Conference Report

A Report on and Response to Studying Music, a Conference Recently Held in Honor of Simon Frith

Hellenic Journal of Music Education, and Culture

Vol. 5 | Conference Report
ISSN 1792-2518

www.hejmec.eu

Jane Harrison

Center for Advanced Studies in Music, Istanbul Technical University, Turkey

ABSTRACT | In April 2014, a conference in Edinburgh honoring Simon Frith upon his academic retirement featured three days of paper sessions, enjoyable activities, and distinguished guests. For the benefit of colleagues who did not attend it, this article offers some description of and purposefully subjective commentary on the conference Studying Music. Particular attention is given to the themes highlighted in the call-for-papers: Frith's position in music scholarship, writing about music, the current relationship among the various disciplines that claim music as a subject of study, and boundaries between different categories of music (high/low, popular/art). Topics of highlighted papers include the socio-semantics of vocal timbre, the etymology of the term "popular music," historiography of celebrities, sociology of race relations, and a plethora of perspectives on music and technology. Studying Music presented several strengths, especially because its paper and panel sessions encompassed researchers from media, music, and sociology departments. The achievements of Simon Frith and popular music scholarship were duly celebrated, extended, and reconsidered in new ways. Yet, a persistent ideological suspicion of art music scholars and musical analysis among popular music scholars who were present troubled me, as a musicologist who researches French art music. Taking this antagonism as a point of departure, this article concludes with a reflection on both positive and negative social and political implications of art music scholarship based on my own experiences in academic life.

Over the weekend of April 9-12, 2014, I had the privilege of attending the conference *Studying Music*, held in honor of Simon Frith at the University of Edinburgh, College of Art upon Frith's retirement from academia this year. Among the vast majority of papers that concerned popular music and the state of popular music studies, I gave a talk on an art music topic. I found myself in a relatively unique perspective among the other attendees, as one of very few musicologists or art music scholars there. Furthermore, by the end of the conference I became aware of an antagonism towards art music and those who study coming from many of the other attendees who consider themselves to be popular music scholars. This disciplinary divide and the historical and ideological reasons behind it was news to me. My article about this sometimes surprising, yet always intellectually stimulating, conference has two aims. First, I hope to provide some information about this event, which revolved around the work of such an influential figure in music studies, to any other scholars who might be interested to

learn about it. Second, I will respond to the paper sessions, panel sessions, and many informal discussions I experienced at *Studying Music* as a musicologist who currently researches European art music, which made me something of an outsider there. As such, this will not be an all-encompassing, objective review of the contents of the conference, but rather a summary of my experience of attending the conference. I expect that at certain points readers who know more about the topic at hand or are coming towards it from a different perspective might disagree with my intellectual yet certainly subjective reactions. Important issues about the current state of music research within the humanistic and social sciences disciplines were at hand in nearly every paper I saw; in this conference report I seek to turn what was at times antagonism towards musicologists and music theorists into productive agonism that helps me to reflect on the work that I do.

Professor Matt Brennan and several student volunteers from the University of Edinburgh presented attendees with a well-organized conference featuring many unique and thoughtful details. Meals emphasized locally-sourced and homemade food and drink, and among their conference materials attendees were surprised with random 45 rpm singles, which they could take home as well as opt to spin for everyone else at the reception on Thursday night (my album was the rap album *Cool Cuts,* recorded in 1988). Sessions were a mix of parallel and plenary formats, with a few keynotes mixed in as well. Rock critic and journalist Robert Christgau's keynote speech and sustained presence at the conference activities was a nice touch, underlining Simon Frith's work as a music critic and journalist in addition to what he has accomplished within the sphere of academia. Saturday featured an intriguing panel session titled "What are we doing when we are listening to music?" involving Simon Frith and his brothers Fred Frith, an accomplished improvising musician, and Chris Frith, a professor of cognitive psychology. That same night Fred Frith, Chris Cutler, and Tom Arthurs played a free concert of improvised music.

In the call for papers, potential presenters were asked to consider Simon Frith's contributions and legacy; and the state of the disciplines which study music and relate to Frith's own work, especially sociology, popular music studies, and musicology. During the 3-day conference I met scholars who had trained as sociologists, composers, historical musicologists, ethnomusicologists, popular studies scholars, media studies scholars, and even one German studies researcher. The vast majority of the research papers—around 75%—took Anglophone rock music culture or Frith's body of work centered on the same repertoire as their main subject. A colleague informed me that at IASPM conferences, non-English speaking cultures and regions of the world are typically better represented, so this statistic perhaps merely reflects the centralizing force of having a guest of honor whose work has been concentrated in one area. More significantly, all plenary and panel session speakers except for ethnomusicologist Beverly Diamond emphasized this repertoire.

Fortunately, the methodological approaches to Anglo-centric subjects were fairly mixed, including empirical sociological, music analytical, and political perspectives; freely interrogative reflections on disciplinary issues; close readings of primary or secondary sources; and expositive/exploratory approaches. An example of the latter category was the look composer Sean Williams provided into the fascinating world of DIY ping filters over the last forty years. Immanent semantic readings or structural analysis of musical pieces were generally a rarity at this conference, which was not surprising given that many presenters expressed appreciation for the lack of abstract,

structural musical analysis in Frith's work and his tendency towards empiricism. At times a more literary or journalistic approach dovetailed nicely with the music-critical side of Frith's career, such as in the whimsical and creative "How Tall is Lou Reed?" in which Ninian Dunnett considered "some of the methodological problems which confront the seemingly-straightforward question(s)" about pop music, such as Lou Reed's height and his real name. With artistry, Dunnett held the audience spellbound with his dramatic tale about researching the "facts" of popular music legends; yet, there were for me some troubling exchanges between Dunnett and the audience in the question period, in which Dunnett seemed to dismiss questions posed to him about gender, possibly in order to maintain a particular performative stance.

Dunnett's aestheticization of the way in which he reported his research related to several other papers in which speakers such as Dai Griffiths, Paula Hearsum, Devon Powers, and David Laing discussed the special relationship between journalistic and scholarly writing about music by Frith and other popular music scholars, a legacy of the discipline's birth in music journalism in the 1970s and 1980s. Griffiths and Laing lauded Frith's scholarly writing style, which they described as de-centered (never committed to a particular theory, critical method, or political ideology), whimsical, sometimes ironic, and full of sharp aphorisms and observations with the potential to set readers' minds alight. I appreciated how these and other scholars treated writing as a medium in which one can respond to and interpret the music one studies in creative ways, not limiting their books and articles to making arguments, coining theories, and providing information. As someone trained to write in an "objective" style, I was at once repulsed by this approach according to my sense of scholarly ethics and attracted to it because of my love of both writing and music. Exposure to this different point of view has given me pause to examine my pretension to objectivity: what do art music scholars gain but also lose if we try to adopt a perspective of cold distance from the music we analyze? Meanwhile, Paula Hearsum and Devon Powers problematized the relationship between journalism and scholarship within popular music studies, questioning to what extent professors and reporters really are "allies." Both speakers discussed the tension between these two groups who write about popular and rock music, but were ultimately optimistic that they can work together to continue to strengthen popular music studies' position within the academy. Tellingly, Powers's paper was the very last paper in the last panel session that closed the conference: the organizers perhaps wanted to emphasize this issue of how to write about music as one of Frith's principal legacies.

Of the many thoughtful papers on specific research projects rather than disciplinary topics that I heard, a handful stood out, especially. With a fascinating array of cartoons and illustrations from turn-of-the-century American print media, Keir Keightly traced the rich etymology of terms used to refer to popular, mass-produced music around 1900. Through careful examination of archival material, Keightly unearthed a link between "tin pan alley" and the term "tin can alley" This latter term referred in the late nineteenth century to the sudden influx of canned meat and other foods into the American economy and the public hysteria engendered by the tainted meat scandals that quickly followed. We also learned that "popular music" at one time referred not to audience, class, or even to politics, but was a euphemistic way to market and label mass-produced sheet music or recordings being sold at cheap prices. Cultural worlds apart from Keightly's paper but still dealing with the early history of mass-produced popular music was Bob Labaree's talk on performers' stylistic elective choices in the context of Turkish recording practices of Turkish art music between 1900 and 1950. By comparing and

contrasting different recordings, Labaree illuminated the creativity and problem-solving that developed at the intersection between older Ottoman aesthetics, in which long-standing traditional songs are brought to life by distinctive performers, and newer mass-produced recording practices whose commodification strategies threatened to flatten signature performing distinctives. In this talk we glimpsed the tension between two different paradigms of the ontology of musical works, as some performers were able to adapt luxurious Ottoman conventions to the miniature stage of the short-playing record.

Recording technology was also a main issue in Mark Duffett's sociological interrogation of Steve Reich's *Come Out* as an example of how creating and listening acts involving specific musical works can be understood as "residues of social relations." Duffett's paper delighted me because, as someone who is interested in musicological and sociological methods, his approach seemed to me to fall at an appropriate level of musical and socio-structural empirical detail.[1] The speaker took *Come Out* as the "expressions of concrete social relations between situated racial subjects" such as composer Steve Reich, victim of racial profiling Daniel Hamm, and various listeners who have interpreted the piece. From Reich, Duffett moved on to consider the likes of Sam Phillips and the recent spate of tech-savvy middle class whites who are making auto-tune hits out of sound bites of lower class African American speech. The latter case seems especially rich in these terms of race, class, and social relations in present cultures. Another useful addition to this study might be Bob Ostertag's manipulations of similarly emotionally-charged field recordings, such as *Sooner or Later* (Ostertag, incidentally, has also worked with Fred Frith).[2]

A final, memorable presentation I will mention was one given by John Encarnacao, whose research focuses on musicians who actively seek a non-mainstream cultural position and yet produce innovations that eventually impact large parts of the whole cultural field, sometimes including the mainstream. In his paper, John used a qualitative empirical approach to lay out what I term a socio-semantic method. Instead of traditional content analysis for songs that tries to interpret lyrics with the musical sounds that accompany their utterance, John tracked and interpreted non-literal, paralinguistic qualities of music recordings in social terms. He took particular care in his description of guitarist and singer Mark E. Smith's vast timbrel range and diversity in *This Nation's Saving Grace,* interpreting specific timbrel configurations resulting from both vocal and instrumental parts as signs of particular social configurations among author, singer, and audience. John's future work, of which this paper was an initial part, promises to be worth following.

Some of the presenters that took Frith's work as their starting point focused on the strengths of Frith's scholarship and congratulated him on his accomplishments, an appropriate and expected behavior at an event in honor of a specific scholar. Many such presenters celebrated Frith's hybrid research method consisting of one part sociology of music and one part music journalism, as well as his vibrant and plainspoken writing style, which they argued expressed a kind of solidarity with the popular music audiences he often wrote about and for. Frequent mentions were made to Frith's notion of "low theory" and its applications in specific research studies. I will return to that latter issue in more detail a

[1] For more on the "right level" of musicological and sociological analysis see Tia DeNora, *After Adorno: Rethinking Music Sociology* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003), 35-58.
[2] I thank my colleague Robert Reigle for bringing these pieces to my attention.

few paragraphs later. Younger speakers at the conference generally seemed more willing to subject Frith to fruitful yet respectful criticism, such as Mikkel Ålvik, who problematized Frith's observation in *Performing Rites* that languages besides English may misalign with the conventions of rock music, mostly formed as they were by native Anglophone speakers (Frith 1998, 175). Ålvik interrogated the quotation based on his own experiences with and knowledge of Scandinavian rock bands that have made it big with crowds, including crowds in the U.S. and Britain. Attendees at this paper were edified by the perspective of a non-native Anglophone on the relationship between musical conventions and specific languages. Ålvik was also in a position to comment upon a bias for Anglophone rock music that he finds to be still alive in popular music studies. As an important aside: by the end of the conference a consensus emerged that Frith's *Performing Rites* was his most powerful scholarly piece, based on the number of speakers like Ålvik who made direct and sustained references to it.

At this conference I witnessed a variety of methodologies, yet I became aware that very few presenters were doing any kind of analysis of specific sounds. Some papers that I witnessed were so musically unspecific that they included not a single song title or band name. At a conference in which disciplinary questions are in the foreground, this suppression is fair enough, but only to a point, in my opinion, because this was after all a conference about *music* just as much as *studying*. I would like to take this basic observation about the contents of the conference down a path of inquiry that has a few different steps. First, this downplaying of musical analysis can in part be explained due to disciplinary distinctions. In my own work as a musicologist I emphasize musical texts (scores, transcriptions, recordings of performances) as the most important empirical evidence for the claims I am making, and I think this is generally true for the other musicologists and ethnomusicologists that I know. When I look back over the papers that made the greatest impression on me at *Studying Music*, I see that, true to my musicologist stripes, they tend to contain some kind of analysis of musical sounds. Contrastingly, scholars at this conference, who were mostly in popular music studies or sociology, seemed intent not on analysis of texts but on the relationships of the social, the economic, and the political to the creation and the consumption or use of music. They took a more or less sociological approach to the material, often with an emphasis on the audiences who listened to the music, the fans who appropriated it, and the music industry that helped to produce it. For me, as an art music scholar who deals mostly in musical analysis and interpretation, it was fascinating to see how in this conference focused on popular music, such a different emphasis was so dominant.

In addition to these more general divides that one tends to find among different academic disciplines, I believe there is an ideological position that was also driving the sometimes gleeful neglect of musical analysis that I observed at *Studying Music*. In the first panel session, Keith Negus lauded Frith's "embedded" and "low" theoretical approach, which he characterized as open-ended and flexible, opposing it to a sophisticated, monolithic kind of structural or semantic analysis in which the analysis "hovers over" the text. Paul Harkins described low theory as the privileging of social and historical "realities"—I assume this means data collected during one's research—over abstract theory. I bring up Negus's talk because I sensed that his ideas were widely shared by conference participants. I appreciated his terminology, because the image of something "hovering over" something else raises issues of authority and power. These issues are fundamental considerations for any scholarship that takes humans, who seem to never tire of wielding power over each other, as their subject of study. Negus's emphasis on the seemingly benign Frithism that rock music is the "struggle for fun" is also

powerful due to its similar sociological and political resonances. Along similar lines, David Laing argued that Frith's "low" approach demonstrated solidarity with the lower- and middle-class consumers of popular music that he writes about. By writing in entertaining, simple, jargon-free prose, Frith's works are accessible to people without extensive (and expensive) educations. Frith thus takes an implicitly political stance in his scholarship, as Martin Cloonan noted in his presentation, choosing to take part in rather than ignore the class, gender, racial and other forms of politics that both the music he discusses and this research itself takes part in.

Still, at some papers in which the "low/embedded theory" concept was ostensibly operating, I had the impression that for more than a few popular music scholars, a refusal to deal with the specific sonic qualities of musical experiences was a power play itself, wherein "grounded," "embedded," or "low theory" based on sociological theory or primary source material about fans was made to seem ethically superior to a kind of imaginary, facile, arcane musical-structural analysis. At one parallel session, in particular, I found myself reacting strongly against open ridicule of classically trained music analysts who have worked on popular music, as their graphs and charts became the butt of witty jokes about how not to do music scholarship. It seemed necessary to try to defend people whose work I found valuable. When I myself asked one presenter about the possibility of something like Schenkerian analysis offering anything useful to the study of popular music, the dissatisfying response that came back was that music should never be treated like an "object." This was an effective refusal to engage with a significant question. Certainly, complex analysis of music generally cannot be understood without an advanced and highly specialized kind of education, and it could be argued that such exclusive scholarship is implicated in socio-economic imbalances. Yet, a lacunae among popular music scholars and sociologists studying music—formal musical education—seemed to be perversely treated by some of the presenters as an ethical strength of their disciplines. In arguing for this ethical superiority, I felt that the current state of music analysis was being misrepresented and summarily dismissed as utterly invaluable.

As I mingled with other attendees I came to understand that this resistance to engaging with specific sound in research on popular music was related to a more general, pervasive mistrust of art music and research about art music. This suspicion became clear through multiple exchanges in informal conversations. I was confused, for instance, by the many scholars who, after learning that I studied French art music, asked me if I knew I could study popular music instead. Of course I knew that I could do research on popular music if I so desired! Based on my experiences with the several universities in the United States where I have previously studied or taught, I learned to consider popular, traditional, and art musics with equal respect. This was largely due to my luck of being in places where historical musicologists and ethnomusicologists were constantly rubbing brains within the same department. Fortunately, I have found myself in a similar situation in my current post at Istanbul Technical University. I was taken aback by the multiple references I heard at the *Studying Music* conference to "classical music," a value-laden term that I try to avoid, and even to the more loaded term "highbrow music!" Consulting with some of my colleagues at the conference and elsewhere led me to understand that indeed in the 1980s scholars of popular music had been given a hard time by some musicologists, especially in Europe, who were devoted to art music. I have heard that at musicology conferences one still occasionally comes upon professors trying to de-legitimize popular music, despite its tremendous social, political, aesthetic, and emotional value. The noses upturned to

music that had allegedly started the whole thing by turning up its nose first (European art music) were baffling, erecting walls between me and colleagues I was attempting to get to know. I do not doubt that these wounds are real and damaging, but based on my own experience, I am hopeful that they are quickly receding into academia's history, and we must all take care to push these old configurations still further away. Indeed, as I write this article in October, 2014, I have very recently heard the current president of the International Musicological Society, Dinko Fabris, speak in Istanbul. At a graduate-student conference that drew together musicologists and ethnomusicologist working on a variety of types of music, Fabris's keynote talk struck a warm and inclusive tone regarding different types of music scholars and musical traditions.

As a kind of response to upturned musical noses, I encourage all of my colleagues who seek to follow in the popular-music-loving footsteps of Simon Frith to take seriously what I see as Frith's most endearing and intellectually powerful quality: his ability to listen. Don't take revenge on the stuffy professors who once refused to give Johnny Cash his due by plugging your own ears! Listening was a principal theme at the conference, best exemplified by the panel about this subject featuring Simon Frith and his two brothers. In general, all three Friths usefully advocated open listening and open scholarly listening to listening subjects. At one moment a man in the crowd asked Simon Frith if he didn't concur that rock music listening, which ideally took place at a rousing concert, wasn't better than the suit-stuffed classical music experience. Frith, however, did not take part in this Dionysian glorification of rock music, instead answering that although he did not know much about classical music himself (Frith does not read music and has had little formal musical education), he had learned from knowledgeable colleagues and classical musicians that listening to concert art music could also involve just as much richness and meaning. Frith emphasized during his brief talk in the panel on listening that people can use the musical frame to isolate the daily listening activity, shifting into an aestheticized experience in which less mundane and more creative, individualistic listening techniques and interpretive strategies might have their way. From this perspective one is interested not in the identity someone might give to the music or the listener—popular, classical, high or low— but in the interaction between, sound, culture, and the individual in the listener's experience. In some traditions, such as European art music, this interaction might be only subtly observed by others.

Making good on the reputation for his renowned ears, Frith was the only person in the audience at the session in which I presented my paper on early twentieth-century French art music composers, along with Labaree's paper on Turkish recording practices and a paper by Anja Bünzel on Johanna Kinkel's Lieder as potential cultural tools in the gradual political revolution of nineteenth-century Germany. It was especially unfortunate, I thought, that so many popular music researchers did not have the chance to hear Labaree's comments on Ottoman popular music. Skipping papers in the parallel session all about the glories of his own work, Frith listened carefully and engaged warmly in the group discussion among the speakers and the moderator. Differences in methodology, education, or musical repertoires did not hinder our dialogue. We only had one audience member, we three presenters later said to each other, but how glad we were that it had been Simon!

Clearly, there are significant problems with the wholesale dismissal of a certain musical culture because it involves formal education, and it is worth remembering that even the guest of honor at *Studying Music* does not share this view. At the same time, I take seriously this claim that art music is an

activity that involves a portion of society with the highest economic and cultural capital, to the exclusion of members of the lower- and lower-middle class. What are the implicit political stances I might be taking in my own research on art music? This is an area of thought that I do think art music scholars tend to neglect in their written works. It is easy to get caught up in one's passion for the music she or he studies. Concerning their positions within social structures, many musicologists have considerable teaching duties within schools of music or conservatoires. A large portion of the university-level musicians in musicologists' classrooms are not destined to teach private lessons to the children of wealthy elites nor to become part of the upper class. They will instead work as music teachers and ensemble directors in public school programs that offer affordable music training to young students. At the same time, art music culture does correlate in certain respects to wealth: expensive instruments, pricey private lessons, and the lavish atmosphere and ticket prices at many operas and symphonies. We must also admit that most of the scholarship in musicology journals can be understood only by people with advanced musical training and literacy skills. This scholarship functions at least in part as a display of ability, helping to secure a musicology professor's position as an educator of the highest rank, an elite social category with high cultural capital. In other words, there might be some merit to popular music scholars' suspicion of art music based on the social work it performs.

Because I have not done adequate research on the current state of the musicology discipline, I can only speak with greater specificity about the social ramifications of my own work as a researcher and teacher of art-music topics. I am currently a professor in Istanbul, Turkey, and my strongest and most direct impact on other people is as a teacher. In Turkish society, art music plays a role in an opposition between people who are religious and others who are resolutely secular. This is currently quite a sharp division, exacerbated by the strategies of politicians. Special knowledge of European culture, such as being able to speak a European language or appreciate a concert of art music, plays a role in this division as an identity marker for Turkish citizens who consider themselves inheritors of the secular, Westward-looking vision of the country of Mustafa Kemal Atatürk. It is not uncommon for someone who claims this political identity to argue that the moderately religious ruling party's disinterest in European art music is evidence of their lack of intelligence. Bad news about art music venues and educational programs is used as a barometer that measures how quickly the country is sliding into cultural decay.[3] My purpose here is not to assess the validity of these claims, but to observe that these claims are being made and that they implicate art music in identity politics. Based on my experience in Turkey, it does also seem that engagement with art music skews towards upper-middle class, urban Turkish citizens who have had access to very good education.

So, I must admit that my work as a musicologist can and probably does play a role in social division and exclusion, because any students with a secularist point of view can use the knowledge they gain from my classes to affirm and even strengthen the sense of righteous distance they feel from the mostly religious and poor component of their society currently supporting the ruling party. To try and

[3] For an example of this discourse, see Susanne Güsten, "Overhaul of State Theaters Opens Turkish Cultural Rift," *The New York Times,* May 30, 2012, http://www.nytimes.com/2012/05/31/world/europe/overhaul-of-state-theaters-opens-turkish-cultural-rift.html?pagewanted=all (accessed October 25, 2014). For a more recent example, look at the comments in the final paragraph of Alexandra Ivanoff, "5th İstanbul Opera Festival concludes with Dmitri Hvorostovsky," *Today's Zaman*, June 22, 2014, http://www.todayszaman.com/anasayfa_5th-istanbul-opera-festival-concludes-with-dmitri-hvorostovsky_351012.html (accessed October 24, 2014).

mitigate this effect, I try to illustrate in my classes how many other kinds of music can give them the same kinds of opportunities for enrichment they might find in European art music culture, and this includes plenty of discussion of popular music. Given what I know about Turkish society, it would be good of me to teach students about how art music can be symbolically appropriated to do socio-cultural warfare, encouraging them to take a peek behind the mystical aura that shrouds the music they hold dear and at least appropriate music with care. (Actually, in Turkey, a Muslim country with its own, distinctive popular music, rock music can and does take on the same function.) On the other hand, I strongly believe that art music culture and cultural products are not only useful as symbols that can be appropriated for social exclusion and distinction. In my case, classes about art music provide an environment in which Turkish students can live out certain interests and ways of being that they are drawn to but feel are not widely supported in their own society. Experiencing contemporary art music also gives us the chance to think about our lives in unique ways. At the moment I am preparing for a class on the music of Alfred Schnittke, and I have been struck by his explanation for the hard-to-grasp formal structures of his compositions as manifestations of the structural unity that orders both the good and the evil in the world. Provocatively, Schnittke has also positioned his sounding of the irrational individual psyche against the stereotyped emotional content of pop culture.

All in all, I can say that the three days I recently spent with popular music scholars at *Studying Music: A Conference in Honor of Simon Frith* has certainly gave me much to think about: the relationship between art music and social struggle, the social implications of certain analytical approaches, and the rich possibilities of writing about music as its own sort of invigorating art. As I look back over what I have written, it strikes me that I have engaged in some "low" theoretical analysis of my own, as I have reacted to the conference largely based on the grounded "realities" of my own life. One topic mentioned in the call-for-papers was the boundary between popular and art music, and the status of the notion of high- versus low music culture. More than a few scholars I met seemed eager to reify rather than problematize these boundaries, and this disappointed me. It is my opinion that scholars of popular music need to let go of the notions that all or even a majority of art music scholars are boogiemen out to get them, and that art music culture is only good for class warfare. Art music scholars who are still reading along, I ask them to take popular music seriously as aesthetically and socially valuable, and to give colleagues such as Simon Frith, whose work on popular music has already had such a positive impact on music studies in the academy, the credit they deserve! Here is to Simon, whose methodological conscientiousness, literary talent, and determined unwillingness to cover his ears at any stage of his career is a model for music scholars of all kinds.

JANE HARRISON
Center for Advanced Studies in Music, Istanbul Technical University, Turkey

Jane Harrison earned her doctorate in musicology in 2011 from the Ohio State University, with a dissertation on the shared compositional techniques, aesthetics, and social behavior of composers writing "Debussyste" music in early twentieth-century France. Her research has been supported by a Fulbright Grant to France and multiple doctoral fellowships from Ohio State. She has presented her research at several conferences including the 2010 annual meeting of the American Musicological Society and the 2012 annual meeting of the Nineteenth Century Studies Association. Currently Jane currently teaches musicology at Istanbul Technical University, Center for Advanced Studies in Music.