

Theoretical Aspects of Musical Critical System of Jaroslav Volek
Theoretische Aspekte des musikkritischen Systems von Jaroslav Volek,
Teoretické aspekty hudebně kritického systému Jaroslava Volka

Petr Lyko

Jaroslav Volek represents a significant personality of our musical criticism. The character of his professional review activity was, from the beginning, influenced by his wide education in the theoretical, as well as musical practical level. By maximum using of his conservatory, as well as university studies in the branch of musical science and aesthetics, he managed, even in his youth, to become a highly erudite critic, who was able not only to evaluate the subject of review, but also to express then objectively and appropriately his judgement. One of the specificities of Jaroslav Volek's profile as a musical critic was thus the approach to evaluated phenomena, which came out from using of aesthetic, philosophical or social premisses, having their paradigmatic base in a scientific level. His reviews are characterized by a high communicability, because Volek outlined their form and style of expression carefully, according to a character of readers, to whom his work was stated.

In his system Jaroslav Volek came out mainly from the principles of dialectic materialism, so, in his work of musical critic, his aesthetic and philosophical opinions are highly reflected. One of the significant features of his profile was a systematic nature in general theoretical questions of musical criticism and in concrete reviews. For theoretical aspects of his critical system was typical the approach using noetics, gnoseology and logic. The mentioned features represent especially positive aspects of Volek's professional profile, because they guarantee, to a large extent, the timelessness of his review legacy. If it became nearly a rule for Volek that his arguments were accurately formed, based perfectly and they created absolutely coherent system, then their value is not reduced even by their link to intellectual paradigmatic starting point in the form of dialectic materialism or marxism-leninism.

Professional profile of every critic is formed not only by his review activity, consisting of evaluation, commenting, assesing etc. of some concrete entity from the branche of art or cultural life, but also by his theoretical opinions, connecting the criticism itself. These opinions usually synthesize all the range of other attitudes, for example from the sphere of esthetics, history of music and art, musical theory etc. It thus concerns the sphere, into

which, together with the level of art criticism, interferes in a large extent also the science.⁵⁴ So, by the theoretical aspects of the musical-critical system, here is meant the summary of the theoretical solutions for all the relevant questions of the musical criticism, which are necessary for its function in praxis, as well as its existence “before” the concrete practical level, which we can grasp, into a large extent, as an objective (general) and also subjective paradigm of the critic. It is apparent that this set is internally very stratified because it comprises the questions of primary, pure criticism (problems of critical judgement, value measures etc.), as well as the questions of the methodological approach.

Jaroslav Volek published his opinions concerning the theoretical aspects of the musical criticism separately only in several journal studies, but he presented his ideas also in some musicology symposiums.⁵⁵

As a main source thus remains above all the paper *O zákonitostech kritiky* (On the Laws of Criticism),⁵⁶ published in 1962 in *Hudební rozhledy*, resp. the paper *Ještě k problémům kritiky* (Some more notes to problems of criticism)⁵⁷ from 1963. These works were inspired by the discussion on musical criticism in the above mentioned periodical in 1961. However, their primary aim was not to interfere directly the discussion, but more to express author's theoretical approaches to this topic as a whole.

Jaroslav Volek reflected here especially the following theoretical fields: function of musical criticism, problems of critical judgement, critical abilities of the reviewer, relation of criticism and science, questions of the reception of the musical work, resp. the bond between the author, work and the critic (recipient) and the critical qualification. As the mentioned papers represent in this aspect the most complex Volek's theoretical works, which clearly demonstrate his grasping of musical criticism, it is necessary to deal with each of the spheres published here.

Function of the musical criticism

In his system, Jaroslav Volek did not try to define the function of musical criticism as a firmly given, dynamically stagnated and theoretically dogmatic summary. He understood by them more a complex of the means, which enable, due to their plurality, to form a cri-

⁵⁴ In fact, here comes to a synthesis of specifically critical questions, which can be viewed as “the theory of criticism” itself, and also to comprising of mainly social standpoints (ideological, historical etc.) and finally also – which is typically specific for Jaroslav Volek – to an enjambements from the sphere of philosophy, which, of course, primarily is not a science. However, it is a fact that Volek used many of its disciplines (noetic, gnoseology, logic) in a way typical for science.

⁵⁵ It concerns especially the papers from the conference on the relation of fine arts to artistic criticism, resp. the conference of musicologists and musical critics, held in Zvíkovské podhradí from 10th to 12th September, 1979 and 8th to 9th December, 1981. Volek gave here papers: To three backgrounds of relations of fine arts to artistic science (1979) and On specificity of artistic criticism (1981).

⁵⁶ Volek, Jaroslav: *O zákonitosti kritiky*. *Hudební rozhledy* XV, 1962, n. 21, p. 886–893.

⁵⁷ Volek, Jaroslav: *Ještě k problémům kritiky*. *Hudební rozhledy* XVI, 1963, n. 15, p. 618–621.

tical judgement of a high quality. Of course, even in his opinions, a certain differentiation or better the realizing of the functions of the criticism is apparent.

There are two basic function directions, or "general functions", forming also the shape of the concrete functions of musical criticism, according to Volek. We can call the first direction as an analytical function. Volek ranks here especially those critical processes, whose aim is to analyze the given concrete reality (e.g. to define the character of the work structure, interpretation, to catch the system of the inner links of the entity etc.). The second synthetizing function is then the axiological function, whose aim is attributing of the values and the making of the value judgement itself.

However, it is apparent that this definition does not have a general validity for the whole sphere of the functions of musical criticism, because it represents only one of the possible ways of stratification. From another point of view Volek e.g. defined the social function as one of the most important. And it is clear even here that between any stratifications of the suggested way a whole field of mutually interfering phenomena is formed. The general social function comprises the analytical, as well as axiological pole.

Volek himself admits the questionability of the exact definition of the functional spheres of the musical criticism also due to their enjambement to partly different spheres, such as e.g. journalism, scientific essayistics etc. (and even with the consciousness that these are not any more the functions typically specific for the musical criticism). He even considers this great functional range as useful, because it serves to the qualitative amplification of the criticism.

He denotes e.g. the explicative, propaganda etc. functions as other important functions (which are from the point of the above mentioned definition again more an intertype). From the social-axiology point of view Jaroslav Volek understands the function of the musical criticism in concrete, time-bound process of evaluation, but also in time processual attribution of the values, which are bound to historical, ideological etc. aspects of development. Another function, according to him, is also the role to generalize and apply critically one creative process on the second one.

Critical judgement

Critical judgement is, according to Jaroslav Volek, the key factor, which defines the criticism. It is a component, which can not be dismissed from the review, because in this case the criticism would be transformed into another genre. Volek grasped the basic principle of the critical judgement in its axiological essence. In the narrowest meaning of this word it is the critic's evaluation. It is usually based on the justification of the judgement. The justification can be marked by the subjective, personal, emotional approach, or, on the other hand, the approach can be exact, cognitive etc., but it is not necessary for the maintenance of the essence of the criticism itself. We can thus consider any brief judgement of the axiological character as a criticism. In the opposite case, the case of judgement absence, although with a large "explanation", we can not speak of criticism.

It is apparent from this Volek's definition why he did not give any deeper analytical thoughts or detail description of the work structure in his own critical activity. If he considered the value judgement to be the central point of the criticism, then he directed all its other sets just to this aspect. From the same reason he was not afraid to go often to subjective approach, when giving reasons. Even Volek's grasping of critical abilities gives evidence of the dominant function of the critical judgement. The critical abilities unfold from the above mentioned hierarchizing view.

Critical abilities

By the critical abilities in its real meaning of the word Volek understands especially the ability of forming the critical judgement, these are not the aspects as a scientific erudition, critic's qualification etc. Taken more widely, this category comprises also other additive abilities such as the ability to analyse in a scientific way, disseminate, to present the opinions in an adequate way etc. However, these abilities stand on the edge between the critical and musicological qualities and their presence need not guarantee the quality of the pure critical judgement. In the character of the critic Volek thus admits the possible discrepancy between the scientific (musicological) abilities and the critical ones. Then this discrepancy can form the discrepancy between the correct scientific work judgement and the erroneous evaluating judgement.⁵⁸ Not correct evaluating judgement can here result e.g. also from nonrespecting of the unique qualities and signs of the concrete work resp. its judgement through general dogmatic norms.

In a general level, Volek summarizes the mentioned possible discrepancy in a definition of the critical judgement on one hand and the analysis, explication or applying of the work on the other hand. For this reason it is also necessary for the reviewer to realize what aim does the criticism have and what range of readers it is written for, and to emphasize, according to this, one or another set.

Relation of the criticism and science

From the mentioned discrepancy also the delimitation of the relation of the criticism to science is unfold. According to Volek it is not possible in any case to identify criticism with science or to call criticism, as well as e.g. art, a science. Of course even here Volek admits intertypes and phenomena working on permeable borders of the mentioned spheres. The basic feature of the critical originality lies already in its methodological level. In

⁵⁸ Volek showed this possibility on Stravinski's *Blessing of Spring*, which really, as the critics (as a prove of work "perversity") wrote, celebrates rough, barbarous, harsh aspects of pagan life – to this point it is a justified analytic judgement. However, just this aspect, to a large extent, forms the artistic qualities of the work, and that is why it is not possible to denote the work itself as primitive, barbarous etc., it means to confuse analytical and evaluating knowledge.

this regard the criticism is specific in the movement from general (any general rule, norm etc.) to the specific (unique judgement of a concrete work). The opposite movement, from the individual items to the general ones, is, according to Volek, typical more for the science. And in the same way an intentional abstraction of the subjective view in science and his organic presence in an evaluating judgement clearly demonstrates the difference of the musical criticism. Volek considers the main difference to be in the noetic level. Especially in the case when the form of criticism approaches to a larger analytical paper, it comes to an enjambement to the realm of science (in the same way as sometimes at Volek's papers).

Absolutly essential component of the theoretical opinions of Jaroslav Volek is represented by a range of questions connected with the reception of criticism, mainly in its connection to processual links to terms as work, creator, interpreter, audience etc. In these regards it makes even other, above mentioned spheres of thoughts, complete.

Criticism in the process of "consumption"

It is necessary to add to this subtitle that by this theoretical framework Volek understood a whole range of questions of aesthetic, sociological, psychological ect. nature. From the today terminology point of view, as well as its real conceptual character, the term of reception is the most close to him. However, in some questions it comes also to their meaning enjambement (e.g. the problematic of the reviewer's profile, way of work perception, audience aptitude, error in critical judgement etc.). The term "consumption" in Volek's interpretation lacks the meaning "consumer", thus in the negative meaning of the word, consumerism in specific areas of human life, as it is understood today.

Jaroslav Volek used the problems of reception in the outlined synthetizing meaning for the definition of the criticism itself, which he defined as "*a specific, especially active form of art consumption*".⁵⁹ The starting point for this interpretation is, for him, the theory of artistic reflection of reality. Volek differentiates between the artistic reflection to author (creator) and interpreter. However, the key relation is their dialectic relation, in which there is the art work in the middle. So it is about the applying of Volek's general aesthetic pattern, when the work reflects the subject from one hand and the object from the other one. Although this opinion comes from the ideas of marxism-leninism, it is transformed by the interpretation of the work as a central point, not only as its reflection of the objective reality.⁶⁰ The consumer's and author's reflections thus differ in their object, process and result. According to Volek, for the first one the reality is the object, its creation is the process and the result is the work. For the second one, the work is the object, its consumption is the process and the result are the permanent changes in audience, resp.

⁵⁹ Volek, Jaroslav: O zákonitosti kritiky. Hudební rozhledy XV, 1962, n. 21, p. 888.

⁶⁰ For more details see Stratílková, Martina: K estetickým a hudebně estetickým názorům Jaroslava Volka. Master thesis, FF UP, Olomouc 2003.

society mind. Volek summarizes this difference also as a difference between the depicted reality and the relatively complete reflection of the reality. In his interpretation he thus takes also the psychological point of view of the whole phenomenon into account. He draws attention to the difference between the process of creation as a non-repeatable and unique process, opposite to the more or less repeatable process of consumption.

An important aspect for the fixing of the relation of the criticism to the work, author, resp. in the context of the whole above outlined relation thus lies in the processuality and dynamism of each links and their similar functioning in the framework of the whole – creation and reception in the widest meaning of the word. By comprising the questions of the way of interpretation or appreciation of the work Volek extended the integration of the musical criticism to the process of creation and reception also by the psychological view, problems of perception and apercption. Thus, here the larger meaning of the term “consumption” is apparent. The reason, why Volek emphasized especially the problems of the reception as a, to a great extent, synthetizing phenomenon for many other phenomena, results from his dialectic understanding of art in the context of a general human evolution. Here again it is the realizing of artistic-function bounds between the sphere inside the art, resp. criticism and the outer reality, between the subject – work – object.

The dynamic interpretation of the process, in which the musical criticism works, also creates the form of consumption. According to Volek, the consumption is specific, especially by its active character. Volek speaks directly of gnozeological ranging of the critical activity.⁶¹ The specificity of the critic’s consumption, opposite to the audience consumption, is especially its profundity, consistency in evaluation etc. However, in its substance it is the same link in the processual chain, because Volek did not separated the critic’s personality from the personality of listener. The critical consumption is to represent more the top type of the listener’s consumption. As a matter of principle Volek rejected the interpretation of the critic as an intermediary between work (author) and its listener. From the identification of the critic with the listener also result the same claims for their ideal dispositions, which Volek characterizes, in the widest meaning of the word, as: *“the ability to listen and to react sensitively and flexibly to the real, as well as the pretended values of the work (performance).”*⁶²

However, it is necessary to add to the Volek’s definition of personality of a critic that he did not grasp it one-sidedly, only as a specific type of a listener, but he also realized the complexity of the links between him and other consumers, broader public etc. First of all, he emphasized the often very different opinions of the evaluating judgement of the broader public in the relation to each concrete work or performance. However, even in this situation the critic remains the representative of these groups, and that is why it often comes to a forming of opinions of the mentioned groups from his standpoint. Thus, according to Volek, the critic can become, on one hand (although he himself is

⁶¹ Volek, Jaroslav: O zákonitosti kritiky. Hudební rozhledy XV, 1962, n. 21, p. 889.

⁶² Ibid.

a consumer), also an educator of the consumer group. However, Volek emphasizes that this influence itself is no presupposition for the forming of the quality of the critical, it means consumer judgement. The one, who in fact determines its legitimacy, is not the personality of the critic, but more the temporal interval and the stabilization of value parametres in the process of following progress.⁶³

Volek perceived another link also in the direction consumer – critic. However, in the situation when the critic reacts to the stimuli of consumers (e.g. he lets them influence him by their enthusiasm, or, on the other hand, he is provoked to an opposite reaction etc.), he considers it to be important for the reviewer to react directly to the work and not to interchange, when he makes the evaluating judgement, its own effect for the stimuli from the surroundings.

In the connection with the processual character of the musical criticism Volek paid attention also to the question of the time, in which the criticism is created, formed and finally fulfils its functions. One of their specific features is, according to him, interfering of several temporal levels. The criticism immediately after its forming functions as a topical reflection of the immediate effect of the work in the given, concrete time. Thus, it is the level of presence, in which the criticism works, but which is, at the same time an intersection of other levels – of future and past. The level of future is characterized by Volek as a prediction, whose essence is to predict the value characteristic to the future. This level thus functions as a progressive developing factor.⁶⁴ The level of past mainly proceeds from the critic's subject, it is a summary of his consciousness of historical, aesthetic, cultural, artistic etc. aspects, bound in any way to the evaluated object or other contexts of the similar character or it is their mutual comparison.

In the question of the term-concept "consumption" Volek clashed with the conductor Eduard Fischer,⁶⁵ who criticized confusion of the process of perception (consumption) with the process of evaluation. First of all, Fischer described the process of evaluation as much broader than the process of consumption. The critical process – and it is his specificity – has, according to him, to comprise also the organization of information, analysis, logical support of conclusions etc. In his reaction⁶⁶ Volek argued above all by not understanding the noetic questions of his theory from Fischer's point of view. He again emphasized the synthetizing character of the term-concept "consumption", to which ranks the psychological phenomenon of perception, as well as the aesthetic response and a process of a following reaction to an artistic stimulus – thus in the context of critic's personality also the cognitive and axiological reflection. Fischer's not understanding

⁶³ Volek justifies the necessity of time interval for forming the value attitude by the conception of the work value as a processually forming phenomenon in the relation to the consumers. He refuses the existence of value apriori, as an entity existing in itself, in its separation from the social development.

⁶⁴ Volek, Jaroslav: O zákonitosti kritiky. Hudební rozhledy XV, 1962, n. 21, p. 890.

⁶⁵ See the paper Poznámky k problémům kritiky. Hudební rozhledy XVI, 1963, n. 13, p. 548–549, which was created as a polemics to Volek's paper "O zákonitosti kritiky."

⁶⁶ Volek, Jaroslav: Ještě k problémům kritiky. Hudební rozhledy XVI, 1963, n. 15, p. 618–621.

results, according to Volek, from the identification of consumption with a single process of the immediate perception, in its passive form.

When we compare this Volek's synthetizing definition of "consumption" with a contemporary perception of work reception, we can claim, to a great extent, that Volek (like in the question of musical function) comes closely to a methodological approach called in the world of musicology most commonly as "Rezeptionsforschung", although metodologically he proceeds from the theory of art reflection. Unambiguously it is his contribution to our musicology that he demanded the reflection of the whole process of work reception in all its important contexts. It is necessary to add to his discussion with Fischer that in the way of Volek's reaction his rigorous systematic nature in methodological, noetic etc. questions appeared again. In his reply he dealt with the analysis of the way of understanding the existing premises, those already suggested, in the general level, as well as in making his and his opponent's paper more concrete, more than with the presentation of other opinions.

Critic's qualification, reliability of critical judgement, work of a critic

When comparing the work of a critic and composer, we can come to a false feeling of quantitative and on it depending also qualitative disproportion. The critic forms his judgement during a short time period, usually of tens of minutes, while the composer creates his work in a much longer period. In this question Jaroslav Volek unambiguously stood up for a differentiation between the mentioned temporal difference and the evaluation of the work quality of both subjects, resp. he proved that the shorter reflection of the critic has its logical reasons and that is why it can not, in any case, be taken as less valuable than the creative activity of composer.

Volek defined the reasons for this proclamation: The critic is not taken by his activity out of the audience, he has the same time for his judgement as other consumers, a reproach against him would be applicable also to listeners. The quantitative disproportion is moreover balanced by the possibility of multiple reproducibility of the consumption, opposite to a unique process of creation or interpretation.

The second reason lies in the fact that the essence of critic's work in the complex view is not represented by evaluation of one single work, one performance, but the summary of his activity, which is years-long. While the quality of composer's activity is evaluable according to one single work, the critic's qualities appear usually not sooner than in the context of a larger work, not of one review. Thus it is not possible to confront the real work of an artist with a small section from the critic's "work". The evaluation of the quality of critic's work is, by this, in some way more complicated, for the reason of a longer time period, in which the correctness of the judgement appears. For the same reason also the question of the right of the critic for development is very delicate. It is not possible to compare and judge each evaluating process and to draw a presupposition of critic's abi-

lities from them. Volek emphasizes that we have to perceive even the process of subject development in its whole long-time continuity.

The problem, why the critic's work is often viewed as negative, lies, according to Volek, in the absence of continuity consciousness of his work. In fact, there does not exist any way of continuous grasping, or even evaluating of critic's work by anyone else than the critic itself. And even in this connection Volek emphasized that we must look for the essence of critical work in it itself, not in the surrounding objects in the spheres, which are relevant for the quality of composer's or interpreter's work (it means e.g. in exhausting and detailed knowledge of the technique of composing, in perfect mastering of a concrete musical instrument etc.).

In the context of critical work Volek dealt also with the questions of the work choice for the review, it means whether each work really is worth of critic's attention. If the central point of the critical process is the value judgement, then he considers it necessary to reflect each work (resp. not to omit any), even if the results of his judgement would mean a negative evaluation. He saw the greatest mistake in neglecting or even in direct ignoring of any work.

The question of critic's qualification also represented the second clue point of Volek's controversy with Eduard Fischer. Fischer reproached Volek's approach to critic's personality for his insufficient demands on his erudition in the spheres, which he evaluated at the artist. He did not hesitate to call Volek's conception as playing to dilettantism. Volek contradicted Fischer that by his demand for nearly the same abilities, which artists have – as the clue item of their professional equipment, he denied the uniqueness and specificity of the criticism itself.

In the reaction to Fischer's reproach of "mysteriousness of critical ability" Volek stated that the critical ability is so specific that it is necessary to define it in this way by concepts and also by terms. Using these arguments, Volek in fact proclaimed the qualitative ability of critical act creation as an axiom, which is not necessary to be defined by the abilities from others, above all out of the criticism itself standing, spheres.⁶⁷

It is apparent that Fischer's polemic was lead mainly from the position of a performing artist (conductor), his way of opinion presentation, resp. leading controversy with Volek's opinions showed drawbacks, as for their inner complexity as a system. Volek's reaction was thus lead, with justification, mainly in the noetic and gnoseological level.

Critical error

To get closer to these problems, Volek gave in his paper *O zákonitosti kritiky* (On Criticism Laws) statistic data (however, without illustrating them by adequate research),

⁶⁷ In this connection Volek stated to Fischer's address: "What would happen if I told him now, in retaliation, that, in spite of his public conductor's activity I can not consider him to be a musical expert, until he learns to write criticism or manages to learn better the bases of gnoseology." Ibid., p. 620.

showing, in per cents, the relation of critic's fallibility to his professional quality.⁶⁸ Although the exact grasping of this topic is not an apriori wrong approach, the way, chosen by Volek, more or less refers the delicate questions of musical criticism to a black and white view. It is not possible to define the critical error with an accuracy of one per cent even for the reason, how difficult it sometimes is to differentiate the level of justification, appropriateness, or, on the other hand the erroneousness of the critical judgement. In spite of this mistake his other observations are fitting and logical. According to Volek, by the absence of the exact reflection of the criticism in the general context it comes to a paradox phenomenon that not infrequently those critics, who are often mistaken and who are mediocre and especially one-sided, become more famous.

The cause lies in the continuity of their author (although erroneous) pressure, which makes them more visible. Perhaps the most representative case viewed by Volek was in the personality of the critic Eduard Hanslick.⁶⁹

In the question of critical error margin Volek considers the social, ideological approach as the essentially right. If the critic makes error in this point, it is not possible to excuse it. On the other hand, we can tolerate the inaccuracy in the evaluation of a concrete phenomenon (Volek speaks of a daily criticism). At first sight, this approach can make an impression of a considerable political-ideological determination of Volek's conception, but it is caused mainly by setting of a stated idea into concrete historic and social context, which Volek had in mind. In the general level the relatively correct standpoint comes to a differentiation of the error in the direction of syntagm and paradigm. He perceives the solution for overcoming or more for levelling out of the both levels relation in a dialectic conception of general and unique, essence and phenomenon.

It is necessary to add to Volek's theoretical opinions of criticism that they come out, to a great extent, from the general aesthetic and philosophical conception of dialectic materialism and the theory of artistic reflection of the reality, but in the form, how Volek transformed it (it means the work as a centre of the scheme, which reflects the object on one hand and the subject on the other one). Volek put a strong emphasize on the noetic and gnoseological questions, which he used as a logical starting point for forming of his opinions. Not less important is also his conception of criticism as a dynamic factor in the process of work reception and definition of value judgement. In a correspondence with his practical activity Volek presented his opinions in a full correspondence to practical applications, this correspondence is apparent e.g. from the approach reflecting sociological, aesthetical, philosophical aspects, or the applications of materialistic dialectics.

⁶⁸ Volek states e.g. that a top critic can make mistakes max. in 5 %, 15 to 20 % is a category of reliable critics. He recommends to critics with more than 30% fallibility to think of choosing another activity, more adequate to their abilities.

⁶⁹ Apart from other things, Volek adds to Hanslick that in his many critical works he entirely overestimated the composers, who are in fact unknown today, while he was not able, due to his one-sidedness, to recognize the qualities of today world-known authors.

It is necessary to add to the development of opinions to theoretical aspects of musical criticism that Jaroslav Volek did not deal with their reflection as a part of systematic critical or scientific work, as he did with e.g. the questions of musical theory, aesthetic etc.

The mentioned papers from the 1960s, which represent the main source of his theoretical knowledge, were created more as a consequence of the broader discussion on musical criticism, which was formed in our country at that time, his papers on conferences and seminars in the eighties only make his opinions from the sixties more complete. That is why it is not possible to speak of Volek's complex theoretical system of musical criticism in the real meaning of the word, because Volek has never presented his opinions in public in this way and he meant his works more as a topical reaction to a topical status and needs of our criticism.

Zusammenfassung

Jaroslav Volek (1923–1989) stellt einen bedeutenden tschechischen Musikwissenschaftler, Ästhetiker, Musikkritiker und Musiktheoretiker dar. Mit seiner Rezensionstätigkeit fing er schon in den Nachkriegsjahren an, als er in der Tagespresse und in den Musikzeitschriften, wie z.B. *Rytmus* und *Tempo*, publizierte. Nach dem Jahre 1948 begann er in die periodisch erscheinende Musikzeitschrift *Hudební rozhledy* beizutragen. Hier erreichte seine Tätigkeit in den 60er Jahren einen Höhepunkt. Anfangs der 70er Jahre wurde er als politisch unverlässlich bezeichnet und seine Karriere als Musikkritiker wurde im Grund beendet.

Die theoretischen Ansichten von Jaroslav Volek auf die Musikkritik entspringen in nicht geringer Maasse der ästhetischen und philosophischen Konzeption des dialektischen Materialismus und der Theorie des künstlerischen Abbildes der Wirklichkeit, aber in der durch Volek transformierten Auffassung (d.h. das Werk als Mittelpunkt des Schemas, das von einer Seite das Objekt, von der anderen das Subjekt widerspiegelt). Einen grossen Akzent legte Volek auf die Fragen der Noetik und Gnoseologie, die er als logischen Ausgangspunkt für die Formung seiner Ideen benutzte. Spezifisch ist für ihn z.B. die Auffassung der Musikfunktion in den breiteren gesellschaftlichen Zusammenhängen oder Anschauung der Kritik als einer einzigartigen Erscheinung mit ihren eigenen Gesetzmässigkeiten. Nicht weniger wichtig ist auch die Auffassung der Kritik als dynamischen Faktor im Prozess der Werkrezeption und Wertschätzung. Im Einklang mit seiner praktischen Tätigkeit formulierte Volek seine Ansichten vor allem in Beziehung auf das musikalische Werk, während er sich den Fragen der Interpretation weniger widmete. Gleichzeitig aber wählte er einen eher allgemeineren Blickwinkel, deswegen sein Zugang nicht einseitig bleibt. Seine theoretischen Ansichten entsprechen den praktischen Applikationen, dieser Einklang ist z.B. aus dem soziologische, ästhetische, philosophische Aspekte einschliessendem Zugang, oder Applikation materialistischer Dialektik ersichtlich. Volek stellt einen Typ des Kritikers dar, der sowohl das wissenschaftliche Herantreten zur bewertenden Erscheinung, als auch praktische Aspekte der konkreten Musiktätigkeit berücksichtigt.

Resumé

Jaroslav Volek (1923–1989) představuje významného českého muzikologa, estetika, hudebního kritika a hudebního teoretika. Svou recenzentskou činnost zahájil již v poválečných letech, kdy publikoval v denním tisku i v hudebních časopisech, jako např. *Rytmus* a *Tempo*. Po roce 1948 začal přispívat do periodika *Hudební rozhledy*. Zde jeho činnost vyvrcholila v šedesátých letech. Počátkem let sedmdesátých byl označen za politicky nespolehlivého a jeho dráha hudebního kritika víceméně skončila.

Teoretické názory Jaroslava Volka na hudební kritiku vycházejí do značné míry z obecně estetické a filozofické koncepce dialektického materialismu a teorie uměleckého odrazu skutečnosti, ovšem v té podobě, jak ji Volek transformoval (tj. dílo jako střed schématu, které z jedné strany odráží objekt, z druhé subjekt). Značný důraz Volek kladl na otázky noetiky a gnozeologie, které využíval jako logické východisko pro formování svých názorů. Specifické je pro něj např. chápání funkce hudby v širších společenských kontextech či nazírání kritiky jako jedinečného jevu se svými vlastními zákonitostmi. Neméně důležité je i pojetí kritiky jako dynamického činitele v procesu recepce díla a stanovení hodnotového soudu. V souladu se svou praktickou činností Volek předkládal své názory zejména ve vztahu k hudebnímu dílu, otázkám interpretace se věnoval méně. Zároveň však volil spíše obecnější úhel pohledu, takže tento přístup není příčinou určité jednostrannosti. Jeho teoretické názory plně odpovídají praktickým aplikacím; tato shoda je zřejmá např. z přístupu reflektujícího sociologické, estetické, filozofické aspekty, či aplikací materialistické dialektiky. Volek představuje typ kritika zohledňujícího jak vědecké přístupy k hodnocení jevu, tak i praktické aspekty konkrétní hudební činnosti.