

Ultimately, I am arguing that if popular music is going to be interesting to musicologists, it will be interesting because it engages issues that already exist in the current discourse, or because it raises issues that extend or are closely related to issues within the current discourse; this needs to occur before popular music can suggest new issues within the discourse. The proposals made by McClary and Walser, Shepherd, and Middleton not only ask musicologists to look at different music, but also tell them to care about different issues in all the music they study. This is too much to demand of the discipline, and this kind of radical change is therefore unlikely to occur.

—Covach, p.469

- **Do you agree with Covach's assessment?**
- **Why should or shouldn't we defend research that's unpopular within our institutions?**

# NEXT WEEK

- 'Making Histories: Popular Music and the Past'
- How do we write histories of popular music?
- How do we look at the influence of the past on popular music?
- Is history really a linear progression towards a goal (teleology)? If not, why is it often represented as such?
- How does the concept of articulation (by which cultural forms are reappropriated and attached to different meanings) help us in studying popular music's history?
- What is 'truth' in history?