

Despite the radical challenges presented by first ethnomusicology over a century ago, then by the sociology of music, and latterly by popular music studies, [traditional musicology's] followers still often seem to believe in universal values of aesthetic excellence based on a canonic repertoire of work used by a minority of the population over a very limited number of years in the world's smallest continent. Many of these followers hold articles of faith about 'absolute' music transcending sordid social realities outside the 'higher art' of lonely geniuses whose 'masterworks' are authoritatively fixed in the written score.

—Tagg, p.9

- **Why do you think the 'musicology of the popular' has not made more inroads into traditional musicology?**
- **How do you think progress can be made?**

If music in everyday life is overwhelmingly invisible for the majority of those who hear and use it, it's not unreasonable to ask why music studies, including popular music studies, have been so dominated by visible music, mostly in terms of vocal or instrumental performance (occasionally also as sound engineering), but much less, and much less visibly, as composition or arrangement. That anomaly can be partly explained through deconstruction of the absolute music aesthetic and through a critical examination of music education's lopsided concern for poiesis at the expense of aesthesis. But the anomaly is also caused by the simple fact, obvious to the point of tautology, that, in a scopocentric culture...visible music draws much more attention to itself.

—Tagg, pp. 17-18

- **What do you think of Tagg's division of 'visible' and 'invisible' music?**
- **Is any of the music you research yourself invisible?**