



HUDEBNÍ VĚDA

LIX — 2-3/2022

MUSICOLOGY
MUSIKWISSENSCHAFT

OBSAH

CONTENTS

- 146 Notes from the editors
■ Jan Blüml – Aleš Opekar

ČLÁNKY / ARTICLES

- 149 History of Popular Music Research in the Czech Lands and Hungary: Contexts, Parallels, Interrelations (1918–1998) / Dějiny výzkumu populární hudby v českých zemích a Maďarsku: souvislosti, paralely, vzájemné vztahy (1918–1998)
■ Jan Blüml – Ádám Ignácz
- 214 Jiří Fukač and His Contribution to Popular Music Research / Jiří Fukač a jeho přínos pro výzkum populární hudby
■ Aleš Opekar
- 246 Music with a Revolutionary Purpose: Jazz Journalist Emanuel Uggé / Hudba revolučního smyslu: Jazzový publicista Emanuel Uggé
■ Petr Vidomus
- 315 Punk and Oi! Rebellion? Music and Commodification of the Youth Subcultures in Czechoslovakia at the Turn of the 1980–90s / Punk a oi! Rebelie? Hudba a komodifikace subkultur mládeže v Československu na přelomu osmdesátých a devadesátých let 20. století
■ Miroslav Michela
- 348 Private Czech Radio Broadcasting, Its Music Programming and Audience in the 1990s Illustrated with the Regional Station Radio Faktor / České soukromé rozhlasové vysílání, jeho hudební dramaturgie a publikum v devadesátých letech 20. století na příkladu regionální stanice Radio Faktor
■ Petr Šrajcer

KONFERENCE / CONFERENCE

- 387 Conference Activities of Czech Musicology in Relation to Popular Music (Especially Focusing on Popular Music of Communist and Post-Communist Europe) in Recent Years / Konferenční aktivity české muzikologie ve vztahu k populární hudbě (zejména se zaměřením na populární hudbu komunistické a postkomunistické Evropy) v posledních letech
■ Jan Blüml

RECENZE / REVIEWS

- 392 Irena Příbylová – Lucie Uhlíková (eds.): Od folkloru k world music: Hudba a prostor ■ Lubomír Tyllner
- 397 Přemysl Houda: Normalizační festival: socialistické paradoxy a postsocialistické korekce ■ Aleš Opekar
- 400 Ádám Havas: The Genesis and Structure of the Hungarian Jazz Diaspora
■ Yvetta Kajanová

- 406 ČESKÁ RESUMÉ / ENGLISH SUMMARIES

HISTORY OF POPULAR MUSIC RESEARCH IN THE CZECH LANDS AND HUNGARY: CONTEXTS, PARALLELS, INTERRELATIONS (1918–1998)

Jan Blüml – Ádám Ignácz

<https://doi.org/10.54759/MUSICOLOGY-2022-0201>

1. Introduction

The present study deals with the history of theoretical reflection on popular music in the Czech lands¹ and Hungary in the period 1918–1998. Primarily, it discusses the process of formation and the mutual relations of Czech and Hungarian scholarship on popular music, which was institutionalized in both countries under the auspices of Marxist musicology and in the latter case also of (music) sociology in the 1950s and 1960s. In this sense, the main attention is paid to the activities that were concentrated around the crucial institutes of music research of the local academies of sciences and their key representatives.

It is necessary from the outset to define several terms that appear frequently in the present study. The first is the “musicology of popular music”. We understand it as a specific (sub)discipline that was formed in the context of socialist states and that preceded the institutionalization of popular mu-

* This article was written with the financial support of the Czech Science Foundation under the grant GA ČR 21-16304S “The Development of Popular Music Investigation in the Czech Lands in the Context of Central European Culture and Politics since 1945”. For critical comments on the text and help with heuristics the authors thank to Professor Peter Wicke, Professor Yveta Kajanová, and Associate Professor Lubomír Tyllner.

1 The Czech lands were part of the state formation Czechoslovakia between 1918 and 1992. We are aware of the important role of the Slovak environment in mediating Czech-Hungarian relations, and we report on this role in appropriate places. For conceptual reasons, however, we focus our attention primarily on the Czech environment, or the space of the Czech lands. Exclusively Czech-Hungarian musical relations as a specific and autonomous topic were previously dealt with, for example, by Jitka BRABCOVÁ – Jiří FUKAČ: *Typologie česko-maďarských hudebních vztahů a stav současného bádání* [Typology of Czech-Hungarian Musical Relations and the State of Current Research]. In: *Československo-maďarské vztahy v hudbě* [Czechoslovak-Hungarian Relations in Music]. Karel Steinmetz (ed.), Ostrava: KKS, 1982, pp. 45–62. For research on the history of musicology of popular music with an emphasis on the Slovak environment, see Yveta KAJANOVÁ: *Rock, Pop and Jazz Research Development in the Former Czechoslovak Socialist Republic and Present-Day Slovakia*. In: *Popular Music in Communist and Post-Communist Europe*. Jan Blüml, Yveta Kajanová, Rüdiger Ritter (eds.), Berlin: Peter Lang, 2019, pp. 31–48.

sic research in the West (in the form of the founding of the International Association for the Study of Popular Music, IASPM in 1981) by about 20 years. The musicology of popular music differed from the later Western conception of “popular music studies” not only in its origins but also in its methodology, thematic emphases, and overall perspective; in the former, musicology and aesthetics played a central role, and in the latter, cultural studies. Since the 1990s, the parallel existence and differences between popular music studies and the musicology of popular music can also be spoken of in the context of Western Anglophone scholarship.² Czech scholars justified theoretically the existence of a specialized musicological discipline based on popular music research as early as the early 1970s (in Hungary, a similar meta-reflection on the field never developed);³ 10 years later, the discipline became part of Czech disciplinary systematics under the title “Theory and History of Non-Artificial [Popular] Music”.⁴ Although it is a field with identical problems, we use the term “musicology of popular music” for the sake of international comprehensibility.

The purpose of the present study is not to address terminological-conceptual issues (in the form of definitions of specific style-genre types, and so on) that themselves formed a significant part of the debates in Czech and Hungarian musicology before 1989. However, a closer definition of the term “popular music”, which was a central issue in the discourses in question, is necessary. Terms such as “jazz”, “light music”, “dance music”, “entertainment music”, “popular music”, and so on underwent a complex process of development in the Czech lands and Hungary (as well as in other countries of the West and East). Their meaning shifted and settled with each new generation of listeners, journalists, and theorists, all against the background of the linguistic specificities of particular regions, the general development of popular music, and cultural politics. For example, in the Czech lands, we encounter the term popular music (“populární hudba” in Czech) as early as the 1930s, when it referred to simpler and widely accepted genres akin to classical music.⁵ Nevertheless, in the 1960s, the term was already synonymous with “pop music” (which was adopted from the English). It represented a musical expression close to what we would describe today as pop or rock. In Hungary, the term popular music (“populáris zene” in Hungarian) came into the limelight in the 1960s and 1970s, when it often melded with the term pop music (“popzene” in Hungarian), especially in pop-rock journalism.

-
- 2 Cf. Derek B. SCOTT (ed.): *The Ashgate Research Companion to Popular Musicology*. Burlington: Ashgate, 2009, pp. 1–21 and Roy SHUKER: *Popular Music: Key Concepts*. London: Routledge, 2005, pp. 181–183.
- 3 Cf. Josef KOTEK – Ivan POLEDŇÁK: *Teorie a dějiny tzv. bytové hudby jako samostatná muzikologická disciplína* [Theory and History of so-called “Bytovaya Muzyka” as an Autonomous Discipline of Musicology]. *Hudební věda* 11 (1974), No. 4, pp. 335–355.
- 4 Cf. Vladimír LÉBL – Ivan POLEDŇÁK et al: *Hudební věda* [Musicology]. Praha: SPN, 1988, pp. 823–853.
- 5 Cf. Anna PATZAKOVÁ: *Prvních deset let československého rozhlasu* [The First Ten Years of Czechoslovak Radio]. Praha: Radiojournal, 1935.

Between the 1960s and the 1980s, the term popular music (or as it was referred to in the Czech lands, “non-artificial music”) underwent an evolution within the theoretical discourse and eventually stabilized as a superordinate category encompassing a vast set of musical phenomena alongside folk and art music.⁶ According to Czech theoreticians, it was characterized by the following features: (a) a typologically standardized basis of creation; (b) lesser importance given to the compositional uniqueness of the work and a greater one to performance; (c) spontaneity of perception and consumption; (d) the strong and immediate presence of social and psychological functions; (e) a broad consumer base (but at the same time, more class-, social group-, and generation-specific); and (f) commodification of most music production and hence its subordination to common economic mechanisms and laws, especially the law of supply and demand. These and other features, according to Czech theorists, led to the separation of popular from other music, which from the 19th century created preconditions for its relative developmental autonomy.⁷

When we speak of the musicology of *popular music* in the context of the Czech lands and Hungary, we mean systematic research on the style-genre field as defined above. In the Czech lands, this field is best described in Josef Kotek’s synthesis *Dějiny české populární hudby a zpěvu*, a work that has no counterpart in Hungary, a point that will be discussed below. Kotek traces the development of Czech popular music from the first half of the 19th century to 1918, then from 1918 to 1968. In the first part, the author systematically analyses musical phenomena and genres such as broadside ballads, societal songs of the Czech national revival, brass and military bands, workers’ songs, cabaret songs, and operettas; in the second part, in addition to “lidovka” (“folk” songs), camp-fire songs, musicals, Estrada music, and mass songs, Kotek focuses on jazz, swing, rock, country, and other related genres.⁸ Czech scholars have often distinguished between older European “traditional popular music” and “modern popular music” (sometimes referred to synonymously as “music of the jazz circuit”) influenced by imported Afro-American

6 Cf. Josef KOTEK: *O české populární hudbě a jejích posluchačích* [On Czech Popular Music and Its Listeners]. Praha: Panton, 1990.

7 Antonín MATZNER – Ivan POLEDŇÁK – Igor WASSERBERGER (eds.): *Encyklopedie jazzu a moderní populární hudby* (věcná část) [Encyclopaedia of Jazz and Modern Popular Music (Subject-Based Part)]. Praha: Editio Supraphon, 1983, p. 293. Richard Middleton’s and Peter Manuel’s 2001 definition agrees with the older Czech interpretation in its basic features, including the historical definition. The authors state that: “Even if ‘popular’ music is hard to define, and even if forms of popular music, in some sense of the term, can be found in most parts of the world over a lengthy historical period, in practice its most common references are to types of music characteristic of ‘modern’ and ‘modernizing’ societies – in Europe and North America from about 1800 [...]” Richard Middleton – Peter Manuel: *Popular Music*. In: *Grove Music Online*, 2001. Available at <https://www.oxfordmusiconline.com>.

8 Josef KOTEK: *Dějiny české populární hudby a zpěvu 1, 2* [History of Czech Popular Music and Singing 1, 2]. Praha: Academia, 1994, 1998.

musical folklore.⁹ We use both terms in the present study. The importance of modern popular music as an object of scientific research increased rapidly from the 1960s, the period when the popular music began to be studied at the Czech and Hungarian academies of sciences. This reflected the growing influence of popular music of Anglo-American origin from the Second World War on.

The definition of musical genres is closely related to the conception of scholarly disciplines that deal with these genres and that define them for their own purposes. Thus, the musicology of popular music, especially in its early phase, was partly following the folk music studies, which resulted in the early 1960s in a tendency to create song editions, collect and catalogue “Schlagers”, and so on. However, such approaches soon gave way to more modern perspectives, such as historical analyses of specific styles and genres, investigations of the mechanisms of the music industry, and sociologically based analyses of music reception. These approaches were chiefly concerned with modern popular music (jazz, rock, pop, and other similar genres in today’s sense of the word).

Regarding the selected countries, it is valuable to compare them also because they have long-standing ties in terms of popular music history as such. The relationship began with the influence of Czechoslovak jazz anthologies on Hungarian audiences in the 1960s¹⁰ and continued with the cult of Hungarian rock in Czechoslovakia in the 1970s and trips by Czechoslovak fans to Budapest a decade later for concerts of world popular music stars. This history, which runs parallel with the topic of theoretical reflection on popular music, has not yet been scientifically treated either from the Czech¹¹ or the Hungarian side. Czech-Hungarian musical relations have nevertheless been the subject of several studies that, while approaching the issue mainly from the perspective of art music, have defined some of the common features of both musical cultures on a general level. The comprehensive analysis of Czech-Hungarian musical relations by Czech musicologists Jitka Brabcová and Jiří Fukač is particularly noteworthy. The authors discuss the manifestations of a marked parallelism between the two cultures, which defined themselves in relation to their surroundings in a similar way, received similar stimuli, and responded analogously to certain musical developments. Furthermore, the authors state that “apart from Poland, we could hardly find a musical culture in the Czech surroundings that is typologically as close to our musical culture as the Hungarian musical culture.”¹²

9 Cf. Ivan POLEDŇÁK: *Úvod do problematiky hudby jazzového okruhu* [Introduction to the Music of the Jazz Circuit]. Olomouc: Univerzita Palackého, 2000.

10 Vojtěch HUEBR: *Dunaj není Mississippi* [The Danube is not Mississippi]. *Melodie* 18 (1980), No. 6, p. 176.

11 The topic was touched upon by Barbara Bothová in her conference paper “Locomotiv GT versus Balaton – Pop Music in Hungary in the 1970s-80s” at The Underground and Czechoslovakia 1981–1986 conference, which was organized by the Institute for the Study of Totalitarian Regimes and held on 21 October 2021 in Prague.

12 BRABCOVÁ – FUKAČ 1982, p. 60 (see n. 1).

These two national traditions, however, were based on different historical roots, defined at the beginning of the 20th century amongst other things by their respective statuses as “victorious” and “defeated” countries after the First World War, which of course had several political, socio-economic, and other consequences. The later affiliation of the Czech lands and Hungary with the socialist Eastern bloc, which was subject to unifying Sovietizing tendencies, did not entirely eradicate their deeper historically conditioned individual characteristics. Thanks to this fact, the comparison provides a very good opportunity to define the most general assumptions underpinning the development of popular music research; this is one of the main objectives of the present study.

The discussion on the Czech and Hungarian musicology of popular music is structured on the basis of general historical milestones, such as the communist takeovers in 1948. Here, however, it should be recalled that the discourses on popular music themselves often crossed sharp historical and political turning points.¹³ For this reason, the present study takes a generational perspective, distinguishing between three generations of theorists: (1) pioneers who were born around 1900 and who significantly influenced the discourse of the 1930s to 1950s, which primarily concerned the Czech lands; (2) scholars who were born in the interwar period and who linked their careers specifically to the musicology of popular music in the 1960s to 1980s, both in the Czech lands and in Hungary; and (3) disciples of the second generation of theorists who were born in the 1950s and who witnessed the fading of the musicology of popular music in both countries in the post-communist era of the 1990s.

The present study addresses the extent to which popular music research in the Czech lands and Hungary was a direct product of so-called Eastern European or Marxist musicology, the officially declared goals of which included a turn to the study of the musical culture of “today”, as well as an appeal to the study of the so-called mass genres (including their aesthetic, economic, social, and other contexts, and their dialectical links to other segments of the musical universe).¹⁴ In this context, Marxist musicology is understood on two levels: first, as an umbrella term that covers the socialist countries (or the counterpart of what was then called bourgeois musicology), and second, as the application of a specific methodology that examines the history of music primarily through the lens of class conflict. That said, the bearers of popular music research in both countries were only partly orthodox Marxists; indeed, the long-term proponents of the Marxist scientific perspective were a minority in both musicological communities, though their voice often stood out in official

13 Cf. Gábor GYÁNI: *Valóban korszakhatár 1945?* [Is the Year of 1945 Really a Beginning of a New Era?]. *Levéltári Közlemények* 86 (2015), Nos. 1–2, pp. 5–13.

14 János MARÓTHY – Dénes ZOLTAI – József UJFALUSSY: *Utak és választak a mai marxista zenetudományban*. [Paths and Crossroads in Contemporary Marxist Musicology]. *Magyar Zene* 6 (1965), No. 6, pp. 563–576.

forums. Most scholars, by contrast, worked with traditional historiographical and other methods without any significant traces of ideology.

The hypothesis that there was a relationship between Marxist musicology and the early institutionalization of popular music research in socialist countries was supported by the Czech musicologists Jiří Fukač and Ivan Poledňák, who reflected on the general causes of the long-lasting downplaying of and lack of interest in the subject by the international academic community. They identified five, the first three of which are especially relevant to our topic: (1) the class division of society, which orientated class-based theory or science towards music that was in one way or another associated primarily with the ruling class; (2) the poor sensitivity of musicological knowledge to the distinctive, differentiating, and polarizing trends of music as a result of the low dialectic nature of this knowledge; (3) the inability of theory to grasp holistically the meaning of music for human beings and thus the reduction of perspectives on such music, which deliberately suppresses its concretized functionality in human existence and tends towards artistic autonomy; (4) the nature of the preserved musical sources, which emphasize written musical manifestations, that is, manifestations belonging to the poles of “high art” or “art music”; and (5) the traditionalist inertia of social science disciplines, especially those orientated towards the human sciences (of which musicology has long been one).¹⁵

The following text is divided into two broad sections. The first considers, respectively, the Czech and Hungarian backgrounds of popular music research after 1918 and the establishment of Czech and Hungarian musicologies of popular music after 1948. The second discusses in detail the post-war contacts between the Czech and Hungarian academic communities; identifies the nature of their relationship and cooperation; and attempts to understand the role of both national schools on the map of Central European popular music research in the second half of the 20th century.

2. Development of Popular Music Research in the Czech Lands and Hungary

Theoretical Reflection on Popular Music in the Czech Lands after 1918

The theoretical reflection on popular music in the Czech lands after 1918 had at least two starting points. The first concentrated on the research of folk music and the forms close to traditional Central European popular music, and the

15 Jiří FUKAČ – Ivan POLEDŇÁK: *K typologickým polarizacím hudby, zejména polarizaci hudby artificiální a nonartificiální* [To the Typological Polarizations of Music, Especially the Polarization of Artificial and Non-Artificial Music]. *Hudební věda* 14 (1977), No. 4, p. 317.

second was rooted in the exploration of modern popular music imported from the West, which, in the first decades of the 20th century, was collectively referred to as “jazz”. From the interwar period onwards, the two strands existed close to each other, shared their exponents, and complemented each other in wider public debates.

The pioneers of popular music research in the Czech lands usually represented different fields from that of musicology. They were often personalities with a close relationship to literature (literary theory and journalism) or practical musicians. If there was a trace of musicology, it was through folk music studies, which had a long tradition and institutional background in the Czech lands. This field dates back to 1905, when, in connection with the project Folk Song in Austria, committees were established for the scientific treatment of folk song in Bohemia and Moravia, the leading representatives of which were the founders of Czech university musicology, Otakar Hostinský (1847–1910) and Zdeněk Nejedlý (1878–1962). The ambition of the project was to collect all folk songs and music, and, according to Hostinský, even artificial songs and nationalized songs were not excluded “insofar as they contribute to the knowledge of the nature and taste of the people”.¹⁶ Both Hostinský and Nejedlý were later, after the Second World War, reminded by the founders of the musicology of popular music – in the first case with regard to the broadening of the field of folk music studies¹⁷ as well as reflections on the social functions of art¹⁸ and in the second case mainly with reference to Nejedlý’s treatment of 19th century revival songs and his investigation of the history of Hussite singing.¹⁹

The institutionalization of folk music studies continued after the First World War, specifically in 1919 with the establishment of the State Institute for Folk Song, the activities of which were associated, among others, with literary theorist Bedřich Václavěk (1897–1943) and musicologist Robert Smetana (1904–1988). The joint work of the two researchers (“at a high systematic and methodological level”²⁰) both “discovered” urban folk song as a legitimate subject of research (hitherto neglected by the priority interest in village folklore) and showed the possibilities of its complex analysis in terms of text, music, and performance. In this sense, the later musicology of popular music referred especially to Václavěk and Smetana’s edition of *České písně kramářské*²¹ as

16 Otakar HOSTINSKÝ: *Lidová píseň v Rakousku* [Folk Song in Austria]. *Český lid* 16 (1907), No. 4, p. 162.

17 MATZNER – POLEDŇÁK – WASSERBERGER 1983, p. 301 (see n. 7).

18 Dušan HAVLÍČEK: *O novou českou taneční hudbu* [For New Czech Dance Music]. Praha: SČS, 1959, p. 104.

19 MATZNER – POLEDŇÁK – WASSERBERGER 1983, pp. 301, 310 (see n. 7).

20 *Ibid.*, p. 301.

21 Robert SMETANA – Bedřich VÁCLAVEK: *České písně kramářské* [Czech Broadside Ballads]. Praha: Fr. Borový, 1937.

well as to the edition of the *Český národní zpěvník*²² with its analysis of the most popular songs of the urban society in the first half of the 19th century. The significance of Václavek's theoretical work *Písemnictví a lidová tradice*²³ was also recalled; in this work, the author carried out a thorough critique of Hans Naumann's theory of "gesunkenes Kulturgut" and stated the independent creative contribution of folk song, its distinctive social functions, and the dialectical link with art music – and thus according to Josef Kotek and Ivan Poledňák actually built "the theoretical foundations for the later research of non-artificial music [i.e. traditional and modern popular music] in general".²⁴

In the interwar period, Czech musicologists rarely paid attention to jazz. The fact that, for example, Zdeněk Nejedlý hardly registered the genre even at the end of the 1940s was confirmed by Emanuel Uggé's comment on the situation after the communist party came to power: "Finally, it is interesting that at least Nejedlý was not fundamentally so hostile to jazz. He only smiled at jazz and asked, somewhat ironically, whether the 'wailing' was music, but he waved his hand and quite accepted that jazz was being practiced".²⁵ Also telling is a 1933 poll organized by *Přehled rozhlasu* magazine, in which representatives of various professions, including those of the major scientific and artistic institutions of the day, commented on the question of the impact of jazz. The president of the Czech Academy of Sciences and Arts, composer and educator Josef Bohuslav Foerster, replied: "Mr. Editor, I regret that I cannot give you any answer on the matter of the survey on jazz, I have no relation to it at all."²⁶ According to the survey, not only representatives of radio, theatres, and entertainment establishments but also Václav Tille, a university professor and literary historian close to Foerster's age, had a better overview of current events in the field of modern popular music. Unlike his colleague, Tille was able to give a solid opinion on the subject, stating: "I consider jazz, as I have heard it played in America, to be a new musical form suitable for Europe, which, although it disturbs its music tradition, can become the basis for new creativity."²⁷

Especially in the 1930s, discussions on popular music were stimulated by the development of radio broadcasting, which was established in Czechoslovakia as one of the first cases in Europe in the spring of 1923 (more than two years before the launch of Hungarian radio in December 1925); let us note

22 Robert SMETANA – Bedřich VÁCLAVEK: *Český národní zpěvník* [Czech National Songbook]. Praha: Melantrich, 1940.

23 Bedřich VÁCLAVEK: *Písemnictví a lidová tradice* [Literature and Folk Tradition]. Olomouc: Index, 1938.

24 MATZNER – POLEDŇÁK – WASSERBERGER 1983, pp. 301–302 (see n. 7).

25 Uggé's letter from 3 May 1950 to jazz fan Ladislav Pospíšil. Archive of Jan Blüml.

26 Josef KOTEK: *Kronika české synkopy 1 (1903–1931)* [Chronicle of the Czech Syncope 1 (1903–1931)]. Praha: Supraphon, 1975, p. 135.

27 *Ibid.*, p. 135.

that it was radio that, for many theorists and other observers, discovered “a new audience of hundreds of thousands and millions of members of the most diverse social classes and cultural strata, whose socialization takes place in an imaginary space, the ether.”²⁸ Radio’s 10-year existence was summarized in an extensive monograph by the musicologist Anna Patzaková published in 1935,²⁹ and, three years later, the folk music researcher and musicologist Karel Vetterl devoted an article to the sociology of the medium in question.³⁰ The discussion of radio also resulted in an essay by the pianist, composer, organizer, and journalist Josef Stanislav (1897–1971) entitled *O té lidové a vážné hudbě a lidových hudebnících* [On the Folk and Art Music and the Folk Musicians] (1939),³¹ which Kotek and Poledňák later described as “the first attempt at a global (not just historical) view of non-artificial music, its relationship to art music, its aesthetic foundations and its social – organizational and listeners – background”.³² The article responded to a series of surveys conducted in previous years, the content of which is suggested by their titles: “Light and Serious Music” (Tempo, 1936), “So What Should We Sing?” (Přítomnost, 1936), and “The National Song and the Schlager” (Tempo, 1937). In his study, Stanislav emphasized the necessity of the scientific investigation of popular music and, at the same time, defined himself against the elitist conception of music as exclusively art music, as, for example, V. E. Babka formulated it in one of the discussions: “The problem of so-called light music is not a problem of music, nor of composers, because light music is not actually music, and those composers are only somehow mistakenly called composers. If there is any connection, it is only external and consists in the fact that the so-called composers use the notes by accident when composing so-called light music, so that at a first rough glance we can blithely assume that we are in the field of music.”³³

As has already been mentioned, the theoretical reflection on modern popular music in the Czech lands was originally tied to literary circles. For example, the first references to jazz-related phenomena were brought to the Czech environment in 1903 by the poet Otakar Theer;³⁴ the artists around the influential Prague cabaret Červená sedma were first informed about the existence of the “new syncopated music” of Western Europe by the journalist and writer Eduard Bass.³⁵ A close relationship to jazz can be traced especially

28 Karel VETTERL: *K sociologii hudebního rozhlasu* [On the Sociology of Music Radio]. *Musikologie* 1 (1938), No. 1, p. 27.

29 PATZAKOVÁ 1935 (see n. 5).

30 VETTERL 1938, pp. 27–44 (see n. 28).

31 Included in Josef STANISLAV: *Kritiky a stati* [Criticism and Essays]. Praha: SČS, 1957, pp. 33–52.

32 MATZNER – POLEDŇÁK – WASSERBERGER 1983, p. 302 (see n. 7).

33 STANISLAV 1957, p. 37 (see n. 31).

34 KOTEK 1975, p. 9 (see n. 26).

35 Lubomír DORŮŽKA – Ivan POLEDŇÁK: *Československý jazz: minulost a přítomnost* [Czechoslovak Jazz: Past and Present]. Praha: Supraphon, 1967, p. 15.

among representatives of a specific Czech literary movement of the 1920s known as poetism, which included the first Czech theorist of modern popular music, composer, playwright, director, and journalist Emil František Burian (1904–1959). If we are talking about theoretical reflection on jazz, the primary attention should be paid to his book of the same name from 1928,³⁶ which, according to Dorůžka and Poledňák, in its “meandering criticism and apologetics” was a good representative of one of the late but “remarkable documents of Czech post-war poetism”.³⁷

Let us add that the mid-1920s was the period when the first major theoretical writings on jazz in a global context began to appear: within Europe, which was ahead of the United States in this sense at the time,³⁸ we can mention the publication *Das Jazzbuch* (1926)³⁹ by the German musicologist Alfred Baresel (1893–1984), a pupil of Hugo Riemann and Arnold Schering; *Le Jazz* (1926)⁴⁰ by the French musicologist André Schaeffner and music critic André Coeuroy, and a book by another German, Paul Bernhard, *Jazz: Eine Musikalische Zeitfrage* (1927);⁴¹ in the United States, the first major treatise on jazz was a book by radio host Mary Margaret McBride and bandleader Paul Whiteman, *Jazz* (1926).⁴² Burian’s work was one of the most extensive contemporary writings on the subject. It straddled the boundaries of popularization, propaedeutic literature, and scholarly text, and its disciplinary range spanned the fields of music aesthetics, music analysis, the study of instrumentation, musical forms, organology, and music ethnography. The author cited the aforementioned foreign writers as well as domestic theorists, such as Hostinský and Janáček. According to Krzysztof Karpiński, the publication was also sold in Poland,⁴³ where the first book on jazz, specifically Leopold Tyrmand’s *U brzegów jazzu*,⁴⁴ was surprisingly not published until the 1950s.

The reflection of modern popular music during the interwar period was influenced both by the general political and economic circumstances and by the internal laws of music development, which brought about a deeper genre differentiation, for example in the sense of distinguishing jazz from unspecified “light music” and hence explaining these differences based on more pro-

36 Emil František BURIAN: *Jazz*. Praha: Aventinum, 1928.

37 DORŮŽKA – POLEDŇÁK 1967, p. 26 (see n. 35).

38 Alan P. MERRIAM: *A Short Bibliography of Jazz*. Notes 10 (1953), No. 2, p. 202.

39 Alfred BARESEL: *Das Jazzbuch*. Berlin: Jul. Heinr. Zimmermann, 1926.

40 André SCHAEFFNER – André COEUROY: *Le Jazz*. Paris: Éditions Claude Aveline, 1926.

41 Paul BERNHARD: *Jazz: Eine Musikalische Zeitfrage*. Frankfurt am Main: Eisenbletter u. Naumann, 1927.

42 Mary Margaret MCBRIDE – Paul WHITEMAN: *Jazz*. New York: J. H. Sears, 1926.

43 Krzysztof KARPIŃSKI: *Był jazz* [There Was Jazz]. Kraków: Wydawnictwo Literackie, 2014, pp. 135–136.

44 Leopold TYRMAND: *U brzegów jazzu* [On the Shores of Jazz]. Kraków: Polskie Wydawnictwo Muzyczne, 1957.

found historical analyses. Such a conception slowly began to be applied in the Czech lands from the early 1930s, whereas Burian's book actually represented "a punctuation mark for the epoch of the first enchantment".⁴⁵ Dorůžka and Poledňák characterized the transformation by noting that, while the first European works on jazz, including Burian's, suffered from a lack of specific information about the folklore roots of jazz and were based only on later European derivations of the original sources (according to Burian, the "kings of jazz" were George Gershwin, Paul Whiteman, and Rudolf Friml), the attention in the era of the 1930s and 1940s was focused on the "indigenous black area, which it tried very consistently to purge of white influences".⁴⁶

It was the folkloristic approach with an emphasis on early jazz that characterized the concept of Emanuel Uggé (1900–1970),⁴⁷ the founder of Czech jazz journalism, who became involved in the music scene after his university studies of German literature and music theory in Germany in the first half of the 1920s. He then developed rich educational activity, which included collecting records, translating, publishing printed materials, giving lectures, editing Czech editions of foreign records, and so on. After 1929, Uggé published not only at home but also in prestigious foreign magazines, such as *Esquire*, *Gramophone*, *Melody Maker*, *Ebony*, and *Music-Magazine international du jazz*, and established contact with key representatives of Western jazz journalism.⁴⁸ These activities also became the basis for the first attempt to institutionalize non-academic jazz studies in the Czech lands on a club basis, specifically in the form of the nationwide organization Gramoklub. It officially functioned from 1935 until the occupation and was briefly restored after the Second World War. It should be added that a proposal for the establishment of a specialized state jazz school, library, and discotheque was made by the leading members of Gramoklub at the end of the war and sent to the Minister of Education and National Enlightenment Zdeněk Nejedlý in 1945. The proposal (which Dorůžka and Poledňák described as "considerably utopian"), however, was never implemented.⁴⁹ Personalities from the Gramoklub circle were also responsible for the development of immediate post-war jazz journalism. Its roots can be seen in a war-time unofficial jazz fanzine, *Okružní korespondence* [Circular Correspondence], which was followed by *Členský zpravodaj Gramoklubu* [Gramoklub's Member Newsletter],

45 DORŮŽKA – POLEDŇÁK 1967, p. 43 (see n. 35).

46 *Ibid.*, p. 11.

47 Regarding similar approaches in contemporary Western European journalism, see Laurent CUGNY: *Jazz in France 1917–1929: The Missing Object of the Reception*. In: *Jazz from Socialist Realism to Postmodernism*. Yveta Kajanová, Gertrud Pickhan, Rüdiger Ritter (eds.), Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 2016, pp. 43–58.

48 Zbyněk MÁCHA – Ivan POLEDŇÁK: *Uggé, Emanuel*. In: https://www.ceskyhudebnislovník.cz/slovník/index.php?option=com_mdictinary&task=record.record_detail&id=3088 [cit. 20. 1. 2022].

49 DORŮŽKA – POLEDŇÁK 1967, pp. 194, 224 (see n. 35).

and this was soon replaced by the first professional monthly, *Jazz*, published under Uggé's leadership in 1947 and 1948.

The pioneers of Czech theoretical reflection on popular music shared several important characteristics. In general, it was the same generational experience of people born around 1900, who were influenced by personalities such as Zdeněk Nejedlý, the ideas of the interwar avant-garde (*Devětsil*, poetism, the association for contemporary music *Přítomnost*, etc.), and the public discussions about the new phenomena of jazz, radio, and urban musical culture as such but who were also confronted with the political and economic crisis of the 1930s. In this sense, most of the exponents of the first theoretical reflections on popular music were leaning towards leftist politics, specifically the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia and Marxist aesthetics, which was programmatically interested in the culture of marginalized social groups and classes. First and foremost, this concerned Bedřich Václavek, one of the most important representatives of the Czech left-wing cultural front, who had already become interested in the world of the poor during the First World War;⁵⁰ at the same time, he was a Marxist for whom "literary theory merged with organization of culture, cultural politics, and political culture".⁵¹ The situation of Josef Stanislav was similar; he was a leading figure of proletarian culture in the field of music, who abandoned his original avant-garde starting point at the turn of the 1930s and focused entirely on his work in the Music Section of the Union of Czech Workers' Theatre Amateurs, where he wrote mass songs, conducted amateur workers' ensembles, and played the accordion (as a "graduate of the master school!"⁵²). In many ways, a similar development characterized E. F. Burian, whose attitude towards modern popular music also changed in the breakthrough period of the early 1930s, as he himself confirmed in 1933: "If I published then a thick volume of a respectable format for jazz in general, I would now have to publish several such folios to continue against jazz as it is practiced with bad taste today."⁵³ At the same time, Burian talked about the song of the periphery, which is especially magical "when heard with a harmonica somewhere on the grass behind a factory wall."⁵⁴ Emanuel Uggé, who also subscribed to the communist party, applied the Marxist perspective directly to jazz to distinguish the authentic and the folklore-based forms of the genre from their commercialized appearances: "Hot jazz was Uggé's central concept and problem, which he characterized in a number of his articles; he understood hot jazz as folk music with a certain social function and considerable artistic significance. Furthermore, Uggé always

50 Miloslav PETRUSEK: *Václavek, Bedřich*. In: https://encyklopedie.soc.cas.cz/w/V%C3%A1clavek_Be%C5%99ich [cit. 20. 1. 2022].

51 Ibid.

52 STANISLAV 1957, p. 8 (see n. 31).

53 DORŮŽKA - POLEDŇÁK 1967, p. 27 (see n. 35).

54 Ibid.

suggested that hot jazz was not a fashionable plaything of a bored bourgeoisie but the only true and uncorrupted jazz, that it was the music expression of an oppressed and resisting black race [...].”⁵⁵

Another common denominator of the mentioned personalities was their influence after 1948. Although Václavek died during the Second World War, as the founder of Marxist criticism and aesthetics, he became a cult figure after the communist party came to power. His legacy in folk music studies was consistently recalled by Robert Smetana, who worked on publishing Václavek’s works and refining his concepts,⁵⁶ which were served by a regular art history conference organized by Palacký University titled Václavek’s Olomouc (1960–1988). Josef Stanislav would become a typical personality linking the interwar period with the reconstruction of musical life after the Second World War and then with the installation of communist party in power after 1948. His influence can be seen at the organizational, ideological, and scientific levels, the latter in particular relating to his consistent attention to mass genres, which directly influenced later researchers of popular music, such as Dušan Havlíček (1923–2018), Vladimír Karbusický (1925–2002), and Zbyněk Mácha (1928–2007). After 1948, E. F. Burian, as an artist and journalist, fully embraced socialist realism and extended his influence within the top political positions. Although Emanuel Uggé himself was persecuted after 1948,⁵⁷ his circle of original collaborators and disciples, led by Lubomír Dorůžka (1924–2013), made a significant impact on jazz research in the following years. In the 1950s, Uggé’s folkloristic and anti-commercial conception of jazz as progressive music of oppressed Afro-Americans still resonated strongly in Czech music journalism and in a simplified form became part of the official doctrine of socialist realism, as represented by Antonín Sychra’s *Stranická hudební kritika, spolutvůrce nové hudby*.⁵⁸

Theoretical Reflection on Popular Music in Hungary after 1918

The development of theoretical reflection on popular music in interwar Hungary lagged behind that in Czechoslovakia, both in terms of exploring urban folk music and in terms of informed jazz journalism. This fact can be traced back, on the one hand, to the general political situation after the First World War. While the “victorious” Czechoslovakia was formed by the merger of the Czech

55 Ibid, p. 45.

56 Cf. Pavlína PŘIBILOVÁ: *Kritická korespondence Roberta Smetany s Bedřichem Václavkem* [Robert Smetana’s Critical Correspondence with Bedřich Václavek]. Dissertation. Olomouc: Palacký University, Faculty of Arts, Department of Musicology, 2020.

57 Cf. Petr VIDOMUS: *Hudba revolučního smyslu: jazzový publicista Emanuel Uggé* [Music of Revolutionary Meaning: Jazz Journalist Emanuel Uggé]. *Hudební věda* 59 (2022), Nos. 2–3, pp. 246–314.

58 Antonín SYCHRA: *Stranická hudební kritika, spolutvůrce nové hudby* [Party’s Music Criticism, Co-Creator of New Music]. Praha: Orbis, 1951, pp. 109–110.

lands with Slovakia and Subcarpathian Russia, Hungary, as a “defeated country”, lost the better part of its territory and population.⁵⁹ This caused national and international tensions in the following years and meant the loss of some of Hungary’s original urban cultural centres and potential scientific capacities.

A major event of European significance, alongside the end of the First World War and the fall of the Habsburg Monarchy, was the October Revolution in Russia in 1917, after which a large part of the European population, including some of the intellectual elite, became socially radicalized and which fuelled a growing preference for parties of the political left, including the communist parties. In March 1919, a Soviet Republic [Tanácsköztársaság] was proclaimed in Hungary, but it was soon defeated.⁶⁰ Subsequently, the Kingdom of Hungary was restored for more than 20 years⁶¹ under the leadership of Admiral and Regent Miklós Horthy,⁶² and the environment of conservative right-wing politics of the authoritarian Horthy’s regime adversely affected the possibility of developing the first Marxist-anchored reflections on (popular) music based on the ideal of the democratization of musical culture. By contrast, these were encountered to a large extent in the Czech lands in the interwar period, where the socialist parties successfully profiled themselves,⁶³ which in 1921 gave rise to the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia as a political force with mass support,⁶⁴ and where Marxist criticism and aesthetics had already taken shape during the 1930s. The activities of similar political parties in Hungary were either suppressed or directly criminalized.

Together with politics, the socio-economic context determined the form of theoretical reflection on popular music in both countries. While the Czech lands were already the industrial centre of the Austro-Hungarian Empire at the end of the 19th century, Hungary was a predominantly agrarian state⁶⁵ in which the share of industrial production began to approach that of the Czech lands only in the 1960s.⁶⁶ The process of industrialization was logically linked

59 Ignác ROMSICS: *Magyarország története a XX. században* [History of Hungary in the 20th Century]. Budapest: Osiris, 1999, pp. 139–147.

60 Péter APOR: *Az elképzelt köztársaság* [The Imagined Republic]. Budapest: MTA BTK, 2014, pp. 9–11.

61 The form of the government was officially changed to republic only in 1946.

62 ROMSICS 1999, pp. 149–268 (see n. 59); Krisztián UNGVÁRY: *Horthy Miklós* [Miklós Horthy]. Budapest: Jaffa, 2020.

63 Jindřich DEJMEK a kol.: *Československo. Dějiny státu* [Czechoslovakia. History of the State]. Praha: Nakladatelství Libri, 2018, p. 166.

64 Ladislav CABADA: *Intelektuálové a idea komunismu v českých zemích 1900–1939* [Intellectuals and the Idea of Communism in the Czech Lands 1900–1939]. Praha: Institut pro středoevropskou kulturu a politiku, 2000, p. 66.

65 György KÖVÉR: *Iparosodás agrárországban. Magyarország gazdaságtörténete 1848–1914* [Industrialization in an Agricultural Country. Economic History of Hungary 1848–1914]. Budapest: Gondolat, 1982.

66 Richard PRAŽÁK: *Má madarská cesta* [My Hungarian Journey]. Brno: Masarykova univerzita, 2014, p. 93.

to urbanization and deeper social stratification and thus to the development of urban folk music and its theoretical reflection. Understandably, economic factors also determined the state of the music industry and, consequently, the popular music scene itself, which, in the Czech lands, was more intensively affected by the jazz wave coming from the West.

Apart from the non-musical factors, the specific development of local musicology also played an important role in the fact that the theoretical reflection on popular music was almost non-existent in interwar Hungary. We should first refer to the influence of the composers and traditional folklorists, Béla Bartók (1881–1945) and Zoltán Kodály (1882–1967), who shaped the (academic) discourses on Hungarian music most profoundly after the First World War.⁶⁷ They both subordinated their entire work to a cultural and educational concept that, instead of following Western modernity, aimed to create a uniquely Hungarian (musical) modernity. This concept was, on the one hand, about the dissemination of the values of art music to the broader society and, on the other, about the search for a source that would express the majority of the society and that could be used to create a “high culture for the masses”.⁶⁸ It was particularly Kodály who found this source in Hungarian village folk music, which he assumed to be pure and uncorrupted. Forms of urban popular culture (including urban folk music and jazz), therefore, did not fit Kodály’s musical-educational concept.

Hungarian musical elites were mainly concerned with the issue of popular music when they discussed the local tradition of Gypsy music,⁶⁹ or referred to the public debate on the conflicts between Gypsy bands and the competing jazzbands⁷⁰ that had been arriving in the country since the mid-1920s. Bartók,

-
- 67 See Melinda BERLÁSZ (ed.): *Kodály Zoltán és tanítványai* [Zoltán Kodály and His Students]. Budapest: Rózsavölgyi és Társa, 2007; Anna DALOS: *Kodály Zoltán, a tudós zeneszerző* [Zoltán Kodály, Scholar and Composer]. In: *A Kodály Zoltán Zenei Alkotói Ösztöndíj* [Zoltán Kodály Composition and Musicology]. Anna Dalos, Tamás Várkonyi (eds.), Budapest: MANK, 2015, pp. 15–24; Miklós HADAS: *A nemzet prófétája. Kísérllet Kodály pályájának szociológiai értelmezésére* [The Nation’s Prophet: Essay on the Sociological Interpretation of Kodály’s Career]. *Szociológia* 16 (1987), No. 4, pp. 469–490.
- 68 Ádám IGNÁCZ – András RÁNKI: *Zoltán Kodály and the Hungarian Revolutions of 1918/1919*. Paper presented at the 2017 international conference on the 50th Anniversary of Zoltán Kodály’s death (A National Master in International Context, Budapest, Institute of Musicology, HAS).
- 69 Gypsy musicians and bands, interpreting mainly folk music and folkish urban music, played a crucial role in the 19th and early 20th century Hungarian musical entertainment, as evidenced by the activities by their association (Magyar Cigányzenészek Országos Szövetsége [Union of Hungarian Gypsy Musicians]) and their own journals, *Magyar Cigányzenészek Lapja* [Journal of Hungarian Gypsy Musicians] and *Magyar Cigányzene* [Hungarian Gypsy Music], which were among the first popular music related newspapers in Hungary. Cf. Tamás HAJNÁCZKY: *Magyar Cigányzenészek Lapja. Cigányzenész önszerveződés, érdekképviselet és közélet a két világháború között* [Journal of Hungarian Gypsy Musicians. Gypsy Musicians’ Self-Organization, Representation and Public Life between the Two World Wars]. *Pro Minoritate* 29 (2019), No. 4, pp. 123–136.
- 70 Kornél ZIPERNOVSZKY: “*Ki fog győzni – a jazz vagy a cigány – nehéz megjósolni*”: *A cigányzenészek megvédik a magyar nemzeti kultúráját* [“Who Will Win – the Jazz or Gypsy, It Is Hard to Tell.” Gypsy Musicians Defend Hungarian National Culture]. *Replika* 101–102 (2017), Nos. 1–2, pp. 67–87.

Kodály, and their pupils were mostly aware that a large part of the Hungarian society did not play or listen to peasant music and consumed rather what they called “intermediate music” [köztes zene], that is, the popular music of the time, including gypsy music, operetta, salon music, and jazz. However, it is also clear from their writings and interviews⁷¹ that they did not consider all of these genres to be uniformly bad: they rated gypsy music, especially in its village form, more positively than jazz both because it was more familiar to them and because it seemed to be more artistically demanding than the new Western popular music.

Toward the end of his career, Bartók worked together with the American clarinetist and jazz star Benny Goodman and even dedicated his piece *Contrasts* (1938) to him. As an art music composer, nevertheless, the only way he could think of to work with jazz was to use some of its individual elements in his compositions. Moreover, he viewed the jazzy dance music that he had heard in Hungary in the 1920s with suspicion, partly because of its foreignness and, as he expressed it in an interview in 1932, because it had “lost its originally fresh, vernacular character” and become a shallow, boring music, which Hungarians, who had their own folk music, did not need.⁷² Interestingly, the Czech composer Bohuslav Martinů spoke in a similar vein in the mid-1920s, when he praised the rhythm of Czech and Slovak folk songs, saying that there was no need to “turn to jazzband”.⁷³

The interwar relationship between Hungarian musicology and jazz is best summed up in the work of Antal Molnár (1890–1983), Kodály’s pupil, musicologist, composer, cellist, and professor at the Budapest Academy of Music,⁷⁴ who published the first ever Hungarian book on the subject, *Jazzband* (1928),⁷⁵ coincidentally in the same year as E. F. Burian’s pioneering book. Like the Czech author, Molnár’s work demonstrated his insight into current, mainly German-language, literature. The difference, however, was that Burian, in the spirit of

71 Béla BARTÓK: *Cigányzene? Magyar zene?* [Gypsy Music or Hungarian Music?]. *Ethnographia* 42 (1931), No. 2, pp. 49–62; Margit PRAHÁCS: *Cigányzene és magyar népzene* [Gypsy Music and Hungarian Folk Music]. *Napkelet* 8 (1930), No. 1, pp. 47–52; Pál JÁRDÁNYI: *Zenei ízlés, zenei műveltség* [Musical Taste, Musical Education]. *Forrás* 2 (1944), No. 7, pp. 89–92; Pál JÁRDÁNYI: *Könnyű zene* [Light Music]. *Szabad Szó* 49 (1947), No. 84, p. 8; Pál JÁRDÁNYI: *Népzene – műzene* [Folk Music vs. Art Music]. *Szabad Szó* 49 (1947), No. 112, p. 7; Mihály ITTÉZS: “*Ez nem az én világom.*” *Kodály a jazzről és a könnyű zenéről – szubjektíven és objektíven* [“This Is not My Cup of Tea.” Kodály on Jazz and Light Music – Subjectively and Objectively]. In: *Fejezetek a magyar jazz történetéből 1961-ig* [Chapters from the History of Hungarian Jazz until 1961]. Géza Gábor Simon (ed.), Budapest: Magyar Jazzkutató Társaság, 2001, pp. 87–89.

72 Quotes Attila RETKES: *Bartók Béla és a jazz* [Béla Bartók and Jazz]. In: *Zenetudományi tanulmányok Kroó György tiszteletére* [Studies in Musicology in Honor of György Kroó]. Márta Papp (ed.), Budapest: Magyar Zenetudományi és Zenekritikai Társaság, 1996, pp. 228–237.

73 KOTEK 1975, p. 91 (see n. 26).

74 Cf. József UJFALUSSY: *Molnár Antal zeneesztétikai szemlélete* [The Music Aesthetic Approach of Antal Molnár]. In: *Zenetudományi Dolgozatok 1999* [Studies in Musicology 1999]. Márta Sz. Farkas (ed.), Budapest: MTA Zenetudományi Intézete, 1999, pp. 305–310.

75 Antal MOLNÁR: *Jazzband*. Budapest: Dante, 1928.

Czech literary poetism, celebrated jazz as a modern invention, while Molnár took his book as a warning against the pernicious effects of American popular music on European traditions; in this sense, the author quoted, among others, well-known advocates of “high culture”, such as Spengler or Ortega y Gasset. Molnár’s second book, *A könnyű zene és társadalmi szerepe*,⁷⁶ carried the same diction, as did the occasional works of his contemporaries like Gábor Oldal,⁷⁷ who interpreted the issue of jazz in a very similar way. Although Molnár lost his influence after the communist party came to power in 1948⁷⁸ and was not rehabilitated until the 1960s, his critique of jazz was in many ways in line with the state cultural policy of the 1950s, specifically in its anti-Americanism, its call for the protection of traditional culture, and its demand for the regulation of popular music and the education of the “masses”.⁷⁹

For a long time, this discourse was completely dominant in Hungary. Among the few exceptions were the texts of Sándor Jemnitz (1890–1963), a composer who, after graduating from the Academy of Music, made his mark on the German music scene, first as a student of Max Reger and Arthur Nikisch at the Leipzig Conservatory, then as a private student of Arnold Schönberg in Berlin, and later as a friend of Theodor W. Adorno. After returning to his homeland in 1916, Jemnitz became known primarily as a music critic for the leading social democratic newspaper *Népszava*.⁸⁰ In relation to modern popular music, it is worth noting his German-language article in the 1925 jazz issue⁸¹ of the *Musikblätter des Anbruch* (beside the texts of P. Stefan, D. Milhaud, L. Gruenberg, and P. Grainberg), his writing for the representative volume *Magyar Muzsika Könyve*,⁸² and his review of Baresel’s book in which Jemnitz dared to claim that “jazz expresses the prevailing spirit of the times and today’s world view

76 Antal MOLNÁR: *A könnyű zene és társadalmi szerepe* [Light Music and Its Social Role]. Budapest: Sárkány, 1935.

77 E.g. Gábor OLDAL: *Negyedszázados a jazz* [A Quarter Century of Jazz]. *A Zene* 20 (1939), No. 12, pp. 220–222.

78 Anna DALOS: *A samesz és a csodarabbi. Molnár Antal dokumentumok Hernádi Lajos hagyatékában* [The Bottle-Holder and the Miracle Rabbi. Antal Molnár’s Documents in the Estate of Lajos Hernádi]. In: http://www.parlando.hu/2021/2021-2/Dalos_Anna.pdf [cit. 20. 1. 2022].

79 See Ádám IGNÁCZ: *Milliók zenéje. Populáris zene és zenetudomány az államszocialista Magyarországon* [Music for Millions. Popular Music and Musicology in Socialist Hungary]. Budapest: Rózsavölgyi és Társa, 2020, pp. 79–88.

80 János BREUER: *Jemnitz Sándor, a lipcsei diák* [Sándor Jemnitz, the Leipzig Student]. *Muzsika* 37 (1994), No. 7, pp. 25–27; János BREUER: *Jemnitz Sándor és Arnold Schoenberg kapcsolatai* [Relations between Sándor Jemnitz and Arnold Schoenberg]. *Magyar Zene* 25 (1984), No. 1, pp. 3–13; Vera LAMPERTH (ed.): *Jemnitz Sándor válogatott zenekritikái* [Selected Reviews of Sándor Jemnitz]. Budapest: Zeneműkiadó, 1973.

81 Sándor JEMNITZ: *Der Jazz als Form und Inhalt*. *Musikblätter des Anbruch* 7 (1925), No. 4, pp. 188–196. In Hungarian Sándor JEMNITZ: *A jazz mint tartalom és forma*. *Crescendo* 2 (1928), Nos. 11–12, pp. 8–16.

82 Sándor JEMNITZ: *A jazz* [The Jazz]. In: *A magyar muzsika könyve* [Book of Hungarian Music]. Imre Molnár (ed.), Budapest: Merkantil, 1936, pp. 117–118.

as honestly as the minuet or the Viennese waltz [did]”.⁸³ Moreover, he imagined that jazz could inspire the Hungarian people and Hungarian folklore.⁸⁴ It is also noteworthy that Jemnitz responded to the phenomenon of workers’ movement songs, which otherwise was overlooked by the local musical elite. He supported the Association of Hungarian Workers’ Song Ensembles – not only as a member of its executive committee but also by lecturing on the history of art music to the Association’s members and as the editor of its journal, *Munkások Dal- és Zeneközlőnye* [Song and Music Bulletin of the Workers].⁸⁵

More serious reflections on jazz came only in the brief period immediately after the Second World War, when recordings from the United States began to reach Hungary in greater numbers.⁸⁶ It was then that musicians such as Sándor Pál (1912–1989), composers like Rezső Kókai (1906–1962), and musicologists such as the young János Maróthy (1925–2001) began to address questions of the folk origins of jazz, its importance in the history of music, and its potential connection to the 19th century Romantic era.⁸⁷

Establishment of Czech Musicology of Popular Music after 1948

The Union of Czechoslovak Composers [Svaz československých skladatelů], established at its founding congress on 14–15 May 1949, played a fundamental role in the process of institutionalizing research on popular music in the Czech lands. As early as December 1949, a commission of music scholars and critics was established within the Union, which, in 1954, was transformed into a section of music scholars and critics. It was this section, with Marxist musicologist and aesthetician Antonín Sychra (1918–1969) as its long-term chairman, that, in the following years, provided a representative body of Czechoslovak musicology⁸⁸ until the Union’s reorganization under the advent of normalization in 1970.

From the beginning, the theoreticians of the Union, in accordance with the official tasks of Marxist musicology, focused on the key issues of “today”, including a wide range of questions related to folk music, folk creativity, mass musical culture, and thus popular music. During the Stalinist era of the early

⁸³ Sándor JEMNITZ: *A jazz tankönyve* [The Jazz Schoolbook]. *Népszava*, 24. II. 1926, p. 11.

⁸⁴ An interesting parallel to Jemnitz’s interpretation of jazz can be found in the writings of Emil Haraszti, a music critic and musicologist who emigrated to France in the 1920s. See e.g. Emil HARASZTI: *Cigányzene, parasztzene, hivatalos zene* [Gypsy Music, Peasant (Folk) Music, Official Music]. *Budapesti Hírlap* 49 (I. 5. 1929), pp. 1–3.

⁸⁵ Sarolta KÖVÁGÓ: *A Magyarországi Munkásdalogyletek Szövetsége* [Union of Hungarian Workers’ Song Associations]. *Párttörténeti Közlemények* 30 (1984), No. 3, pp. 136–163.

⁸⁶ IGNÁCZ 2020, pp. 88–90 (see n. 79).

⁸⁷ See e.g. Sándor PÁL: *A jazz eredete* [The Origins of Jazz]. *Magyarok* 3 (1947), No. 10, p. 696; Rezső KÓKAI: *Jazz és népzene* [Jazz and Folk Music]. *Magyarok* 3 (1947), No. 11, pp. 752–754; János MARÓTHY: *Improvizáció és romantika* [Improvisation and the Romantic Era]. *Zenei Szemle* 2 (1948), No. 7, pp. 350–359.

⁸⁸ LÉBL – POLEDNÁK 1988, p. 229 (see n. 4).

1950s, discussions on such topics had a strong ideological character, with an emphasis on the political function of music and its basis in domestic tradition;⁸⁹ from the mid-1950s, however, one can register a retreat from ideology in favour of objective scientific criteria as well as the gradual rehabilitation of previously rejected genres of modern popular music imported from the West.

The theoretical positions on popular music within the Union in the first phase were formulated mainly by representatives of the Marxist conception of music of the 1930s, such as Josef Stanislav, who, in 1946, had already co-founded the Syndicate of Czech Composers to which the Union was directly linked. In May 1947, during the 1st International Congress of Composers and Music Critics organized by the Syndicate, Stanislav presented a paper on mass songs in the broader context of modern popular music of the time, including sound samples of Czech folk and workers' marches, a topic that was never addressed by any of the other guests at the congress.⁹⁰ At the end of 1948, Stanislav was the first to discuss popular music within the official doctrine of socialist realism in the spirit of A. A. Zhdanov, highlighting mass song, for example against the "pessimism" of the First Republic's camp-fire songs or the "kitschy commercial Schlagers of the luxury and idleness" of the capitalist society of the time.⁹¹

In the autumn of 1950, the Central Committee of the Union decided that the primary task for the next period would be the creation of new popular music. At the same time, it stated the need to overcome the existing "sectarian" boundary between popular and art music. The new popular music, which professional composers were permanently encouraged to create, was supposed to be joyful, optimistic, beautiful, and healthy in the sense of Dunayevsky's March of the *Jolly Fellows*, with the Czech paraphrased lyrics stating that "Song helps us to build and live, and as a friend leads us forward into battle".⁹² The issue of *song* became one of the main interests of the Union's theoreticians in the following years and in a way opened the door to later systematic research into popular music in its entirety.

An evaluation of the efforts made so far took place at a national conference with the apt title "Song – the truth about life", which the Union of

89 To the ideological issues beyond popular music see Lenka KŘUPKOVÁ: "Ideologically Progressive Art" Meets Western Avant-Garde. In: *The Tunes of Diplomatic Notes: Music and Diplomacy in Southeast Europe (18th–20th century)*. Ivana Vesic, Vesna Sara Peno, Bostjan Udovic (eds.), Belgrade and Ljubljana: University of Ljubljana, 2020, pp. 155–164; Lenka KŘUPKOVÁ: *Das Warschauer Fenster in die Neue Musik*. In: *Musikgeschichte in Mittel- und Osteuropa*. Mitteilungen der internationalen Arbeitsgemeinschaft an der Universität Leipzig. Joachim Braun, Kevin C. Karnes, Helmut Loos, Eberhard Möller (eds.), Leipzig: Gudrun Schröder Verlag, 2008, pp. 290–301.

90 *Hudba národů* [Music of Nations]. Praha: Syndikát českých skladatelů, 1948, pp. 6–7.

91 Josef STANISLAV: *Socialistický realismus a hudba* [Socialist Realism and Music]. *Hudební rozhledy* 1 (1948), No. 4, pp. 69–71.

92 *Za nový rozkvět populární hudby* [For a New Flourishing of Popular Music]. *Hudební rozhledy* 2 (1950), No. 3, p. 4.

Czechoslovak Composers held in Prague on 9–10 November 1955. The significance of the event was demonstrated not only by the presence of foreign guests from East Germany and Romania but also by representatives of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia, the Ministry of Culture, the Ministry of Education, the Ministry of the Interior, Czechoslovak Radio, Gramophone company, and other institutions. The basic conception of the phenomenon of song was defined by the pre-conference paper of Vladimír Hudec (“The Role of Song in Czech Musical Development”) and then by the three main conference presentations of Vladimír Karbusický (“On the Historical Example of Workers’ Song”), Zdeněk Sádecký (“On the Current Situation of Our Mass Song”), and Josef Stanislav (“On Dance and Estrada Song”).⁹³ Although the emphasis was still placed on the themes promoted by the cultural politics of the time, on the whole, the papers already reflected the effort to capture the phenomenon in a broader context, as evidenced by Stanislav’s attempt to classify the current scene in terms of genres and their audience.⁹⁴ These papers were followed by a rich discussion, which was attended not only by musicologists, composers, and critics but also by songwriters, representatives of educational institutions, the youth union, the army, and managers of literature and music stores. The transformation of discourse in the sense of greater tolerance of a wider spectrum of modern popular music was documented especially by the contribution of Karel “Harry” Macourek, who clearly opposed the earlier ideologically based tendencies to condemn jazz as a degenerate import from the West.⁹⁵

The Union’s theoretical reflection on popular music during the 1950s was subject not only to the current trends in cultural politics (as a result of Stalin’s death in 1953 and the revelation of the cult of personality in 1956) but also to the evolution of public taste, which the institution’s members learned during their personal visits to Czechoslovak regions to discuss music with various working collectives. These talks often showed a somewhat different reality of mass preferences from that implied by official proclamations, especially in relation to the growing popularity of modern popular music and, conversely, the receding interest in the then-protected mass songs. Trips to the regions were made in preparation for the Congress of Socialist Culture held in June 1959, a national event during which 2,366 talks were held, at which 2,131 cultural workers from Prague and the regions spoke, and which were attended by almost 230,000 people.⁹⁶ On 1 December 1959, after discussing

93 *Konference SČS o písni* [Union’s Conference on Song]. *Hudební rozhledy* 8 (1955), No. 20, p. 992.

94 Dušan HAVLÍČEK: *A nechť i jiskry létají* [And Let the Sparks Fly]. *Hudební rozhledy* 9 (1956), No. 23, p. 976.

95 *Píseň: pravda o životě* [Song: the Truth about Life]. Praha: SČS, 1956, p. 62.

96 *Sjezd socialistické kultury: sborník dokumentů* [Congress of Socialist Culture: a Collection of Documents]. Praha: Orbis, 1959, p. 7.

the conclusions of the Congress, the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia adopted a resolution in which it responded to the development of mass culture with an appeal to the usefulness of examining the social functions and ideological background of genres “intended for the entertainment and recreation of the working people”.⁹⁷ Whatever the regime’s motivations for researching a given segment of culture, similar resolutions opened the way to the inclusion of mass genres, that is, popular music, in the state’s scientific plan.

The ground-breaking event in terms of accelerating the scientific research of popular music in Czechoslovakia was the conference “On Small Musical Forms”,⁹⁸ organized by the Union of Czechoslovak Composers on 24–25 June 1961 in Banská Bystrica. It was attended by 61 composers, music scholars and critics, poets, and lyricists and 33 representatives of central music institutions, including radio and music publishers. Alexej Fried, Dušan Havlíček, and J. F. Fischer formulated the main paper, which analysed all the components of domestic popular music from traditional popular songs (“lidovka”) to mass songs and jazz-influenced dance songs.⁹⁹ The innovation of that meeting rested on several interconnected levels: (1) the discussion clearly demonstrated the necessity of a plurality of perspectives on a given segment of musical culture, not only in terms of the specifics of individual genres but also with regard to the equal application of historical, aesthetic, sociological, psychological, economic, and other perspectives, which was only a step towards the subsequent development of adequate musicological subdisciplines in relation to popular music; (2) the discussion emphasized scientific and methodologically based research, which was to replace the previously dominant ideologically tinged music criticism; and (3), finally, there was also the issue of personnel in the form of the emergence of new scholars who would be essential to musicological research on popular music in the following decades. The main new faces among the established group of Marxist theoreticians led by Josef Stanislav and Dušan Havlíček were Lubomír Dorůžka and Josef Kotek (1928–2009), who were distinguished from their colleagues and ideologists, among others, by the absence of Zdeněk Nejedlý’s influence and the personal experience of persecution after 1948.

In addition to the conferences, the publication activities of the Union were important. If we leave aside the magazine *Hudební rozhledy* [Musical Horizons], published regularly since October 1948, which, during the 1950s, best reflected the development of theoretical reflection on mass musical genres with all their specifics and problems, the editorial series of *Knížnice*

97 *Pro zpěv a radost lidí* [For the Singing and Joy of the People]. Praha: SČS, 1962, p. 76.

98 *Malé formy – velká odpovědnost* [Small Forms – Big Responsibility]. *Hudební rozhledy* 14 (1961), No. 14, p. 575.

99 *Pro zpěv a radost lidí* 1962, pp. 9–10 (see n. 97).

Hudebních rozhledů is worthy of attention. During the 1950s, alongside conference proceedings and monographs on various topics, this series published a collection of essays and criticism by Josef Stanislav and especially the work of Dušan Havlíček, *O novou českou taneční hudbu: vývojové tendence taneční hudby v ČSR v letech 1945–1958* [On the New Czech Dance Music: Developmental Tendencies of Dance Music in the Czech Socialist Republic, 1945–1958].¹⁰⁰ Havlíček's book still bore traces of the ideologically tinged journalism of the previous years, but, apart from that, it raised a number of innovative scientific questions: for example, the analysis of contemporary popular music in relation to the media, an attempt at stylistic analysis, and a proposal for a corpus analysis of popular songs using quantitative methods. In addition to traditional popular songs, mass songs, and other genres, the author devoted a relatively large space to a discussion on jazz, with references to the texts of Burian, Uggé, Finkelstein, Feather, and others; he also touched on issues such as the social functions of music, the psychology of listeners, and record sales.

At the turn of the 1960s, the topic of popular music became so strong that it was also directly or indirectly mentioned by scholars who are now generally associated with other professional interests, especially Marxist aestheticians. The situation is shown, for example, by the first issue of the scientific popularization yearbook *Taneční hudba a jazz* [Dance Music and Jazz] from 1960, in which, alongside Jan Rychlík, Lubomír Dorůžka, Ivan Poledňák, and Josef Kotek, Antonín Sychra examined the current issues of the genre.¹⁰¹ The same author, together with Václav Kučera and Jaroslav Jiránek, also discussed the problems of popular music during the aforementioned conference in Banská Bystrica in 1961. Here, however, it was mainly Jiránek who called for an interdisciplinary approach to popular music, arguing that “aesthetics is no longer enough, because here more than anywhere else the market and commodity relations are at stake, and these are questions of economics directly, and from there, indirectly, sociology, psychology, etc. [...] It would also be appropriate to join forces with folklorists, with those who are engaged in research on workers' song, broadside ballads, historians, etc., and comprehensively try to arrive at a deeply scientific and complex analysis [...]”¹⁰² It was in this spirit that, not long after the conference, research on popular music was launched at the Czechoslovak Academy of Sciences within the newly established Institute for Musicology under Jiránek's leadership. The activities of the Institute were initially divided into three departments: aesthetics, theory, and history; the history department also had a working group (initially with two members) for research on popular music.

100 HAVLÍČEK 1959 (see n. 18).

101 Václav KUČERA: *Hlas naší kritiky: Profesor dr. Antonín Sychra* [Voice of Our Critics: Professor Dr Antonín Sychra]. In: *Taneční hudba jazz*, Praha: SNKLHU, 1960, pp. 138–139.

102 *Pro zpěv a radost lidí* 1962, p. 122 (see n. 97).

The Institute was founded on 1 February 1962 and closely followed the activities of the Cabinet for Contemporary Music of the Union of Czechoslovak Composers¹⁰³ (including its “group for the study of entertainment and dance music issues”¹⁰⁴), from which it took over some experts as well as a research plan that was supposed to cover the cataloguing of folklorized songs, collecting existing song editions, Schlager production, and other sources. In accordance with the theory of Marxist musicology, the Institute sought to conduct holistic research on musical culture through a wide range of musicological subdisciplines and possibly other related fields. This was to be served by a consistent collective conception of the research process as well as one of the key principles of Marxist science. The basic focus of the workplace was defined by the project assigned to the Institute by the Department of Science and Culture of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia, which aimed to study the history of Czech music in the 20th century.¹⁰⁵ In connection with it, Jaroslav Jiránek spoke in 1964 of a qualitatively new type of division of labour, without which it would have been impossible to address the processes of composition in the development of musical genres, the question of the philosophy of 20th century Czech music, or the issue of means of expression and representation in the works of Czech composers. This included, moreover, the vast circle of so-called mass genres, “without the scientific knowledge of which the question of the genesis of our socialist musical culture would be understood in a one-sided way”.¹⁰⁶ It was precisely the holistic conception of musical culture, including all types and genres, namely “art and entertainment music, professional, semi-professional and amateur music”,¹⁰⁷ that made the Institute for Musicology unique among art history departments within the Czechoslovak Academy of Sciences, which in a sense reflected the prestige of popular music in the 1960s.

The preparation of the aforementioned project was carried out conceptually and, with regard to the investigation of popular music, in a way that organized the whole research field, which was not yet fully coordinated and systematized. The expert materials were prepared not only by the employees of the academic unit but also by a number of externs, who were commissioned

103 Ivan POLEDŇÁK – Milan KUNA a kol.: *Ústav pro hudební vědu Akademie věd České republiky 1962–1994* [Institute of Musicology of the Czech Academy of Sciences 1962–1994]. Praha: Ústav pro hudební vědu AV ČR, 1994, p. 1.

104 Dušan HAVLÍČEK: *Zpráva o činnosti skupiny pro studium otázek zábavné a taneční hudby* [Report on the Activities of the Group for the Study of Entertainment and Dance Music Issues]. In: *Hudební věda* 3, Praha: Panton 1961, pp. 170–171.

105 Jarmila PROCHÁZKOVÁ: *Ústav pro hudební vědu Akademie věd* [Institute of Musicology, Academy of Sciences]. In: https://www.ceskyhudebnislovník.cz/slovník/index.php?option=com_mdictionary&task=record.record_detail&id=7804 [cit. 20. 1. 2022].

106 *Hudební věda* 1 (1964), No. 1, pp. 3–4.

107 Věra DOLANSKÁ: *Lehká múza na půdě ČSAV* [The Light Muse at the Czechoslovak Academy of Sciences]. *Melodie* 3 (1965), No. 3, p. 51.

to engage in partial studies and monographs, which were subsequently to serve as a basis in their published and unpublished forms. In 1965, the main researcher in the field of popular music, Josef Kotek, specified the preparatory phase in terms of personnel and subject matter:

“We are literally starting to build from the ground up here, since there is neither material documentation nor any earlier systematic work to fall back on. So far we have drawn up a first outline of the historical development, the aim of which is to sort out the whole area and try to bring in a material and chronological overview. On the basis of this preliminary classification, we have commissioned a number of partial works from our leading experts specializing in certain sections (e.g. the history of Czech jazz – Ivan Poledňák, the history of the swing period of Czech music – Lubomír Dorůžka, cabaret song and urban folk song – Vladimír Karbusický, brass music – Robert Šálek, songs of small theatre scenes after 1945 – Nina Dlouhá, etc.) It is also envisaged to deal with issues related to trade union and social organizations of musicians, copyright, issues related to the publishing business, the cultural and social function of radio, etc.”¹⁰⁸

The final work, the two-volume *Dějiny české hudební kultury*, published in 1972 and 1981, covered the periods 1890–1918 and 1918–1945,¹⁰⁹ and it was the first Czech synthesis of this kind to include popular music alongside art music.

In the above sense, the Institute for Musicology institutionally covered both dominant research traditions, the roots of which date back to the interwar period: on the one hand, a nationally oriented folkloristic line of research related to traditional popular music and, on the other hand, a line of jazz journalism growing into an expert reflection on modern popular music in a broader international context. In the first case, the workplace was a continuation of the Institute for Ethnography and Folklore Studies, which had been established at the Czechoslovak Academy of Sciences at the beginning of 1954.¹¹⁰ In the first phase, it was briefly headed by Josef Stanislav and oriented towards the period-exposed subject of workers’ songs. In the following years, Vladimír Karbusický, who was an employee of the Institute for Ethnography and Folklore Studies from 1954 to 1966 and then of the Institute for Musicology from 1966 to 1970, was particularly active in this field.

108 Ibid., p. 51; further Josef KOTEK: *Poodhalená minulost* [The Past Revealed]. *Melodie* 4 (1966), Nos. 8–9, p. 177.

109 Jaroslav JIRÁNEK – Vladimír LÉBL (eds.): *Dějiny české hudební kultury 1* [History of Czech Musical Culture 1]. Praha: Academia, 1972; Jaroslav JIRÁNEK – Josef BEK (eds.): *Dějiny české hudební kultury 2* [History of Czech Musical Culture 2]. Praha: Academia, 1981.

110 Josef STANISLAV: *Zřízení Ústavu pro ethnografii a folkloristiku Československé akademie věd* [Establishment of the Institute for Ethnography and Folklore Studies of the Czechoslovak Academy of Sciences]. *Československá ethnografie* 2 (1954), No. 2, pp. 111–112.

Karbusický's initial interest in workers' songs was extended in the 1960s by theoretical reflection on cabaret songs and Schlagers.¹¹¹ As for the second line, the Institute, through its integrative project on the history of Czech music in the 20th century, initiated a collaboration between established jazz journalists, such as Lubomír Dorůžka, and emerging jazz musicologists, who, after the publication of the propaedeutic work *Kapitolky o jazzu*,¹¹² included Ivan Poledňák, member of the Institute for Musicology from 1968.¹¹³ The result of the collaboration between these two authors was the representative book synthesis *Československý jazz: minulost a přítomnost* [Czechoslovak Jazz: Past and Present], published in 1967.

Through the project, the new academic workplace had a direct influence on the development of the general theory of popular music, especially in the sense of defining the type of music in question. Resolving this issue was already a prerequisite for the inclusion of popular music in the forthcoming book on the history of Czech musical culture of the 20th century, given the practice of labelling. In this respect, the era of the 1960s and 1970s was characterized by a long-lasting debate not only about the terminology but also about the social functions and aesthetics of popular music and finally about its dialectical connection to folk as well as art music. The first major contribution in this field was Josef Kotek and Lubomír Fendrych's 1962 concept of "genres directly connected with the life of the masses",¹¹⁴ which was followed up in 1967 by Karbusický's extensive study *K pojmu a estetice "lehké hudby"*,¹¹⁵ in which he critically examined not only the conclusions of Czech authors but also the contributions of foreign scholars. Among them, he quoted T. W. Adorno, F. Bachmann, A. Silbermann, S. Liberovici, and H. C. Worbs, but the concept of H. Besseler ("Umgangsmusik" vs. "Darbietungsmusik") was discussed in more detail. Karbusický's text also introduced the concept of "бытовая музыка" (in Czech "bytová hudba"),¹¹⁶ which was later examined especially in connection with the work of B. V. Asafyev and which also became the terminological basis of *Dějiny české hudební kultury*.¹¹⁷

111 Cf. Antonín MATZNER – Ivan POLEDŇÁK – Igor WASSERBERGER (eds.): *Encyklopedie jazzu a moderní populární hudby* (československá scéna) [Encyclopaedia of Jazz and Modern Popular Music (Czechoslovak Scene)]. Praha: Editio Supraphon, 1990, p. 257.

112 Ivan POLEDŇÁK: *Kapitolky o jazzu* [Chapters on Jazz]. Praha: SHV, 1961.

113 Cf. MATZNER – POLEDŇÁK – WASSERBERGER 1990, pp. 429–431 (see n. 111).

114 Lubomír FENDRYCH – Josef KOTEK: *Žánry bezprostředně spjaté s životem mas jako předmět hudebněvědeckého bádání* [Genres Directly Related to the Life of the Masses as an Object of Musicological Research]. In: *Hudební věda* 7–8, Praha: Panton, 1962, pp. 200–206.

115 Vladimír KARBUSICKÝ: *K pojmu a estetice "lehké hudby"* [On the Concept and Aesthetics of "Light Music"]. *Hudební věda* 4 (1967), Nos. 1–3, pp. 22–44, 328–338, 440–454.

116 Cf. Jaroslav JIRÁNEK: *Vzájemný vztah bytové a umělecké hudby jako muzikologický problém* [The Interrelation of Bytovaya Muzyka and Art Music as a Musicological Problem]. In: *Colloquia musicologica*, Brno 1972, 1973, Fasc. I. Rudolf Pečman (ed.), Brno: Mezinárodní hudební festival, 1979, pp. 22–33.

117 JIRÁNEK – LÉBL 1972, p. 9 (see n. 109).

Addressing the theoretical issues, in the second half of the 1970s, culminated in the formulation of the concept of the typological polarization of “artificiální” [artificial] and “nonartificiální” [non-artificial] music in the sense of the dialectical tension between popular and art music as a fundamental feature of European musical culture of the last centuries and the main driver of the development of this culture. Ivan Poledňák and his colleague from Jan Evangelista Purkyně University in Brno, Jiří Fukač, attempted with this theory to overcome the previous imperfect approaches, which understood this relationship originally as a theoretically questionable dichotomy of “high” and “low” art, later as the polarity of “artistically autonomous” and “functionally heteronomous” music, and most recently as the polarity of the application of different creative principles stemming from different sociological and psychological assumptions. In formulating the concept, the authors drew on Bessler and Asafyev but also took inspiration from H. H. Eggebrecht (“artifizielle Musik” vs. “funktionale Musik”).¹¹⁸

Between the 1960s and the 1980s, the Institute’s main representatives of popular music research, such as Kotek and Poledňák, spontaneously formed teams of theorists from musicology and other related scientific disciplines as well as music journalism. The result of these uniting tendencies was, on the one hand, many partial studies and, on the other hand, one of the most important works of Czech music lexicography, at the same time a synthesis of the existing results of domestic musicology of popular music, *Encyklopedie jazzu a moderní populární hudby* [Encyclopaedia of Jazz and Modern Popular Music]. Under the editorship of Antonín Matzner, Ivan Poledňák, and Igor Wasserberger, and with an authorial team of several dozen personalities, including foreign contributors (Alexey Batashev, Monika Bloss, Dariusz Michalski, Peter Wicke, and others), it was published in three volumes and four books between 1980 and 1990.¹¹⁹ The first volume attracted attention with its scholarly foundation and extensive subject-based entries (uncommon among similar contemporary lexicographical works in the international context); the subsequent name-based volume, focusing on the world scene, was unique in its overlap with socialist countries. The second key synthesis of Czech musi-

118 FUKAČ – POLEDŇÁK 1977, pp. 316–335 (see n. 15).

119 The first subject-based volume was published in 1980 (with the second edition in 1983), the second name-based volume, focused on the international scene, was published in two books in 1986 and 1987, and the final name-based volume, focused on the Czechoslovak scene, was published in 1990. As a whole, the work exceeds 2,000 pages. The encyclopaedia built on the project of the Slovak jazz publicist Igor Wasserberger, who had already formed a collective of Czech authors in Slovakia in the mid-1960s (Antonín Matzner, Roman Staněk, Stanislav Titzl, Ota Žák, Zbyněk Mácha), with whom he prepared *Jazzový slovník* [Jazz Dictionary] (Bratislava: ŠHV, 1965). MATZNER – POLEDŇÁK – WASSERBERGER 1983, p. 5 (see n. 7). Further on the cooperation of Czech and Slovak researchers, see Petr MACEK: *Československá lexikografická spolupráce v minulém století* [Czechoslovak Lexicographical Cooperation in the Last Century]. *Slovenská hudba* 33 (2007), Nos. 3–4, pp. 535–540.

colony of popular music of the 1960s to the 1980s was the two-volume *Dějiny české populární hudby a zpěvu* [History of Czech Popular Music and Singing] by Kotek, published in 1994 and 1998. In its conception, it reflected the long-term development of theoretical reflection on the genre in the Czech lands, including balanced coverage of traditional and modern popular music. Above all, however, it testified to the remarkable and, even in the international context, unique career of Josef Kotek, a professional musicologist who, by the nature of his academic position, had been continuously researching exclusively popular music for more than 30 years.¹²⁰

In 1983, Aleš Opekar (b. 1957), a young researcher in the field of rock music, joined the musicological department of the Czechoslovak Academy of Sciences under the supervision of Poledňák (and the informal guidance of Kotek). Later, together with his colleagues, he successfully developed international cooperation between Czech musicology and the International Association for the Study of Popular Music (IASPM). These activities culminated in the establishment of the Czechoslovak branch of the IASPM in May 1991 and the organization of an international conference, “Central European Popular Music”, in July the following year.¹²¹ In the 1990s, Opekar’s organizational activities as a professional member of the Institute for Musicology of the Czech Academy of Sciences continued both in the IASPM’s top bodies and in the development of domestic documentation centres, especially dedicated to the long-neglected rock music: in 1993, he initiated the building of an audio-visual department in the Libri Prohibiti library,¹²² and, in 1998, he founded the Museum and Archive of Popular Music in Prague (Popmuseum).¹²³ The expectations of new impulses for the development of the field in the post-revolutionary conditions, however, were not fulfilled for various reasons,¹²⁴ and the departure of Kotek, Opekar, and Poledňák from the Academy of Sciences in 1998 marked the end of Czech musicology of popular music as a distinct discipline, which had formed a solid part of the domestic musicological discourse and disciplinary systematics for at least three decades and,¹²⁵ at the same time, was ideologically, organizationally, generationally, and otherwise closely tied to the post-war development, especially the atmosphere in science, culture, and society of the 1960s.

It should be added that the Czech branch of the IASPM functioned between 1991 and 1995 in Prague as a Popular Music Study Group within the

120 MATZNER – POLEDŇÁK – WASSERBERGER 1990, pp. 282–283 (see n. 111).

121 Cf. Aleš OPEKAR: *Konference “Středoevropská populární hudba”* [Conference “Central European Popular Music”]. *Hudební věda* 30 (1992), No. 1, p. 71.

122 <https://www.libpro.cz/>

123 <https://www.popmuseum.cz/>

124 Cf. Jan BLÜML: *Popular Music Studies in the Context of Post-Communist Historiography in the Czech Republic*. In: *Popular Music Studies Today*. Julia Merrill (ed.), Wiesbaden: Springer VS, 2017, pp. 35–42.

125 LÉBL – POLEDŇÁK 1988, pp. 823–853 (see n. 4).

Society for Musicology (with Poledňák as chairman, Fukač as vice-chairman, Opekar as secretary, and other prominent journalists, including Josef Vlček and Petr Dorůžka, as members), then between 1996 and 1999 at the Institute of Musicology in Brno (under the leadership of Jiří Fukač and with members from among the university students of the time, who also participated in the publication of the *Face to Pop* bulletin), and finally in 1999–2001 at the Department of Musicology in Olomouc (again with Poledňák as chairman and mainly a student background), which was the last attempt to revitalize the field in the Czech lands on an institutional basis.¹²⁶

Establishment of Hungarian Musicology of Popular Music after 1948

The Union of Hungarian Musicians [Magyar Zeneművészek Szövetsége], like the Union of Czechoslovak Composers, was established in 1949.¹²⁷ Moreover, the development of the Hungarian Union, before its activities were interrupted by the revolutionary events of 1956, was similar in many ways to that of its Czechoslovak sister organization: it drew attention to contemporary musical culture in all its forms, it then tried to overcome the traditional conflict between popular and art music, to establish a new, ideologically and aesthetically perfect, popular music for the “masses”, and, at the same time, it attempted to formulate a comprehensive critique of American jazz and interwar “light music”.¹²⁸ However, the Union of Hungarian Musicians never became the very centre for the scientific investigation of popular music that the Union of Czechoslovak Composers did, and the discussions on genres such as operetta, popular songs, and gypsy music remained rather at the level of practical artistic instructions under the responsibility of the sub-sections of music entertainment [szórakoztatózenei szakosztály] and mass music [tömegzenei szakosztály].¹²⁹ Instead, the main representative body of the musicology of genres of everyday music in the 1950s was the Folk Music Research Group [Népzene kutató Csoport] of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences, founded in 1953 by Zoltán Kodály. Although the unit was officially supposed to research all forms of folk music and then to establish contact with research centres in the Soviet Union and other socialist countries as well as applying Marxist scientific methods, Kodály’s Group consistently ignored these tasks beyond the collection, systematization, and analysis of traditional village folk music.¹³⁰

126 František HAVELKA: *Revitalizace IASPM v Olomouci* [Revitalization of IASPM in Olomouc]. *Hudební rozhledy* 53 (2000), No. 2, p. 41.

127 National Archives of Hungary MNL OL P2146 59.d. Documents of the Union of Hungarian Musicians.

128 MNL OL P2146 60.d., 61.d., 62.d., 63.d., 65.d. Documents of the Union of Hungarian Musicians.

129 IGNÁ CZ 2020, pp. 113–184 (see n. 79).

Members of the Union of Hungarian Musicians, who did not really deal with popular music between the two world wars, tried to approach the subject from several different perspectives: (1) they attempted to determine which musical criteria could be used to produce optimistic music free of Western influences, which could entertain and educate at the same time; and (2) they investigated how peasant and Gypsy music could serve as a source for the new popular music. After Stalin's death in 1953 and the subsequent political changes, however, the concept of building a new musical culture weakened, while the interest in learning about the real needs and preferences of the public intensified. These issues were mostly taken up by the young generation of Hungarian Marxist musicologists and sociologists, such as János Maróthy, Iván Vitányi (1925–2021), and József Ujfalussy (1920–2010). In age, ideology, and scientific terms, we are talking about personalities close to the Czech theoreticians, such as Antonín Sychra and Jaroslav Jiránek, who, however, already represented the second generation of Marxist scholars in the Czech lands.

Ujfalussy, as an employee of the music department of the Ministry of Culture, criticized the lack of grounding of the existing transformation of socialist popular music in knowledge of the structure and tastes of society as early as 1953.¹³¹ A year later, Vitányi pointed out in an article¹³² the theoretical distortions that can result from the idea that the habits of listeners are immutable and, from judging public taste, based on preconceived notions of what the “masses” want. The same issues were raised in Maróthy's keynote lecture at the Third Week of Hungarian Music in 1956. Here, the speaker already urged the necessity of scientific investigation of the everyday musical practice of the Hungarian society as well as acknowledging the diversity of tastes and musical demands of the “masses”.¹³³ His argument was similar to those of Josef Stanislav at the conference “Song – the Truth about Life” organized by the Union of Czechoslovak Composers in 1955.

The turn from ideological dictates to the analysis of the actual tastes of society resulted in the implementation of the first musical-sociological surveys in both countries in the following years. In the case of Hungary, these were initiated from the second half of the 1950s onwards partly by the newly founded Communist Youth Union, which, for example, commissioned a national survey

130 LÓRÁNT PÉTERI: *Adalékok a hazai zenetudományi kutatás intézménytörténetéhez (1947–1969)* [Contributions to the Institutional History of the Domestic Musicological Research (1947–1969)]. *Magyar Zene* 38 (2000), No. 5, pp. 161–191, here 173–174. It is to be added, though, that the research group was not completely against collecting Gypsy music or folkish urban music, but it did not deal with their systematization and analysis before the late 1960s.

131 MNL OL P2146 61.d. Documents of the Union of Hungarian Musicians.

132 IVÁN VITÁNYI: *A tömegek zenei igényei* [The Musical Needs of the Masses]. *Új Zenei Szemle* 5 (1954), No. 9, pp. 32–35.

133 JÁNOS MARÓTHY: *Zenénk és a tömegek* [Our Music and the Masses]. *Új Zenei Szemle* 7 (1956), No. 5, pp. 1–13.

in 1962 of the “purposeful use of youth leisure time”, including an emphasis on musical interests.¹³⁴ However, it was only the music sociologist Ágnes Losonczy (b. 1928) who began truly scientific research into musical tastes with her 1962 and 1963 works,¹³⁵ which coincided almost exactly with the analogous, but not coordinated, activities of Jaroslav Kasan and Vladimír Karbusický.¹³⁶

As already mentioned, however, Hungarian research on mass genres lagged somewhat behind Czech research for a long time for various reasons. For example, a frequent topic of Czech academic discourse in the 1950s, the issue of workers’ movement songs, was mostly ignored in Hungary by both Kodály’s Group at the Hungarian Academy of Sciences and the Union of Hungarian Musicians. The only important initiative in this field can be seen in the Department of Ethnography at the Eötvös Loránd University. It was supported by the scholars Gyula Ortutay, Tekla Dömötör, Imre Katona, Dezső Nagy, and Linda Dégh, who had already planned to publish a collection of Hungarian workers’ songs at the beginning of the 1950s and, from 1954, secured financial support for the study of workers’ culture in Budapest.¹³⁷ In the 1950s, however, Ortutay’s team researched only the lyrics and, unlike Czech scholars, did not attempt deeper research involving the analysis of the music as well as the theoretical elaboration of the subject in an international context.¹³⁸

The institutional expansion of mainstream Hungarian musicology in the 1950s, which was to overcome the existing narrow profile of the field, is particularly associated with the music historian Bence Szabolcsi (1899–1973). In 1951, he founded the Department of Musicology at the Budapest Academy of Music as a purely educational institution, but, in addition to this, he established the Committee for Musicology at the Hungarian Academy of Sciences, which was to provide a scientific platform for specialists in music history, music theory, and aesthetics and which, over time, played a key role in the restarting of musicological discourse in Hungary.¹³⁹ It was under Szabolcsi’s supervision that János Maróthy, in 1953, began his research on mass music genres in a wide

134 *Művelődés, pihenés, szórakozás. A KISZ KB értékelése és határozata a szabad idő felhasználásának tapasztalatairól és a KISZ-szervezetek feladatairól* [Education, Leisure, Entertainment. Evaluation and Resolution of the Central Committee of the Hungarian Communist Youth Association on the Experience of the Use of Free Time and the Tasks of the Committees of the Hungarian Communist Youth Association]. Magyar Ifjúság, 25. 4. 1964, pp. 4–5.

135 Ágnes LOSONCZY: *A zenei ízlés. Zene és közönsége* [Musical Taste. Music and Its Audience]. Manuscript. Archives for 20th–21st Century Hungarian Music, Institute of Musicology, Research Centre for the Humanities, Hungary.

136 Cf. Ivan POLEDŇÁK: *Karbusický, Vladimír*. In: https://www.ceskyhudebnislovník.cz/slovník/index.php?option=com_mdictinary&task=record.record_detail&id=5900 [cit. 21. 1. 2022].

137 Dezső NAGY: *A munkásdal és munkásfolklor magyar szakirodalma* [Hungarian Literature on Workers’ Songs and Urban Folklore]. Budapest: [unknown publisher], 1962, pp. 1–2.

138 János. MARÓTHY: *A magyar munkásdalkutatás* [The Hungarian Workers’ Song Research]. Magyar Zene 3 (1965), No. 2, pp. 170–181.

139 PÉTERI 2000, pp. 167–173 (see n. 130).

historical range from the Middle Ages to the 20th century. The first related paper by Maróthy was published in the same year in the first volume of the book series *Zenatudományi Tanulmányok*,¹⁴⁰ and it was followed by Maróthy's doctoral thesis *Az európai népdal születése*, which was published in an article in 1957,¹⁴¹ and then in a book form in 1960.¹⁴² In this context, Maróthy was the first to bring to Hungarian musicology the topic of urban folk music, which had already been developed in the Czech lands since the 1930s by Václavek and Smetana.

In 1961, the efforts of Szabolcsi and the young Marxists to break the dominance of Kodály and the traditional folk music studies resulted in the establishment of the Bartók Archives at the Hungarian Academy of Sciences, which was transformed into the Institute for Musicology of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences in 1969 and with which the original Folk Music Research Group led by Kodály merged in 1973.¹⁴³

The activities of this institution, which was headed in the first phase by Szabolcsi, resembled in many respects those of the Institute for Musicology of the Czechoslovak Academy of Sciences. Apart from the similarity of the time of its foundation, it mainly shared the idea of comprehensive research into the history of the country's music in its entire thematic and genre range.¹⁴⁴ Just as was the case with the Czech academic institution, the Hungarian institution consisted of a unit primarily focused on the mass genres, specifically the "section of music sociology", the tasks of which were carried out by Maróthy. These included archiving the musical monuments of the Hungarian labour movement as well as conducting research on its international context and further research on urban folk music, amateur choirs, instrumental ensembles, and so on. During the 1960s, however, the conditions were not yet developed enough for an objective examination of genres considered "worthless" from an ideological or aesthetical point of view, such as commercial popular songs,

140 János MARÓTHY: *A középkori tömegzene alkalmi és formái* [The Events and Forms of Medieval Mass Music]. In: *Zenatudományi Tanulmányok I* [Musicological Studies]. Bence Szabolcsi (ed.), Budapest: Akadémiai, 1953, pp. 439–494.

141 János MARÓTHY: *Az európai népdal születése* [The Birth of European Folk Song]. In: *Zenatudományi tanulmányok Kodály Zoltán 75. születésnapjára* [Musicological Studies for the 75th Birthday of Zoltán Kodály]. Bence Szabolcsi, Dénes Bartha (eds.), Budapest: Akadémiai, 1957, pp. 503–626.

142 János MARÓTHY: *Az európai népdal születése* [The Birth of European Folk Song]. Budapest: Akadémiai, 1960.

143 Tibor TALLIÁN: *A Magyar Tudományos Akadémia Zenatudományi Intézetének rövid története* [A Brief History of the Institute of Musicology of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences]. Manuscript. In: https://zti.hu/files/zti/MTA_ZTI_Tortenete.pdf [cit. 20. 1. 2022].

144 Melinda BERLÁSZ: *A Zenatudományi Intézet 20. századi magyar zenetörténeti gyűjteményének kutatástörténeti szerepe az első húsz éves periódusban (1966–1986)* [The Role of the Department of 20th Century Hungarian Music History in the Research Activities of the Institute of Musicology in the First Twenty Years (1966–1986)]. In: *Zenatudományi dolgozatok 2013–2014* [Musicological Studies 2013–2014]. Ágnes Papp (ed.), Budapest: MTA BTK Zenatudományi Intézet, 2016, pp. 452–473.

salon music, operetta, or mainstream pop-rock music; the only types of music imported from the West that were viewed as worthy of academic research and archiving at the time were protest songs and (from the early 1970s on) jazz, either because of their presumed folk or proletarian origins and protest character or because of their complexity and aesthetic quality.

As was the case in the Czech lands, the Hungarian Institute through its section of music sociology represented the main carrier of the local musicology of popular music, which in a way integrated existing research activities related to popular music within other disciplines and institutions. Through Maróthy, the Institute collaborated, for example, with the Committee for Workers' Song of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences, which had been operating under Antal Szatmári's leadership since 1961 and which, in addition to collecting and publishing songs, dealt with theoretical issues such as the redefinition of the concept of "folk music", including historical and aesthetic contexts, thus approaching other hitherto neglected genres of the last few centuries.¹⁴⁵ One of the results of this collaboration was the 1968 collection *A parasztdaltól a munkásdalig*, edited by Imre Katona, Maróthy, and Szatmári.¹⁴⁶ The Institute also collaborated with the aforementioned Department of Ethnography at the Eötvös Loránd University.

The first efforts in the field of empirical music sociology, carried out by the above mentioned Ágnes Losonczi, an employee of the Institute of Sociology of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences from the mid-1960s, were also partly connected with Maróthy's section. In 1962 and 1963, she was commissioned by Maróthy and Szabolcsi to conduct a survey of the musical tastes and listening habits of workers at the Ganz-MÁVAG factory in Budapest.¹⁴⁷ The research, using questionnaires, interviews, and statistics, was to be the first part of a (never realized) long-term project, the aim of which included the study of radio music programmes and the listening habits of their recipients as well as the musical sociography of the working class and peasants in Budapest and the countryside. Later, independent of the Institute for Musicology, Losonczi researched jazz and rock as a generational phenomenon, and the first summary of her work conducted in the 1960s was the book *A zenei élet szociológiája* published in 1969.¹⁴⁸

It should be added, though, that, along with Losonczi, the sociology of popular music in Hungary at that time was mainly represented by Iván Vitányi. He was one of the first to advocate the importance of the study of music reception and, by the 1960s, became an important sociologist and aesthetician,

145 Documents of the section for music sociology. Archives for 20th-21st Century Hungarian Music, Institute of Musicology, Research Centre for the Humanities, Hungary.

146 Imre KATONA – János MARÓTHY – Antal SZATMÁRI (eds.): *A parasztdaltól a munkásdalig* [From Peasant Song to Workers' Song]. Budapest: Akadémiai, 1968.

147 LOSONCZI, *A zenei ízlés*.

148 Ágnes LOSONCZI: *A zenei élet szociológiája* [The Sociology of Musical Life]. Budapest: Zeneműkiadó, 1969.

who, as a leading intellectual, regularly participated in political and public debates on musical life. It was in his work in the 1960s and early 1970s that the effect of Marxist ideology and the simultaneous openness to the contemporary Western sociological and philosophical trends could be felt the most strongly. From 1964 onwards, Vitányi increasingly referred to the works of German sociologists, such as A. Silbermann, H. Engel, and K. Blaukopf, as well as M. Weber's, T. W. Adorno's, and N. Chomsky's philosophy and linguistics, and used them to develop his own theory in which he aimed to describe the historical and social levels in the evolution of people's musical creativity.¹⁴⁹ In 1968 and 1969, Vitányi conducted research on the music reception of youth and the sociology of genres of modern popular music in a research group at the Mass Media Research Centre of Hungarian Radio and Television and, in the 1970s, also as a director of the Institute of Culture [Népművelési Intézet]. Vitányi was associated not only with the pioneering collective monographs on Hungarian rock music¹⁵⁰ and Schlager¹⁵¹ but also with the emergence of a new generation of scholars focusing on rock and other related genres, for example Júlia Lévai. Vitányi and Maróthy were already senior researchers in the 1960s, and they represented a generation that had been socialized in the music scene of the 1940s and 1950s, yet these two were the ones who made the greatest impact on the professionalization and institutionalization of local popular music research from the 1970s onwards.

Maróthy's career entered a new phase in 1969, when, as already stated, the Bartók Archives was transformed into the Institute for Musicology and the originally one-man sociology section got the official status of the Department of Music Sociology, gaining other permanent staff. This phase was mainly associated with attempts at larger-scale collective projects, in a similar spirit to that which had already characterized the work of the Institute for Musicology of the Czechoslovak Academy in the mid-1960s. Unlike its Czech counterpart, however, Hungarian musicology was mostly unable to bring ambitious projects to fruition for at least two reasons: the main one was the considerably narrower institutional and personnel background of the field, with the absence of university institutes, for instance, which, in the post-war Czech lands, had successfully developed in Prague, Brno, and Olomouc; the other one was the higher degree of decentralization of the public and academic sphere, which in Hungary began after the 1956 uprising and proceeded gradually until the end of the communist period.

One of the Department's first projects was prompted by the idea of János Gonda (1932–2021), a well-known Hungarian jazz scholar and musician, to set

149 IGNÁCZ 2020, pp. 239–299 (see n. 79).

150 Erika BÁCSKAI – Péter MAKARA – Róbert MANCHIN – László VÁRADI – Iván VITÁNYI: *Beat*. Budapest: Zeneműkiadó, 1969.

151 Júlia LÉVAI – Iván VITÁNYI: *Miből lesz a sláger?* [What Makes a Hit?] Budapest: Zeneműkiadó, 1973.

up a jazz research team to collect written and oral sources on the early history of Hungarian jazz. The team began its work with the participation of Attila Csányi, Sándor Pál, and Géza Gábor Simon in 1971 but stopped after a short time.¹⁵² From the mid-1970s, Maróthy kept two new scholars of popular music, Anna Szemere (b. 1954) and Erzsébet Szeverényi, employed. A 1978 research proposal co-authored by them emphasized reflection on the social assumptions of music and, in this sense, transcended the traditional boundaries between art, popular, and folk music; specifically, it promised research on all types of music, including Schlagers, couplets, jazz, dance songs, Gypsy music, brass music, folk music, salon music, operetta, and revolutionary songs.¹⁵³ Each of the authors of the proposal was tasked with elaborating on a different segment: Maróthy focused on urban folk music, protest songs, and folk movements, while Szemere explored Hungarian operetta, musicals, and rock and Szeverényi explored Stalinist dance songs, jazz, and fusions of poetry and popular music. As early as 1970, the Hungarian Institute for Musicology also planned to produce a comprehensive (five-volume) history of Hungarian music, that would include a volume (the fifth and final one) devoted to the 20th century, in which Maróthy's department was to make a major contribution. However, the volume, edited by Ujfalussy and then in the 1980s by Tibor Tallián, was never completed.

Similar to the case of Czechoslovakia, the institutionalization of popular music research in Hungary generated a higher level of theoretical thinking about the genres in question. While, in the Czech case, the discussions touched upon the terminology, social functions, and dialectics of popular and art music, the Hungarian discourse also partly emphasized concepts of musical analysis. The motivations for addressing terminological issues in Hungary were identical to those in the Czech lands, with the primary concern being to overcome the dichotomy of the “two music cultures” with all its aesthetic, social, cultural-political, and musical educational implications. Thus, local academics came to terms with the notion of “light music” [könnyűzene] and considered the possibilities of foreign concepts, such as Bessler's “*umgangsmässige Musik*” and Asafyev's “*бытовая музыка*”, the Hungarian equivalent of which was “*közhasználatú zene*” [music of everyday use], referring to music that supposedly carried a social message, had a presumed folk (amateur) origin, and was part of the class struggle.¹⁵⁴ The dialectics of amateur and profes-

152 Cf. János GONDA: *A jazzkutatás dokumentációja, feladatai és szervezeti feltételei az MTA Zenetudományi Intézetében* [Documentation, Tasks and Organizational Conditions of Jazz Research at the Institute of Musicology of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences]. Manuscript, 1969. This text and other related documents can be found at the Archives for 20th-21st Century Hungarian Music, Institute of Musicology, Research Centre for the Humanities, Hungary.

153 János MARÓTHY - Anna SZEMERE - Erzsébet SZERVERÉNYI: *A 20. századi magyar zene szociológiai szemszögű vizsgálatához* [For a Sociological Research Perspective on 20th Century Hungarian Music]. Manuscript, 1978. Archives for 20th-21st Century Hungarian Music, Institute of Musicology, Research Centre for the Humanities, Hungary.

154 IGNÁ CZ 2000, pp. 68-75 (see n. 79).

sional creations also resonated in Maróthy's research on historical forms of "mass music" and workers' movement songs, in which he contrasted "munkás népzene" [workers' folk music] and "workers' music", drawing inspiration from the terminology introduced by the East German scholar W. Steinitz.¹⁵⁵ Among the original concepts in the above sense was Vitányi's notion of "közkeletű művészet" [popular art/common art] from his first book *A könnyű műfaj*, published in 1965.¹⁵⁶

The second type of theorizing concerned the study of the linguistic and compositional characteristics of popular music genres. One of the most important starting and reference point for such investigations was Bence Szabolcsi's concept of "zenei köznyelv" [vernacular (common) language of music], which was similar to, but developed independently of, Asafyev's theory of intonation. Szabolcsi had been building his concept since the 1930s. His aim was to show the weakness of the claim that every piece of music is an "individual" work and that musicology should therefore concentrate only on the great personalities and their individualized great works. Conversely, Szabolcsi wanted to show that "great personalities and great works are only the purest forms of what lives in the masses, whether without a specific form or unconsciously",¹⁵⁷ and that masterpieces can become popular and widespread precisely because the masses understand and feel their "basis" and "language".¹⁵⁸ Szabolcsi later interpreted "zenei köznyelv" as a "background" that connects the individual and the general levels of music and that forms a "common code" between masterpieces and ordinary works in a particular period.¹⁵⁹ In this view, great music was not the antithesis of ordinary music but a dialectical part of it. Szabolcsi therefore considered the most valuable periods in the history of music to be those in which the language of folk, popular and art music did not differ significantly; on the contrary, the most problematic periods were to him those in which the two types of music diverged, as happened at the turn of the 20th century.

Several Hungarian scholars elaborated Szabolcsi's concept directly in the context of jazz and modern popular music. Among them were Iván Vitányi and Mária Sági, who applied the theory to their analyses of musical creativity, con-

155 See e.g. János MARÓTHY: *Zene és polgár, zene és proletár* [Music and Bourgeois, Music and Proletarian]. Budapest: Akadémiai, 1966.

156 Iván VITÁNYI: *A könnyű műfaj* [Light Genre]. Budapest: Zeneműkiadó, 1965.

157 Bence SZABOLCSI: *Beszélgetés a zenetörténetről* [A Conversation about Music History]. Nyugat 27 (1934), Nos. 12–13, pp. 13–17.

158 E.g. Bence SZABOLCSI: *A művész és közönsége. Zeneszerző, társadalom és zenei köznyelv a polgári korszak küszöbén* [The Artist and His Audience. Composer, Society and the Vernacular Language of Music on the Threshold of the Bourgeois Era]. Budapest: Zeneműkiadó, 1952; Bence SZABOLCSI: *Népi és egyéni műalkotás a zenetörténetben* [Collective and Individual Works of Art in Music History]. MTANYIrKözl 4 (1953), No. 4, pp. 273–299.

159 Bence SZABOLCSI: *A zenei köznyelv problémái. A romantika felbomlása* [The Problems of the Vernacular Language of Music. The Disintegration of the Romantic Era]. Budapest: Akadémiai, 1968.

cluding that creativity exhibits structurally distinct levels of “creative” and “generative”. They associated the former with educated composers who create closed compositional structures and the latter with the instinctive application of rules that leads to ever new variations of a sedimented prototype or model. Historical examples of such generative creativity for them were both various lines of folk music and more recent forms of 20th century popular music.¹⁶⁰ The concept of “zenei köznyelv” was also used by Maróthy in the context of his reflections on the existence of two parallel musical cultures in the history of (Western) music, best illustrated in his monograph *Zene és polgár, zene és proletár* (1966),¹⁶¹ later published in English as *Music and Bourgeois, Music and Proletarian* (1974).¹⁶²

In the context of theoretical reflection on jazz, Szabolcsi’s work was elaborated by the Marxist musicologist and professor at the Budapest Academy of Music András Pernye (1928–1980). Although most people knew Pernye for his popular 1964 book on jazz history, *A jazz*,¹⁶³ he also wrote several serious studies in which he examined jazz from the perspective of his other research topic, the history of musical interpretation. Here, he evaluated historical epochs of music according to the degree to which the roles of composer and performer merged; in this sense, he particularly valued the Baroque and, on a similar basis, highlighted jazz as a potential way out of the crisis of 20th century music.¹⁶⁴ Pernye’s theory did not find a response in Hungarian academia, mainly because jazz research was appropriated and successfully institutionalized by his colleague János Gonda, who drew more on Western works on the history of jazz than on Marxist reflections and Szabolcsi.¹⁶⁵

The departure from Szabolcsi, Maróthy, and Vitányi, however, was particularly relevant to younger popular music researchers who, during the 1970s and 1980s, increasingly adhered to Western scholarship in the form of British cultural studies or the sociologizing trends of the American new musicology. It should be added, though, that these young scholars, collectively, did not form a generation that would have the same national influence as their predecessors on the institutional, the theoretical, or the cultural-political level. The only scholar who was able to develop long-term activity in popular music research (especially in the field of rock and its Hungarian history) was Anna Szemere, who permanently relocated to the United States in the 1980s. The musicology of popular music in Hungary came to an end with Maróthy’s departure from

160 Mária SÁGI – Iván VITÁNYI: *Kísérlet a zenei köznyelv experimentális vizsgálatára* [An Attempt of an Experimental Study on Vernacular Language of Music]. Budapest: MRT Tömegkommunikációs Kutatóközpont, 1970; Mária SÁGI: *Zeneszociológia új módszerekkel* [Music Sociology with New Methods]. Új Írás 13 (1973), No. 1, pp. 97–100.

161 MARÓTHY 1966 (see n. 155).

162 János MARÓTHY: *Music and Bourgeois, Music and Proletarian*. Budapest: Akadémiai, 1974.

163 András PERNYE: *A jazz* [Jazz]. Budapest: Gondolat, 1964.

164 E.g. András PERNYE: *A dzsesszről* [On Jazz]. Valóság 5 (1962), No. 3, pp. 57–70.

165 IGNÁCZ 2020, p. 276 (see n. 79).

the Institute for Musicology of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences in 1996, two years before research on popular music was also terminated within the analogous institution in the Czech lands.

3. Czech-Hungarian Relations in the Field of Musicology of Popular Music

In the interwar period, Czech-Hungarian musicological relations were not developed in any essential way. If there were already scholarly intersections around music, they were rather in the field of folk music studies, which included Bedřich Václavek, who, in his pioneering work *Písemnictví a lidová tradice* [Literature and Folk Tradition] (1938) cited current Western and Eastern European authors of folk song research, including Hungarian ones (e.g. Béla Bartók, besides J. Meier, M. Bringmeier, H. Mersmann, J. Schwietering, and I. N. Rozanov). The absence of stronger scholarly relations in the given period is explained by Brabcová and Fukač's thesis that the politically induced freezing of cultural contact between the two countries lasted de facto from the 19th century until 1945.¹⁶⁶ It was only the post-war development that introduced targeted attempts to link the two national musicological traditions: first within the immediate reconstruction of war-damaged international relations and then after 1948 within the unifying Sovietizing tendencies in culture and science in the framework of the socialist Eastern bloc, of which both Czechoslovakia and Hungary became part at the same time.

In the first decades after the Second World War, the Czech lands played a crucial role in the integration of the international musicological community. This was conditioned on the one hand by the relative maturity of local musicology and on the other hand by the favourable geographical location and the tradition of rich diplomatic and economic contact with the whole world from the times of the First Republic, when Czechoslovakia was an important exporting country. From the late 1940s onwards, these advantages were also used by the Soviet Union, for which the Czech lands represented a mediator in its cultural and scientific influence in Central Europe.¹⁶⁷ From 16 to 26 May 1947, the new organization of the Syndicate of Czech Composers held the 1st International Congress of Composers and Music Critics to overcome several years of isolation from global creative and musicological trends and to re-establish the international relations that had been interrupted by the war. More than 40 delegates from 16 countries on several continents attended the congress,¹⁶⁸

166 BRABCOVÁ – FUKAČ 1982, p. 59 (see n. 1).

167 Cf. Marta Edith HOLEČKOVÁ: *Příběh zapomenuté university* [The Story of a Forgotten University]. Praha: FF UK, 2019, pp. 28–29.

168 *Hudba národů* 1948, pp. 3–4 (see n. 90).

which established a tradition of ambitious Prague meetings that contributed significantly to the integration of musicologists and composers from socialist countries under the banner of Marxist musicology in the 1950s and 1960s.

A year later, from 20 to 29 May 1948, the same association organized the 2nd International Congress of Composers and Music Scholars, which already adhered to the normative aesthetics of socialist realism following A. A. Zhdanov and which was later described as fundamental by the representatives of Marxist musicology.¹⁶⁹ In contrast to the first congress, which was largely informative, the participants in the second convention adopted a resolution that sought to contribute to the solution of the “crisis” of music. This crisis was seen in the deepening isolation of art music from the real musical interests and needs of the broad masses but also, conversely, in the commercialization and pandering of popular music, represented primarily by the American music industry. The way to resolve this crisis was to stick to the national cultures of one’s own country, to support the musical education of the broad layers of society, and especially to remain faithful to the most concrete musical forms in terms of content, namely songs (mass songs, building songs, revolutionary songs, etc.).¹⁷⁰ The congress resolution emphasizing the above principles was signed directly in Prague or later by representatives of the musical communities of Austria, Belgium, Brazil, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, France, Iceland, Israel, Italy, the Netherlands, Poland, Romania, Switzerland, the UK, the USSR, and Yugoslavia. Dénes Bartha, Pál Kadosa, and György Enyedi signed the appeal on behalf of Hungary.¹⁷¹

After 1948, unions of composers (or musicians) became the basic platform for communication between musicologists in socialist countries. In their conception and structure, these largely followed the model of the Union of Soviet Composers, which had existed as an association of composers, music scholars, and critics from 1932 and which, through its commissions (including the Commission of Mass Music), sought to promote and manage the domestic musical culture, including its ideological direction.¹⁷² The Union of Czechoslovak Composers was particularly active in the field of convergence of national Marxist musicologies, for instance through regular international conferences. Following the meetings in the 1950s, a tradition of international Marxist musicological seminars was established in Prague at the beginning of the following decade. The first one took place in the capital of Czechoslovakia from 27 May to 2 June 1963 and was attended by delegations from the unions

169 *Mezinárodní porady skladatelů v Praze* [International Composers’ Meetings in Prague]. *Hudební rozhledy* 3 (1950–1951), Nos. 18–20, pp. 75–78.

170 LÉBL – POLEDŇÁK 1988, p. 228 (see n. 4).

171 *A zeneszerzők és zenekritikusok prágai kongresszusának határozatai* [Resolutions of the Prague Congress of Composers and Music Critics]. *Zenei Szemle* 2 (1948), No. 6, pp. 293–296.

172 *Hudba národü* 1948, p. 80 (see n. 90).

of Bulgaria, East Germany, Poland, Romania, the USSR, and Yugoslavia in addition to local scholars.¹⁷³ Among the Hungarians, the most frequent visitors to the Czechoslovak conferences were Bence Szabolcsi, János Maróthy, and József Ujfalušsy.¹⁷⁴

The development of international relations, as shown by the congresses mentioned above, involved several phases: in particular, there was a characteristic shift from the dogmatism of the early 1950s, when the linking of national musicologies was officially declared rather than actually implemented, to the rehabilitation of the ideals of Marxist musicology and the spontaneous establishment of contact in connection with specific projects from the late 1950s onwards. The intersections of Czech and Hungarian musicology in the first phase were determined mainly by the personalities of the leaders of the unions and other major institutions, who, from the essence of their position, were the most exposed in international interaction.¹⁷⁵ In this sense, the Marxist aestheticians Antonín Sychra and Jaroslav Jiránek received the most attention in Hungary,¹⁷⁶ while, in the Czech environment, the composer, folk music researcher, and pedagogue Zoltán Kodály and the musicologist Bence Szabolcsi attracted the most consideration. The interest in these personalities in a sense reflected the very disposition of both national musicologies and their potential contribution to the partner country: while the Hungarian musicologists often adopted the very Marxist concepts (including reflection on mass genres) of their Czech colleagues, Czech musicology absorbed more traditional historical or folkloristic topics from Hungary.

The Czech lands, as a source of knowledge of Marxist scholarship, also stood at the beginning of the Hungarian reception of Zdeněk Nejedlý. In Czechoslovakia, after 1948, he was described as the prototype of the Marxist historian who combined science with active politics and at the same time as a progressive musicologist who understood the interdependence of music with social development. In this sense, Nejedlý was also described as a forerunner of popular music research, based on his reflections on the “singing and musicality of Czech pre-March society” in his monograph on Bedřich Smetana and further on his discussion of the history of Hussite singing.¹⁷⁷ Marxist musicologists in Hungary viewed Nejedlý in the same way. The post-

173 Jaroslav VOLEK: *Mezinárodní seminář hudebních vědců* [International Seminar of Music Scholars]. *Hudební rozhledy* 16 (1963), No. 14, pp. 596–599.

174 József UJFALUSSY: *Marxista zenetudományi szeminárium Prágában* [Marxist Musicology Seminar in Prague]. *Magyar Zene* 4 (1963), No. 4, pp. 408–410; MARÓTHY – UJFALUSSY – ZOLTAI 1965 (see n. 14).

175 Ádám IGNÁCZ – Jan BLÜML: *Populáris zenei kutatások az államszocialista Csehszlovákiában és Magyarországon* [Popular Music Research in Socialist Czechoslovakia and Hungary]. *Betekintő* 15 (2021), No. 3, pp. 7–31, here 8–10.

176 E.g. József UJFALUSSY: *Előszó* [Preface]. In: Jaroslav Jiránek: *A XX. századi cseh zenéről* [On the 20th Century Czech Music]. Budapest: Zeneműkiadó, 1972, pp. 5–9.

177 MATZNER – POLEDŇÁK – WASSERBERGER 1983, pp. 301, 310 (see n. 7).

war Hungarian reception of Nejedlý can generally be divided into two phases: (1) the Stalinist years of the early 1950s; and (2) the period after 1956. Each of these phases was then characterized by an emphasis on different thematic areas. While the first phase was distinguished by Nejedlý's ideologically based reflections on cosmopolitanism and progressive national traditions, with references to his texts on Smetana,¹⁷⁸ after 1956, the scope broadened to include new perspectives related to the study of music in all its genre forms, including the relationship between mass music and high art. In this sense, János Maróthy already referred to Nejedlý's writings on Hussite singing as a pioneering work on urban folk music in the early digest of his monograph *Az európai népdal születése* [The Birth of European Folk Song] (1957)¹⁷⁹ on the origins of European folk songs in the social and musical changes between antiquity and the Middle Ages. It should be added that, as early as 1953, parts of Nejedlý's *Dějiny husitského zpěvu za válek husitských* [History of Hussite Singing during the Hussite Wars] were published in the Hungarian musicological journal *Zenetudományi Értesítő*,¹⁸⁰ and a year later translations from *Počátky husitského zpěvu* [The Beginnings of Hussite Singing] were published in the literary journal *Irodalomtudományi Értesítő*.¹⁸¹

Hungarian scholars were also attracted by newer Czech research into urban folk music, especially workers' movement songs. While Czech scholars had already theoretically justified the investigation of this type of music in the interwar period, in post-war and socio-economically differently situated Hungary, it was a novelty that, despite the official appeal to explore proletarian culture after 1948,¹⁸² still encountered resistance from traditional folklorists following in the footsteps of Kodály. It was also for this reason that the original local initiative in this field was not connected with the Hungarian Academy of Sciences, where a group for research on folk music had been operating since 1953 under Kodály's leadership, nor with the theoretical section of the Union of Hungarian Musicians but with the Department of Ethnography at Eötvös Loránd University. In this respect, the Hungarian environment differed from the Czech environment, where, in 1954, the newly established Institute for Ethnography and Folklore Studies of the Czechoslovak Academy of Sciences took up the study of workers' songs under the leadership of Josef Stanislav, who, with his colleagues and pupils, also developed the topic at the Union of Czechoslovak Composers.

178 E.g. Jiří MACEK: *Nemzeti történetünk kozmopolita felfogása ellen* [Against the Cosmopolitan Conception of Our National History]. *Történettudományi Értesítő* 3 (1952), Nos. 11–12, pp. 132–165.

179 MARÓTHY 1957, pp. 503–626, here 521 (see n. 141).

180 E.g. Zdeněk NEJEDLÝ: *A dal és a zene a huszita hadseregben* [Song and Music in the Hussite Army]. *Zenetudományi Értesítő* 3 (1953), No. 9, pp. 69–92.

181 Zdeněk NEJEDLÝ: *A huszita ének kezdetei* [The Beginnings of Hussite Singing]. *Irodalomtudományi Értesítő* 4 (1954), No. 1, pp. 161–196.

182 MNL OL P 2146, 62. d; 63. d. Documents of the Union of Hungarian Musicians.

The work of scholars around the Department of Ethnography in Budapest accelerated, especially after its leader, Gyula Ortutay (1910–1978), a renowned ethnographer and Minister of Religion and Public Education in the period 1947–1950, published an article in the main political newspaper Szabad Nép in 1955 calling for the concentrated study of workers' songs as "working-class folk poetry". The text was written immediately after a study trip to Czechoslovakia, where Ortutay seemed to be impressed by the fact that scholars of urban folk music and workers' music were employed as researchers at scientific institutes, had a serious infrastructure behind them, and were publishing their results in prestigious anthologies; in this respect, Ortutay regarded Karbusický's 1953 monograph *Naše dělnická píseň*¹⁸³ as a major contribution to the subject.¹⁸⁴

The second impulse for the institutionalization of the theoretical reflection of the genre in Hungary also came from Czechoslovakia, with the international conference on workers' song research organized by the Czechoslovak Society for Ethnography at the Czechoslovak Academy of Sciences in Liblice on 16–19 March 1961. In addition to local experts, such as Jiránek, Stanislav, Karbusický, and Pletka, it was also attended by guests from Austria (F. Vogel), Bulgaria (K. Kaufman), England (K. Thomson, J. Miller, A. L. Lloyd, and H. C. Parker), East Germany (W. Steinitz and I. Lammel), West Germany (G. Heilfurth), Italy (S. Liberovici), Poland (A. Dygacz), the USSR (M. S. Druskin), and Yugoslavia (R. Hrovatin).¹⁸⁵ Among the Hungarian delegation, József Pálinkás and Antal Szatmári actively contributed; furthermore, Miklós Istvánovics, Tekla Dömötör, and János Maróthy were present without papers. It was not only these scholars who reported on the representative event, the first of its kind not only within the Soviet bloc but in a pan-European context, in the Hungarian media: Dömötör published a long report in the periodical *Muzsika*,¹⁸⁶ and Péter Szőke reported on the conference and especially the research work of Karbusický and Pletka in his 1961 study *A cseh munkásdalkutatás eredményei, módszere és feladatai* to underline the importance and relevance of the topic.¹⁸⁷ Moreover, the main paper of the Liblice conference, which Karbusický and Pletka co-authored, was translated into Hungarian, but it was never published as planned.

The Liblice symposium was conceptually linked to another Czech event, which took place soon afterwards on 20–22 March 1961 and which welcomed some of the same foreign guests, namely Druskin and Maróthy. It was the

183 Vladimír KARBUSICKÝ: *Naše dělnická píseň* [Our Workers' Song]. Praha: Orbis, 1953.

184 Gyula ORTUTAY: *A munkásosztály népdalköltészete* [Folk Song Poetry of the Working Class]. Szabad Nép, 20. 6. 1955, p. 4.

185 Jaroslav JIRÁNEK: *O výzkumu dělnické písně* [About the Research of Workers' Song]. *Hudební rozhledy* 14 (1961), No. 8, pp. 346–347.

186 Tekla DÖMÖTÖR: *Az első nemzetközi munkásdal konferencia tanulságai* [Lessons from the First International Workers' Song Conference]. *Muzsika* 4 (1961), No. 6, pp. 1–2.

187 Péter SZŐKE: *A cseh munkásdalkutatás eredményei, módszere és feladatai* [Results, Methods, and Tasks of Czech Research on Workers' Songs]. *Magyar Zene* 2 (1961), No. 4, pp. 409–431.

second edition of Václavek's Olomouc art history conference, organized by the Faculty of Arts of Palacký University in Olomouc. Although this time the main topic was broadside ballads, the conclusions of the debates summarizing the meaning and possibilities of exploring urban folk music in all its forms and contexts were similar to those heard in Liblice.¹⁸⁸

In a 1965 report summarizing the results of Hungarian workers' song research to date, Maróthy stated that the recent development of domestic research on urban singing was directly influenced by the Czechoslovak conferences of the early 1960s.¹⁸⁹ In 1961, the Commission for Workers' Song was founded at the Hungarian Academy of Sciences to organize research facilities for the Bartók Archives, established at the Hungarian Academy of Sciences in the same year.¹⁹⁰ The intensity of the contact between the two national musicologists in this field at the beginning of the 1960s is revealed, among other things, by Karbusický's personal visit to the Budapest departments of both Eötvös Loránd University and the Hungarian Academy of Sciences in 1962.¹⁹¹

The leader of musicological research on workers' song and urban folk music in Hungary was largely Maróthy himself, who, in 1962, attempted to summarize the current literature in this field in his study *Társadalmi dal. Bibliográfiai adalékok a zenetudomány egy fontos problémaköréhez*. In addition to citations of Italian texts written and edited by S. Liberovici, the dominant part of the bibliography consisted of works by Czech authors, such as Nejedlý, Václavek, Smetana, Karbusický, and Pletka.¹⁹² Following them, Maróthy tried to combine the study of urban songs with research on other musical phenomena; he interpreted workers' music as an "intermediate" phenomenon with dialectical links to folk, popular, and art music, through which a wide range of sociological and aesthetic questions were to be explored, for example the folk nature of genres such as jazz, the influence of mass musical culture on the entertainment industry, the use of folk and popular music in art music, and, conversely, the characteristics of music created for the masses by professional composers.

Close links between traditional folk music, traditional popular music, and modern popular music were still an everyday reality of Czechoslovak and Hungarian music as well as the public's taste at the beginning of the 1960s,

188 Milada LADMANOVÁ: *Česká kramářská píseň* [Czech Broadside Ballad]. *Hudební rozhledy* 14 (1961), No. 8, pp. 346–347.

189 MARÓTHY 1965, p. 172 (see n. 138). It is worth noting that Hungarian worker research soon gained international respect, as evidenced by the fact that the 1965 international conference on workers' song research was held in Budapest.

190 For the co-operation of the two institutions, see the Archives for 20th–21st Century Hungarian Music, Institute of Musicology, Research Centre for the Humanities, Hungary.

191 Ibid.

192 János MARÓTHY: *Társadalmi dal. Bibliográfiai adalékok a zenetudomány egy fontos problémaköréhez* [Social Song. Bibliographical Contributions to an Important Problem of Musicology]. *Magyar Zene* 3 (1962), No. 4, pp. 378–385.

and it is in this sense that the contemporary theoretical reflection on this area should be understood, otherwise naturally fed by Marxist theses about life-giving and revolutionary impulses coming from below from the culture of the people. The mentioned genre overlaps were reflected in the conception and titles of contemporary publications, such as Dorůžka and Mácha's *Od folklóru k Semaforu*,¹⁹³ which caught the attention of Péter Szőke through Poledňák's review. Another example is Karbusický's book *Mezi lidovou písní a šlágrem*.¹⁹⁴ In this sense, however, it is true that, as a result of the weakening of the dogmatic Marxism of the 1950s, as well as under the influence of the massive advent of modern popular music in the 1960s, a general shift of musicologists away from the study of primarily folklore-based phenomena towards a modern conception of popular music can be registered from the second half of this decade. This was also the case for those personalities who had previously profited themselves as international leaders in the study of workers' songs, which is best exemplified by the thematic shift of Vladimír Karbusický.

If the development of research on phenomena related to urban folk music, and thus traditional popular music, in Hungary was significantly supported by impulses coming from Czechoslovakia, the situation was similar in the case of modern popular music. Although jazz was severely restricted in Czechoslovakia for ideological reasons in the first half of the 1950s, its theoretical reflection with its roots in the interwar period never ceased; it only moved into the unofficial or illegal sphere for a few years.¹⁹⁵ The article by American Marxist Sidney Finkelstein, *Odyssea jazzu*, published in *Hudební rozhledy* in 1956, can be seen as an indicator of the beginning of the rehabilitation of the genre in the official press.¹⁹⁶ Finkelstein's article was followed by other texts, including the first book on the subject since Burian's *Jazz*, Jan Rychlík's *Pověry a problémy jazzu*, in 1959.¹⁹⁷ In Hungary, jazz research was essentially absent for the entire decade of the 1950s, also as a result of the immediate post-revolutionary developments in the second half of the decade, which extended the delay not only behind Czechoslovakia and Poland but also behind the Soviet Union.¹⁹⁸ Although the first Hungarian translations of Finkelstein's texts were also pub-

193 Lubomír DORŮŽKA – Zbyněk MÁCHA: *Od folklóru k Semaforu* [From Folklore to Semafor]. Praha: SHV, 1964.

194 Vladimír KARBUSICKÝ: *Mezi lidovou písní a šlágrem* [Between Folk Song and Schlager]. Praha: Supraphon, 1968.

195 DORŮŽKA – POLEDŇÁK 1967, pp. 95–106 (see n. 35).

196 Sydney FINKELSTEIN: *Odyssea jazzu* [The Odyssey of Jazz]. *Hudební rozhledy* 9 (1956), No. 20, p. 840.

197 Jan RYCHLÍK: *Pověry a problémy jazzu* [Superstitions and Problems of Jazz]. Praha: SNKLHU, 1959.

198 Cf. Rüdiger RITTER: *Researching Jazz in Socialist Countries*. In: *Popular Music in Communist and Post-Communist Europe*. Jan Blüml, Yveta Kajanová, Rüdiger Ritter (eds.), Berlin: Peter Lang, 2019, pp. 49–74.

lished in 1955 and 1956,¹⁹⁹ it was not until the early 1960s that an attempt was made to import jazz-related literature and initiate jazz research in Hungary. The situation changed in 1961, partly through the translation of Finkelstein's review on the jazz book of Eric Hobsbawm²⁰⁰ and partly through the translation of Rychlík's book, which was published under the title *A jazz világában* in 1963²⁰¹ by the main publishing house, Gondolat, which focused on "popular and scientific literature in the humanities and sciences by leading Hungarian and foreign authors".²⁰²

As in Czechoslovakia, the critics in Hungary did not accept Rychlík's book without objection. According to Dorůžka and Poledňák, the author did not attempt a comprehensive summary of information about jazz but gave a few distinctive reflections on selected partial problems of the genre, which had several consequences. A positive consequence was that Rychlík, as an experienced practitioner and an original theorist, raised issues that had been overlooked by standard world jazz journalism (for example, the relationship between jazz and older art music), but the negative ones were the factual inaccuracies and the very nature of the work, which was far from a systematic introduction to the issues that could compensate for the long-standing lack of literature in this field in socialist countries.²⁰³ In this sense, the book did not meet the high expectations of critics in Hungary either. Of the surprisingly few reflections, the majority were negative, which was also the case of the only extensive review by the jazzman and publicist Sándor Pál, who, in addition to factual errors, faulted the book for its inability to reach a wider public, among other things because of its pervasive attempt to link jazz analytically with art music.²⁰⁴

Soon after Rychlík's book, however, the first original writings by local musicologists were published in Hungary: András Pernye's *A jazz*²⁰⁵ in 1964 and János Gonda's *Jazz* a year later.²⁰⁶ The context of the first publication was in a sense reminiscent of the sudden turn to jazz by Ivan Poledňák around 1960 as a young musicologist who had hitherto been mainly devoted to art music but who, under the influence of circumstances, responded to the modern themes

199 Sydney FINKELSTEIN: *Afrika és a világ zenéje* [Africa and the Music of the World]. *Világ Ifjúsága* 9 (1955), Nos. 5–6, pp. 34–35; Sydney FINKELSTEIN: *A jazz* [Jazz]. *Világ Ifjúsága* 10 (1956), No. 6, pp. 8–10.

200 Sydney FINKELSTEIN: *A dzsessz. Nemzeti kifejezőmód vagy nemzetközi népzene?* [Jazz. National Form of Expression or International Folk Music?]. *Valóság* 4 (1961), No. 1, pp. 42–51.

201 Jan RYCHLÍK: *A jazz világában* [In the World of Jazz]. Budapest: Gondolat, 1963.

202 <https://www.gondolatkiado.hu/english.php>

203 DORŮŽKA – POLEDŇÁK 1967, p. 130 (see n. 35).

204 SÁNDOR PÁL: *Néhány szó Rychlík A jazz világában című könyvről* [sic!] [A Few Words about Rychlík's Book In the World of Jazz]. *Szórakoztatózenészek Tájékoztatója* 3 (1964), No. 1, pp. 5–7.

205 PERNYE 1964 (see n. 163).

206 JÁNOS GONDA: *Jazz. Történet – elmélet – gyakorlat* [Jazz. History – Theory – Practice]. Budapest: Zeneműkiadó, 1965.

brought about by the times or publishing institutions. Poledňák's popularizing Chapters on Jazz, published in Czech in 1961 (in 10,000 copies) and 1963 and in Slovak in 1964, was intended to serve as a general introduction to jazz, and Pernye's book (published in 6,200 copies) was similar. Gonda's book (published in 20,000 copies) was also designed to be an introduction to the genre; however, here, the author's starting point was quite different – Gonda was a pupil of Bence Szabolcsi and Dénes Bartha, as was Pernye, but he was also a professional pianist who had shown an interest in jazz from his youth.

As founding works of Hungarian jazz musicology, both publications attracted the attention of Czechoslovak music journalism, particularly the Slovak critic Igor Wasserberger, who reviewed them for the Czech magazine *Melodie* in 1966.²⁰⁷ Wasserberger saw the only positive aspect of Pernye's book in the abundant references to international jazz literature; otherwise, he reproached the text for excessive subjectivism and disproportionate interpretation and the absence of the developments of recent years. Wasserberger, on the other hand, described Gonda's book as impressive, and the work was written about in a similar vein in Czechoslovakia in later years. The evaluation was based primarily on the scope and broad thematic coverage of the book, which Gonda used to compensate for the lack of a deeper understanding of jazz in Hungary. Typologically, the book differed from contemporary Czech writings, which were mainly historically based, in its overlapping with music theory (melody and form, rhythm, harmony, arranging, and improvisation) and its rich notated examples and references to current Western theoretical concepts (e.g. George Russell). It should be added that, although music theoretical works on jazz were produced in the Czech lands at the time, they fulfilled primarily a practical function and their authors were exclusively professional musicians without an academic musicological background.²⁰⁸ The theoretical passages in Gonda's book were complemented by a historical excursus, which included an attempt to reflect on the European development, including that in Czechoslovakia and the Soviet Union (nonetheless excluding the Hungarian history of jazz, which the author interpreted as non-existent before the late 1950s). Wasserberger did not consider these particular passages to be the best (he was bothered by the inclusion of only three records from Supraphon and only one bibliographical reference to Rychlík's book), but they were nevertheless an initial impulse towards a systematic treatment of jazz and popular music in the socialist countries, which was later most significantly approached in the Czechoslovak *Encyklopedie jazzu a moderní populární hudby* [Encyclopaedia of Jazz and Modern Popular Music]. Especially thanks to his ability to combine

207 Igor WASSERBERGER: *Nové publikace* [New Publications]. *Melodie* 4 (1966), Nos. 8–9, pp. 211–212.

208 Cf. Karel KRAUTGARTNER: *O instrumentaci tanečního a jazzového orchestru* [On the Instrumentation of the Dance and Jazz Orchestra]. Praha: Panton, 1961; Karel VELEBNÝ: *Jazzová praktika* [Jazz Practice]. Praha: Panton, 1967.

music theory with history, Gonda was spoken of with respect in Czechoslovakia as “Budapest’s Dorůžka and Velebný combined”.²⁰⁹

Czechoslovak critics began to follow Hungarian jazz more closely after the scene there was accelerated by the founding of the first Budapest jazz club in 1962 and the organization of the first Budapest Jazz Festival in 1964. At this time, the Czech press also began to mention János Gonda more frequently – first as a musician and composer whose records were available at the Hungarian Cultural Centre in Prague and then as a jazz theorist and founder of the jazz department of the Bartók Béla Conservatory in Budapest in 1965. A closer connection between early Czech and Hungarian jazz musicology occurred in 1967, when Gonda made a study trip to Prague at the invitation of the Union of Czechoslovak Composers. His subsequent report²¹⁰ showed that he was impressed by the local state of popular music and its theoretical reflection. In this sense, Gonda referred in particular to the quality of research at the Institute for Musicology at the Czechoslovak Academy of Sciences; specifically, he spoke of the research activity focused on urban folk music and Prague cabaret as well as the history of Czechoslovak jazz and the economic, sociological, and psychological aspects of modern popular music in general. Gonda attributed the high level of Czech popular music research to Josef Kotek, whom he also met personally during his stay.

As already mentioned, Gonda visited Prague in 1967, at a time when popular music research was still at initial stage in Hungary. This changed two years later, however, when the Department of Music Sociology was established at the Institute for Musicology of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences under the direction of János Maróthy and when the research group on beat music led by Iván Vitányi was established at the Centre for Mass Communication Research of Hungarian Radio and Television. At this time, Hungarian popular music research opened up to younger scholars and became more professionalized overall. The discussions about the outcomes of Czech musicology as a potential source of inspiration diminished as a result of these innovations; however, this did not mean a break in contact as such. After the turn of the 1970s, these continued to happen but often in a broader international context within new disciplinary specializations and institutional structures.

As was the case in the first post-war decade, in the 1960s, Czech musicological institutions provided key impulses for bringing together scholars not only from the socialist countries of Central Europe. Before the occupation of 1968, it was still the Union of Czechoslovak Composers that, for example, held an international music sociological conference on 6–8 June 1966.²¹¹ The main

209 HUEBR 1980, p. 177 (see n. 10).

210 JÁNOS GONDA: *A jazzművészet szerepe a csehszlovák zenei életben* [The Role of Jazz in Czechoslovak Musical Life]. *Muzsika* 10 (1967), No. 1, pp. 25–27.

211 Cf. VLADIMÍR KARBUSICKÝ – LADISLAV MOKRÝ: *Otázky hudební sociologie* [Issues of Music Sociology]. Praha: Osvětový ústav, 1967.

motive of the seminar was, on the one hand, to rehabilitate the discipline as such²¹² and, on the other hand, to explore the musical interests and needs of the broader society, in other words to perform an objective assessment of the reality of musical life, which, in the context of the political thaw and the popular music boom of the 1960s, often showed a substantially different picture from that constructed by the dogmatic Marxism of the previous decade. In this sense, significant attention was paid to empirical research and its methodology but also to the first concrete results that began to appear spontaneously and without strong intersections in Central European socialist countries from the first half of the 1960s onwards. During the seminar, interest was aroused by the contributions of the East German and Hungarian delegations, among others.²¹³ In the first case, these were representatives of the Marxist musicology at Humboldt University, Konrad Niemann and Reiner Kluge, who discussed not only the Berlin-based research on the “social psychology of musical entertainment” but also the sociologically anchored investigation overlapping with popular music at the musicological institutes of Martin Luther University in Halle and Karl Marx University in Leipzig. Ágnes Losonczi then reported on the situation in Hungary. Furthermore, both foreign delegations registered the innovations of Czech musicology in this field, especially thanks to the research on contemporary musicality by Vladimír Karbusický and Jaroslav Kasan, which was published in 1964 and reviewed by Losonczi a year later in Hungary.²¹⁴

Although the seminar hoped to deepen the international cooperation that would lead to the preparation of comparative empirical research on basic music sociological issues across European socialist countries, such a goal was never realized. However, the contemporary trend towards the integration of national music sociological research was seized upon soon after 1969 by the International Institute for Music, Dance and Theatre in the Audio-Visual Media (IMDT) in Vienna under the leadership of Kurt Blaukopf. The contribution of the Austrian institution was the provision of a network of diverse research entities not only in the field of musicology but also in theatre studies, film studies, radio, and television practice. The exchange of materials and experiences not only occurred between Western European and American institutions but also integrated representatives from the Eastern bloc, including some from Czechoslovakia and Hungary.²¹⁵ The main departmental project for the years

212 Cf. Vera SZABARI: *Krátké dějiny maďarské sociologie v letech 1948–1989* [A Short History of Hungarian Sociology 1948–1989]. *Sociologický časopis* 41 (2005), No. 4, p. 662.

213 Pravdomila ETLÍKOVÁ – Ladislav HRDÝ: *Sociologický seminář skončil* [Sociological Seminar is Over]. *Hudební rozhledy* 19 (1966), No. 10, p. 294.

214 Ágnes LOSONCZI: *V. Karbusický – J. Kasan: A muzikalitás jelenlegi állapotának kutatása* [Research into the Current State of Musicality]. *Magyar Zene* 6 (1965), No. 6, pp. 654–655. On the original research see Vladimír KARBUSÍČKÝ – Jaroslav KASAN: *Výzkum současné hudebnosti I* [Research on Contemporary Musicality I]. Praha: Čs. rozhlas, 1964.

215 LÉBL – POLEDŇÁK 1988, pp. 530–531 (see n. 4).

1971–1976 aimed to research the musical activities of contemporary youth in all the existing social systems, and, in this sense, on 18–23 September 1972, a conference on the topic of “Neue musikalische Verhaltensweisen der jungen Generation in der industriellen Gesellschaft” was held in Vienna. The congress was attended by representatives of Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Canada, Czechoslovakia, Finland, France, East and West Germany, Hungary, Italy, the Netherlands, Poland, Romania, Sweden, the USA, and the USSR, including Iván Vitányi from the Budapest Centre for Mass Communication Research and Jiří Vysloužil from the Institute for Musicology at the Jan Evangelista Purkyně University in Brno and Milan Šimek from the Institute for Cultural Research in Prague. It contained several interesting moments: for example, there was a direct confrontation of the music sociology of socialist countries, based on musicology and aesthetics, in which the main role was played by the categories of aesthetic value and aesthetic education, with the research on musical sub-cultures by representatives of the so-called Birmingham School, in particular Paul Willis, presenting his paper “Jugendgruppen in Birmingham und ihr spezifisches Verhältnis zur Popmusik”, who in turn approached musical activities as a specific kind of communication and code system that can be interpreted in terms of an oppositional political function.²¹⁶

Although closer Czech-Hungarian cooperation did not develop in the field of sociology of popular music, research in this field peaked in both countries at the turn of the 1970s. The motivations were very similar, that is, cultural-political, musical-educational, and prognostic. Key Hungarian writings included the above-mentioned collective monograph *Beat* edited by Iván Vitányi, which was cited as a representative work by Lubomír Dorůžka in his 1981 book *Panoráma populární hudby 1918/1978*,²¹⁷ and *Zene – Ifjúság – Mozgalom* by Ágnes Losonczi,²¹⁸ which was later cited in *Encyklopédie jazzu a moderní populární hudby* [Encyclopaedia of Jazz and Modern Popular Music].²¹⁹ In the Czech lands, the main research was *Průzkum postojů české veřejnosti k populárním zpěvákům*,²²⁰ conducted by the aforementioned Institute for Cultural Research and published in 1975, which, however, was not registered by Hungarian scholars.

The involvement of the Central European musicology of popular music of the socialist countries in the broader European structures occurred at the same time in the field of jazz. Here, research was concentrated mainly in the

216 Jiří VYSLOUŽIL: *Symposion o hudebních aktivitách mládeže* [Symposium on Youth Music Activities]. *Opus musicum* 4 (1972), Nos. 8–9, pp. 239–241.

217 Lubomír DORŮŽKA: *Panoráma populární hudby 1918/1978* [Panorama of Popular Music 1918/1978]. Praha: Mladá fronta, 1981, p. 283.

218 Ágnes LOSONCZI: *Zene – Ifjúság – Mozgalom* [Music – Youth – Movement]. Budapest: Zeneműkiadó, 1974.

219 MATZNER – POLEDŇÁK – WASSERBERGER 1983, p. 52 (see n. 7).

220 Vladimír HEPNER – Iva MAŘÍKOVÁ: *Průzkum postojů české veřejnosti k populárním zpěvákům* [Survey of Czech Public Attitudes towards Popular Singers]. Praha: Ústav pro výzkum kultury, 1975.

activities of the Austrian Institut für Jazzforschung at the Hochschule für Musik und darstellende Kunst in Graz, founded as early as 1964.²²¹ Jazz musicology, as a new sub-discipline of the field, was established in Graz thanks to the personalities of Friedrich Körner and Dieter Glawischnig, founders of the Internationale Gesellschaft für Jazzforschung and organizers of the first international conference on jazz in April 1969 on the topic of “Musicology and Jazz”,²²² from which papers were published in the first issue of the new jazz periodical, specifically the yearbook *Jazzforschung*. At that time, the contributors from the German-speaking area (Austria, West Germany, and Switzerland) were joined by Lubomír Dorůžka, the only representative of the Eastern bloc. In the second edition, Josef Kotek appeared here alongside Dorůžka, and, in the third edition, the Eastern European theoreticians were represented by the Czech composer and critic Pavel Blatný together with the Pole Roman Kowal and János Gonda.

Speaking of jazz, another place of lively international contact in this field was the European Jazz Federation, which was founded in 1969 after several years of preparatory work, mainly on the initiative of Polish, Yugoslavian, and Czechoslovak music journalists and organizers.²²³ According to the original plan, its activities were carried out through partial subdivisions, which, in addition to the critics’ section and the music education section, included a musicological one. During the founding meeting, Johann Fritz, the president of the Austrian Jazz Federation, was elected as secretary-general, and Vienna became the headquarters of the organization, its convenient location allowing contact with “all corners of Europe”.²²⁴ During the 1970s, when the organization was transformed into the International Jazz Federation in connection with its accession to UNESCO and opened its ranks to non-European members (from India, Japan, the USA, etc.), it was represented by its President Lance Tschannen (Switzerland), Secretary General Jan Byrczek (Poland), and Vice-Presidents Charles Delaunay (France), Wolfram Röhrig (West Germany), Lubomír Dorůžka, and János Gonda.²²⁵

Given the long-standing focus of the Federation’s work on music pedagogy, Gonda, the head of its music education section, was one of the key figures. It was also through his activities related to jazz education that the cult of Hungarian music pedagogy deepened in Czechoslovakia. This can be

221 Cf. Michael KAHR: *The Jazz Institutes in Graz: Pioneers in Academic Jazz and Their Impact on Local Identity*. *European Journal of Musicology* 16 (2017), No. 1, pp. 45–59. Available at <https://bop.unibe.ch/EJM/article/view/5778> [cit. 21. 1. 2022].

222 Lubomír DORŮŽKA: *Jazz a hudební věda* [Jazz and Musicology]. *Melodie* 7 (1969), No. 5, p. 158; János GONDA: *Jazzkutatás, federáció, fesztiválok* [Jazz Research, Federation, Festivals]. *Muzsika* 12 (1969), No. 8, pp. 15–19.

223 GONDA 1969 (see n. 222).

224 *Evropská jazzová federace* [European Jazz Federation]. *Hudební nástroje* 6 (1969), No. 4, p. 110.

225 MATZNER – POLEDŇÁK – WASSERBERGER 1983, p. 203 (see n. 7).

confirmed, for example, by Poledňák's reflection on a large-scale international symposium held in Budapest on 9–12 April 1980. In his report, Poledňák captured several programme lines of the symposium: regarding the presentations of contemporary music, he pointed out the wide range of genres covered, from the “classics” of the 20th century (Bartók) to works applying timbre composition, aleatoric music, and serialism to jazz and rock, while the diversity did not shock anyone and was taken for granted.²²⁶ Furthermore, Poledňák noted the remarkable demonstrations of musical education, including examples of the interconnection of music and visual arts, during which the children were at home with uncompromising avant-garde musical language and clearly enjoying themselves; the same applied to the demonstrations using jazz by Gonda.²²⁷ On the other hand, it was significant that, although Poledňák referred to the Budapest seminar as a model of Czechoslovak music pedagogy at the top level, he lacked the higher theoretical reflection on the problems in question, which, in the context of popular music as such, Czech musicology was particularly inclined to tackle at that time.

As stated earlier, a key impetus for the development of a general theory of popular music in the Czech lands (in the sense of elaborating basic terminological, definitional, taxonomic, and other issues) was provided by the Institute for Musicology of the Czechoslovak Academy of Sciences and its project on the history of Czech music in the 20th century. Its resulting two-volume publication, with its comprehensive treatment of the “totality of musical culture” (deliberately not just “music” or “art music”) as well its overlap with mass genres, understandably attracted the attention of Hungarian Marxist musicologists, including János Maróthy. The Hungarian scholar wrote a review of the work in the English-language Hungarian musicological journal, *Studia Musicologica*²²⁸ and cited it, among others, in a survey on the prediction of the development of musicology up to the year 2000 published by the Czech journal *Opus musicum*. Here, he associated with this book, on the one hand, the “discovery” of teamwork and, on the other hand, the innovation of a deep dialectical analysis of complex structures, involving the elaboration of a typology of styles, genres, processes, and finally the study of music set in extra-musical conditions.²²⁹ Leaving aside the fact that *Dějiny české hudební kultury* [History of Czech Musical Culture] probably inspired thoughts about the implementation of a similar project in Hungary, it is true that, from the 1960s, Czech scholars applied a similar comprehensive approach to popular music itself.

226 Ivan POLEDŇÁK: *Maďarsko opět v souvislosti s hudební výchovou* [Hungary Again in the Context of Music Education]. *Hudební rozhledy* 33 (1980), No. 9, p. 400.

227 *Ibid.*, p. 401.

228 János MARÓTHY: *Dějiny české hudební kultury 1890–1945* [The History of Czech Musical Culture 1890–1945]. *Studia Musicologica* 26 (1984), No. 1, pp. 419–420.

229 *Opus musicum* 6 (1974), No. 2, p. 41.

During the 1970s and 1980s, the results of these efforts were regularly presented to the wider academic community, especially through the International Musicological Colloquia in Brno, established in 1966. For a long time, Europe's only regularly recurring "primarily important musicological event"²³⁰ created both a stable platform for dialogue between Marxist and non-Marxist schools of musicology and a space for regular meetings of scholars focused on popular music. As one of the priority topics, the genre in question was discussed especially in the 1970s, for example in 1972, under the topic "Man of Today Perceives Music".²³¹ Another occasion was the 1977 conference "Music and Revolution" dedicated to the anniversary of the Russian October Revolution,²³² which was attended by 39 speakers and debaters (13 from Czechoslovakia, 8 from East Germany, 3 from the USSR, 2 from Hungary, 2 from Bulgaria, 5 from West Germany, 3 from Switzerland, and 1 each from Finland, Denmark, and the USA).²³³ A special panel on popular music was then represented by Poledňák, Kotek, Ujfalušy, Lukas Richter, and Albrecht Roethmüller.

In addition to the announced panels, popular music was discussed in many side discussions, as evidenced by the proceedings of the 1979 "Music as Communication" conference,²³⁴ allegedly one of the most scientifically interesting in the series to date.²³⁵ The discussion on the topic "Musikgeschichte als Kulturgeschichte?" with the main speakers Carl Dahlhaus and Georg Knepler, alongside H. H. Eggebrecht, H. Goldschmidt, M. K. Černý, and J. Maróthy, through the confrontation of Marxist and non-Marxist approaches in music historiography, opened the question of the very relevance of popular music as an object of musicological research not only in a sociological sense, in opposition to Dahlhaus's claim that only "works of art" should be the subject of music historiography.²³⁶ M. K. Černý later summarized the discussion by stating that: "[...] liberal-bourgeois conceptions of historiography, to which the conception espoused by Dahlhaus belongs, cannot provide an explanation of the historical processes to which they so much refer and can only exist in the realm of compromise. If they are forced to bring some of their positions to their consequences, they are in contradictions with themselves and in absurd situations.

230 LÉBL - POLEDŇÁK 1988, p. 230 (see n. 4).

231 Cf. Rudolf PEČMAN (ed.): *Colloquia musicologica, Brno 1972 & 1973*. Brno: Mezinárodní hudební festival, 1979.

232 Cf. Rudolf PEČMAN (ed.): *Colloquia musicologica, Brno 1976 & 1977*. Brno: Mezinárodní hudební festival, 1978.

233 Ivan POLEDŇÁK: *Hudba a revoluce* [Music and Revolution]. *Hudební rozhledy* 30 (1977), No. 12, pp. 558-561.

234 Cf. Rudolf PEČMAN (ed.): *Colloquium "Musica communicatio": Brno 1979*. Brno: Mezinárodní hudební festival, 1989.

235 Jiří BAJER: *Brněnské hudebněvědné kolokvium* [Brno Musicological Colloquium]. *Hudební rozhledy* 32 (1979), No. 12, p. 539.

236 M. K. ČERNÝ: *Brněnské hudebně vědné kolokvium* [Brno Musicological Colloquium]. *Hudební rozhledy* 32 (1979), No. 12, p. 541.

On the contrary, the Marxist position, if it avoids simplifications and vulgarizations, is strong precisely in its consistency, which aims at revealing the phenomena's essence.²³⁷ The appeal to widen the field of musicology “across the boundaries of genres and epochs” was heard especially from the mouths of the Marxist musicology representatives in the following years as well.

In the 1980s, thanks to the Brno Colloquia, Czech and Hungarian musicologists also began to become more familiar with younger representatives of international popular music investigation, such as Peter Wicke (b. 1951) and Philip Tagg (b. 1944). Furthermore, it was the 1980s that brought not only a new generation of scholars oriented towards rock but also new institutional structures that framed such research. In the context of the socialist countries, the Forschungszentrum populäre Musik, operating since 1983 at the Department of Musicology of the Humboldt University in Berlin under the leadership of Peter Wicke, represented an institution of this type. Wicke had already regularly met Czech and Hungarian researchers in Brno and Berlin in the early 1980s; he had a close relationship with Jiří Fukač and Ivan Poledňák, and he had contact with János Maróthy as well as with students and colleagues of these personalities, such as Aleš Opekar and Anna Szemere. From its inception, the Berlin Centre, which sought to integrate popular music research from the two sides of the Iron Curtain, cooperated with the IASPM and the journal *Popular Music*.²³⁸

The IASPM's very first conference in Amsterdam in 1981²³⁹ hosted around a hundred visitors, including representatives from East Germany, the USSR, and Yugoslavia.²⁴⁰ In 1985, for the first time, Czech scholars, namely Jiří Fukač and Ivan Poledňák, also actively participated in the IASPM's conference, arriving in Montreal, Canada, along with Anna Szemere.²⁴¹ During another conference in Paris in 1989, Aleš Opekar, Petr Dvořák, and Jiří Fukač spoke side by side, and the latter, together with Anna Szemere and the Pole Jolanta Pekacz, prepared a panel on the peculiarities of the social functioning of music of mass ambition in the Central European space.²⁴²

In July 1992, the representative delegations from both sides of the former Iron Curtain symbolically met in Prague at the first (and simultaneously the

237 Ibid., p. 542.

238 Maróthy was one of the editors of *Popular Music* journal between 1982 and 1987.

239 Anna SZEMERE: *Elméletek, programok a popzenekutatásban* [Theories, Programmes in Popular Music Research]. *Magyar Zene* 25 (1984), No. 2, pp. 179–184, here 179.

240 Jiří FUKAČ: *Populární hudba v ohnisku internacionálního a interdisciplinárního zájmu* [Popular Music in the Focus of International and Interdisciplinary Interest]. *Opus musicum* 14 (1982), No. 10, pp. 302–303.

241 Jiří FUKAČ: *1985 – Montreal '85 aneb svět se točí kolem populární hudby* [1985 – Montreal '85 or the World Spins around Popular Music]. *Opus musicum* 17 (1985), No. 9, p. II–VI.

242 Jiří FUKAČ: *Revoluce a demokracie jako muzikologická témata* [Revolution and Democracy as Musicological Themes]. *Hudební rozhledy* 43 (1989), No. 11, pp. 508–509.

last) international conference of the IASPM's Czech branch dedicated specifically to the issue "Central European popular music". Here, however, the Hungarians were missing. Although the most prominent disciples of the post-war generation of Czech and Hungarian popular music researchers, Aleš Opekar and Anna Szemere, shared similar scholarly interests (rock of socialist and post-socialist countries), as well as membership of international organizations such as the IASPM, we can no longer speak of close ties. Neither the political system nor the requirements of the individual actors' careers still created the preconditions for their conceptual development.

4. Conclusions

The history of popular music research in the Czech lands and in Hungary during the 20th century shows the extent to which the two traditions were linked to the political and socio-economic contexts at the local and global levels. In interwar democratic Czechoslovakia, the discussion on traditional and modern forms of popular music was relatively intense, especially under the influence of leftist writers, who, through the genre in question, "discovered" and defended the culture of previously neglected social groups and classes the more deeply those social segments suffered during the economic crisis of the 1930s. The authoritarian political system in Hungary, in line with the trend of the defeated European countries after the First World War, in turn countered such tendencies by both suppressing left-wing politics as such and emphasizing traditional values and elite art.

The facts that, in the Czech lands, unlike in Hungary, research into urban folk music began as early as the 1930s and that well-informed jazz journalism emerged in parallel with it were based on the development of the music scenes themselves and hence the degree of industrialization and economic prosperity of the country in question as well as its openness to foreign musical phenomena and markets. Thanks to these factors, the musicology of popular music was established earlier in the Czech lands than in Hungary: first within the theoretical section of the Union of Czechoslovak Composers in the second half of the 1950s and then in 1962 at the newly founded Institute for Musicology of the Czechoslovak Academy of Sciences. Popular music research in Hungary was first carried out by the Bartók Archives, which existed from 1961 and transformed into the Institute for Musicology of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences in 1969.

The delay of Hungarian musicology after the Second World War was also conditioned by the events of 1956. As a result of the Hungarian Uprising, profound institutional transformations took place, including the interruption of the Union of Hungarian Musicians' activity for several years – at the very time when the first concrete steps towards the establishment of a musicology of popular music were taking place within the Union of Czechoslovak Compos-

ers. An analogous moment, the onset of normalization in Czechoslovakia, occurred later, in 1968, and to some extent preserved the existing musicological discourse concentrating mainly on jazz and did not allow the full development of research on contemporary rock music. This, in turn, gained ground in Hungary thanks to the post-war generation of academics, such as Iván Vitányi and Ágnes Losonczi, and their support of young scholars in the 1970s and 1980s.

An important factor determining the appearance of theoretical reflection on popular music in both countries was the maturity and character of the local musicologies. In the case of the Czech lands, the key role was played by the Prague (Czech and German) university tradition of the field, dating back to the second half of the 19th century, with significant roots in music aesthetics and historiography. In this sense, one can recall the personalities of Otakar Hostinský and Zdeněk Nejedlý and their relationship to social contexts of music and art and, through Nejedlý, to left-wing politics and Marxism. The theoretical reflection on music in Hungary, on the other hand, was shaped by composers, traditional folklorists, and music teachers, such as Béla Bartók and Zoltán Kodály, or by their students, like Bence Szabolcsi, the founder of the musicological department at the Academy of Music in Budapest in the early 1950s. These traditions obviously determined, for example, the beginnings of Czech and Hungarian jazz musicology in the 1960s, in the former case rooted in music aesthetics and historiography (Dorůžka and Poledňák) and in the latter case close to music theory and pedagogy (Gonda). In addition, higher jazz education had already been established in Hungary in the mid-1960s, many years before the establishment of a similar type of music schooling in the Czech lands, and Hungarian music pedagogy was for a long time an unrivalled world model for Czech musicologists. Hungarian academics in the Czech lands, on the other hand, adopted the very concept of Marxist musicology, including the cult of Zdeněk Nejedlý and the scientific interest in mass genres. The level of musicological institutional infrastructure in the Czech lands after the Second World War, which, in addition to the Composers' Union and the Academy of Sciences, relied on three university musicological departments, the two existing academies of performing arts, and other institutions, has never been matched in Hungary.

The convergence of Czech and Hungarian musicology began to take place especially after 1948 in the context of the general Sovietization tendencies of the Eastern bloc and the official call for the cooperation of science in European socialist countries. An analysis of Czech-Hungarian relations in the field of the musicology of popular music shows that it was the Czech lands that played a dominant role in the integration of the international scientific circles of Central and Eastern Europe from the 1950s to the 1980s, especially through the organization of regular international conferences: after the Second World War, these were the Prague congresses of composers, critics, and musicologists, which were followed in the 1960s by seminars of Marxist musicology. In the 1970s and 1980s, it was mainly the International Musicological Colloquia

in Brno, thanks to which scholars from socialist countries could also become better acquainted with colleagues from Western countries operating within the International Association for the Study of Popular Music.

Regarding the process of the integration of musicologies of socialist countries, which gradually moved from the formal phase of the early 1950s to the informal level of spontaneous discussion on specific research issues in the next decade, even in the first half of the 1960s, “disturbances in the communicative function of language” were perceived as the fundamental obstacles, which were supposed to hinder the transfer and processing of information through mutual contact “and therefore also real research cooperation”.²⁴³ In the case of Czech-Hungarian relations, this problem was to some extent eliminated by the long-standing connection to the German-language environment of both countries under study; the founders of Czech musicology were already in close contact with their Austrian and German colleagues through Prague institutions, and the same was true of the fathers of Hungarian musicology, such as Bence Szabolcsi, a graduate of the University of Leipzig, or Dénes Bartha, a graduate of the University of Berlin. For this reason, too, Czech-Hungarian musicological contact was often made through German-language publications, translations, and sometimes even institutions – in the case of jazz research in the late 1960s and early 1970s, for example, the Institut für Jazzforschung in Graz and, in the case of rock music in the 1980s, the Forschungszentrum Populäre Musik in Berlin.

A natural catalytic role in Czech-Hungarian musical relations was played by the Slovak environment, in which a Hungarian minority of several hundred thousand people still lived in the interwar and post-war periods. Slovak translations of Hungarian texts as well as original Czech texts in Hungarian were published in Slovakia, and some important scholars of popular music, who later became prominent in Czech music journalism and musicology, came from Slovakia. These included Igor Wasserberger, a graduate in Slovak and Hungarian and subsequently a teacher of those languages, who, in the 1960s, reported in the Czech press, for example, on the first Hungarian musicological writings on jazz. László Dobossy, a Hungarian Bohemist who popularized the work of Zdeněk Nejedlý in Hungary from the interwar period,²⁴⁴ was also born in Slovakia, as was Péter Szőke, a musicologist who reported on Czech research in the field of urban folk music in Hungary after the Second World War.²⁴⁵

243 Jaroslav VOLEK: *Mezinárodní seminář hudebních vědců* [International Seminar of Music Scholars]. *Hudební rozhledy* 16 (1963), No. 14, p. 599.

244 E.g. László DOBOSSY: *Zdeněk Nejedlý és a cseh irodalomtörténeti kutatás* [Zdeněk Nejedlý and Research on the History of Czech Literature]. *Filológiai Közlöny* 4 (1958), No. 2, pp. 374–378; László DOBOSSY: *Két haza között* [Between Two Homelands]. Budapest: Magvető, 1981, pp. 210–231.

245 From 1963 on, in the leading Hungarian musicological journal *Magyar Zene*, Szőke regularly summarized the contents of articles published in *Hudební věda* and *Hudební rozhledy*.

As the present study confirms, the period of the most intensive Czech-Hungarian musicological contact in the field of popular music research was the 1960s, when Czech scholarship, especially thanks to the conceptual and systematic work at the Czechoslovak Academy of Sciences, directly inspired the development of the field in Hungary. The situation was somewhat different in the 1970s, when scholars from both countries regularly met in the international field as equal partners, and then in the 1980s, when both national musicologies began to orient themselves more towards the Western concept of popular music studies – the interaction between “Eastern” musicology of popular music and “Western” popular music studies, with all its methodological, institutional, generational, and other differences, is a topic beyond the scope of this study.²⁴⁶

In the 1980s, both in the Czech lands and in Hungary, there was already a perceived lack of young musicologists focusing on popular music. This fact is interesting mainly because the cultural policy development in the two countries at the time was quite different: in the Czech lands, the stagnation and isolationism of the normalization period was still in place, while Hungary was opening up to the Western musical and cultural trends of the time. In this respect, it is clear that the retreat of the musicology of popular music was not merely a result of momentary local administrative measures but a deeper phenomenon. Its cause can be seen on at least two interconnected levels: on the one hand, in the loosening of the relationship between politics and science in the sense of earlier state appeals to investigate the music of the broadest social strata and, on the other hand, in the diminishing potential of traditional Central European musicology to cope with the new discourses of popular music research coming from the Anglophone environment. One can also consider the decline in the social prestige of popular music itself, which, in the 1960s, represented a significant topic across professions and social segments on a global scale but which, in the following years, became a standardized part of popular culture and as such attracted the attention only of more narrowly defined interest groups.

In 1994, Marxist musicology was criticized by its original representative, Vladimír Karbusický, who claimed that the field had already failed in the 1960s and 1970s with its futile attempt to assign epochs and styles to “classes”, which János Maróthy had tried in his major book for the West, *Music and the Bourgeois – Music and the Proletarian* (1974).²⁴⁷ If we move away from a narrower conception of Marxist musicology as a specific methodology to a broader understanding of Marxist musicology as an umbrella institution with preferred topics and support for research, then it can be said that the musicology of

246 Cf. Yveta KAJANOVÁ: *The Rock, Pop and Jazz in Contemporary Musicological Studies*. International Review of Aesthetics and Sociology of Music 44 (2013), No. 2, pp. 243–359.

247 Vladimír KARBUSICKÝ: *Smysl a význam v hudbě* [Sense and Meaning in Music]. Hudební věda 31 (1994), No. 1, p. 39.

popular music was to a large extent a direct product of such a conceived science. The end of musicological research on popular music at the Czech and Hungarian academies of sciences in the 1990s, a time that was radically opposed to anything that in any way resembled the communist past, is in this respect both symbolic and symptomatic, although it was undoubtedly also conditioned by a number of specific circumstances. Both in the Czech lands and in Hungary, in the following years, musicology returned to its roots in the form of a predominant interest in art music of earlier historical epochs.

Moreover, the retreat of the musicology of popular music within the framework of globalization tendencies and the general inclination towards the West in the 1990s can also be seen through the crises of the *national musicologies* as such.²⁴⁸ Here, it should be recalled that the formation of the field in both countries under discussion was closely linked to state-sponsored projects focused primarily on the history of local musical cultures. In the case of the Czech lands, in this sense, there is a direct link between large-scale book-length syntheses, such as the collective *Dějiny české hudební kultury* [History of Czech Musical Culture] (1972, 1981), and Kotek's later *Dějiny české populární hudby a zpěvu* [History of Czech Popular Music and Singing] (1994, 1998). The intention to elaborate the local history of 20th century musical culture comprehensively also existed in Hungary, but the fewer personnel and narrower institutional profile of the field, and partly the higher degree of decentralization of public institutions as a result of the political developments after 1956, did not allow the project's completion.

The above-mentioned discussion touches on the most important difference between the two musicological traditions under consideration, which was the effectiveness of the teamwork that the Czech scholars were praised for in the 1970s by János Maróthy.²⁴⁹ Systematic source research, including the creation of thematic bibliographies and other similar activities, started late in Hungary and was never developed to such an extent that a representative comprehensive work in the manner of the Czechoslovak *Encyklopedie jazzu a moderní populární hudby* [Encyclopaedia of Jazz and Modern Popular Music] (1980, 1986, 1987, 1990) could be produced. The individualized (monographic) approach defined by the specific interests of particular personalities, which was rather typical of Hungarian musicology, also never resulted in attempts to address systemic issues such as the inclusion of popular music research as a specific subdiscipline in musicological systematics, as represented in the Czech environment by another synthetic three-volume work, *Hudební věda* [Musicology] (1988).

248 Cf. Stanislav TESAŘ: *Dvojití účtování aneb několik poznámek k setkání českých a slovenských muzikologů* [Double Counting or a Few Remarks on the Meeting of Czech and Slovak Musicologists]. *Hudební rozhledy* 42 (1989), No. 9, pp. 422–423.

249 MARÓTHY 1984 (see n. 228).

Remarkably, among Czech and Hungarian musicologists, we find several typologically very similar personalities, for example Jaroslav Jiránek and János Maróthy, who represented the same generation of academics who grew up scientifically in the debates of the 1950s, who promoted a Marxist perspective on the domestic and international scene for a long time, who understood the importance of incorporating mass genres into academic discourse, and who supported such activities organizationally from their authoritative disciplinary positions, including the academy of sciences. However, we also encounter unique figures who had no counterpart in the partner country. One such figure was Josef Kotek, who, thanks to his specific position at the Czechoslovak Academy of Sciences, had a rare opportunity to research exclusively popular music for more than 30 years. Kotek's work (free of any ideology), which thematically covered music from the early 19th century to the late 20th century, was highly conceptual and prolific, ranging from rigorous source surveys to the formulation of original theories and partial syntheses. The final one was the above-mentioned two-volume *Dějiny české populární hudby a zpěvu* [History of Czech Popular Music and Singing], published in the 1990s but mainly summarizing the research from the 1960s to the 1980s. Personalities and careers of this type did not exist in Hungary. In addition, Kotek's academic path bore traces of uniqueness in the wider international context, which was eventually also documented by the professional background of Western scholars and founders of the International Association for the Study of Popular Music, who, for the most part, were not originally members of academic institutions and, if they were, their official subjects were not popular music research.

Bibliography

- A zeneszerzők és zenekritikusok prágai kongresszusának határozatai.* Zenei Szemle 2 (1948), No. 6, pp. 293–296.
- APOR, Péter: *Az elképzelt köztársaság.* Budapest: MTA BTK, 2014.
- BÁCSKAI, Erika – MAKARA, Péter – MANCHIN, Róbert – VÁRADI, László – VITÁNYI, Iván: *Beat.* Budapest: Zeneműkiadó, 1969.
- BAJER, Jiří: *Brněnské hudebněvědné kolokvium.* Hudební rozhledy 32 (1979), No. 12, p. 539.
- BARESEL, Alfred: *Das Jazzbuch.* Berlin: Jul. Heinr. Zimmermann, 1926.
- BARTÓK, Béla: *Cigányzene? Magyar zene?.* Ethnographia 42 (1931), No. 2, pp. 49–62.
- BERLÁSZ, Melinda (ed.): *Kodály Zoltán és tanítványai.* Budapest: Rózsavölgyi és Társa, 2007.
- BERLÁSZ, Melinda: *A Zenetudományi Intézet 20. századi magyar zenetörténeti gyűjteményének kutatástörténeti szerepe az első húsz éves periódusban (1966–1986).* In: *Zenetudományi dolgozatok 2013–2014.* Ágnes Papp (ed.), Budapest: MTA BTK Zenetudományi Intézet, 2016, pp. 452–473.
- BERNHARD, Paul: *Jazz: Eine Musikalische Zeitfrage.* Frankfurt am Main: Eisenbletter u. Naumann, 1927.

- BLÜML, Jan: *Popular Music Studies in the Context of Post-Communist Historiography in the Czech Republic*. In: *Popular Music Studies Today*. Merrill, Julia (ed.), Wiesbaden: Springer VS, 2017, pp. 35–42.
- BREUER, János: *Jemnitz Sándor és Arnold Schoenberg kapcsolatai*. Magyar Zene 25 (1984), No. 1, pp. 3–13.
- BREUER, János: *Jemnitz Sándor, a lipcsei diák*. Muzsika 37 (1994), No. 7, pp. 25–27.
- BURIAN, Emil František: *Jazz*. Praha: Aventinum, 1928.
- BRABCOVÁ, Jitka – FUKAČ, Jiří: *Typologie česko-maďarských hudebních vztahů a stav současného bádání*. In: *Československo-maďarské vztahy v hudbě*. Steinmetz, Karel (ed.), Ostrava: KKS, 1982, pp. 45–62.
- CABADA, Ladislav: *Intelektuálové a idea komunismu v českých zemích 1900–1939*. Praha: Institut pro středoevropskou kulturu a politiku, 2000.
- ČERNÝ, M. K.: *Brněnské hudebně vědné kolokvium*. Hudební rozhledy 32 (1979), No. 12, p. 541.
- CUGNY, Laurent: *Jazz in France 1917–1929: The Missing Object of the Reception*. In: *Jazz from Socialist Realism to Postmodernism*. Kajanová, Yveta – Pickham, Gertrud – Ritter, Rüdiger (eds.), Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 2016, pp. 43–58.
- DALOS, Anna: *Kodály Zoltán, a tudós zeneszerző*. In: *A Kodály Zoltán alkotói ösztöndíj*. Dalos, Anna – Várkonyi, Tamás (eds.), Budapest: MANK, 2015, pp. 15–24.
- DALOS, Anna: *A samesz és a csodarabbi. Molnár Antal dokumentumok Hernádi Lajos hagyatékában*. In: http://www.parlando.hu/2021/2021-2/Dalos_Anna.pdf [cit. 20. 1. 2022].
- DEJMEK, Jindřich a kol.: *Československo. Dějiny státu*. Praha: Nakladatelství Libri, 2018.
- DOLANSKÁ, Věra: *Lehká múza na půdě ČSAV*. Melodie 3 (1965), No. 3, p. 51.
- DOBOSSY, László: *Zdeněk Nejedlý és a cseh irodalomtörténeti kutatás*. Filológiai Közlöny 4 (1958), No. 2, p. 374–378.
- DOBOSSY, László: *Két haza között*. Budapest: Magvető, 1981.
- DÖMÖTÖR, Tekla: *Az első nemzetközi munkásdal konferencia tanulságai*. Muzsika 4 (1961), No. 6, pp. 1–2.
- DORŮŽKA, Lubomír – MÁCHA, Zbyněk: *Od folklóru k Semaforu*. Praha: SHV, 1964.
- DORŮŽKA, Lubomír – POLEDŇÁK, Ivan: *Československý jazz: minulost a přítomnost*. Praha: Supraphon, 1967.
- DORŮŽKA, Lubomír: *Jazz a hudební věda*. Melodie 7 (1969), No. 5, p. 158.
- DORŮŽKA, Lubomír: *Panoráma populární hudby 1918/1978*. Praha: Mladá fronta, 1981.
- ETLÍKOVÁ, Pravdomila – HRDÝ, Ladislav: *Sociologický seminář skončil*. Hudební rozhledy 19 (1966), No. 10, p. 294.
- Evropská jazzová federace*. Hudební nástroje 6 (1969), No. 4, p. 110.
- FENDRYCH, Lubomír – KOTEK, Josef: *Žánry bezprostředně spjaté s životem mas jako předmět hudebněvědeckého bádání*. In: *Hudební věda 7–8*, Praha: Panton, 1962, pp. 200–206.
- FINKELSTEIN, Sidney: *Afrika és a világ zenéje*. Világ Ifjúsága 9 (1955), Nos. 5–6, pp. 34–35.
- FINKELSTEIN, Sidney: *Odysea jazzu*. Hudební rozhledy 9 (1956), No. 20, p. 840.
- FINKELSTEIN, Sidney: *A jazz*. Világ Ifjúsága 10 (1956), No. 6, p. 8–10.
- FINKELSTEIN, Sidney: *A dzsessz. Nemzeti kifejezőmód vagy nemzetközi népzene?*. Valóság 4 (1961), No. 1, p. 42–51.
- FUKAČ, Jiří – POLEDŇÁK, Ivan: *K typologickým polarizacím hudby, zejména polarizaci hudby artifiální a nonartifiální*. Hudební věda 14 (1977), No. 4, p. 316–335.
- FUKAČ, Jiří: *Populární hudba v ohnisku internacionálního a interdisciplinárního zájmu*. Opus musicum 14 (1982), No. 10, pp. 302–303.

- FUKAČ, Jiří: 1985 – *Montreal '85 aneb svět se točí kolem populární hudby*. Opus musicum 17 (1985), No. 9, pp. II–VI.
- FUKAČ, Jiří: *Revoluce a demokracie jako muzikologická témata*. Hudební rozhledy 43 (1989), No. 11, pp. 508–509.
- GONDA, János: *Jazz. Történet – elmélet – gyakorlat*. Budapest: Zeneműkiadó, 1965.
- GONDA, János: *A jazzművészet szerepe a csehszlovák zenei életben*. Muzsika 10 (1967), No. 1, pp. 25–27.
- GONDA, János: *Jazzkutatás, federáció, fesztiválok*. Muzsika 12 (1969), No. 8, pp. 15–19.
- GYÁNI, Gábor: *Valóban korszakhatár 1945?*. Levéltári Közlemények 86 (2015), Nos. 1–2, pp. 5–13.
- HADAS, Miklós: *A nemzet prófétája. Kísérlet Kodály pályájának szociológiai értelmezésére*. Szociológia 16 (1987), No. 4, pp. 469–490.
- HAJNÁCZKY, Tamás: *Magyar Cigányzenészek Lapja. Cigányzenész önszerveződés, érdeképviselet és közélet a két világháború között*. Pro Minoritate 29 (2019), No. 4, pp. 123–136.
- HARASZTI, Emil: *Cigányzene, parasztzene, hivatalos zene*. Budapesti Hírlap 49 (1. 5. 1929), pp. 1–3.
- HAVELKA, František: *Revitalizace IASPM v Olomouci*. Hudební rozhledy 53 (2000), No. 2, p. 41.
- HAVLÍČEK, Dušan: *A necht i jiskry létají*. Hudební rozhledy 9 (1956), No. 23, p. 976.
- HAVLÍČEK, Dušan: *O novou českou taneční hudbu*. Praha: SČS, 1959.
- HAVLÍČEK, Dušan: *Zpráva o činnosti skupiny pro studium otázek zábavné a taneční hudby*. In: Hudební věda 3, Praha: Panton 1961, pp. 170–171.
- HEPNER, Vladimír – MAŘÍKOVÁ, Iva: *Průzkum postojů české veřejnosti k populárním zpěvákům*. Praha: Ústav pro výzkum kultury, 1975.
- HOLEČKOVÁ, Marta Edith: *Příběh zapomenuté univerzity*. Praha: FF UK, 2019.
- HOSTINSKÝ, Otakar: *Lidová píseň v Rakousku, Český lid 16 (1907), No. 4, pp. 161–164. Hudba národů*. Praha: Syndikát českých skladatelů, 1948.
- HUEBR, Vojtěch: *Dunaj není Mississippi*. Melodie 18 (1980), No. 6, p. 177.
- IGNÁČZ, Ádám: *Milliók zenéje. Populáris zene és zenetudomány az államszocialista Magyarországon*. Budapest: Rózsavölgyi és Társa, 2020.
- IGNÁČZ, Ádám – BLÜML, Jan: *Populáris zenei kutatások az államszocialista Csehszlovákiában és Magyarországon*. Betekintő 15 (2021), No. 3, pp. 7–31.
- ITTZÉS, Mihály: *“Ez nem az Én világom.” Kodály a jazzről és a könnyű zenéről – szubjektíven és objektíven*. In: Fejezetek a magyar jazz történetéből 1961-ig. Géza Gábor Simon (ed.), Budapest: Magyar Jazzkutatási Társaság, 2001, pp. 87–89.
- JÁRDÁNYI, Pál: *Zenei ízlés, zenei műveltség*. Forrás 2 (1944), No. 7, pp. 89–92.
- JÁRDÁNYI, Pál: *Könnű zene*. Szabad Szó 49 (1947), No. 84, p. 8.
- JÁRDÁNYI, Pál: *Népzene – műzene*. Szabad Szó 49 (1947), No. 112, p. 7.
- JEMNITZ, Sándor: *Der Jazz als Form und Inhalt*. Musikblätter des Anbruch 7 (1925), No. 4, p. 188–196.
- JEMNITZ, Sándor: *A jazz tankönyve*. Népszava, 24. 11. 1926, p. 11.
- JEMNITZ, Sándor: *A jazz mint tartalom és forma*. Crescendo 2 (1928), Nos. 11–12, pp. 8–16.
- JEMNITZ, Sándor: *A jazz*. In: *A magyar muzsika könyve*. Imre Molnár (ed.), Budapest: Merkantil, 1936, pp. 117–118.
- JIRÁNEK, Jaroslav: *O výzkumu dělnické písně*. Hudební rozhledy 14 (1961), No. 8, pp. 346–347.
- JIRÁNEK, Jaroslav – LÉBL, Vladimír (eds.): *Dějiny české hudební kultury 1*. Praha: Academia, 1972.

- JIRÁNEK, Jaroslav: *Vzájemný vztah bytové a umělecké hudby jako muzikologický problém*. In: *Colloquia musicologica*, Brno 1972 & 1973, Fasc. I. Rudolf Pečman (ed.), Brno: Mezinárodní hudební festival, 1979, pp. 22–33.
- JIRÁNEK, Jaroslav – BEK, Josef (eds.): *Dějiny české hudební kultury 2*. Praha: Academia, 1981.
- KAHR, Michael: *The Jazz Institutes in Graz: Pioneers in Academic Jazz and Their Impact on Local Identity*. *European Journal of Musicology* 16 (2017), No. 1, pp. 45–59. Available at <https://bop.unibe.ch/EJM/article/view/5778> [cit. 21. 1. 2022].
- KAJANOVÁ, Yvetta: *The Rock, Pop and Jazz in Contemporary Musicological Studies*. *International Review of Aesthetics and Sociology of Music* 44 (2013), No. 2, pp. 243–359.
- KAJANOVÁ, Yvetta: *Rock, Pop and Jazz Research Development in the Former Czechoslovak Socialist Republic and Present-Day Slovakia*. In: *Popular Music in Communist and Post-Communist Europe*. Blüml, Jan – Kajanová, Yvetta – Ritter, Rüdiger (eds.), Berlin: Peter Lang, 2019, pp. 31–48.
- KARBUSICKÝ, Vladimír: *Naše dělnická píseň*. Praha: Orbis, 1953.
- KARBUSICKÝ, Vladimír – KASAN, Jaroslav: *Výzkum současné hudebnosti I*. Praha: Čs. rozhlas, 1964.
- KARBUSICKÝ, Vladimír: *K pojmu a estetice "lehké hudby"*. *Hudební věda* 4 (1967), Nos. 1–3, pp. 22–44, 328–338, 440–454.
- KARBUSICKÝ, Vladimír – MOKRÝ, Ladislav: *Otázky hudební sociologie*. Praha: Osvětový ústav, 1967.
- KARBUSICKÝ, Vladimír: *Mezi lidovou písní a šlágre*m. Praha: Supraphon, 1968.
- KARBUSICKÝ, Vladimír: *Smysl a význam v hudbě*. *Hudební věda* 31 (1994), No. 1, pp. 25–84.
- KARPIŃSKI, Krzysztof: *Był jazz*. Kraków: Wydawnictwo Literackie, 2014.
- KATONA, Imre – MARÓTHY, János – SZATMÁRI, Antal (eds.): *A parasztdaltól a munkásdalig*. Budapest: Akadémiai, 1968.
- KÓKAI, Rezső: *Jazz és népzene*. *Magyarok* 3 (1947), No. 11, pp. 752–754.
- Konference SČS o písni*. *Hudební rozhledy* 8 (1955), No. 20, p. 992.
- KOTEK, Josef: *Poodhalená minulost*. *Melodie* 4 (1966), Nos. 8–9, p. 177.
- KOTEK, Josef – POLEDŇÁK, Ivan: *Teorie a dějiny tzv. bytové hudby jako samostatná muzikologická disciplína*. *Hudební věda* 11 (1974), No. 4, pp. 335–355.
- KOTEK, Josef: *Kronika české synkopy 1 (1903–1931)*. Praha: Supraphon, 1975.
- KOTEK, Josef: *O české populární hudbě a jejích posluchačích*. Praha: Panton, 1990.
- KOTEK, Josef: *Dějiny české populární hudby a zpěvu 1 (do roku 1918)*. Praha: Academia, 1994.
- KOTEK, Josef: *Dějiny české populární hudby a zpěvu 2 (1918–1968)*. Praha: Academia, 1998.
- KRAUTGARTNER, Karel: *O instrumentaci tanečního a jazzového orchestru*. Praha: Panton, 1961.
- KŘUPKOVÁ, Lenka: *Das Warschauer Fenster in die Neue Musik*. In: *Musikgeschichte in Mittel- und Osteuropa*. Mitteilungen der internationalen Arbeitsgemeinschaft an der Universität Leipzig. Braun, Joachim – Karnes, C. Keven – Loos, Helmut – Möller, Eberhard (eds.), Leipzig: Gudrun Schröder Verlag, 2008, pp. 290–301.
- KŘUPKOVÁ, Lenka: *"Ideologically Progressive Art" Meets Western Avant-Garde*. In: *The Tunes of Diplomatic Notes: Music and Diplomacy in Southeast Europe (18th–20th century)*. Vesic, Ivana – Peno, Sara Vesna – Udovic, Bostjan (eds.), Belgrade and Ljubljana: University of Ljubljana, 2020, pp. 155–164.

- KŐVÁGÓ, Sarolta: *A Magyarországi Munkásdalogyletek Szövetsége. Párttörténeti Közlemények* 30 (1984), No. 3, pp. 136–163.
- KÖVÉR, György: *Iparosodás agrárországban. Magyarország gazdaságtörténete 1848–1914*. Budapest: Gondolat, 1982.
- KUČERA, Václav: *Hlas naší kritiky: Profesor dr. Antonín Sychra*. In: *Taneční hudba jazz*, Praha: SNKLHU, 1960, pp. 138–139.
- LADMANOVÁ, Milada: *Česká kramářská píseň*. *Hudební rozhledy* 14 (1961), No. 8, pp. 346–347.
- LAMPERTH, Vera (ed.): *Jemnitz Sándor válogatott zenekritikái*. Budapest: Zeneműkiadó, 1973.
- LÉBL, Vladimír – POLEDŇÁK, Ivan a kol.: *Hudební věda* 1, 2, 3. Praha: SPN, 1988.
- LÉVAI, Júlia – VITÁNYI, Iván: *Miből lesz a sláger?*. Budapest: Zeneműkiadó, 1973.
- LOSONCZI, Ágnes: *V. Karbusický – L. Kasan: A muzikalitás jelenlegi állapotának kutatása*. *Magyar Zene* 6 (1965), No. 6, pp. 654–655.
- LOSONCZI, Ágnes: *A zenei élet szociológiája*. Budapest: Zeneműkiadó, 1969.
- LOSONCZI, Ágnes: *Zene – Ifjúság – Mozgalom*. Budapest: Zeneműkiadó, 1974.
- MACEK, Jiří: *Nemzeti történetünk kozmopolita felfogása ellen*. *Történettudományi Értesítő* 3 (1952), Nos. 11–12, pp. 132–165.
- MACEK, Petr: *Československá lexikografická spolupráce v minulém století*. *Slovenská hudba* 33 (2007), Nos. 3–4, pp. 535–540.
- MÁCHA, Zbyněk – POLEDŇÁK, Ivan: *Uggé, Emanuel*. In: https://www.ceskyhudebnislovník.cz/slovník/index.php?option=com_mdictionary&task=record.record_detail&id=3088 [cit. 20. 1. 2022].
- Malé formy – velká odpovědnost*. *Hudební rozhledy* 14 (1961), No. 14, p. 575.
- MATZNER, Antonín – POLEDŇÁK, Ivan – WASSERBERGER, Igor (eds): *Encyklopedie jazzu a moderní populární hudby* (věcná část). Praha: Editio Supraphon, 1983.
- MATZNER, Antonín – POLEDŇÁK, Ivan – WASSERBERGER, Igor (eds.): *Encyklopedie jazzu a moderní populární hudby* (československé scéna). Praha: Editio Supraphon, 1990.
- MARÓTHY, János: *Improvizáció és romantika*. *Zenei Szemle* 2 (1948), No. 7, pp. 350–359.
- MARÓTHY, János: *A középkori tömegzene alkalmi és formái*. In: *Zenetudományi Tanulmányok* I. Szabolcsi, Bence (ed.), Budapest: Akadémiai, 1953, pp. 439–494.
- MARÓTHY, János: *Zenénk és a tömegek*. *Új Zenei Szemle* 7 (1956), No. 5, pp. 1–13.
- MARÓTHY, János: *Az európai népdal születése*. In: *Zenetudományi tanulmányok Kodály Zoltán 75. születésnapjára*. Szabolcsi, Bence – Bartha, Dénes (eds.), Budapest: Akadémiai, 1957, pp. 503–626.
- MARÓTHY, János: *Az európai népdal születése*. Budapest: Akadémiai, 1960.
- MARÓTHY, János: *Társadalmi dal. Bibliográfiai adalékok a zenetudomány egy fontos problémaköréhez*. *Magyar Zene* 3 (1962), No. 4, pp. 378–385.
- MARÓTHY, János: *A magyar munkásdalkutatás*. *Magyar Zene* 3 (1965), No. 2, pp. 170–181.
- MARÓTHY, János – ZOLTAI, Dénes – UJFALUSSY, József: *Utak és választutak a mai marxista zenetudományban*. *Magyar Zene* 6 (1965), No. 6, pp. 563–576.
- MARÓTHY, János: *Zene és polgár, zene és proletár*. Budapest: Akadémiai, 1966.
- MARÓTHY, János: *Music and Bourgeois, Music and Proletarian*. Budapest: Akadémiai, 1974.
- MARÓTHY, János: *Dějiny české hudební kultury (The History of Czech Musical Culture) 1890–1945*. *Studia Musicologica* 26 (1984), No. 1, pp. 419–420.
- MCBRIDE, Mary Margaret – WHITEMAN, Paul: *Jazz*. New York: J. H. Sears, 1926.
- MERRIAM, Alan P.: *A Short Bibliography of Jazz*. *Notes* 10 (1953), No. 2, pp. 202–210.

- Mezinárodní porady skladatelů v Praze*. Hudební rozhledy 3 (1950–1951), No. 18–20, pp. 75–78.
- MIDDLETON, Richard – MANUEL, Peter: *Popular Music*. In: Grove Music Online, 2001. Dostupné na <https://www.oxfordmusiconline.com>.
- MOLNÁR, Antal: *Jazzband*, Budapest: Dante, 1928.
- MOLNÁR, Antal: *A könnyű zene és társadalmi szerepe*, Budapest: Sárkány, 1935.
- Művelődés, pihenés, szórakozás. A KISZ KB értékelése és határozata a szabad idő felhasználásának tapasztalatairól és a KISZ-szervezetek feladatairól*. Magyar Ifjúság, 25. 4. 1964, pp. 4–5.
- NAGY, Dezső: *A munkásdal és munkásfolklor magyar szakirodalma*. Budapest [unknown publisher], 1962.
- NEJEDLÝ, Zdeněk: *A dal és a zene a huszita hadseregben*. Zenetudományi Értesítő 3 (1953), No. 9, pp. 69–92.
- NEJEDLÝ, Zdeněk: *A huszita ének kezdetei*. Irodalomtudományi Értesítő 4 (1954), No. 1, pp. 161–196.
- OLDAL, Gábor: *Negyedszázados a jazz*. A Zene 20 (1939), No. 12, pp. 220–222.
- OPEKAR, Aleš: *Konference “Středoevropská populární hudba”*. Hudební věda 30 (1993), No. 1, pp. 71–73.
- ORTUTAY, Gyula: *A munkásosztály népdalköltészete*. Szabad Nép, 20. 6. 1955, p. 4.
- PÁL, Sándor: *A jazz eredete*. Magyarok 3 (1947), No. 10, p. 696.
- PÁL, Sándor: *Néhány szó Rychlik A jazz világában című könyvről [sic!]*. Szórakoztatózenészek Tájékoztatója 3 (1964), No. 1, pp. 5–7.
- PATZAKOVÁ, Anna: *Prvních deset let československého rozhlasu*. Praha: Radiojournal, 1935.
- PEČMAN, Rudolf (ed.): *Colloquia musicologica, Brno 1976 & 1977*. Brno: Mezinárodní hudební festival, 1978.
- PEČMAN, Rudolf (ed.): *Colloquia musicologica, Brno 1972 & 1973*. Brno: Mezinárodní hudební festival, 1979.
- PEČMAN, Rudolf (ed.): *Colloquium “Musica communicatio”: Brno 1979*. Brno: Mezinárodní hudební festival, 1989.
- PERNYE, András: *A dzsesszről*. Valóság 5 (1962), No. 3, pp. 57–70.
- PERNYE, András: *A jazz*. Budapest: Gondolat, 1964.
- PÉTERI, Lóránt: *Adalékok a hazai zenetudományi kutatás intézménytörténetéhez (1947–1969)*. Magyar Zene 38 (2000), No. 5, pp. 161–191.
- PETRUSEK, Miloslav: *Václavek, Bedřich*. In: https://encyklopedie.soc.cas.cz/w/V%C3%A1clavek_Bed%C5%99ich [cit. 20. 1. 2022].
- Píseň: pravda o životě*. Praha: SČS, 1956.
- POLEDŇÁK, Ivan: *Kapitolky o jazzu*. Praha: SHV, 1961.
- POLEDŇÁK, Ivan: *Hudba a revoluce*. Hudební rozhledy 30 (1977), No. 12, pp. 558–561.
- POLEDŇÁK, Ivan: *Maďarsko opět v souvislosti s hudební výchovou*. Hudební rozhledy 33 (1980), No. 9, p. 400.
- POLEDŇÁK, Ivan – KUNA, Milan a kol.: *Ústav pro hudební vědu Akademie věd České republiky 1962–1994*. Praha: Ústav pro hudební vědu AV ČR, 1994.
- POLEDŇÁK, Ivan: *Úvod do problematiky hudby jazzového okruhu*. Olomouc: Univerzita Palackého, 2000.
- POLEDŇÁK, Ivan: *Karbusický, Vladimír*. In: https://www.ceskyhudebnislovník.cz/slovník/index.php?option=com_mdictionary&task=record.record_detail&id=5900 [cit. 21. 1. 2022].
- PRAHÁCS, Margit: *Cigányzene és magyar népzene*. Napkelet 8 (1930), No. 1, pp. 47–52.
- PRAŽÁK, Richard: *Má maďarská cesta*. Brno: Masarykova univerzita, 2014.

Pro zpěv a radost lidí. Praha: SČS, 1962.

PROCHÁZKOVÁ, Jarmila: *Ústav pro hudební vědu Akademie věd.* In: https://www.ceskyhudebnislovník.cz/slovník/index.php?option=com_mdictionary&task=record.record_detail&id=7804 [cit. 20. 1. 2022].

PŘIBILOVÁ, Pavlína: *Kritická korespondence Roberta Smetany s Bedřichem Václavkem.* Dissertation. Olomouc: Univerzita Palackého, Filozofická fakulta, Katedra muzikologie, 2020.

RETKES, Attila: *Bartók Béla és a jazz.* In: *Zenetudományi tanulmányok Kroó György tiszteletére.* Papp, Márta (ed.), Budapest: Magyar Zenetudományi és Zenekritikai Társaság, 1996, p. 228–237.

RITTER, Rüdiger: *Researching Jazz in Socialist Countries.* In: *Popular Music in Communist and Post-Communist Europe.* Blüml, Jan – Kajanová, Yvetta – Ritter Rüdiger, Berlin: Peter Lang, 2019, pp. 49–74.

ROMSICS, Ignác: *Magyarország története a XX. században.* Budapest: Osiris, 1999.

RYCHLÍK, Jan: *Pověry a problémy jazzu.* Praha: SNKLHU, 1959.

RYCHLÍK, Jan: *A jazz világában.* Budapest: Gondolat, 1963.

SÁGI, Mária – VITÁNYI, Iván: *Kísérlet a zenei köznyelv experimentális vizsgálatára.* Budapest: MRT Tömegkommunikációs Kutatóközpont, 1970.

SÁGI, Mária: *Zenezsziológia új módszerekkel.* Új Írás 13 (1973), No. 1, pp. 97–100.

SCHAEFFNER, André – COEUROY, André: *Le Jazz.* Paris: Éditions Claude Aveline, 1926.

SCOTT, Derek B. (ed.): *The Ashgate Research Companion to Popular Musicology.* Burlington: Ashgate, 2009.

SHUKER, Roy: *Popular Music: Key Concepts.* London: Routledge, 2005.

Sjezd socialistické kultury: sborník dokumentů. Praha: Orbis, 1959.

SMETANA, Robert – VÁCLAVEK, Bedřich: *České písně kramářské.* Praha: Fr. Borový, 1937.

SMETANA, Robert – VÁCLAVEK, Bedřich: *Český národní zpěvník.* Praha: Melantrich, 1940.

STANISLAV, Josef: *Socialistický realismus a hudba.* Hudební rozhledy 1 (1948), No. 4, pp. 69–71.

STANISLAV, Josef: *Zřízení Ústavu pro ethnografii a folkloristiku Československé akademie věd.* Československá ethnografie 2 (1954), No. 2, pp. 111–112.

STANISLAV, Josef: *Kritiky a stati.* Praha: SČS, 1957.

SYCHRA, Antonín: *Stranická hudební kritika, spolutvůrce nové hudby.* Praha: Orbis, 1951.

SZABARI, Vera: *Krátké dějiny maďarské sociologie v letech 1948–1989.* Sociologický časopis 41 (2005), No. 4, pp. 659–673.

SZABOLCSI, Bence: *Beszélgetés a zenetörténetről.* Nyugat 27 (1934), Nos. 12–13, pp. 13–17.

SZABOLCSI, Bence: *A művész és közönsége. Zeneszerző, társadalom és zenei köznyelv a polgári korszak küszöbén.* Budapest: Zeneműkiadó, 1952.

SZABOLCSI, Bence: *Népi és egyéni műalkotás a zenetörténetben.* MTANyIrKözl 4 (1953), No. 4, pp. 273–299.

SZABOLCSI, Bence: *A zenei köznyelv problémái. A romantika felbomlása.* Budapest: Akadémiai, 1968.

SZEMERE, Anna: *Elméletek, programok a popzenekutatásban.* Magyar Zene 25 (1984), No. 2, pp. 179–184.

SZŐKE, Péter: *A cseh munkásdalkutatás eredményei, módszere és feladatai.* Magyar Zene 2 (1961), No. 4, pp. 409–431.

TALLIÁN, Tibor: *A Magyar Tudományos Akadémia Zenetudományi Intézetének rövid története.* Rukopis. In: https://zti.hu/files/zti/MTA_ZTI_Tortenete.pdf [cit. 20. 1. 2022].

- TESAŘ, Stanislav: *Dvojí účtování aneb několik poznámek k setkání českých a slovenských muzikologů*. Hudební rozhledy 42 (1989), No. 9, pp. 422–423.
- TYRMAND, Leopold: *U brzegów jazzu*. Kraków: Polskie Wydawnictwo Muzyczne, 1957.
- UJFALUSSY, József: *Marxista zenetudományi szeminárium Prágában*. Magyar Zene 4 (1963), No. 4, pp. 408–410.
- UJFALUSSY, József: *Előszó*. In: Jiránek, Jaroslav: *A XX. századi cseh zenéről*. Budapest: Zeneműkiadó, 1972, pp. 5–9.
- UJFALUSSY, József: *Molnár Antal zeneesztétikai szemlélete*. In: *Zenetudományi Dolgozatok 1999*. Farkas, Márta Sz. (ed.), Budapest: MTA Zenetudományi Intézete, 1999, pp. 305–310.
- UNGVÁRY, Krisztián: *Horthy Miklós*. Budapest: Jaffa, 2020.
- VÁCLAVEK, Bedřich: *Písennictví a lidová tradice*. Olomouc: Index, 1938.
- VELEBNÝ, Karel: *Jazzová praktika*. Praha: Panton, 1967.
- VETTERL, Karel: *K sociologii hudebního rozhlasu*. Musikologie 1 (1938), No. 1, pp. 27–44.
- VIDOMUS, Petr: *Hudba revolučního smyslu: jazzový publicista Emanuel Uggé*. Hudební věda 59 (2022), Nos. 2–3, pp. 246–314.
- VITÁNYI, Iván: *A tömegek zenei igényei*. Új Zenei Szemle 5 (1954), No. 9, pp. 32–35.
- VITÁNYI, Iván: *A könnyű műfaj*. Budapest: Zeneműkiadó, 1965.
- VOLEK, Jaroslav: *Mezinárodní seminář hudebních vědců*. Hudební rozhledy 16 (1963), No. 14, pp. 596–599.
- VYSLOUŽIL, Jiří: *Symposion o hudebních aktivitách mládeže*. Opus musicum 4 (1972), Nos. 8–9, pp. 239–241.
- WASSERBERGER, Igor: *Nové publikace*. Melodie 4 (1966), Nos. 8–9, pp. 211–212.
- ZIPERNOVSZKY, Kornél: *“Ki fog győzni – a jazz vagy a cigány – nehéz megjósolni”*: *A cigányzenészek megvédik a magyar nemzeti kultúrát*. Replika 101–102 (2017), Nos. 1–2, pp. 67–87.
- Za nový rozkvět populární hudby*. Hudební rozhledy 2 (1950), No. 3, p. 4.

Addresses:

Jan Blüml

Katedra muzikologie, FF UP Olomouc [Department of Musicology,
Faculty of Arts, Palacký University Olomouc]

Univerzitní 3, 779 00 Olomouc

e-mail: jan.bluml@upol.cz

Ádám Ignác

ELKH Bölcsészettudományi Kutatóközpont Zenetudományi Intézet,
20–21. Századi Magyar Zenei Archívum [Archives for 20th–21st Century
Hungarian Music, Institute of Musicology, Research Centre for the Humanities]
Táncsics Mihály utca 7, 1014 Budapest

e-mail: ignacz.adam@abtk.hu

Redakční poznámka

České znění článku je publikováno online na internetové adrese
<http://hudebniveda.cz/>

DĚJINY VÝZKUMU POPULÁRNÍ HUDBY V ČESKÝCH ZEMÍCH A MAĎARSKU: SOUVISLOSTI, PARALELY, VZÁJEMNÉ VZTAHY (1918–1998)

Jan Blüml – Ádám Ignácz

Badatelé zabývající se populární hudbou se obecně shodují, že obor „Popular Music Studies“ vznikl zejména z iniciativy mladých sociologů na přelomu sedmdesátých a osmdesátých let 20. století na Západě, a to jako disciplína primárně zkoumající moderní populární hudbu, jakou je rock a pop. Takový výklad sdílí také řada akademiků ze zemí bývalého východního bloku. V důsledku této skutečnosti zůstává historie systematického výzkumu populární hudby v původních socialistických zemích z velké části neznámá a neprobádaná. Zájem o dané téma registrujeme teprve v posledních letech, což dokládá několik dílčích textů (českých, slovenských, polských a maďarských), které se však zaměřují výhradně na lokální problematiku. Předložená studie je vůbec prvním uceleným pojednáním, které sleduje dějiny výzkumu populární hudby jak v širším střeoevropském kontextu, konkrétně na příkladu české a maďarské situace, tak na delší časové ose 1918–1998. Studie se opírá o detailní analýzu rozsáhlého souboru českých a maďarských pramenů (archivních materiálů, publikovaných textů akademické i mimoakademické povahy – monografií, dílčích studií, článků v populárně hudebních magazínech apod.). Jejím cílem je ukázat specifika teoretické reflexe populární hudby v obou vybraných zemích, způsob a rozsah kontaktů mezi vědeckými komunitami daných zemí, to vše ve světle vývoje populární hudby i kulturní politiky.

Klíčová slova: české země; Československo; Maďarsko; výzkum populární hudby; muzikologie populární hudby; dějiny vědy; 20. století

HISTORY OF POPULAR MUSIC RESEARCH IN THE CZECH LANDS AND HUNGARY: CONTEXTS, PARALLELS, INTERRELATIONS (1918–1998)

Jan Blüml – Ádám Ignácz

Popular music scholars generally agree that the *popular music studies* discipline emerged between the mid-1970s and the early 1980s in Western Europe and North America, mainly on the initiative of young sociologists, and that it focuses primarily on modern pop-rock music. Many academics from the former Eastern bloc countries share this narrative. Consequently, the history of popular music's systematic exploration in this region remains largely unknown. Recent years, however, have witnessed growing interest in the history of popular music research in East-Central Europe, as shown by a few (Czech, Slovakian, Polish, and Hungarian) texts, albeit focusing exclusively on local issues. The present study is the first to deal with the history of popular music research between 1918 and 1998 in a wider Central European context, and the Czech lands and Hungary in particular. It provides a detailed analysis of an extensive collection of Czech and Hungarian sources (archival materials and published texts of both an academic and non-academic nature – monographs, individual studies, articles in popular music magazines, and so on). It aims to show the specifics of theoretical reflection on popular music in both states and the manner and extent of the contacts between the respective scholarly communities in light of developments in popular music and cultural policy.

Key words: Czech lands; Czechoslovakia; Hungary; popular music research; musicology of popular music; history of scholarship; 20th century