

supply, but is vital if church music of any style is to be truly meaningful. This sifting must be done whenever one deals with new music—there are far less gems available in new music as it has not yet had time to be factored out on the basis of quality. This is why, at least in part, that contemporary worship music often pales drastically in comparison with established hymns. The hymnal is a collection of gems that have stood the test of time. There have, undoubtedly, been hundreds of hymns every bit as hackneyed as that praise chorus you cannot stand, but thankfully they have been swept up in history's dustbin. It will take years for a serious repertory of "contemporary" worship music to be amassed, and by that time, there will be a new genre pressing for inclusion.

In Tune with God is a must-read for those even remotely involved in planning or presenting worship services, and for anyone wishing to learn more about the sometimes-turbulent saga of church music. We all owe Lilianne Doukhan a debt of gratitude.

Southern Adventist University

KEN PARSONS

Doukhan, Lilianne. *In Tune with God*. Hagerstown, MD: Review and Herald, 2010. 301 pp. Hardcover, \$24.99.

I have argued that at the heart of the worship and music wars is the matter of culture. At the outset of her work, Lilianne Doukhan, Associate Professor of Music at Andrews University, recognizes the cultural nature of music, stating unequivocally that true artists speak to their culture and have something to say to their society: "Through their works composers celebrate life, comment on life, express their view of life, draw attention to issues in society, protest, criticize, accuse, stir awareness and consciousness, or drive home a reality" (18). Music, worship, and, indeed, all of life is cultural. Therefore, a person's appreciation of consonance and dissonance is subjectively based upon one's cultural comfort zone. The harmonic language that Westerners find so appealing took centuries to evolve to the satisfactory familiar perspective from which we argue for our music as superior *vis-à-vis* other cultural music or other contemporary nonclassical music.

Doukhan notes that "A given melodic turn, a particular chord progression, a rhythmic pattern, or a specific instrument may evoke a number of different meanings" (33). The reason for this is because music is an acquired experience. "Music does not happen in a vacuum but is intimately tied with, and carried by, a given culture or society" (38). Context and education give music its meaning. "There is no universal way music is appreciated in different cultural settings" (39; cf. 58). She gives a number of good examples of this statement of fact. The illustration I regularly use is that of Bob Marley's first visit to Russia. After performing his first number, the audience politely applauded as they would after hearing a Rachmaninoff piano concerto. Marley responded

by telling the audience that this was not the way to respond to reggae. He had to educate them on how to move and gyrate to the rhythm and sounds. They had to be educated into Jamaican culture.

Doukhan debunks the concept that elements of music such as beat, rhythm, and syncopation are evil in themselves. Nor are they evil because their origins are in the spirit world of Africa. Such postulations are based on “misinformation, ignorance, or simply prejudice” (23). She painstakingly demonstrates both the neutrality of these elements as well as their universality. For example, the fact that syncopation is a basic rhythmic feature of Western European music since the Middle Ages was an enlightening discovery. It was imported to Louisiana by early French settlers. Africans incorporated this feature into their music, with jazz being the resultant hybrid.

Doukhan’s arguments and illustrations are an important positive contribution to the worship wars. The issues at stake have nothing to do with biblical orthodoxy or soteriological morality. It is all about culture. She also rightly recognizes that the biblical perspective on worship addresses human beings as a whole: the body, emotions, and mind. She strongly urges for a balance to be struck between the cognitive and the emotive elements of music. “Addressing both mind and heart is still essential for today’s worship,” she writes (102). Very little, however, is said about the body, and when it is addressed (at least in one place), it is identified as “our senses” (37). I wish to argue that the “body” should not only refer to the senses, but also to the physical elements. The fear of dancing as a part of the worship experience has led to denigrating the use and movement of the body in worship. This, of course, arises out of the Greek dichotomy of the body and soul—the former being evil and in need of suppression, the latter good and in need of elevation. Holistic worship, however, must incorporate the physical. Many cultures, such as the African cultures, use bodily movements as worshipful sacrifices to God. Just as the music prior to the sermon sets the heart in tune to hear a cognitive sermon, so music can set the pace for a physical expression of worship.

The issue of sacred versus secular is an issue of wholeness, Doukhan proposes. She notes that “There is no such thing as inherently sacred music, neither by the use of a particular instrument or genre nor by a given musical style. Our interpretation of music as sacred is also a learned experience” (44). It is the religious community that “needs to determine which musical language belongs to *its own cultural setting*, and which is appropriate to express the values attached to the sacred and supernatural as they are understood within that given culture or subculture” (46). I agree strongly with her on this point. Again, I draw on the Jamaican context: Marley and reggae music, which were anathema to most devout Christians just a few decades (or maybe just a few years) ago, have now found pride of place in the Anglican hymnal, resulting in “One love!/. . . Let’s get together and feel all right”

now recognized as a Christian hymn, sung with luster and danced with vibrancy on many a Sunday morning in Church of England sanctuaries across the nation!

Doukhan is correct that we must “distinguish between the aesthetic (spiritual) experience and a religious experience; they are not equivalent” (48). She is also correct in rejecting the Platonic dichotomy between the spiritual and material world in terms of good and bad. However, I would not limit the spiritual to the realm of the aesthetic. Spiritual is the overarching concept. The opposite of spiritual is not material or secular. The antonym is “profane.” There can be sacred versus secular—that is, something set apart for a special purpose versus something for general use; the sacred or the religious can be profane or it can be spiritual. The same is true for the secular. The focus of the spiritual is the triune God, while the center of the profane is self. For example, when Marley wrote “One Love” it was out of a deep Rastafarian religious experience. However, the popular (what some would call “secular”) society took it over and made it profane in the self-centered culture of drugs and sex. The religious world has now rebaptized it and filled it with its original alterocentric spirituality—an other-centeredness with its center in Jesus Christ.

All music can be appropriately performed (which is not the best word because worship is not a performance, as Doukhan correctly argues) in the public worship service if Christ is at the center. That is what makes it “spiritual.” Whether it comes originally from nonreligious or religious settings, music must be Christocentric for it to be acceptable for the worship experience. In this vein, I would suggest that her historical (and theological?) discussion of *contrafacta* (the technique of borrowing entire tunes and songs from secular or religious traditions without substantially changing the music) is worth the price of the book. This excellent discussion, beginning on p. 166, but highlighted throughout the work, should put to rest once and for all the arguments of those who see worldly influences creeping into the church when so-called secular music is incorporated into the worship liturgy.

Doukhan’s timid opposition to clapping in church (96) is a classic example of the cultural nature of worship. She notes that “people would never think to clap after a prayer.” In African (American) culture, all expressions are accepted if they come from the soul. I have often experienced much clapping, moaning, shouting, and rich and soft amens during a powerful prayer. As I visit churches today, I find that clapping has replaced the traditional amen and/or the nonresponse of more Eurocentric congregations. Clapping as a response is not only done after the musical selection, but it is the response of choice throughout the entire service, especially during a heart-touching sermon.

Walla Walla University
College Place, Washington

PEDRITO U. MAYNARD-REID