of the differences between the various kinds of music can be expressed in differentiated genre classifications.

There is an apparent lack of effort to more actively divide the music into genres. While broader categories of genres such as “rock,” “pop,” “jazz,” etc. are often applied, a more genuine differentiated genre division would enable users to perform more fruitful searches. Such a classification would make it

possible to obtain music that belongs to the particular musical style or genre that the listener may be looking for, without needing to have prior knowledge of the name of the artist or album.

In practical indexing there seems to be more effort applied to indexing of one form of music compared to another, even though this is not recognized. Classical music seems to be more differentiated compared to popular music. This may be related to different worldviews and values, which influence what is regarded as more or less important. These worldviews and values may not just influence the choices of objects to be included in the library, but may also influence the way knowledge is defined, classified and organized, i.e.: the selection of genre categories.

This is where epistemology and paradigms become significant. How have musicology and libraries di-

vided the world? Which worldview underlies the divisions that have been made, and which topics have been stressed? Which considerations have been emphasized in the process? Which paradigms can we find in musicology? What are the values that lay behind those? The issues raised by these questions will be examined in this article. More concretely, some of the epistemological conditions that underlie the way the genre has commonly been classified and defined in musicology, as well as in libraries, will be investigated. Throughout this article, emphasis has been placed at genre indexing connected to popular music.

The relation between epistemology and indexing is not a simple and straightforward cause and effect relationship. Mutual influences and often other factors (e.g. pragmatic reasons such as available time) may contribute to the results. The aim of this paper is not to uncover or exemplify all the reasons behind how musical genres are classified, defined, divided and constituted, but rather to draw attention to how epistemological and paradigmatic assumptions influence the way musical genres are classified.

One of the main goals of this article is to show a connection between the dominant paradigm in musicology and the genre categories of popular music that have been used in musicology, as well as in libraries. A further goal is to show how this is significant for genre concepts as potential subject access points in databases. An aim of this article is to build a theoretical framework that can work as the point of departure for defining and indexing musical genres and thus improving access to music in libraries and databases. The context of this article is the indexing of popular music in public libraries in Denmark and Norway.

2 The music domain

2.1 *Introduction to domain analysis, epistemological and sociological perspective*

Domain analysis as a theoretical approach to Library and Information Science (LIS) and Knowledge Organisation (KO) can be traced to Hjørland (1991, 1993), who explicitly developed it as an alternative to the dominant cognitive view. According to Hjørland (2002b), a domain analysis should consider a field sharing common concepts, terms, and knowledge and investigate the nature and structure of the knowledge and communication at the chosen level of specialization. In Hjørland (2002a), eleven approaches to domain analysis are presented. Hjørland argues that these approaches together, make a unique compe-

tence for information specialists. The following quotation is central for the domain analytic approach:

A central point in my approach [domain-analytic] is the claim that tools, concepts, meaning, information structures, information needs, and relevance criteria are shaped in discourse communities, for example, in scientific disciplines, which are part of society's division of labor. A discourse community being a community in which an ordered and bounded communication process takes place. (Hjørland, 2002b, p.258)

Two central elements in domain analysis are the epistemological and sociological influences on information in a field.

Epistemology can be described as "...the theory of knowledge, the philosophical study of the nature, origin and scope of knowledge" (Moser, 1997, p.197). According to Hjørland: "Epistemologies can be seen as the generalization and interpretation of collected scientific experience. Therefore, theories of epistemology are the most fundamental theories of relevance, and any theoretical question in information science is, in the end, based on epistemological assumptions" (2002a, p.438). Further:

Epistemological studies are studies that examine the explicit or implicit assumptions behind research traditions. Such assumptions are often linked to ontological assumptions concerning the object under study. They represent an analysis of the approaches or paradigms in research fields. (Hjørland, 2002a, p.438)

Sociology is the study of communities and societies. In domain analysis, this study is particularly related to the different actors, institutions and communication channels in different domains. The domain analytic framework, and its emphasis on epistemology and sociology, are the main points of departure in this article, as summarized in this quotation:

In domain analysis, we are less inclined to speak about mental models and more inclined to talk about knowledge, (pre)understanding, theories, paradigms, and epistemologies. We mainly see the individual person as influenced by different theories, epistemologies, and paradigms, which are very often partly unconscious or neglected by the individual. (Hjørland, 2002b, p.261)

An important method that is applied in this article from the starting point of domain analysis and the epistemological and sociological perspective is the analysis of discourses. According to Talja (2001):

In the discourse analytical approach, the viewpoint is on social practices. This viewpoint does not deny the fact that individuals are active, create meanings, and thus have the power to change the world. It is emphasized that meanings are created in “communicatings,” between individuals, not inside individuals. (Talja, 2001, p.29).

This illustrates that the analysis of discourses is overlapping with the project of domain analysis.¹

2.2 Music understood as a domain

In the UNISIST model of scientific communication, Fjordback Søndergaard, Andersen & Hjørland (2003) suggested that the mapping of actors, institutions, types of documents, and communication channels is one way to analyze a domain from the perspective of library and information science. From this point of departure, the overall domain of music will be treated as everything that can be connected to, or defined as music. Music may, of course, also be regarded as something belonging to other domains such as education (teaching music), philosophy (thinking about music in philosophical ways), business (selling music), information science (organizing and retrieving music), etc.

Neither musicology² nor other parts of the domain of music are unified or homogenous fields. Music may also be understood as sets of related discourses and domains. We might, for example, see the discourses on music as influenced by disciplinary borders (e.g. discourses inside musicology or sociology or more interdisciplinary discourses). Certain views and paradigms (e.g. materialistic views, stylistic and semiotic views) may cross such disciplinary borders. All domains/discourses may of course be partly overlapping, the concrete degree of the overlap being an empirical question. With this comprehensive definition in mind, a general structure will now be outlined of the elements which should be taken into consideration in organizing and mapping the field of music.

Actors

In music, a set of actors contributes to, or is loosely connected to, the domain. Examples of actors are the

producers of music (composers, musicians), the producers of knowledge about music (scholars, musicologist, sociologists, music critics) and the intermediaries (journalists, librarians, teachers). Actors are also the users of music and of knowledge about music (music audience, readers, listeners). Some of these actors are more influential and greater contributors to parts, or the whole of, the music domain. Different kinds of writers of music (historians, journalists, music critics etc.) have much influence on the verbalisation of music, on how music is understood and how the domain is perceived.

Institutions, disciplines and discourses

The actors are often members of different institutions and discourses, which again are part of broader communities. Examples of such institutions are conservatories, universities and music academies. Examples of micro-level discourses are concert audiences and listeners of a specific musical genre. Macro-level discourses may be found in sub-cultures, social classes and societies ranging from small to large. Scientific disciplines such as anthropology, musicology, psychology and sociology are also parts of this broad understanding of the domain. Such disciplines tend to focus on different aspects of music and to be influenced by different academic influences and views. According to Dogan (2001), the specialities in and between disciplines are generally more important discursive units than the disciplines themselves, because no one can master the whole field of any discipline. Among all the disciplines concerned with music, musicology is in many respects central.

Classical Music and Popular Music as Sub-domains

Contemporary musicology can be characterised by the lack of unity rather than by some shared characteristics concerning its object of study, its values and its goals (see e.g., Nettl, 2001). It consists of specialized sub-disciplines that are more or less independent from each other:

The three sub-disciplines of modern musical research (historical musicology, ethnomusicology and music theory) constitute distinct subcultures, each with its own professional organization to insure the perpetuation of its own distinctive social structure. (Shelemay, 1996 rendered in Korsyn, 2003, p.6)

Among the set of several possible ways of classifying subdomains and discourses in music, we might consider *classical music* (with weight on European art-music as the main object of study) and *popular music* (which regards classical music, ethno-music and popular music as being of equal worth of study, although it has chosen to concentrate on the study of the last named kind) as two important subdomains.

Many research and educational institutions (Nettl 2001) treat research in classical music and popular music as two different subdomains. This has, in turn, led to the tendency to the application of different research methods and philosophies. In other words: they have a tendency to support different paradigms. The classical subdomain has had a tendency to support “the traditional paradigm” while the popular subdomain has had a tendency to support “the culture historic/new musicology paradigm”. (These paradigms are characterized later on in this article). There is also research that does not follow any of those tendencies, but this is of minor importance for the understanding of why popular music has been analyzed and valued the way it actually has, and, consequently, the way popular music has been classified into different genres.

It is beyond the scope of this paper to thoroughly investigate and discuss different definitions of concepts like classical music³ and popular music. However, something must be said about those concepts and their treatment here. The concept of classical music is used instead of the terms art-music, serious music or “composition music” which are terms that are much used in musicology. This is because the term classical music is commonly used in the public library context. Further, this avoids some of the value-laden connotations of the terms art music and serious music and their implications (e.g. that rock music can not be serious or art). The concept of popular music refers to the music that does not naturally file under classical music or ethno-music (see e.g., Cutler, 1985, p.17). The aim is to draw attention to the two subdomains in music that are more separated by different actors, institutions and discourses than by the music itself.

Some differences between the treatment of classical and popular music in musicology

Classical music has, to a larger extent than popular music, been analyzed from the point of view of the music’s content, structure, syntax etc. Popular music, on the other hand, has received less interest from

researchers, and this research has focused more on external circumstances such as music significance for youth cultures. Research on popular music has focused on sociological and cultural issues as well as on its historical evolution (Middleton, 1990). Analysis of historical evolution is based on the content and structure of the music, with more weight given on whole genre groups in preference to single works (Bjørnberg, 1991). This is partly due to the fact that popular music generally is simpler in its construction than classical music. This, however, is not a valid argument for ignoring content and structure in the analysis of popular music. Firstly, there exists much popular music that is at least as complex in structure as much of the classical music (cf., note 5). Secondly, complexity can be in “appearance” or “sound” rather than structure or syntax.

There may be other reasons behind the typical difference in the analysis of popular music and classical music. One of the reasons is obviously connected to what Bjørnberg (1991) writes in his *Analyse af populermusik* [Analysis of popular music]:

The field of popular music has long in wide range been neglected inside musicology. This is perhaps especially the case with popular-musical phenomenon’s music analytic aspects, despite that the study of such aspects constitutes the special area of musicology. An important explanation of this circumstance is that aesthetic and/or ideological considerations has influenced researchers attitude toward musical genres and ruled the choice of analysis objects. (1991, p.13; author’s translation)

There is an apparent connection between the conservatory tradition’s aesthetic and the ideological disparagement of popular music and its research methods. The autonomous-aesthetic paradigm of the conservatory tradition, which according to Bjørnberg (1991) has been dominating musicology for a long time, supplies inadequate methods for analyzing popular music. This has led to:

...[that] some researchers inside this tradition [have been led] to the conclusion that intramusical factors are irrelevant...and that this [the popular music] instead is based on sociological, socio-psychological and economical conditions. (Bjørnberg 1991, p.39; author’s translation)

Björnberg says *some researchers*, but this view has strongly influenced the research on popular music. Research on popular music was not born as an independent field in musicology but grew out of other disciplines such as traditional musicology, sociological studies and anthropology (cf., Middleton, 1990).

The subdomains of classical and popular music are not, however, two completely separate areas in musicology. The two research fields influence each other primarily because they belong to the same subject field, but also because much research on popular music has some of its roots in research on classical music (Nettl, 2001). At the same time, it should be noted that the formation of a research tradition on popular music came, in part, as a reaction to traditional musicology's oversight of the area.

At the 2001 IASPM⁴ conference in Turku, Philip Tagg stated: "I soon found that teaching popular music analysis was impossible if you tried to use the methods and concepts of conventional, solely structuralist, musicology" (Tagg, 2001, p.1). This quotation indicates that the research in popular music had to delimit itself from traditional musicology and those methods that have dominated research.

Clearly there have been significant developments in the field of musicology, where studies of popular music have become an important part of research, not the least in the culture historic /new musicology paradigm (Balchin, 2001). Nonetheless, musicology is still lacking interest in treating music without regard to type of music (e.g. classical and popular music). This may be seen as an indicator that the traditional paradigm is still strong. Musicology maintains the distinction between classical music and popular music even though the traditional opposition between "high" art and "low" art in many cases no longer applies, either in musicology or in the library. The rigid distinction between classical and popular music may involve a barrier in studies of music that mixes several genres or traditions. This rigid distinction is also somewhat artificial compared to the "real" world of played music⁵ and this may imply prejudices of how music is perceived. This also implies consequences for the management of information about music in the libraries such as shelf arrangements and categorisations.

Classical music and popular music in the context of libraries

Aesthetic and ideological considerations have influenced the attitude of researchers concerning differ-

ent musical genres (cf., Björnberg, 1991, p.13). This has also been the case in the libraries, although important changes have indeed taken place during the last decade (see, e.g., *Indeksering af Musik*, section 5.1.2). Even though libraries generally have a point of view different from that of musicology, they have at the same time adopted many of its attitudes and values. The Danish Dewey classification scheme, DK5⁶ may serve as an example of this (c.f., Dansk Biblioteks Center, 1997/1999). In the notation group 78.3 - 78.8 [Sheets of music and recorded music], nine pages are dedicated to the classification of classical music, but only one sheet is dedicated to the classification of popular music. The subject classes are few and undifferentiated. This is probably partly due to the fact that the music libraries have traditionally served different musical institutions such as conservatories. Later on, large music sections emerged in the public library and were free from such obligations (see, e.g., Norge [Bibliotekloven] [The Norwegian Library Law], 1997). This has not, however, led to radical changes and the inherent values of the tradition still dominates libraries.

This can be illustrated by analyzing the classification tools that are available (e.g., DK5 and *Dewey Decimal Classification and Relative Index* (2003) with their explicit or implicit values (see below, section 5.1). Another example is the values that are expressed by the music collection. Both the classification of recorded music, and the composition of the collection, express more implicit values that pay debts to different worldviews, ethical principals, paradigms, or epistemological considerations. The worldviews expressed by the classification and collection need not be in accordance with the worldviews of the librarians, in spite of this: "...pre existing conceptualizations, ways of classifying phenomena...for instance, music into serious and non serious...capture even the speaker whose conscious intention is to oppose them" (Talja, 2001, p.15; Hall, 1982). It has been beyond the scope of this project to closely investigate the music collections in different libraries.

Examination of, among others, Deichman Public Library in Oslo, Bergen Public Library, Copenhagen Public Library and their electronic catalogues revealed that the collections of classical music are more differentiated and comprehensive, and less casually selected, than the collections of popular music. This may be due to problems caused by the need to choose from a vast amount of popular music, compared to that of classical music. Because classical mu-

sic has a much longer written history and is a more lucid field, it has been easier to classify and control its different kinds of styles and genres. Part of the reason seems to be connected to the influence of the traditional paradigm in musicology, which has tended to favor classical music. The argument is that it is easier to build a differentiated collection when the field is well organized and mapped.

3 Epistemologies in Music

3.1 *A specific example of how epistemological views influence the way music is defined, described and organized*

Two Danish histories of music can be used to demonstrate how different “paradigms” influence the way music is divided, classified, indexed and organized. The books are Hansen et al. (1990) [Gads History of Music] and Brincker et al. (1982-1984) [Gyldendals History of Music, Vol. 1-4]. They perceive the history of music from two different perspectives that pay debts to different epistemological positions and paradigms. Brincker et al. have the most explicit paradigm, which is presented in the foreword:

The culture of music is viewed as a part of a historical process, where the music is included in a interaction with political, social, economical and ideological elements; and the description of the music’s function in this interaction is this book’s main concern. One could therefore say that it is the music’s cultural- and social history rather than its style- and personal history, that is our concern. (Brincker et al. 1982, p.7; author’s translation).

These authors see music as a kind of socio-cultural construction. They do not regard style- and personal-history as the main goal for exploring the history of music. Music is not to be considered autonomous, nor is the composer the most important factor influencing the development of music and musical styles. The socio-cultural context is considered the primary force in the development and function of music and musical styles; namely political, economical, social and ideological elements. Brincker et al. do not altogether dismiss the style-centred tradition in the history of musicology, but see it as secondary and complementary compared to the broader social and cultural history. It is the sociological as-

pects that are especially stressed. As a result, the authors have chosen to include not only “high” cultural art music (classical music) but also folk music (ethno music) and entertainment music (popular music). This is in contrast to the traditional stylistic treatment of the history of music that has focused on “high” cultural art music.

Structurally, music is treated as one field of study rather than strongly separated areas. Though developments in different fields of music are written about in separate sections of the text, they are still treated in the same chapters, and hence are filed under the same main subject headings. This communicates that the different parts belong to the same evolutionary stage in human cultural and social history. Until the period labelled the “bourgeois culture of music,” which is considered to start in the middle of the 18th century, they try to organize the history of music in respect to the function it had in the society. This is reflected in the titles of the main chapters, for example, *Musik i hoffkulturen* [music in the court-culture] *Musik i teateret* [music in the theatre], *Musik i kirken* [music in the church] etc. At the beginning of the bourgeois music culture, music is still treated with connection to the function it has in the society, but in that age the understanding of music was starting to change. From understanding music as connected to a function, it moved towards understanding music as art for its own sake, as an aesthetic object (Dahlhaus, 1989, pp.1-17). Brincker et al. include this perspective in the organizing of the music, from the beginning of the bourgeois music culture, until the present. Overall, the book interprets and understands changes in musical directions as caused by socio-cultural, political or economical conditions, with keywords such as class struggle, conditions of power, rebellion, ruler’s ideological abuse of music, commercializing, and market forces: “It is a consequence of the basic attitude of this presentation that attempts to explain the history of music can not be made on purely musical terms” (Brincker et al., 1982, Vol.3, p. 233; author’s translation). The work has an implicit view that rebellion against dominating forces in the society is of inherent value and that commercialization disrupts music: “The hippie and flower-power movements’ lack of political theory and foundation in reality made them an easy target for the American record-industry. The transition from progressive sub-culture to commercial mass-culture took place during the years 1965-1967” (Brincker et al., 1982, Vol.3, p.203; author’s translation).

Brincker et al. place less emphasis on musical styles, artists and composers, because they are seen as being of secondary importance. The more direct epistemological or theoretical assumptions that lay behind their view could be connected to a Marxist philosophy of science, which stresses the descriptions of underlying causal structures in explaining observable phenomena in which "...scientific inquiry is inevitably and deeply affected by social interests and relations of social power" (Miller, 1998, p. 147). Historically we could also connect many of the theoretical assumptions we find in Brincker et al. to the Frankfurt School of philosophy, with its "critical theory" of society and its "historical materialistic view" (Honneth, 1998, p. 730-737). It is also important to note that Brincker et al. try to avoid the traditional view of classical music as "high" art and popular music as "low" art.

Hansen et al. state in the foreword that it has not been its task to: "...carry out a specific theoretical understanding of the relationship between particular effecting powers in the historical evolution and on the other hand the caused music" (Hansen et al., 1990, p. 9; author's translation). Already here it distinguishes itself markedly from Brincker et al. Hansen et al. stress that it is the understanding of the musical works that is the main goal, and not only its starting point, as is the case in Brincker et al. It is important to note that Hansen et al. (1990) is written as a textbook on the history of music. With regard to this purpose, Hansen et al. chose a more pragmatic-methodical basis. They begin: "For just a few years ago such a more pragmatic basis could easily have been esteemed as a expression of narrow-mindedness. But exactly an independence from the idea that certain historical moments are decisive in development of music...is today a part of a modern history-methodical understanding, known as *structural history*" (Hansen et al., 1990, p.9; author's translation). They aim to present the "...multifaceted and changing factors that manifests themselves in the formulation of the music, its displayed forms in a given historical epoch and its impact on the future" (Hansen et al., 1990, p.9; author's translation). They also regard the history of music as fundamentally different from general history because of music's aesthetic character, and they have the implicit view that the musical work is relatively autonomous. Consequently, Hansen et al. focus more on the composers and performers role in the development of music. Overall, the view of Hansen et al. on music history is connected to "the style paradigm," "the structural historical paradigm," "the con-

servatory tradition," "the traditional paradigm," or "the romantic intellectual historical tradition" in musicology. It is clear that Hansen et al. try to avoid the more ideological aspects of this tradition, for example, the rigid distinction between "high" art music (classical music) and "low" popular music. They also try to make a broader scope in understanding the history of music, but in spite of this, they are an example of this tradition. We can observe this through the little space that has been given to 20th century popular music (32 pages) compared to classical music in the same period (103 pages). In addition, the classical composers are treated in more detail, and with respect to different musical styles, compared to the treatment of the popular music. "The conservatory tradition," that separates "high" and "low" is thus still evident in Hansen et al. Many of the choices in Hansen et al. are obviously connected to its function as a textbook. Nonetheless, these choices carry underlying epistemological assumptions. The romantic intellectual historical tradition in music is connected to the view of the individual's freedom and a strong subjective sense of art (Nielsen, 1976). This views the composer as the creator of an autonomous musical work (cf., section 3.3). Hansen et al. validate this perspective by focusing on the importance of composers and individual works in style changes throughout the history of music. Correspondingly, they mark divisions in styles and apply music-historical epochs like Baroque and Wiener-classicism. Hansen et al. use as a basis, the concepts and structure-historical elements from "...the development of the written and delivered European art music. It is first with the music from the 20th century...that the aim is more comprehensive and differentiated, with the addition of music from other continents and with jazz and popular music" (Hansen et al., 1990, p. 9; author's translation). This is a basis that Brincker et al. cannot avoid either, even though they try to make their assumptions to it more explicit. In addition, they try to bring this inheritance into discussion, and, more actively, to include popular music and music from other continents in their overall perspective.

It is important to note that it is not only structural elements and content that are influenced by the different points of view, but also terminology. This is only partly the case because overall, they share much of the same terminology due to their common basis in written and delivered European art-music. But as previously noted, Hansen et al. and Brincker et al. use different terms to label music historical epochs. This may easily be compared to problems of defining, in-


dexing and labelling musical genres. Both Hansen et al. and Brincker et al. use mainly common genre terms like rock, jazz, and blues in their treatment of popular music. That does not necessarily mean, however, that they share the same meaning of those musical concepts. Because neither text provides explicit definitions for such genre concepts, it is difficult to pin down the exact nature of the differences.

3.2 General Considerations Concerning Epistemologies in Musicology

Fig. 1 below is based on Ruud (1992, p. 8) and lists some basic dimensions of musicology.

The figure shows that musicology studies different fields or objects using different methods, which are both influenced by values. Musicology shares with other fields certain philosophies of science such as positivism and hermeneutics. There are also “paradigms” in musicology. The word “paradigm” is especially connected with Kuhn (1970), but cannot here be discussed in depth. One aspect of Kuhn is, however, especially interesting in the context of musicology, his view on values: “Usually they [values] are more widely shared among different communities than either symbolic generalizations or models, and they do much to provide a sense of community to natural scientists as a whole” (Kuhn, 1970, p.184).

Fig. 1:



Another quotation further stresses the importance of ethical principles in aesthetic disciplines:

...shared values can be important determinants of group behaviour even though the members of the group do not all apply them in the same way. (If that were not the case, there would be no *special* philosophic problems about value theory or aesthetics.) Men did not paint alike during the periods when representation was the primary value, but the developmental pattern of the plastic arts changed drastically when that value was abandoned. (Kuhn, 1970, p.186)

Values/ethical principles are central because they are implicit or explicit in every part of the music domain in both practical and theoretical aspects. What one considers as valuable research-objects, methods for research, organization principles and so on are of fundamental importance for organizing music in general and for the indexing of musical genres in particular.

Figure 2 below presents a reconstructing of fig. 1. Values are here seen as the most basic influence in musicology. The values are influential on what paradigm is selected by the researchers, which are again related to their philosophy of science. These values and views are again influential on what objects are studied in musicology and what methods are being used in research.

Fig. 2:

STRUCTURE OF MUSICOLOGY
VALUES / ETHICAL BASIS:
PARADIGMS:
PHILOSOPHIES OF SCIENCE
SUB-FIELDS OF MUSICOLOGY:
METHODS OF MUSICOLOGY

If we return to section 3.1 we can see how the two works on the history of music exemplify this model by demonstrating how different values and paradigms tend to address different sub-fields and use different research methods.

3.3 *Paradigms in musicology and their ethical principles*

Traditional paradigm

The conservatory tradition focuses on music as syntax and structure of sound (real or imagined). This has, according to Keil (1966) often led to a dependence on notation in Western musical analysis. This leads to a focus on musical structure in analysis of, or research in, music. The traditional paradigm regards the musical work as an autonomous work created by a composer/composers of a relatively high degree of intellectual sovereignty. This has led to a focus on developments of styles connected to their composers and in some degree, the performers of music, while the analysis of developments in styles connected to socio-cultural aspects have been relatively ignored. In this sense, the traditional paradigm considers musical works to have an eigenvalue regardless of its reception or context. According to Talja (2001, p. 93), the metaphysical concepts of individual freedom, genius, creativity, and inner truthfulness are taken as facts in the ideology of autonomous art (see also Williams, 1977; Wolf, 1987). The romantic ideal of art for art's own sake is also strong in this paradigm. An important ethical principle is that popular music is considered "low art" (low aesthetical value) and classical music (western art-music) is generally considered "high art" (high aesthetical value). This means that popular music is considered to be of lesser value than classical music and, thus, is classified and indexed in less detailed manner. If we look more closely at the values connected to the traditional paradigm, there resides a kind of idealism where there is assumed an existence of a canon of great music (cf., Nettel, 2001, p.306-307). Other parameters for aesthetical value have often been added, for example, degree of complexity or degree of popularity (leading to the fact that some classical music has been considered of lesser aesthetical value than others). The separation between popular music as "low art" and classical music as "high art" are ungrounded in the sense that it is a constructed aesthetical ideal, not an indisputable fact of the nature of music.

A specific German idealistic version exists within this tradition. Nielsen (1976) notes that this intellectual historical/idealistic tradition cannot be labelled an absolute epistemology in many cases "...because its foundation is unconscious of itself and is therefore unformulated" (Nielsen, 1976, p.8; author's translation). Nevertheless the idealistic tradition car-

ries some epistemological implications. Historically, claims Nielsen, the tradition is attached to Germany and the philosophical tendencies that made their way there in the 19th century. In contrast to the rationalism of the Enlightenment philosophy that dominated the French bourgeoisie, the situation was the opposite in Germany where the bourgeoisie culture was: “. . . irrational, it was pervaded by the idea of the individuals absolute freedom and intellectual sovereignty, it became detached from reality and romantic, it became the contrast to the French intellectual class-conscious enlightened reason; - and it became so, because the bourgeoisie...was isolated from economical and political influence on society” (Nielsen, 1976, p.189; author’s translation). Culturally this was expressed through an art that was strongly loaded with subjectivity. This led to a change in the concept of culture and in the general understanding of culture. Nielsen exemplifies this by citing Hauser:

“The artistic creation which was earlier defined unambiguous a definable intellectual activity, justified on rules of taste which could be taught and learned, is now emerging as a secretive process which is explained by such inscrutable sources as divine submittance, blind intuition and unpredictable mood” (Hauser, 1972 rendered in Nielsen 1976, p.189-190; author’s translation).

If we place the traditional paradigm in a larger cultural context it could be connected to what Talja, in her book *Music, Culture, and the Library*, labels “The Common Culture Repertoire.” She outlines three large-scale “theories of culture, art, and civilization from the societal and historical framework within which the library institution receives its form and meaning” (Talja, 2001, p.71). Based on an analysis of library discourses she discovered three different points of departure from which the current state of culture was analyzed:

- [1] the viewpoint of the official, institutional music culture, termed *the common culture repertoire*
- [2] the viewpoint focusing on cultural industry and publicity termed *the consumer culture repertoire* and
- [3] the viewpoint of street culture labeled *the mosaic culture repertoire* (p.72).

In the “The Common Culture Repertoire”:

“Culture is a domain of universally valid values. The very idea of art’s universal humanity, universal validity, and universality explains the unspecified culture talk that is characteristic for the common culture repertoire. Culture and art consistently spoken of without feeling a need to specify the tradition under discussion, the phenomena that are included in culture and art, or the historical position from which culture is approached. Unspecified culture talk is based on the mode of thought where culture is spiritual – that is, neutral and nonpolitical – and in which the term social is connected with politics and economic life” (Talja, 2001, p.89)

Culture historic / New musicology paradigm

In the culture historic / new musicology paradigm⁷ the main focus is on music understood as culture in opposition to music solely understood as structure of sound. This often leads to a materialistic (or symbolic) understanding of music, and music history is regarded as part of a broader cultural or social history. The evolution of music and the development of different musical styles are seen as caused by some materialistic or idealistic conditions in a socio-cultural context. This paradigm consequently includes both the more cultural-sociological/materialistic grounded views and the more cultural/symbolic grounded views. The latter is often connected to the anthropological view where the functions of music, for example, music as ritual, music as symbol, and music and identity, are important (Ruud, 1992, p.58). They both share the understanding of music as cultural/social products and give this aspect precedence over intra-musical aspects with regard to the analysis and interpretation of music. This implies that musical works do not have an absolute eigenvalue but that the value is connected with sociological circumstances (e.g. the ideology of the ruling class and of the uses of music) or with cultural aspects (e.g. with symbolic meaning and reception).

The culture historic / new musicology paradigm does not ignore the influence and importance of personal actors like composers or musicians in the development of new styles and genres. It sees, however, the materialistic conditions or cultural circumstances in society as having greater importance in understanding the development of new styles and genres in music. There are two main standpoints concerning

ethical principles in the culture historic / new musicology paradigm: one, which considers all kind of music equally worthy of study and another, which has preferences for specific kinds of music. Brincker et al. may exemplify the latter because of their implicit view of commercial music as of lesser aesthetic value than non-commercial music.

If we place both the traditional and culture historic/new musicology paradigm in the context of the history of musicology it becomes evident that the culture historic/new musicology paradigm is anchored most strongly in ethnomusicology, and that the traditional paradigm is anchored most strongly in historical musicology. This can be illustrated by the tension between those two sub-disciplines in musicology:

The contrasts have been so pronounced that one might consider historical musicology and ethnomusicology (both of which, in principle, have interests in history and in the place of music in society) as representing the diametrical opposites between which most music is played out: synchronic-diachronic, art-music - functional music, the elite-the entire society, dynamic music-static music, personalized-anonymous, individual-societal, origins known-origins unknown, music as sound-music as culture. (Nettl, 2001, p.308, see also Korsyn, 2003, p.33)

4. Music analysis and music genres

4.1 Defining music genres

Genre terms in popular music are a result of a historical development inside the field of music. It always takes some time from when a new musical style is discovered, until it is accepted as a genre. Fabbri suggest that: "A musical genre is a set of musical events (real or possible) whose course is governed by a definite set of social accepted rules" (1981, p.1). If we look up genre in *The New Grove Dictionary of Music and Musicians* the dictionary article start as follows: "Genre. A class, type or category, sanctioned by convention. Since conventional definitions derive (inductively) from concrete particulars, such as musical works or musical practices, and are therefore subject to change, a genre is probably closer to an 'ideal type' (in Max Weber's sense) than to a Platonic 'ideal form'" (Samson, 2001, p.657). These two quotations emphasise the historical and social aspects in definitions of genres alongside formal musical pa-

rameters. Which elements and aspects to take into consideration when defining genres can be roughly summarized by the following quotation:

The repetition units that define a musical genre can be identified on several levels. In the broadest understanding of the concept, they may extend into the social domain, so that a genre will be dependent for its definition on context, function and community validation and not simply on formal and technical regulation. Thus, the repetitions would be located in social, behavioural and even ideological domains as well as in musical materials. (Samson, 2001, p.657)

This illustrates two complementary approaches to the study of genre, one that focuses on the *qualities of artworks* and another that focus on *qualities of experience* (Samson, 2001, p.657).

Simon Frith argues that the genre terms in popular music arise as a result of the music industry's wish to make the music a commodity: "Genre is a way of defining music in its market, or alternatively, the market in its music" (Frith, 1998, p.76). He continues further:

Genre maps change according to who they're for. And there is a further complication. The point of a music label is, in part, to make coherent the way in which different music media divide the market – record companies, radio stations, music magazines, and concert promoters can only benefit from an agreed definition of, say, heavy metal. But this doesn't always work smoothly, if only because different media, by necessity, map their consumers in different ways. (Frith, 1998, p.77)

Frith emphasises that there are not any general valid definitions of the different genre categories; and in different musical discourses and communities one would be inclined to both define genre categories differently and to use different genre terms. One example of this is how the term RIO (Rock In Opposition) has been used among a group of listeners and journalists connected to progressive music⁸, as a term for a specific musical style or for some common characteristics connected to a specific kind of music (cf., Cutler, 1985, pp.131-135). This is a genre term that is rarely used outside this particular musical discourse. Genre terms rise from the need to be able to separate musical styles and types from each other (on ground of music's internal or external aspects). Different musical discourses illustrate different needs when it comes to the division of music into

different genres. The heavy metal discourse has, for example, classified music into several sub-genres like doom metal, speed metal, grind core and hard core. The blues discourse would generally not have the same need for classifying heavy metal into so many sub-genres and even though commercial interests (making music a commodity) influence the need for genre divisions, it is not the only aspect that influences the development and use of genre concepts. Genre is a complex area and even more so in the field of popular music, partly because the genre concept has been applied differently in classical and popular music. This is probably also due to the influence of an Aristotelian concept theory in the categorization of genres in classical music with a focus on line-up, instrumentation, musical form and so on. Here, the focus has been more on characteristics that are easier to measure compared to others that are more fluid, such as the elements that constitutes rock. This is one reason why little has been done in musicology to define genres more precisely. An example of this is what we find on the subject “rock” in two different dictionaries of music: Middleton’s (2001) description of rock in *The New Grove Dictionary of Music and Musicians* and Slonimsky’s (1998,) description of rock in *Webster’s New World Dictionary of Music*. They demonstrate that many genre categories are defined highly historically, which means that they are connected to the historical evolution of music. They are descriptive in their nature with few strictly drawn borders. Such historical definitions may serve some functions, but when we are going to use them as active subject terms in a phonographic database, a clarification of the genre categories that includes other elements and methods/approaches is much needed.

This analysis points to a possible relationship between paradigms and genres: Genre analysis in the traditional paradigm (primary classical music) has been dominated by the “qualities of artwork approach” while genre analysis in the culture historic / new musicology paradigm (primary popular music and ethno-music) has been dominated by the “qualities of experience” approach.

4.2 Actors responsible for the verbalization of genres in popular music

From the point of view of indexing and organizing music, an important question is: Which actors are responsible for the verbalization of the music and the building of music terminology? In this paper we have focused on the verbalization that musicology exhibits through actors like music historians. Viewed in a his-

torical perspective it becomes evident that the introduction of particular genre terms often emerge at a specific point in history pronounced by, for instance, a music journalist. This can be exemplified by “krautrock.” Krautrock has become, among other things, a designation for German experimental rock at the end of the sixties and in the seventies. The background for this designation was the Amon Duul song *Mama Duul und ihre Sauerkrautband Spielt Auf*, which “...came via the English music press’ reporting on the new wave of German groups, whereby they unintentionally came to name it. Hereafter the wave got the lightly condensed term krautrock (that means ‘cabbage-rock’)” (Marstal & Moos, 2001, p.135; author’s translation).

Afterwards, such genre concepts often became part of a canon in the history of music, which is repeated in newer literature. Historically defined genre concepts are repeated in music literature until music historians obtain new knowledge about the subject, or until they view it from a different angle or paradigm. Some actors in the domain of music have precedence over others concerning which genre concepts that become accepted. This is in accordance with Kuhn’s view (1970).

My view is that the traditional paradigm in musicology has precedence over other paradigms in musicology with the understanding of music, and hence the understanding of genre. This is also evident when we look at how libraries have understood these concepts. There exists a wide range of verbalization of music and musical genres. Concerning popular music, however, only a small part of this verbalization is probably reaching the “canonic” history books of music, or the organization of music in musicology, or the libraries’ indexing and classification (partly due to a lack of interest in musicology in certain areas). The genre concepts used by journalists, listeners, scholars, librarians, and the music industry have varied histories and starting points. Different traditions, paradigms and values inside the music domain are influencing the verbalization of music.

4.3 Analyzing music exemplified by popular music and the connection to values/paradigms

Three main approaches to the analysis of popular music that Björnberg (1991) outlines, will now be presented:

1. Structural analysis of music
2. Sociological analysis
3. Semiotic analysis

The description of these three approaches, together with the prior analysis, is the point of departure for connecting different methods for analyzing music to different paradigms in musicology. Ørom's (2003) suggestions of different paradigms in the domain of art-studies have also been helpful.

For several reasons, sociological analysis has dominated research in popular music. Carlsson & Ling (1980, p. 301-323; rendered after Björnberg, 1991) mention the absence of adequate analytical methods in the study of popular music. "Sound," for example, is important in separating different genres from each other in popular music. It is not, however, something that is regarded by traditional methods for analyzing music. Moreover, the assumption of the traditional paradigm that popular music as something simpler or less complex compared to art-music, has probably influenced much analysis of popular music from the beginning. If one treats popular music as something simpler and of lower value, the implication is quite likely to be that one would not focus so much on the inner structure of the music; the music is expected to be simple, and not much is expected to be gained from a structure analysis point of view. The culture historic/new musicology paradigm, on the other hand, has influenced much research on popular music. It has, however, focused more on music as culture, than on music as structure of sound. Together these factors have produced a sociological bias in the analysis of popular music.

Within these three main approaches, the different kinds of methods applied will be influenced by different epistemologies and philosophies of sciences. One typical example is the quantitative method, which owes much to a positivistic philosophy of science. In concrete music research and analysis there are, of course, other approaches, in addition to those three outlined below, and instances of approaches combined. And in the case of analysis of popular music, one could generally argue that most of the literature on the analysis of popular music is characterised by a fairly pragmatic use of traditional analytical methods (Björnberg 1991).

4.3.1 Structural analysis (Stylistic paradigm)

The structural analysis of music focuses mainly on the inner structure of the musical work, both in a single musical work or whole genres or styles. An example is seen in Maróthy's analysis of style features in "bourgeois" versus "proletarian" music from the middle age up until today (1974, rendered after

Björnberg 1991). Maróthy points to the style marks that characterize the two musical directions and how they have developed historically. This example is also a historical treatment of the problem, which is not typical in structural analysis where an ahistoric approach is equally common. The structural approach is typical for the analysis of music from the point of view of the traditional paradigm. We can also call it the stylistic paradigm and it is interesting here to compare musicology with the domain of art studies. Ørom (2003) has outlined some paradigms in the domain of art-studies and one of those paradigms is comparable to the stylistic paradigm we find in musicology:

Based on stylistic characteristics Wöllfin grouped works into related categories. This meant that the analysis of style became the basis and defining method of the stylistic paradigm in art history and the object was the works of art belonging to high culture. In a more specific sense the object of the stylistic paradigm is the formal aspects of the work of art (style, composition, way of painting and the like). (Ørom, 2003)

We can connect this to musicology's focus on style when it becomes institutionalized after 1900 (Bengtsson, 1973). In addition, we could say that the traditional paradigm in section 3 is highly overlapping with Ørom's (2003) stylistic paradigm. While the analysis of musical structure and the traditional/stylistic paradigm often have been connected to a positivistic philosophy of science (Kerman, 1985, p.31-59), this is not always the case.

The idealistic tradition, or traditional paradigm, regards the musical work as the product of a sovereign composer, akin to Ørom (2003): "As a consequence of the focus on styles the intertextuality is limited to works of art, i.e. the history of art is conceived of as an autonomous history. The content analysis, i.e. the meaning of the works of art, is beyond the horizon of this paradigm." Hansen et al. discussed in section 3.1 offer, with the reservations pointed out in that section, an example of an organization of music from the stylistic perspective.

4.3.2 Sociological analysis (materialistic paradigm)

Sociological analysis of popular music focuses on how social factors influence music. Adorno (1976, p.30-47, rendered after Björnberg 1991) was quite

avant-garde when he formulated his theories on music and sociology. He points to how the industrial production of popular music has led to a standardisation of musical forms. The two main areas of interest for sociological analysis are the production and consumption of music. Many of the studies on the production of music have focused on the economic and political factors that have “ruled” the production of popular music. This particular focus is, according to Bjørnberg (1991), a result of the strong growth of the music industry after the Second World War. The sociological analysis is closely tied to what Ørom calls the materialistic paradigm:

A third paradigm in – or approach to – art history is materialistic and is generally known as the social history of art...The paradigm is based on “the Marxist thesis that the economic base conditions the cultural superstructure and that as a result styles vary according to the character of the dominant class”. (Ferne, 1995, p.18). Within this paradigm the social functions of art and the sociology of art are studied. (Ørom, 2003)

As already demonstrated in section 3.1, Brincker et al. is an example of an organization of music from the materialistic point of view. This becomes even clearer when we look at Ørom’s remarks on the materialistic paradigm:

The works of art are considered as integrated elements in the historical and social context. It means that the materialistic conception of art is opposed to the general Western idea of the autonomous art. The materialistic paradigm aims at analyzing meaning and the function of art in the context of material, social, political and ideological structures. (Ørom, 2003)

Importantly, the materialistic paradigm exceeds the sociological analysis but is nonetheless connected to it. Similarly, the culture historic/new musicology paradigm is exceeding the materialistic paradigm, because, even though we can regard new musicology as connected to the materialistic paradigm, it contains a wider range of perspectives.

4.3.3 Semiotic analysis (iconographic paradigm)

Semiotic analysis of popular music is engaged in finding the meaning, or significance, in the musical

material, rather than intra-musical or sociological relations. Many of the studies in this field have utilized methods that are only loosely connected to established theories in semiotics (Bjørnberg, 1991). This is quite natural as musical communication is different from nonverbal and verbal communication, both oral communication and communication through written language. Music does not have the same strictness in the rules applying to meaning that one normally finds in the languages, where there often would be a consensus on the meaning of different sign constellations within the same cultural context. Bjørnberg explains it in the following way:

In discussions concerning sense and meaning in music, it is often emphasised that music is non-referential: unlike verbal language musical structures lack denotations, and musical meaning arises through those connotations or associations which the music cause in relationship to the listener. (1991, p.51; author’s translation)

Other researchers, however, see this differently, and Middleton argues against analyses which only consider the connotative aspects, or meaning, of music, because this: “...ha[s] a tendency to ignore the semantic process which is connected to the syntactical structure of music”(1990, p.220ff, rendered after Bjørnberg 1991, p.51; author’s translation).

We can connect the semiotic analysis to Ørom’s description of the iconographic paradigm in relation to art-studies – even though there are some obvious differences:

The iconography analysis (which included a stylistic analysis) aims at the interpretation of the intrinsic and symbolical meaning of images. The interpretation of this intrinsic meaning is based on the study of contemporary philosophy and literature...The focus of the iconographic paradigm is on allegorical and symbolic meaning...The research object of the iconographic paradigm is the meaning of the works of art. In general the meaning is interpreted in the cultural context. (Ørom, 2003)

One of the obvious differences is that Ørom’s iconoclastic paradigm is focusing on high culture and that analysis, in this paradigm, may use other methods, such as content analysis. In addition, it is easy to imagine that different kinds of semiotic analysis are indebted to either the stylistic paradigm or the mate-

realistic paradigm or both, dependent on which semi-otic tradition the researcher supports. We can also, to some extent, compare the iconographic paradigm with the culture historic/new musicology paradigm where the iconographic paradigm can be considered to be one part of new musicology, the part that focuses on music as cultural signs and symbols and which is connected to the anthropological view.

4.4 *The traditional paradigm and the culture historic/new musicology paradigm and their consequences for analysis of music*

The traditional paradigm has stressed form and content (syntax) in the analysis and classification of music (for example, at the form level: sonata, suite and symphony⁹). One aspect of the traditional paradigm that is perhaps even more important is the omission of socio-cultural context, which naturally could be drawn upon in the division of music into genres. Why are those context dependent elements not given more weight? We might find the link by looking at what we have written about epistemological background for the idealistic tradition (section 3.3). Would context be important in analyzing music and division into genres, if *the individual's freedom and mental sovereignty* were dominant? In my opinion, it would not. Probably the focus on the single musical work and the single composer in the traditional paradigm has its background in this worldview.

The traditional paradigm's aesthetic and ideological distinction between art-music as something "high" and popular music as something "low," illuminates the connection between the traditional paradigm's epistemology and methods. This distinction between "high" and "low" has led to less interest in analyzing popular music with respect to structure in this tradition and to a larger interest in sociological perspectives when popular music was regarded at all. The culture historic/new musicology paradigm has further emphasized the sociological and historical perspective in the analysis of popular music.

The weakness of the sociological/historical point of view is that it may reduce the music to only a product of a given "sub-culture," and that it can have problems with capturing music that mixes several styles and genres, or cases where the artist is more or less on the sideline of the dominating "sub-cultures."

In my opinion it is narrowing if music is treated more with respect to traditions and methods of production, context, history etc., than with respect to the music in itself (content and expression) and with

respect to the reception of music. This problem becomes reinforced by many of the genre categories that are used in the classification of popular music and especially by the lack of a theoretical basis for defining them. Context, traditions and history are of course vital and important parts of analyzing and categorizing music, but if this is the only focus, it reduces music to a mere product of external factors. Both the "work centred" and the "context centred" analysis stand in danger of omitting important aspects of music if it does not consider and incorporate the opposite method.

5 Genre as subject access criterion

5.1 *Classification and indexing of music through the lenses of DK5 and Indeksering af musik*

Traditional classification systems like Dewey or DK5 have been used both for shelf arrangement and for catalogues. In modern electronic catalogues many kinds of subject access points are available. For example, more than one classification system may be used. Libraries can reuse classifications and indexing from other libraries, for example from Library of Congress. Classifications thus need not be constrained by the demands raised by shelving. All possible subject access points have to be regarded as competing and supplementary systems for subject access to collections of documents (cf., Hjørland & Nielsen, 2001).

Classification and indexing can be seen as relatively similar activities. They may be more or less different depending on the specific conditions and systems used. A classification system is, in principle, a controlled vocabulary as is, for example, a thesaurus. Such systems share the condition that they operate with a set of fixed categories and concepts (e.g. genre categories), which the indexer is bound to use as opposed to indexing systems based on "free" or uncontrolled terms. Any system based on controlled vocabulary thus has to deal with some kind of classification of subject access information, such as genres.

5.1.1 *Genre classification in DK5*

This section presents how the DK5 system has classified popular music in genre (cf., Dansk Biblioteks Center, 1997/1999), illustrating how the traditional paradigm in musicology still influences the organizing of music in libraries. As already mentioned, less than one page is dedicated to classification of popu-

lar music in DK5. Class no. 78.79 with the class label *Blues. Jazz. Beat. Viser* [Ballads]. *Evergreens. Slagere* [Hits] is dedicated to classification of popular music. In addition, there are some possibilities to subdivide these classes. In the subdivision of *Beat* (with the class label: *Rock (Beat). Moderne folkemusik* [Modern folk-music (*Folk*)] at 78.794 are the possibilities for further division as follows:

- .794:2 Country & Western (hillbilly)
- .794:3 Rhythm & blues
- .794:4 Soul
- .794:5 Rock'n roll. Rock. Folk

It is tempting to question whether this genre division has ever functioned well. It is lacking all genre and sub-genre that has appeared in the last 30 years, for example, progressive rock, punk, new wave, disco, techno, hip-hop and many more. It is also important to note that all genres mentioned above are prominent "historical" genre that have appeared in the area of popular music from the late sixties until today. It is difficult to express the manifold of contemporary popular music with such an undifferentiated division. If a library has only a small collection it is possible for the user to find what he is looking for, but, for comprehensive collections of music, the number of classes is evidently problematic. The specificity of the terminology is simply inadequate for retrieval.

Although classification of recorded music in DK5 is different from its indexing, it is important to consider that classification is also often used as the basis for the indexing of popular music. Classification, in many cases, is one of the ruling factors helping to decide which main subject term each document is given. Some libraries have taken the initiative and have provided more categories. However, if there are not noticeably more categories than there are subdivisions in DK5, this does not help much. The main branch of the public library in Copenhagen, for example, still uses large categories like jazz, rock/pop etc., in shelving, explaining why the retrieval of relevant music is very difficult if the name of the artist/composer is unknown¹⁰.

Even though classification and indexing are two operations that may be applied independently in order to supplement each other and to enhance genre retrieval, this does not seem to be the case in practice.

5.1.2 Genre division in *Indeksering af musik* [indexing of music]

Indeksering af musik (Dansk Biblioteks Center, 1996/1998) was written as an answer to a concrete need in the libraries to work out subject indexing of recorded music. This need had been documented by a pre-investigation done by *Dansk Biblioteks Center*, DBC [The Danish Bibliographical Centre] in connection with finding out how to start a subject project in the field of music (Hanghøj Petersen, 1995, p.13-14). Based on this background, DBC produced *Indeksering af musik* as an indexing guide for libraries. In the introduction it says:

This guide in subject-indexing of music is based on the music itself and those media or documents that is contributing to maintain and arrange it, first and foremost notes and phonograms. (Dansk Biblioteks Center, 1996/1998, introduction; author's translation)

In the introductory chapter, subject analysis is treated and sub chapter 1.2.2.1 introduces a checklist of elements that can be crucial in making decisions regarding subject terms for a given document. On this checklist genre/style is mentioned first, and some comments are added:

Does the musical recording belong to a certain genre or style? - a musical expression which is often connected to either a certain time (period), a certain place (nation, region) and/or a certain environment (social, by age, by race). (Dansk Biblioteks Center 1996/1998, 1.2.2.1; author's translation)

We are here given some cues of what is considered important to take into consideration when deciding a phonogram's genre or style. We are not, however, given any elaborate consideration on what constitutes different genres or styles. We find also in subchapter 1.2.1.1 an account of the investigation of the document: "A complete listening of the phonogram would normally be impossible – and not necessary. But the indexer should guard oneself against overlooking useful information" (Dansk Biblioteks Center, 1996/1998; author's translation).

The end of the guide lists the sources one should examine when describing genre, such as databases, encyclopedias, Internet, information from record companies, reviews and inquiries to subject specialists. Chapter 2 deals with principles for assignment

of subject terms and chapter 3 deals with the shaping of the same subject terms. Chapter 5 is about indexing practices, which is of course highly relevant in this context. This applies especially to sub chapter 5.4: [Subject-terms on the music's genre or style]. Under the topic "non-classical music" is written:

Subject-terms should be provided for main-genres...: rock, jazz, blues, gospel, folk-music (but not entertainment) as well as for sub-genres: hip hop, heavy metal, techno, folk, soul, country, swing, bop, fiddlers-music, klezmer and so on, along with sub-genres' sub-genres. (Dansk Biblioteks Center (1996/1998) 5.4.1.3; author's translation)

Further practices for subject assignment of music that mix several genres are outlined. One is here asked to weigh the most prominent genre, and, if possible to use well established crossover genres like fusion (jazz/rock).

Compared to DK5 there are greater possibilities in *Indeksering af musik* for providing a document a more specific subject term. This is clearly an advantage and it provides possibilities for greater differentiation of genres. One can, however, still ask how adequate the division of main genres is: rock, jazz, blues, gospel and folk music, or whether they are the main genres. (They are, by the way, similar to the most important classes in DK5). When sub-genres are mentioned, the implication must be that there is a connection between a sub-genre and the broader genre. What is then, for example, hip hop a sub-genre of? It is also important to stress that in indexing there are greater possibilities to assign several subject terms to the same document, where a goal in classification is often to be able to place a document in one category only (especially in classification systems designed for shelf arrangement).

There is no need to criticize *Indeksering af musik* for elements that the authors obviously consider outside the scope of the guide. *Nonetheless, it seems to be taken for granted that there exists a set of "given" and unproblematic genre terms.* Further, what is assumed to be problematical for the indexer is how to place each document in the correct genre. The authors are by no means ignorant of the existence of new and uncertain genres, but they do not address this problem. The guide says nothing about how you are supposed to identify the documents belonging to the different genres. And here we are at the core of the problem concerning: what characterizes the dif-

ferent genres? What is it that constitutes a musical genre, and what lies behind the terms that have been used? The different genre concepts or terms are not defined; neither in DK5 nor in *Indeksering af musik*. What is, for example, the definition of rock? Such definitions should not necessarily have been included but it becomes a major problem when there does not exist any generally valid classification criteria of the genre categories in popular music.

Those who search for rock music in databases will have their own definitions and understandings of what rock music is. These definitions are not necessarily the same as those held by indexers. We touch here a well-known problem in human indexing, namely: inconsistency. And even though this is impossible to completely eliminate in real life, this inconsistency is much more prominent because there is a lack of theoretically founded definitions in this field. There should be a theoretical foundation and description of the genre concepts that have been used in a given database of phonograms. The electronic catalogues in *Deichman Public Library* (in Oslo) and the electronic catalogue in *Copenhagen Public Library* and other visited libraries, do not contain such definitions with regard to recorded music. There are some attempts of making definitions of genres in music databases available on the Internet. Allmusic.com is an example, but it is preliminary and raises the question of authority. If there had been a stronger theoretical basis for the genres used in library databases, it would be helpful for the users. Users would have something to connect to the genres and it would be easier to find what is searched for. The problem is especially pressing concerning recordings that are difficult to place under only one genre category, or concerning music that has not been placed under a historical period or genre by music historians.

Often there are many complementary (or contradictory) subject index terms assigned to a musical record in addition to the main genre category (cf., the electronic catalogues in *Deichman Public Library* and in *Copenhagen Public Library*). This is an attempt to cope with the problem of the lack of a theoretical ground for defining and indexing genres in popular music. This is probably done in order to make sure that different users with different mappings of genres can retrieve a given record. This may be a fruitful ideal but it is a problem that this strategy is not consistent through the whole catalogues because it is based on the individual indexer's knowledge and choices. In addition, it does not display the relation-

ship between different genre terms. The users are not provided with the basis for how the different genre terms have been applied. This basis is probably connected with different pre-understandings of the music and connected to different musical discourses and to different paradigms in musicology.

5.2 Epistemology of genre and subject indexing

Indexing

When a librarian or an information specialist is indexing music by genres they will not normally perform a thorough analysis of the music at hand. It is obvious that the methods used for placing a concrete record into a genre category is different from the methods a musicologist uses when analyzing music. The goal is to make a subject analysis rather than a regular music analysis. A subject analysis implies, according to Hjørland, "...an interpretation of the potential of the document (or other information entity) in relation to the knowledge interests" (1997, p.41). This assumption was confirmed through conversations with two librarians and the musician working in the *Deichman Public Library* and the *Bergen Public Library*. From these interviews there emerged two main approaches to genre indexing of recorded music. These will be outlined below and connected to two important theories of concepts and classifications (Aristotle and Wittgenstein).

"Listening indexing"

The first approach to genre indexing of music could be characterized by applying a set of more unconscious methods rather than a fixed set of conscious methods that seek specific elements or aspects of the music. This kind of "listening indexing" is an operation that is more based on musical intuition and musical experience as the frame for placing the music in a genre category. "Listening indexing" is often based on resemblance between the indexed document and what the indexer has formerly experienced. "Listening indexing" could lead to an argument in favour of a theory of *family resemblance* based on the philosophy of Ludwig Wittgenstein. Such a theory could form the theoretical basis to genre concepts and be used in the construction of a taxonomy of musical genres. This way of viewing the relationship between a genre concept and the concrete records is related to the so-called prototype theory of concepts developed by the psychologist Eleanor Rosch (1978). This way

of describing a genre is to point to a prototype example of it. The French group Magma can thus be seen as both a prototype example and the historic origin of the subgenre "zeuhl" in progressive rock. Something like this prototype approach has probably been the dominating factor in the genre indexing of popular music.

"Reading indexing"

The second approach to genre indexing is based, to a higher degree, on placing music within a "canonic" history of music and its categorization of genres. The indexer is here not primarily listening to the music, but uses written sources (e.g. music history books, music dictionaries, information from the record inlay etc.) to be able to assign indexing terms. Some of this knowledge is typically provided by other actors in musicology (e.g., through music dictionaries), and in those cases their views on knowledge organization will be more prominent than the indexer's view. This approach is more dominant in indexing of classical music. One reason for this is that genres in classical music are more strongly connected to measurable features, such as musical form and instrumentation, as compared to genres in popular music. One of the librarians in the interview remarked that, in the indexing of classical music, the focus is generally more factual in comparison to the indexing of popular music. This leads to the assertion that this type of indexing is more connected to the traditional paradigm in musicology. In this kind of indexing, structural formal features are more prominent, because this is the way the traditional paradigm in musicology has primarily analyzed music. This seems related to an Aristotelian theory of concept and classification where the music that is put in the same genre category must share a set of some more specific characteristic (positive given), which must be different from music placed in other categories (cf., Sutcliffe, 1993, pp.35-65). This theory of concepts is discussed by Andersen, who states: "...an ancient discussion whether concepts are defined by necessary and sufficient conditions which hold for all instances of the concept in question, or if a concept can only be explicated by typical examples" (2002, p.96). And Andersen (2002) further adds that during most of the 20th century the former has dominated modern philosophy.

The prototype theory applied to musical genres may have its weakness in providing many border cases of music with regard to genre, and in making it difficult to define genres more explicitly. It is, of

course, not possible to define a set of genre categories that is completely mutually exclusive and unambiguous, but it should be possible to improve the definitions of genre concepts considerably in relation to their use in retrieval systems. The strength of the prototype theory is: "...that a family resemblance account of concept seemed to reflect the actual use of concept much better than an account of necessary and sufficient conditions" (Andersen, 2002, p.96). And connected to music, this seems to be the case for the way we normally experience genre. The strength of the Aristotelian theory of concept is that it is possible to provide more precise definitions of genre categories based on some agreed characteristics in the music or connected to the music. The weakness of this view is that it is a simplification of the reality and that, in many cases, it is unable to grasp the way we normally experience genre and define genre concepts. The points made in this section can be further illustrated by the following statement:

The ways in which we describe and categorize music, and how we actually hear and experience music, are two different worlds. Terms and categorizations belong to the world of ideology, and they tell about the society's history and traditions. The historical tradition expressed in words can clash with the consciousness born out of experiences... (Talja, 2001, p.7)

Epistemological aspects

Epistemology has two different implications for genre indexing. First, we have the decision to assign a piece of music *a given* classification of genres. When we are going to analyze a phonogram we need to use certain methods. These methods must include criteria that enable us to pull out the information we need in order to place the music in a genre. Those criteria or approaches can be conscious or unconscious but they will nonetheless always be connected to a world view, which is again connected to paradigms and epistemology. Epistemologically, such classificatory decisions may be substantiated in different ways. A classification of basic epistemological positions can be found, for example, in Hjørland (2002b, p.269). An empirical epistemology tends to substantiate the decision of assigning an item to a class by using "objective" criteria, such as the instruments used or a given sound pattern. A pragmatic epistemology, on the other hand, tends to substantiate the classificatory decisions by pointing to the consequences for

given users; for example, by considering the symbolic meaning of the music.

The second aspect is connected to the establishment of genre categories. Again, different epistemologies are at play, e.g., by defining genres solely on positivistic quantitative measurement of structures in music. We have already seen in section 3 how two different paradigms imply different genre categories. Such categories are never "neutral" or "objective," and there are not any generally valid definitions or understanding of the genre terms that are used in popular music, even though the genre terms have content and meaning for most of the people that use them. As already demonstrated, the traditional paradigm in musicology valued popular music as something "low" aesthetically compared to "high" aesthetically valued classical music, which has influenced the way popular music has been classified in different genre categories.

One may also consider that different views may have suppressed the interest in the genre concept itself. The culture historic/new musicology has failed to contribute to more differentiated genre categories in the organization of music. This is partly due to their main interest in music as culture at the expense of interest in music as an aesthetic object.

Despite the range of new perspectives in musicology, which may be labeled "new musicology,"¹¹ the traditional paradigm is still strong. This is evident in much research and even more evident in the classification and indexing of music in libraries. Classification schemes like DK5 is an example of this. To substantiate this argument, the role of the libraries in the process of producing and organizing knowledge will be considered. The role of libraries has traditionally been to collect and organize the more authoritative and established kinds of knowledge. Such knowledge will typically first mark itself out when we are able to look at it in a historic context – in this case, from the context of the history of musicology. The libraries will typically be one step behind the "state of the art" in musicology, which will again be one step behind the state of the art in the music itself. In section two it was argued for a comprehensive definition of the music domain. This view makes it possible to view and define genres from different epistemological positions by focusing on more than one kind of actor in the discourse communities.

5.3 Genre indexing as a perspective of the music-domain

It seems as if there has been a lack of will in musicology and in libraries to do something more active to create a theoretical basis for classification of the different genre categories in music. This impression was confirmed by Morten Michelsen at the Institution of Musicology, Copenhagen, who said that classification of genres in popular music, and the work with their definitions, are something that generally has low priority in musicology. This article has pointed out through the thoroughfare of DK5 and *Indeksering af musik*, the absence of theoretical underpinnings for choices of genre categories; and this can illustrate the same lack of interest for development of differentiated genre-categories in the libraries. The domain-analytic perspective could be helpful in the building of an adequate theoretical basis for defining genre categories. With the comprehensive definition of the music domain in mind, domain analysis could enable us to draw on more perspectives that cross traditions and schools in musicology and also utilize other actors contributing to the knowledge of music. This would bring into consideration the breadth and complexity of the field of popular music.

A main point here is my assertion that much knowledge concerning genres in popular music resides outside the traditional music institutions, among a group of actors labeled as “professional listeners.”¹² The point of departure of “professional” listeners is often not the same as the point of departure of the more institutionalized parts of the music domain or the music industry; the former is not research or profit, but connected to enjoyment and the value of the personal experience. The music knowledge that resides in the “professional listeners” is, to a higher degree, unwritten and is, in some cases, not even verbalized. Much of the verbalization of this knowledge is found in smaller magazines, in underground fanzine’s, in local radio shows, in sub-cultures and so on. Imagine the die-hard heavy-metal fan that can easily tell the difference between black-and death-metal, something that is almost impossible to hear without having extensive experience of this kind of music. This highlights the importance of extensive domain specific knowledge in the classification of different music genres, which is today lacking in libraries, as well as in musicology. We should start collecting and using the more formalized verbalization caused by those actors. This would typically be through written material in magazines, fanzines, books or on the Internet.¹³

6 Summary and conclusions

Section 2 considered music as a domain. Within the overall field of music, two subdomains related respectively to classical and popular music were introduced. These two subdomains have, to a large degree, different actors, institutions and processes. We have also seen that the two subdomains normally differ in their ways of analyzing and describing music (e.g., in genres) by applying different criteria originating from different “paradigms.” It is argued that a comprehensive definition of the domain of music is the best starting point for organizing and analyzing music. The holistic perspective is important: The organization of musical knowledge should regard the whole field of music and not just certain sub-fields or paradigms inside the field. Depending on the goal of the organization, many possible perspectives on music, as well as many kinds of music, may turn out to be valuable for knowledge organization. The goals, purposes, values, epistemologies and paradigms of different classification schemes or indexing practices should be made explicit for the user of those system. Thus, in addition to mapping the field of music as this is now done in mainstream musicology, we need to supplement with other approaches and sub-fields of music, in order to enable an analysis and organization of the music domain not limited to paradigms in musicology such as the traditional or the culture historic/new musicology paradigm. This paper argues for the inclusion of many perspectives and views and for a modified paradigm in organizing music in libraries and databases. This argumentation implies the view that the domain of music is not necessarily identical to how musicology has hitherto defined it.

It appears as if the libraries have often taken over the classification and organization of music from musicology, and that they have done this without taking into consideration the underdeveloped status of research in popular music, even though the shortcomings of this organization have been recognised among librarians. This is also the case in many classification schemes, of which DK5, the Danish modified Dewey-system, is an example. Libraries have encountered difficulties when the amount of popular music started to increase in the library collection because there is not any well-developed and well-functional taxonomy that can meet the multiplicity in this field.

In section 3, two Danish histories of music written from two different theoretical or paradigmatic points of view were examined. The two books offer empirical evidence on how different views affect the way music is labeled, described, defined and organized.

Each paradigm tends to develop, to some extent, its own terminology, its own system of periods, its own system of musical genres, as well as its own theoretical view on the causes that have formed the history of music, the functions that music have, the value of different kinds of music, what music is considered worthy of study and – in the end – different definitions of what music is. This has very important consequences for theories on how to select and organize music in libraries and databases. Any specific solution will always be more related to some views than to others. The two examples were followed by consideration of some general connections in musicology between sub-fields, research methods, paradigms and values. Two main paradigms in musicology were outlined: the traditional paradigm and the culture historic/new musicology paradigm.

Section 4 pointed to different factors that have been dominant in defining genres in popular music in musicology. The factors that have been stressed are external factors connected to socio-cultural context. This section has further focused on actors responsible for the verbalization of genres in popular music where music historians have had precedence over other actors. Research in popular music is both connected to and delimited from research in classical music. This is seen as a factor influencing the approaches used in the analysis of popular music. The most important methods used to analyze music are *structural analysis* (associated with the stylistic paradigm), *sociological analysis* (connected to the materialistic paradigm) and *semiotic analysis* (connected to the iconographic paradigm). An attempt was made not to draw overly precise lines in the analysis of paradigms or to outline all possible paradigms in musicology. The purpose is rather to demonstrate that it is relevant to argue for the existence of different paradigms in musicology, as well as to demonstrate that they are related to paradigms that can be found in other aesthetic domains (cf., Ørom, 2003_{a+b}). Paradigms in musicology may be considered part of broader traditions or macro-sociological discourses in, for example, history of art and cultural history (cf., Talja, 2001).¹⁴

Section 5 showed that the actual possibilities for using genre as subject indexing in popular music are faced with difficulties because adequate definitions of genres are lacking, as is the theoretical foundation for deciding the basis on which to construct such genre concepts. This has been exemplified in the context of knowledge organization with DK5 and *Indeksering af musik*. The shortcomings in these sys-

tems are not seen as accidental, but as connected to the status that popular music has received in the traditional paradigm, where it has been considered as representing low aesthetical value. Because popular music has not been considered worthy of structural analysis in the traditional paradigm and, moreover, because music as culture has been stressed in the culture historic /new musicology paradigm, a socio-cultural based analysis in mainstream musicology as well as in libraries. The analysis of the popular music in itself (its content or expression) has been neglected. This is problematic because the music itself is of fundamental importance for the organization of music in differentiated genre categories. In this section we have also regarded two different theoretical approaches of viewing concepts and the nature of the relationship between concepts (the Aristotelian theory of concept and “prototype” theory). They both have strengths and weaknesses, which are discussed.

What have we discovered about the relation between genre indexing of popular music and epistemological presupposition, values and ideologies?

First of all, we have seen that there is a connection between the elements above. The connection between genre indexing of popular music and epistemology has most clearly been found in the methods that are used to analyze popular music and the way genres have been divided and classified. We have seen that the type of context based sociological methods that have their basis in positivism are those that have most strongly influenced the analysis and on how genres in popular music are divided in the traditional paradigm. But the idealistic tradition has also influenced the classification and the analysis of popular music.

How could one build a theoretical foundation for organizing music and for defining and indexing genres? It can be done by viewing the music in perspective of the domain analytical approach (Hjørland & Albrechtsen, 1995). It would facilitate the use of interdisciplinary methods, for example, the combination of music-structural, sociological and semiotic analysis and the inclusion of other perspectives in the theoretical foundation for defining genre categories. It will also provide a point of departure for mapping the knowledge and terminology of music. Librarians and information specialists can have an advantage compared to musicologists precisely by being able to consider more perspectives from the listeners’ position. They could also utilize the knowledge of actors in the domain that has not normally played a role in the organization of musical knowledge (e.g. “professional listeners”). The domain analytic perspective

also offers inspiration from other domains (such as art) and the study of how such fields have both similarities and differences. This might provide more precise and comprehensive knowledge of the domain of music, which can be applied to improve the information services in general and the genre division in particular. If such differentiated and theoretical well-founded genre taxonomy is incorporated in library catalogues and databases, can access and retrieval of music be highly improved.

A task for the library community could be to help build a new paradigm which is based on music considered as a whole field. It could be a kind of anthropological based paradigm like the one Ruud (1992) argues for. The anthropological based paradigm is concerned with the relationship between music and the socio-cultural context in which the music functions. Its starting point is to regard sound structures as socially constructed, both in the sense that they have been created socially, and by recognizing the meaning they get from a social interpretation by a listener. According to Ruud, "Listening is to be understood as a strategic action more than a mechanical scanning" (1992, p.82), and meaning in music is not immanent but is dependent on cultural positions. Another important characteristic of such an anthropological paradigm is that it does not make a distinction between "high" classical music and "low" popular music.¹⁵ At the same time, however, the musical structures, the musical work and its creators, as well as music reception and use, should be regarded as important. All this should be applied in the construction of a theoretical foundation for genre-categories. The new paradigm should utilize the knowledge provided by the existing paradigms in musicology (e.g., traditional paradigm and the culture historic/new musicology paradigm). At the same time, however, it should be based on theories and knowledge of knowledge organization, goals, uses, users, etc. in the context of library and information science. Here it is important to acknowledge the wide range of actors in the music domain and that values and meanings connected to music may exist on several levels and be regarded from different perspectives (Abrahamsen, 2003). The organization of knowledge is never neutral and the users should ideally be provided with different perspectives and at least be informed of the perspective that is chosen in e.g., a phonographic database. This might provide a greater understanding of the genre categorization on the part of the user and it might enable a higher level of access to recorded music.

Notes

- 1 The term "discourse" is used in a comprehensive meaning in this article, including both a macro-sociological approach (Talja, 2001, p. 3) and a micro-sociological approach. Some discourses can be unique and connected to a specific context, for example, a jazz discourse at a specific jazz club.
- 2 For a comprehensive definition of the discipline of musicology see Adler (1885).
- 3 Bengtsson (1973) points to various definitions of art-music (classical music) where there has been attempt to establish some criteria on the different elements connected to music. According to Bengtsson, the first criterion is connected to: "...that the art-music is a product of relative complicated and hierarchical society with obvious differentiation of different kind of work tasks on different kind of occupational groups" (Bengtsson 1973, p.14; author's translation). However, he puts forward one criterion that he deems more suitable: "...the existence of conscious musical abstraction, consequently a piece of music theory (and/or music-ethnology)" (Bengtsson 1973, p.14; author's translation).
In addition he mentions the institutionalisation of professional musicians and the emergence of special groups of recipients: "...whose educational level and material level at the same time give birth to a 'art-music' and a adequate music-linguistic 'competence' to understand it" (1973, p.14; author's translation) as an additional criterion.
- 4 The background for the founding of IASPM (The International Association for the Study of Popular Music) was Philip Tagg and Gerard Kempers decision to attempt to improve the popular music's status, position and methods inside musicology. This led to the organising of *The First International Conference on Popular Music Studies* in Amsterdam in 1981, where among others Charles Hamm, Paul Oliver, Simon Frith, Günter Mayer and Franco Fabbri participate. The result was the foundation of IASPM. IASPM's goal was: "...to act as an international, interdisciplinary and interprofessional association dedicated to the serious study of popular music" (Tagg, 2001, p.2). The foundation of such an organisation is an indicator of the need of some completely new methods and approaches for the study of popular music.
- 5 The music ensemble The Science Group is an excellent example of this. The songwriter of the

group, Stevan Tickmayer, is a classical trained composer who applies modern classical composition techniques when writing songs (studied under Andreissen and Kurtag). At the same time, two of the other group members, Chris Cutler and Bob Drake, have their background from rock music (and improvisation) and they contribute to “the sound” and the shaping of the music. In an email to the present author, Cutler explained that they moved towards each other, in other words, Tickmayer moved towards rock music and improvisational music while Drake and Cutler moved towards modern classical music.

- 6 DK-5 is used in Public libraries as well as in the Danish National Bibliography.
- 7 It must be stressed here that the concept of new musicology is used slightly different in this context than in other contexts in this paper. In this context the concept refers to the fact that interest in socio-cultural aspects in musicology has primarily been inside ethnomusicology and in the flow of new perspectives and approaches that has been labelled new musicology: “In the last two decades of the 20th century, there was an explosion in the field of musicology as scholars sought to give voice to broader range of concerns” (Balchin, 2001, p.491). I have used new musicology in this context in a more restricted meaning. See also note 11.
- 8 Progressive music is here to be understood as a term for a type of experimental music.
- 9 See e.g., *Dewey Decimal Classification and Relative Index* (2003, p.682-686)
- 10 The possibility for retrieval of relevant music is increased if one uses electronic catalogues. More subject access points are available, which is why, for example, an increased number of genre and sub-genre terms may be applied alone or in combination with each other or other kinds of search criteria.
- 11 It is important to remark that the concept of new musicology is here to be understood in a more comprehensive way than used in the context of the description of the culture new musicology paradigm. In this context the concept new musicology could include more than one potential paradigm and is a generic term for a set of new approaches in musicology: “...‘structural’ and ‘post-structural’ critical perspectives from linguistics and the literary disciplines and their combination with a hermeneutic view variously derived from Adorno’s social theory, gender studies and criticism, as well as reception theory and history...Furthermore, social history and anthropological and ethno-musicological methodologies...” (Stanley, 2001, p.557).
- 12 I use “professional listeners” as a term for people with great knowledge of music (competence) build primary on listening to music (and/or playing music) and a general interest in music. This competence is typically of a more informal type opposed to a more formal competence of e.g. a musicologist. Examples of “professional listeners” could be music journalists (amateurs), non-trained musicians, listeners of a particular sub-genre (e.g. progressive rock) etc.
- 13 Even though this perspective will not solve the problems concerning definitions of genres, it will nonetheless give more grounds to define music genres from. In addition to the specialised knowledge those actors have of different genres they might also be able to provide valuable knowledge on which elements in the music (and elements connected to the music) they consider to be prominent concerning the characteristics of different genres. This is the background for proposing a comprehensive definition of the domain of music that is built on viewing music as a whole without losing the focus on the music itself. This view is different from both the traditional and the culture historic / new musicology paradigm in respect to the way they have normally materialised in music research, organising of music and defining of genres in the musicology and in the libraries treatment of music organisation (e.g. genre categorisation). At the same time this view is based on the existing ones and could be regarded more as combination of the two paradigms with some suggestion of improvements. I will return to this in the *summary and conclusions*. Even though genre classification and categorisation has not been an area that has been given priority in musicology, I would argue that it should be given priority in the library sector and particularly in the field of knowledge organisation.
- 14 See section 3.3.
- 15 An important contribution to building such a paradigm could be found in Hjørland’s (1997) book *Information Seeking and Subject Representation: An Activity-Theoretical Approach to Information Science*, where he among other things points to the value of pragmatic philosophy, anthropology and scientific realism in defining the concept of subject: “The activity-theoretical conception

of subject is pragmatic in that it views cognition, knowledge, knowledge representation, and subject analysis in their functionality, their teleological and goal-oriented nature, and their consequences for human practice” (1997, p.83).

References

- Abrahamsen, K.T. (2003). *Musikk og betydning i et semiotisk perspektiv* [Music and meaning in a semiotic perspective]. København: Danmarks Biblioteksskole. (Unpublished thesis).
- Adler, G. (1885). Umfang, Methode und Ziel der Musikwissenschaft. *Vierteljahrsschrift für Musikwissenschaft*, 1, 5-20.
- Adorno, T. W. (1976). *Inledning till musiksociologien: tolv teoretiska föreläsningar* [Introduction to the sociology of music]. [Lund]: Bo Cavefors.
- Andersen, H. (2002). The Development of Scientific Taxonomies. IN: *Model-Based Reasoning: Science, Technology, Values*. New York: Kluwer Academic. 95-111.
- Balchin, R. (2001). The Nature of Musicology: 5. New Trends. IN: *The New Grove Dictionary of Music and Musicians* (vol. 17, p.491-492) / ed. by S. Sadie. 2. ed. Oxford: Macmillan Publishers.
- Bengtsson, I. (1973). *Musikvetenskap: en översikt* [Musicology: an overview]. Stockholm: Esselte Studium.
- Björnberg, A. (1991). *Analyse af populærmusik: Teorier og metoder*. [Analysis of popular music: Theories and methods]. Aalborg: Institut for musik og musikterapi.
- Brincker, J.; Gravesen, F.; Hatting, C. E. & Krabbe, N. (1982-1984). *Gyldendals Musikhistorie. Den europæiske musikkulturs historie. Bind 1-4*. Redigeret af Knud Ketting. [Gyldendals History of Music, Vol. 1-4]. Copenhagen: Gyldendal.
- Carlsson, A. & Ling, J. (Eds.). (1980). *Nordisk musik och musikvetenskap under 1970-talet* [Nordic music and musicology during the nineteenth seventies]: *en rapport från 8:e nordiska musikforskarkongressen, Ljungskile folkhögskola*. [Göteborg]: Göteborgs universitet.
- Cutler, C. (1985). *File under popular: theoretical and critical writings on music*. London: R&R Megacorp. ISBN 0-946423-04-0
- Dahlhaus, C. (1989). *The Idea of Absolute Music*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Dansk Biblioteks Center (1996/1998). *Indeksering af musik* [Indexing of Music]. Project manager: Lars Hanghøj Petersen. ISBN (Printed version): 87-552-2370-2. (Internet version): 87-552-2371-0. <http://www.indeksering.dk/musik/> [Only available to subscribers] (DBC's indekseringsvejledninger).
- Dewey Decimal Classification and Relative Index* (2003) / Ed. by J. S. Mitchell et. al. 22.nd. ed. Dublin: Online Computer Library Center. Vol. 3. Dansk Biblioteks Center (1997/1999). *DK5: decimalklassedeling*. Vol. 1-3. [Ballerup]: Dansk Biblioteks Center.
- Dogan, M. (2001) Specialities and recombination of specialities. *International Encyclopedia of the Social and Behavioral Sciences*, Vol. 22, pp. 14851–14855.
- Fabbri, F. (1980). *A Theory of musical genres: two applications* [online]. URL: <http://theblackbook.net/acad/tagg/articles> [Visited 2003-10-27].
- Fernie, E. (1995). *Art history and its methods: a critical anthology*. London: Phaidon Press.
- Fjordback Søndergaard, T.; Andersen, J. & Hjørland, B. (2003). Documents and the communication of scientific and scholarly information. Revising and updating the UNISIST model. *Journal of Documentation*, 59(3), 278-320. <http://www.db.dk/bh/UNISIST.pdf> (Visited February 15, 2004).
- Frith, S. (1978). *The Sociology of Rock*. London: Constable.
- Frith, S. (1998). *Performing rites: evaluating popular music*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Hall, S. (1982). The rediscovery of “ideology”: Return of the repressed in media studies. IN: Gurevich, M., Bennet, T., Curran, J. & Woollacot, J. (Eds.). *Culture, society and the media*. London: Methuen. 56-90.
- Hanghøj Petersen, L. (1995). *Grunge eller Trash? - emneord på musikposterne i 1996!*. *Libretto*, 1, 13-14.
- Hansen, F. E. et al. (1990). *Gads Musikhistorie* [Gad's History of Music]. Copenhagen: G. E. C. Gad.
- Hauser, (1972). *Konstarternas sociala historia*. Stockholm: Pan/ Norstedts. (Translated from *The Social History of Art*, New York: Random House, Vintage Books, 1951).
- Hjørland, B. (1991). Det kognitive paradigme i biblioteks – Og informationsvidenskapen [The cognitive paradigm in Library and Information Science]. *Biblioteksarbejde*, 33, 5-37.
- Hjørland, B. (1993). *Emnerepresentation og informationsøgning. Bidrag til en teori på kunskabsteoretisk grundlag* [Subject representation and information seeking. Contributions based on theory of knowledge]. Göteborg.: Valfrid.

- Hjørland, B. (1997). *Information Seeking and Subject Representation: An Activity-Theoretical Approach to Information Science*. Westport, Conn.: Greenwood Press.
- Hjørland, B. (2002a). Domain analysis and information science: Eleven approaches – traditional as well as innovative. *Journal of Documentation*, 58(4) 422-462.
- Hjørland, B. (2002b). Epistemology and the Socio-Cognitive Perspective in Information Science. *Journal of the American Society for Information Science and Technology*, 53(4), 257-270.
- Hjørland, B. & Albrechtsen, H. (1995). Toward A New Horizon in Information Science: Domain Analysis. *Journal of the American Society for Information Science*, 46(6), 400-425.
- Hjørland, B. & Nielsen, L. K. (2001). Subject access points in electronic retrieval. *Annual Review of Information Science & Technology*, 35, 249-298.
- Honneth, A. (1998). Frankfurt School. IN: *Routledge Encyclopedia of Philosophy* (vol. 3, pp.730-737). London: Routledge.
- Kerman, J. (1985). *Contemplating Music: Challenges to Musicology*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Keil, C. (1966). Motion and feeling through music. *Journal of Aesthetic and Art Criticism*, 24, 337-349.
- Korsyn, K. (2003). *Decentering Music: A Critique of Contemporary Musical Research*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Kuhn, T. S. (1970). *The structure of scientific revolutions*. 2. ed. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Maróthy, J. (1974). *Music and the bourgeois, music and the proletarian*. Budapest: Akademiai kiado.
- Marstal, H. & Moos, H. (2001). *Filtreringer: elektronisk musik fra tonegeneratorer til samplere 1898-2001* [Filtration: electronic music from pitchgenerators to samplers 1898-2001]. København: Høst & Søn.
- Middleton, R. (1990). *Studying popular music*. Philadelphia: Open University Press.
- Middleton, R. (2001). Rock. IN: *The New Grove Dictionary of Music and Musicians* (vol. 21, pp.485-486) / ed. by S. Sadie. 2. ed. Oxford: Macmillan Publishers.
- Miller, R. W. (1998). Marxist philosophy of science. IN: *Routledge Encyclopedia of Philosophy* (vol. 6, pp.147-150). London: Routledge.
- Moser, P. K. (1997). Epistemology. IN: *Philosophy of Meaning, Knowledge and Value in the Twentieth Century*: ed. by John V. Canfield. London: Routledge. p.197-246.
- Nettl, B. (2001). The institutionalization of musicology: Perspectives of a North American Ethnomusicologist. IN: *Rethinking music* / ed. by N. Cook and M. Everist. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 287-310.
- Nielsen, P. D. (1976). *Videnskabsteorier i musikfaget*. [Philosophies of science in music]. Århus: Publimum.
- Norge [Bibliotekloven] [The Library Act] (1997). Lov om folkebibliotek [Law concerning public libraries]: av 20. desember 1985 nr 108: med forskrifter, veiledende retningslinjer og instruks for Statens bibliotektilsyn. [Oslo]: Statens bibliotektilsyn.
- Rosch, E. (1978). Principles of categorization. IN: E. Rosch & B. B. Lloyd (Eds.): *Cognition and categorization* (pp. 27-48). Hillsdale, NJ: L. Erlbaum Associates.
- Ruud, E. (1992). *Innføring i systematisk musikkvitenskap*. [Introduction to systematic musicology] Oslo: Universitetet i Oslo.
- Samson, J. (2001). Genre. IN: *The New Grove Dictionary of Music and Musicians* (vol. 9, p.657-659) / ed. by S. Sadie. 2. ed. Oxford: Macmillan Publishers.
- Shelemay, K. K. (1996). Crossing Boundaries in Music and Musical Scholarship: A Perspective from Ethnomusicology. *Musical Quarterly*, 80 (1), 19.
- Slonimsky, N. (1998). *Webster's New World Dictionary of Music*. New York: Schirmer books.
- Stanley, G. (2001). Historiography. IN: *The New Grove Dictionary of Music and Musicians* (vol. 11, p.546-561) / ed. by S. Sadie. 2. ed. Oxford: Macmillan Publishers.
- Sutcliffe, J. P. (1993). Concept, class and category in the tradition of Aristotle. IN: *Categories and concepts. Theoretical views and inductive data analysis*. London: Academic press. 35-65.
- Tagg, P. (2001). *Twenty years after* [online]. URL: <http://theblackbook.net/acad/tagg/articles/turku2001.html> [Visited 2003-10-27].
- Talja, S. (2001). *Music, Culture, and the Library: An Analysis of Discourses*. London: Scarecrow Press.
- Williams, R. (1977). *Marxism and literature*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Wolf, J. (1987). Foreword: The Ideology of autonomous art. IN: Leppert, R. & McClary, S. (eds.). *Music and society: The Politics of composition, performance and reception*. (pp.1-12). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Ørom, A. (2003a). Kunsten at organisere viden om kunsten [The art of organising knowledge of art]. *Biblioteksarbejde*, #65, 61-75.

Ørom, A. (2003b). Knowledge Organisation in the domain of Art Studies: History, Transition and Conceptual Changes. *Knowledge Organization*, 30(3(4), pages n. a. (to be printed in this issue).

Acknowledgement

I thank Jack Anderson (Ph. D. at Royal School of Library and Information Science, Copenhagen) who was my supervisor when I first started this project as part of my Master grade in Library and Information Science at the Royal School of Library and Information Science in Copenhagen. I would especially like to thank Birger Hjørland (Professor at the Royal School of Library and Information Science, Copen-

hagen) who has been my supervisor for my thesis which formed the basis for this article. Without his endless help and support, this article would never have been written. He has kept faith in me and in this project, despite my problems along the road. And the help he has given me in writing this article could not be overestimated. In addition, I thank him for the support and inspiration he has given me and all that I have learned from having him as a mentor. I would also like to thank Tine Vind, Morten Michelsen and Chris Cutler for valuable help in the development of this project and Sanna Talja for valuable comments and suggestions. Last, I would like to thank Bjørn Trygve Baasland and Bradley Long for help with translation of this project to English, Jenna Hartel for language revision, and my wife Jorunn for endless faith and support.