

# Contemplating Alternative Musicology in Contemporary South Korea

## A call for "Integrative Musicology"

Chae Hyun-kyung  
*Seoul National University*

Scholarly discourse or the systematic study of music was first introduced to South Korea in the 1970s. It has been called by various terms, *umakhak* [musicology], *minjok umakhak* [Korean musicology], *chongjok umakhak* [ethnomusicology], or even *umak illyuhak* [anthropology of music]. However, while the West has undergone enormous changes in the field of musicology in the last two decades, its counterpart in South Korea has not made much progress since its inception. Several notable changes in the West are: (1) the integration of the two poles of musicology (historical and ethnomusicology) by studying both text and context in music research; (2) becoming inclusive, encompassing all types of music and various approaches from diverse disciplines; (3) incorporating methodologies of the humanities which emphasize the importance of subjective voices of cultural insiders; and most of all, (4) constant search for an improved guideline for world music research. While these changes continually re-evaluate and re-define the field of musicology and can directly influence Korean musicology as well as the position of Korean music scholarships in the world, the musicology in South Korea has been stagnant. Even the researchers of traditional music who can greatly benefit from the adoption of ethnomusicological methods in studying Korean music are reluctant to accept the discipline (Park 1998).

In this paper, I will first discuss the current trend in Western musicology to show ways in which Western musicologists, regardless of their musical orientations, search to make the field of world music research an inclusive discipline. Following a brief assessment of the current state of musicology in South Korea, I will then analyze the reasons why Korean musicologists have

marginalized or neglected alternative musicology by examining unique situations in contemporary South Korea in comparison to its neighboring cultures, especially those of China (Wong 1988; Yang 1998) and Japan (Tsuge 1996). Finally I will call for “integrative” musicology for the future of Korean music research.

### **Current trends in Western musicology**

Since the 1960s, several significant changes have occurred in Western musicology, especially in the field of ethnomusicology, and those changes have affected a wide spectrum of musicology, e.g., methodology, focus of research, areas of study, scholarships and the dynamics between the two long-held poles of musicology, i.e., historical musicology (straight musicology) and ethnomusicology (the other or alternative musicology).

The most remarkable change is in the methodologies conceived, reshaped, and integrated within a very short time period, reflecting the scholars’ constant search for a better way to study music. Changes in methodologies began in the 1960s and 70s with anthropologists entering the field (Merriam 1964; Blacking 1973; Geertz 1973). These anthropologists called for socio-cultural approaches in music research. Music was until then considered as an independent object and its study was limited to sound only. As the contextual studies enhanced the understanding of music, it was also the beginning of a rising status of ethnomusicology, eventually becoming an alternative canon in both camps. Historical musicologists, including such a well-known figure as Charles Seeger, also began to realize the importance of contextual study.

The humanistic approach was adopted in the 1980s. In his 1982 article, “Towards a Humanizing Ethnomusicology,” Gourlay was called to humanize ethnomusicology. He asserted that music was not art or skill, but an “affecting presence” for humans. He proposed the ABCs in music research as following the tri-part form of Merriam. A is the “affective” or Armstrong field (Armstrong is the anthropologist who came up with the original idea of music being an affective being). B is for Blacking’s field or field of change (I will discuss this later) and C is the field of condition, context and conceptualization (pp. 412-3). Gourlay’s C is identical with Merriam’s, although the model was reshaped with a new focus of music research and a new definition of music. His proposition of the humanistic approaches in music research dismissed scientific methodologies in musicology of the past, which reflected the general trend of the 1980s.

In the 1980s, ethnomusicology included historical approaches to world

music research. In 1987, Tim Rice proposed a new model in his article, "Toward the Remodeling of Ethnomusicology." His approach was drawn from Geertz's idea about music. Clifford Geertz, in his book, *The Interpretation of Culture* (1973), states that music is a symbolic system: "It is historically constructed, socially maintained and individually applied (pp. 363-4)." Rice's syncretic effort of incorporating historical aspects in ethnomusicology was positively received (Crawford 1987: 511-3), especially by historical musicologists. Richard Crawford, an American historical musicologist, for instance, praises Rice's approach as it combines the two divided fields of musicology into one.

The focus of research interests has also changed in the 1970s from the studying of music as a "product" to "process" (Nettl 1992). John Blacking, in his famous article, "The Study of Musical Change" (1984), emphasized the importance of studying musical changes in order to understand the people, culture, and society where the music is made and practiced. He stated that "the study of musical change ... may reveal not only how people have changed their music, but also how, through the medium of music, people can change themselves in unexpected ways (1978: 21, 23)." His view not only underscores the importance of musical changes but also stresses the importance of human aspects in music research. The study of musical changes eventually led to various issues of recent research, such as acculturation, syncretism, Westernization, modernization, nationalism, identity, and so on.

Another important change is in the ever-expanding area of study in ethnomusicology. As opposed to historical musicology having European art music as its only research domain, ethnomusicology has become highly inclusive in its area of study, encompassing all types of music and accepting diverse approaches of various disciplines. Since the 1970s, popular music has become a new area of study in ethnomusicology and new types of scholars from sociology and cultural studies have enriched the music scholarships (Feld 1984, 1994; Keil 1987, 1994, 1995; Shepherd 1992). These scholars call for new ways of evaluating or thinking about music. The traditional view of musical greatness that has been associated with only European art music (Meyer 1965) is challenged (Keil 1987). The populist methodology insists on examining music from "below." Musicology has always stayed up, distancing itself far from the "real" place where the music is being made and received. These scholars call for "participation" in music research as a participant rather than being just an observer.

One of the most important changes in the West in relation to Asian music research in my view is the increasing importance of the native or cultural

insiders' voice. Lately, the humanistic approach and ethical concern have certainly influenced this change (I am brief here since I will talk about this issue later in my conclusion).

I might have appeared to argue that changes have occurred only in ethnomusicology since the 1960s. This is not because I am one of the other musicologists (meaning ethnomusicologists) but because active changes have actually occurred mainly in ethnomusicology. Then, what have historical musicologists been doing during that time? There has not been much development in the historical musicology side, except for reactions to the rising status of ethnomusicology as an alternative research method. Many historical musicologists have accepted ethnomusicology as an alternative methodology and coped with such changes (Kerman 1985). Of course, there were some uncomfortable feelings expressed. For instance, Gilbert Chase (1972), although he accepts a new socio-cultural studies approach, calls ethnomusicology Cultural Musicology. His statement reveals the uneasiness toward ethnomusicology and what it implies. On the other hand, several influential scholars of the historical side, including Charles Seeger, promoted the importance of contextual studies of ethnomusicology through their research and education. Nowadays, in North America at least, it is politically correct to accept the contextual studies as an important aspect of music research, regardless of the origin of music or researcher's training. Therefore, the rift between the two fields has narrowed as both began to accept the contextual studies as an alternative approach to music.

### **Current state of musicology in contemporary South Korea**

The beginning of musicology in South Korea can be traced back to the 1970s when the first generation of musicologists (both historical musicologists and ethnomusicologists) trained abroad returned to Korea; also some foreign musicologists (ethnomusicologists) have come to Korea to study Korean music. Musicology seemed to be the future direction for the field of music in South Korea as the newly arrived musicologists started to teach courses that were related to music history and theory. The music curricula and teaching methods of the West came along with the musicologists and a new set of music curricula in major universities of the West were implemented in South Korea. Needs for an independent musicology program have been widely discussed. However, there was no musicology program at either the undergraduate or graduate level back then and still almost is non-existent even now. Nonetheless, the influx of musicologists, though affiliated with the "other" music departments

(usually performance-oriented ones), have stimulated the need for systematic studies of music in Korea. Many students have been inspired by their teaching and have gone abroad to study following their forerunners' footsteps.

Most of the students in the 1970s and 80s are now coming back with great hopes, and the number of musicologists have increased from only a few in the 1970s to a much greater number (most of them not being tenured and thus having no influence in the policy making process). Now almost two decades have passed and the need for musicology programs at universities seems overwhelming as university curricula have continued to be modeled after those of the United States. For example, according to Park's list of ethnomusicology courses at the undergraduate and graduate levels in South Korea (Park 1998: 71), most courses taught in the West are being taught in South Korea, especially in all the major universities.

Then, why are we not optimistic about the future of musicology in South Korea? While stating a great need for musicology programs as if this is the most urgent matter in music education in Korea, departments of music filled with performance-oriented personnel are still promoting only performances and neglecting historical and theoretical music education. The Korean National University of Arts is the only one in South Korea which has a program titled musicology. Furthermore, incoherent use of the term, musicology, in higher education also creates much doubt. Many graduate programs in music bear the title, musicology, even though the program is in reality a joint program of performance, composition, and in some cases theory as well. The term, musicology, in this case is used simply to indicate higher level of music education.

### **Reasons behind marginalizing musicology program in contemporary South Korea**

I am a student of the first generation of musicologists who went to the United States to study musicology. Since my return to South Korea in 1996, I have been experiencing both optimism and skepticism. Having taught courses in both historical musicology and ethnomusicology at major universities (precisely 5 different ones this semester) in Korea for the past four years, I have observed this extraordinary paradoxical phenomenon of recognizing the need but not actually establishing musicology programs in the universities. In my view there are three major reasons for this.

First, there has not been a firm establishment of musicology which we can use as a model in Korea. The problem starts with the way that musicology

has entered the Korean music community. It did not come in through the front door but entered through the back door. Since there were no musicology departments, musicologists joined universities by becoming faculty members of the “wrong” department. Therefore, the need for establishing independent musicology programs in higher education has been reduced considerably as new musicologists found their temporary “homes.” This arrangement has served both the school administration and musicologists well for the time being. The universities could reduce cost by not establishing an additional department and musicologists at least found a place to teach and research, though the arrangement was not the best. Consequently, musicologists responsible for serving both fields have been forced to slow down their research considerably and in turn have lost energy to promote the field of musicology in Korea.

The very first independent musicology program was established at the Korean National University of Arts (KNUA) in 1997. Its program can be said to be ethnomusicology-oriented. Its main research area is Korean music and adopts the methodology of ethnomusicology. I truly hope that this program will provide a firm ground on which we can build solid programs of Korean musicology. It is interesting to note that Lee Kang-sook, the president of KNUA, is not a musicologist in a strict sense (his degree was in music education). With solid ethnomusicology training from the University of Michigan and his desire to launch a system of Korean musicology, he established the Musicology Department at his university. He believes that Korean musicology has to be different from Western musicology in that foremost it should provide an environment for creating a musical mother tongue. In his two important books on musicology, *Ethnomusicology and Culture* (1982) and *Korean Musicology* (1990), Lee calls for active participation in the process.

Compared to China and Japan, South Korea appears to continue dragging her feet since the slow start. Since ethnomusicology was first introduced to Japan in 1950 (Tsuge 1996: 153), many programs have been established at various universities and produced several internationally renowned musicologists such as Yosihiko Tokumaru and Genich Tsuge. In China, Western ethnomusicology has been established since the 1980s (Wong 1991) and changed the nature of music research in the country. For example, anthropological and socio-cultural studies of music influenced by Western musicology are becoming a major part of musical approach and the historical study of music (Yang 1998). Many important books on ethnomusicology have been translated for general use and many native scholars are making their names on international stages (Wong 1991).

The second reason for the lack of musicology programs in Korea is due to the deeply rooted societal thinking or belief system that generates class divisions. Like Western versus Korean, old versus young, man versus woman, and so on, many aspects in Korea are often dichotomized. It is no exception in the field of music — Western music versus Korean music, art music versus popular music, and traditional music versus new music. Dual division of music in Korea stems from the traditional way of dividing music. Korean traditional music has been largely divided into two categories: elite music, and folk music. This division also reflects the social stratum. Elite music, also called "*chǒngak*" (meaning right music), was appreciated by the nobility, and folk music was by the commoners. Just as the lifestyle of each class was different, so is their evaluation of musical ideal (Hwang 1985: 32).

In contemporary South Korea, there has been much effort to reduce class division. Such effort has been reflected in the newly-composed traditional music combining the two poles of music, elite and folk. However, the rift between the two still prevails along with societal prejudice. This has been one of the critical reasons for divided scholarships in Korea, especially between Western music and Korean music. Western music, which came with Western civilization since the late 19th century, has been promoted in Korea throughout the 20th century. Western economic systems and political systems have made a big contribution to the modernization process of South Korea. Many people believed that Western music represents the modernity in music of Korea. On the other hand, Korean traditional music, which has barely survived political and cultural colonialism in the 20th century, represents pain and hardship of the past, not the glory, of Korea and her people. With the vigorous support by the government, Korean traditional music has gained its legitimacy in the Korean musicscape lately. However, promotion by the government has often been so political that private sectors, including academia are still highly reluctant to accept Korean music, old and new, as the main stream music of Korea.

In the midst of the dichotomy being established between Western music and Korean music, Western musicology was introduced and its system again divided the music of Korea into two categories in their research, Western-oriented versus Korean. The field of Western ethnomusicology which includes Korean music as its research object even further divides elite music and folk music of Korean traditional music. Most first-generation ethnomusicologists practicing the original division of the West assert that Korean traditional music, especially elite music which have been the domain of their research area does not belong to the category of Western

ethnomusicology but of historical musicology. Only the folk music belongs to the category of ethnomusicology. They dismiss ethnomusicology in their research. Most native scholars, at least the ones at major universities in Korea, have mainly been studying the elite music tradition of Korean music. Therefore, Western ethnomusicology has had almost no chance of penetrating its place in Korean scholarships.

Despite continually changing definitions, models, and methodologies, the search to realize a field of study capable of encompassing all music has remained a guiding principle of the discipline of Western musicology. Western ethnomusicology is for Korean scholars still widely perceived as ethnocentric and oriented predominantly towards the study of "others" music by Western scholars and the main research areas are still oral tradition and folk music.

Many scholars of Korean traditional music distance themselves from Western ethnomusicology and redefine the field in the way that is suitable to Korea. The first-generation ethnomusicologists often divide Korean musicology into two divisions: historical musicology and ethnomusicology, or Korean historical musicology and folk musicology. While these divisions may be valid in terms of their own research areas, such divisions are merely direct imports of the Western classification system. While the inclusive, syncretic nature and contextual methodology of "new" ethnomusicology of the West can enhance the much-belated study of Korean traditional music (Korea started in 1959 as opposed to 1912 in China and 1936 in Japan), why are we still dividing Korean music scholarships and reluctant to accept the changes in Western musicology?

Lately, cultural insiders' voices on world music research have become enormously important (Nettl 1992: 393-4) and differences in analyses are being presented with a new method called dialogism (Bahktin 1985). Dialogue between insiders and outsiders as a way of looking into music and people of different cultures rather than simple dialectical approaches can create a new environment for hitherto Western-centered World music scholarship. I believe what we are doing in this conference is the format for that dialogue.

The third reason for the slow establishment of musicology programs in higher education lies in the attitude of the people who can make a difference. Koreans have gone through political and cultural colonialism throughout the 20th century and before. Therefore, the rise of nationalism in the 1970s commenced by the intellectuals certainly created a mood for selective acceptance of overtly Western influences on the nation. Westerners' or outsiders' impact on Korean society has been so great that its reaction has

been equally skeptical. Some traditional Korean music specialists assert that the methodology of Western ethnomusicologists may have been useful only when that of traditional Korean musicological study was not established and thus Westerners' research on Korean music is now no longer persuasive.

Has the methodology of traditional Korean music study been established? While I can understand his uneasiness towards influences of "others," I am not sure of the establishment of Korean scholarships and methodologies on Korean traditional music at this point. This kind of open dismissal of ethnomusicology has aggravated societal prejudice against the field and has been an obstacle to not only the understanding of Western musicology but also the development of Korean musicology. Western musicology is continually moving towards an inclusive nature and developing its methods for universal purposes. We do not have to accept it without critical evaluation, yet we must give it a try.

In order to establish more musicology programs in Korea, we need to change our attitude and seek help from everyone in the music field, especially ones with the power to make changes. Think about the musicologists in the United States who have helped build the field of ethnomusicology, such as Manfred Bukofzer, D.J. Grout, Gustav Reese, and Charles Seeger and others (Lee 1982: 73-85). I strongly believe that it is now the time to think about social responsibility. As long as our music education is being one-sided, meaning heavily performance-oriented or Western oriented, music of Korea will not withstand in the global age of the 21st century. How many musicologists of international recognition do we have? How many books on Korean music published outside of Korea? How many indigenous performers or scholars trained within our culture have succeeded in obtaining international claim? Most of our well-known performers or scholars are the ones who have received their advanced training abroad. We have a lot to catching up to do. Do you want to be just satisfied by maintaining your position and the current state of music in South Korea?

### **Integrative musicology for Korean music research**

As a conclusion, I would now like to contemplate the future of musicology in Korea. We are living at the very edge of the 20th century. However, the current situation in Korea reminds me of what Blacking said three decades ago in his famous book, *How Musical Is Man?* (1973: 3):

Ethnomusicology is a comparatively new word which is widely used to refer to the study of different musical systems of the world. Its seven syllables do not give it any aesthetic advantage over the pentasyllable "musicology," but at least they may remind us that the people of many so-called "primitive" cultures used seven-tone scales and harmony long before they heard the music of western Europe."

He then goes on to say that, "We need a cumbersome word to restore the balance to a world music that threatens to fly up into clouds of elitism."

In contemporary South Korea where the elitism in music is widespread, I call for "Integrative Musicology" for our future direction. First, in order to achieve integration of the divisions of musicology, historical musicology and ethnomusicology, and their methodologies should be combined, thus the analysis of both music and context could pioneer new ways to analyzing music and music history in Korea. Second, Integrative Musicology should include human aspects. Musicology came from the above (Kerman 1985) and its distance from the below where music is being made and received has been a hindrance to understanding Korean music. As Gourlay (1982) states, music is an affecting presence which can constantly establish the close relationship with "us." If we do not consider the human in our research, the understanding of music will never be comprehensive. Third, we must also integrate different methodologies from different fields through interdisciplinary or transdisciplinary studies. Seoul National University, the leading University in South Korea, has recently established a graduate program in musicology. It is too early to predict its outcome, but it is comforting to know that its aim is doing interdisciplinary research.

Lastly and most importantly, we have to dialogue in our effort to integrate musicology. Here dialoguing is not just a conversation to reach a unified conclusion. It is a method which can present two different ideas simultaneously. It began in literature. Mikhail Bakhtin (1895-1975), a Russian philosopher who has early on in his life moved so frequently and thus always tried to understand cultural differences, conceived the idea of "dialogism." Musicology for a long time employed dialectical approaches in the analysis of music and differences which were often buried in what we called an "objective" view. The idea of simultaneous acceptance of different views will shed a new light to the problem of emic/etic in world music research. Now cultural insiders' subjective views can be presented and we will have a chance to dialogue with other scholars even outside the country. In Korea, long dichotomized fields of music need much dialoguing and we should not be afraid of "heterophony" and should not always pursue "unison and harmony" in our debate (Rice 1987).

I urge Korean music scholars to come together, though we have “travelled in different directions, yet report back to each other what we have seen, heard, or discovered on our travels” (Charles Seeger 1977: 102-38), to build Korean musicology. Our dialogue will stimulate the native scholarships and eventually solidify our role in the world music research.

Isn't “Integrative Musicology” a cumbersome word? Yes, but I feel that we must come up with a new term for Korean musicology if that means Koreans can get rid of deeply-rooted societal prejudice toward particular areas of study. I chose the word “Integrative” not just because of its meaning of unifying different things to make a whole but because of its implication, “to remove social barriers imposing segregation upon” (Webster's New Word Dictionary 1972). We need to integrate differences through dialogue and integrative musicology will offer that chance in developing Korean musicology.

## Bibliography

Armstrong, Robert P.

1971 *The Affecting Presence*. Evanston: Northwestern University Press.

Ayto, John

1990 *Dictionary of Word Origins*. New York: Arcade Publishing.

Blacking, John

1973 *How Musical is Man?* Seattle: University of Washington Press (trans. by 채현경. 서울: 민음사, 1998).

1977 “Some Problems of Theory and Method in the Study of Musical Change.” *Yearbook of the International Folk Music Council* 9: 1-26.

1984 “The Study of Music as Cultural System and Human Capability.” *South African Journal of Musicology* 4: 1-15.

1995 *Music, Culture, & Experience: Selected Papers of John Blacking*, ed. by Reginald Byron. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Chae, Hyun-kyung [채현경]

1996 “음악 인류학(Anthropology of Music)의 최근 연구 동향”. 『민족음악학』 제18호: 31-62.

2000 “대안음악학을 생각한다”. 『음악학 7』, 한국음악학학회.

Chase, Gilbert

1972 “American Musicology and the Social Sciences,” *Perspectives in Musicology*, ed. by Barry S. Brook, Edward D.E. Downes, and Sherman van Solkema. New York: Norton, 202-26.

Clark, Katerina & Michael Holquist

1984 *Mikhail Bakhtin*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Crawford, Richard

1987 “Response to Tim Rice.” *Ethnomusicology* 31(3): 511-3.

Feld, Steven

- 1982 *Sound and Sentiment: Birds, Weeping, Poetics, and Song in Kaluli Expression*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Geertz, Clifford  
1973 *The Interpretation of Cultures*. London: Hutchinson.  
1983 "Arts as Cultural System." *Local Knowledge*. New York: Basic Books.
- Gourlay, Kenneth A.  
1982 "Towards a Humanizing Ethnomusicology." *Ethnomusicology* 26(3): 411-20.
- Holquist, Michael  
1990 *Dialogism: Bakhtin and His World*. New York: Routledge.
- Hur, Young-han [허영한]  
1996 "음악학의 위기: 우리의 음악학 환경에 대한 진단". 『낭만음악』 통권33호: 173-84.
- Hwang, Byung-ki  
1985 "Some Notes on Korean Music and Aspects of Its Aesthetics." *The World of Music* 27(2): 32-48.
- Keil, Charles  
1987 "Participatory Discrepancies and the Power of Music." *Cultural Anthropology* 2(3): 275-283.  
1995 "The Theory of Participatory Discrepancies: A Progress Report." *Ethnomusicology* 39(1): 1-20.
- Keil, Charles, and Steven Feld  
1994 *Music Grooves*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Kerman, Joseph  
1985 *Contemplating Music: Challenges to Musicology*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Lee, Kang-sook [이강숙]  
1980 『열린 음악의 세계』. 서울: 현음사.  
1982 『종족음악과 문화』. 서울: 민음사.  
1985 『음악적 모국어론을 위하여』. 서울: 은애.  
1990 『한국음악학』. 서울: 민음사.
- McClary, Susan  
1991 *Feminine Endings: Music, Gender, and Sexuality*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Merriam, Alan P.  
1964 *The Anthropology of Music*. Evanston: Northwestern University Press.
- Meyer, Leonard B.  
1956 *Emotion and Meaning in Music*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.  
1967 *Music, the Arts and Ideas*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Nettl, Bruno  
1978 "Some Aspects of the History of World Music in the Twentieth Century: Questions, Problems, and Concepts." *Ethnomusicology* 22(1): 123-36.  
1992 "Recent Directions in Ethnomusicology." *Ethnomusicology: An Introduction*, ed. by Helen Myers. New York: W.W. Norton, 375-400.
- Palisca, Claude V. and Holoman D. Kern  
1982 *Musicology in the 1980s: Methods, Goals, Opportunities*. New York: Da Capo Press.
- Park, Mi-kyung [박미경]

- 1997 "음악학, 우리의 음악학은 어디에 있는가". 『음악과 민족』 제13호: 5-7.
- 1998 "What Is Ethnomusicology in Korea: An Evaluation of Its Current Status." *Tongyang Umak*, Vol. 20: 61-93.
- Rice, Timothy  
1987 "Toward the Remodeling of Ethnomusicology." *Ethnomusicology* 31(3): 469-88.
- Seeger, Anthony  
1987 "So We Need to Remodel Ethnomusicology?" *Ethnomusicology* 31(3): 491-5.
- Seeger, Charles  
1977 *Studies in Musicology 1935-1975*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.
- Shepherd, John  
1991 *Music as Social Text*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Shepherd, John, and Peter Wicke  
1997 *Music and Cultural Theory*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Solie, Ruth A.  
1993 *Musicology and Difference*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: The University of California Press.
- Song, Bang-song [송방송]  
1985 "Present State of Research on Korean Traditional Music." *The World of Music* 27(2): 63-77.  
1998 『한국음악학의 방향』. 서울: 예술.
- Titon, Jeff Todd  
1988 *Powerhouse of God: Speech, Chant, and Song in an Appalachian Baptist Church*. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Todorov, Tzvetan  
1984 *Mikhail Bakhtin: The Dialogical Principle*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Toorn, Pieter van den  
1995 *Music, Politics, and the Academy*.
- Tsuge, Genichi [柘植元一]  
1996 "동양음악의 개념과 일본에서의 그 연구사". 『낭만음악』 통권33호. 서울: 낭만음악사. 145-55.
- Watkins, Glenn  
1994 *Pyramid*. New York: Schirmer Books.
- Witzleben, J. Lawrence  
1997 "Whose Ethnomusicology? Western Ethnomusicology and the Study of Asian Music." *Ethnomusicology* 41: 220-42.
- Wong, Isabel  
1991 "From Reaction to Synthesis: Chinese Musicology in the Twentieth Century." *Comparative Musicology and Anthropology of Music*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, pp. 37-55.
- Yang, Mu  
1998 "Current State and Methodology of Chinese Music Research in Mainland China." *Tongyang Umak*, Vol. 20: 19-38.
- Yi, Kon-yong [이건용] and Noh Dong-un [노동은]  
1991 『민족음악론』. 서울: 한길사.

〈요약〉

## 우리 음악 연구의 대안 'Integrative 음악학'의 모색<sup>1</sup>

채현경(서울대학교)

음악에 관한 학술적인 담화 또는 체계적인 연구는 1970년대에 우리 나라에 처음으로 소개되었고, 그 동안 음악학, 민족음악학, 종족음악학 및 음악인류학 등의 다양한 명칭으로 불러 왔다. 그러나 서구의 음악학이 지난 20년간 많은 변화를 거친 반면, 한국 음악학에는 이렇다 할 발전이 없었다.

서구의 음악학엔 다음과 같은 변화가 있었다. 두 갈래로 나누어져 있던 음악학, 즉 historical musicology와 ethnomusicology가 음악과 context를 같이 연구하는 방향으로 가고 있으며 통합의 길을 모색하고 있다. 둘째, 음악학이 그 연구의 범위 및 방법론에서 점점 더 포괄적으로 변하고 있다. 예를 들어, 이제껏 음악 연구에서 제외되었던 대중음악도 중요한 연구 대상으로 부각되었고 다른 학문 및 방법론 등이 수용되어 음악학을 더욱 더 통합적인 학문으로 만들고 있다. 셋째, 그 동안 사회과학적인 영향으로 객관적인 관찰 및 분석이 부각되어 문화외부자의 목소리만이 중시되어 왔던 음악학 학계가 인문학 등의 영향으로 인하여 문화내부자의 주관적인 의견을 중시하는 방향으로 변화했다. 즉 세계 음악계가 우리 음악 연구에 우리를 권위자로 생각하기 시작했다는 것이다. 마지막으로 세계 음악 연구에 더 나아가 가이드라인을 찾기 위하여 음악학계가 음악학을 discipline으로 또는 field로서 지속적인 재평가와 재정의의를 내리고 있다.

이러한 변화 중에서도 우리 음악학계가 중시해야 하는 변화는 첫째, 음악학의 소분과로 밖에 간주되지 않았던 ethnomusicology가 context의 연구도 포함하며 서구 및 비서구 음악 연구의 중요한 대안으로 성장하였고, 그 동안 서양 예술음악

<sup>1</sup>이 글의 한글 번역은 세계음악학회 학술지인 『음악과 문화』 창간호(1999)에 게재되어 출판되었다.

의 반응이기도 하다. 1970년 이후 한국사회에는 nationalism이 팽배하였고 이러한 세계, 외부로부터 정치적 또는 문화적으로 시민주의를 겪어온 한국의 지사 사회 관없이 그 방법론을 일기도 전에 사회적으로 비하된 평가를 받고 있는 것이다.

악학의 방법론이 우리 음악 연구에 어떠한 필요성 및 이점을 주는지는와는 전혀 상관이 없다. 음악역사학과 민족음악학으로 나누는 데까지 이어진다. 따라서 민족음악의 방법론은 사회의 계급 및 지식 정도를 반영한다. 이러한 문부는 서양음악과의 위치를 반영한다. 예를 들어, 한국 전통음악은 선비음악과 민속음악으로 분류될 것이다. 우리는 많은 것들을 이원적으로 분류하는데 이 분류는 매우 자주 사회 두 번째는 우리 사회 깊숙히 팽배하여 있는 사회적인 엘리트 사고방식을 그 이유 거둬와서 체계적으로 알려진 세계 또는 도쿠마루 같은 학자들을 배척하였다.

다. 우리의 이공인 인물은 1950년 민족음악학이 영입되었고 그 동안 많은 발전을 마련하지 못하고 있다. 첫 단추가 잘못 끼워졌기에 일어나는 인공의 연쇄 현상이 못한 음악학계의 풍토 속에 여러 학교에서 강의만 할 뿐 연구를 할 수 있는 여건을 마련하여 이끌어갈 수 있는 차세대들이 아직도 그 용타리를 찾지 못하고 진강하지 영향을 받고 외국에 나가 musicologist가 된 현재의 많은 음악학자들, 즉 학계를 후 학교 당국 및 학자들의 의지 부족으로 인하여, 지난 20년간 제1세대 학자들의 고가르칠 수 있는 환경이 제공되었기에 차선책이었지만 안주하여 버렸다. 그 이 시 음악학이라는 학과의 부재로 다른 학과로 영입되었고, 어떠한 상태는 연구하는 중요성을 인식하고 발전시켜 나갈 수 있는 영향력을 가진 제1세대 학자들은 음악계의 과묵함이 소개되었다. 음악대학 및 대학원의 음악학 계통의 학문들의 체계 자리를 찾기가 힘든 것이다. 서양의 대학 및 대학원의 교과과정은 도입하여 온 문제이다. 음악학은 정문이 아닌 뒷문으로 들어왔다. 즉, 잘못 내린 뿌리였기에 첫째는 음악학이 발전되어 나갈 수 있는 어떠한 뿌리가 아지 없다는 것이 가장 비고하여 살펴보았다. 필자는 그 이유를 세 가지로 보았다.

ethnomusicology를 간파하는지를 우리 나라의 독특한 상황을 중국 또는 일본과 비교한다는 주장은 70년대 이후 계속하여 거론하면서 대안음악학으로서의 학문의 중요파복으로 포함하였으며, 또한 음악대학에 음악학이라는 독립된 학과가 이 큰에서 필자는 왜 한국이 표면적으로는 민족음악학이라는 과목을 대학 및 대

의 연구에만 사용되었다는 명칭이 이제는 오히려 ethnomusicology를 뜻해야 한다고 주장하기에 이르렀다는 점이다. 둘째는 세계음악 연구에서 소외되었던 우리의 목소리가 중요하게 부상되었다는 것이다. 서구의 이러한 변화가 우리 음악 연구 및 세계 음악계의 우리 학자들의 참여에 직접적인 영향을 줄 수 있음에 도를 구하고 우리 음악학은 아직도 제자리걸음을 하고 있다. 서구의 구태의연한 음악역사학과 민족음악학의 이분법이 고스란히 그대로 옮겨져서 더욱 심화되었다. 특히 한국의 전통음악학자들은 우리 음악 연구의 민족음악학적 방법론의 도입을

사회적 현상이 외부의 관찰자가 우리를 대표하는 우리의 음악 및 문화를 그들의 '객관적'이며 '편파적'인 안목으로 연구하는 민족음악학을 무조건 받아들일 수 없었기 때문이다. 그 당시의 세계음악 연구는 다분히 편파적이었던 것이 사실이다. 그러나 그 동안의 많은 변화는 세계음악 연구에 우리를 절대적으로 필요로 하고 있고 초대하고 있다. 우리는 이러한 기회를 절대로 그냥 지나쳐서는 안된다.

필자는 우리가 서양 것을 답습하기보다는 서양의 변화를 예로 삼아 우리의 자체의 음악 연구 방법을 만들어야 한다고 생각한다. 그것이 바로 다름 아닌 'Integrative' 음악학이다. Integrative라는 말은 '통합하는' 또는 '완전하게 하는'이란 뜻 외에도 '인종 차별이 없는'이란 의미도 지니고 있다. 따라서 여러 갈래로 갈라져 있는 우리 음악학계는 편견 없이 '대화'를 통하여, 또는 서로 다른 의견을 변증법적으로 논하여 하나만의 결론을 유추하는 것이 아닌, 즉 서로 다른 것을 있는 그대로 동시에 받아들일 수 있는, 그래서 반드시 하나만이 옳은 것이 아닌 음악학을 만들어야 할 것이라고 생각한다. 우리가 "서로 다른 길을 걸어왔으나 우리가 그 동안에 본 것, 들은 것, 그리고 발견한 것들을 서로에게 알리며, 우리 스스로를 가르치 말고 함께 '대화'를 통하여 세계음악계에 적극적으로 참여할 것"을 호소한다. 우리의 대화적 참여는 안으로는 우리 음악학에 자극을 주고 밖으로는 음악학을 재정립하는 과정에 참여함으로써 세계 음악학계에서 우리의 위치를 확고히 해주리라고 믿는다.