

# DISCUSSION

- Talk to each other, not just me
- Ask questions if you need clarification on what someone has said
- Don't interrupt!
- You don't need to raise your hand but please try to consider your 'airtime' and how much you've spoken in relation to others.
- Don't put down someone else's ideas - explain why your interpretation differs (or ask a follow-up question!)

...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?