

...it is now timely to problematize two dominant conceptual boundaries that have underpinned the hegemony of a certain kind of musicology. The first boundary concerns *what music is*: it rests on the ontological assumption that 'music's' core being has nothing to do with the 'social' (a conceptual equation in which the 'cultural' is often seen as a mediating or even substitute term for the social). According to this conceptual dualism, the 'social' is extraneous to 'music', and equivalent to 'context', such that the appropriate focus in music scholarship is self-evidently on the 'music itself'. The second boundary concerns *what counts as music to be studied*.

—Born, pp. 208-209.

- What is music? What is popular music?
- What counts as music to be studied?
- Is there music that isn't worthy of study?

...Previous studies of interdisciplinarity have tended to assume an integrative or synthesis model, in which the interdisciplinary field is conceived in terms of the integration of two or more 'antecedent disciplines' in relatively symmetrical form...In the second, subordination-service, mode, one or more disciplines are organized in a relation of subordination or service to other component disciplines. This points to the hierarchical division of labour that characterizes many examples of interdisciplinary practice, an arrangement that may favour the stability of component disciplines and inhibit epistemic change. In this mode the service discipline(s) are usually understood to be filling in for an absence or lack in the other, (master) discipline(s)...In the third, agonistic-antagonistic, mode, in contrast, interdisciplinary research is conceived neither as a synthesis nor in terms of a disciplinary division of labour, but as driven by an agonistic or antagonistic relation to existing forms of disciplinary knowledge and practice. Here, interdisciplinarity springs from a self-conscious dialogue with, criticism of, or opposition to, the intellectual, aesthetic, ethical or political limits of established disciplines.

—Born, pp. 210-211.

- What purpose might each of these modes of interdisciplinarity serve?
- Do you agree with Born that the agonistic-antagonistic mode is the best to break new ground in popular music research?
- (Does progress in the discipline matter?)