A number of typos and awkward sentences mar the book. Since one assumes that English is not the writer’s first language, he should not shoulder the blame for the numerous grammatical mistakes and spelling errors. Rather, they betray substandard editorial work. Examples include: “bij” for “by” (61); “M. Oehming” for “M. Oeming” (63); the reference to n. 7 on p. 72 should actually be to n. 8; “helpes” for “helps” (73); “modelled” for “modeled” (76); “Read Sea” for “Red (or Reed) Sea” (77); “inclusing” for “including”; and “I like to thank” should state, “I would like to thank” (86).

Nevertheless, Beentjes has provided a fine volume of carefully researched articles that represents a worthy, if not highly original, contribution to the ongoing research on Chronicles. A festschrift honoring his work on Ben Sira and Chronicles is forthcoming this year (J. Corley and H. Van Grol, eds., Rewriting Biblical History: Essays on Chronicles and Ben Sira in Honour of Pancratius C. Beentjes, Deuterocanonical and Cognate Literature Studies 7 [Berlin: Walter de Gruyter 2011]). It is hoped that his two-volume commentary on Chronicles (hitherto available only in Dutch) will also appear in an English edition.

Berrien Springs, Michigan

Jeff Hudson


As a musically voracious teenager in the 1970s with a strong interest in my faith, I read everything I could find published by the church on music. However, the general tenor of most of it bothered me, condemning as it did entire genres of music as evil—insidiously inflicting spiritual, moral, and even physical harm on all who dared listen. In 1983, as a capstone project for the Honors program at Walla Walla College, I wrote a paper titled “A History of Appropriateness in Protestant Church Music.” What I discovered was that controversy over church music has been brewing, and in many cases boiling over, for hundreds of years. The project gave me an even greater sense that music’s reputation had been unjustly besmirched by many church writers, and left me with an abiding interest in books on music, the mind, and spirit. Hence, I was eager to read Lilianne Doukhan’s new book, In Tune with God. I was delighted to find the book impeccably researched, carefully thought out, and clearly and convincingly written. While the entire book has much to recommend it, I will focus on Doukhan’s efforts to restore music’s good name. Doukhan brings a wealth of experience from her scholarship as
a pianist, associate professor of music history and musicology at Andrews University, and her experience as a well-traveled citizen of the world.

A cardinal argument made by earlier writers is that certain rhythms, chords, and even entire genres of popular music are at best “damaged goods” and more likely simply evil. This notion always struck me as somehow Gnostic in its equating a part of the created order with evil. During the Middle Ages, the church adamantly denounced the interval of the tritone (three whole steps) as *diabolus en musica*—“the Devil in the music”—and forbade its use. With time, this prohibition faded, and today every hymn on every page of every Christian hymnal contains tritones. In spite of many similar prohibitions that have eventually wilted, commentators have continued to rail against the “evils” of various instruments and styles. Doukhan incisively traces this objection back to the Greek doctrine of “ethos” and the Platonic view of the spiritual world as the only true reality. Music was held to be a sign of this spiritual reality and was, therefore, able to effect spiritual and emotional changes in listeners. Musical scales believed to upset listeners’ emotional equilibriums were banned by the Greeks (47-52).

Doukhan contrasts this philosophy with the biblical perspective, in which the power to transform lives belongs not to created objects or elements, but to the Holy Spirit (53). Unlike the Greeks who conceived of good and evil as residing in concepts such as harmony and dissonance, Bible writers describe good and evil as obedience or disobedience to the law of God (54, cf. Mark 7:15). When it comes to music, however, church leaders have tended and continue to side with Plato and Aristotle rather than Jesus and Paul.

So is Doukhan saying that music is neutral, completely powerless? Certainly not. “The real power of music lies in its ability to transform a given situation, namely, to intensify, to beautify, to stimulate, to create associations, and to build community” (62). In my experience, and perhaps Doukhan’s as well, it is the associative phenomenon that is most powerful in shaping human response to music. We all have specific associations with individual pieces of music: for me, *Day is Dying in the West* will forever conjure up vivid images of Sabbath vespers in the Walla Walla College Church, while *A Bicycle Built for Two* reminds me of my son as a three year old (he learned to sing it at daycare!). Many of us have shared associations. Elgar’s “Pomp and Circumstance,” March No. 1 reminds us of countless graduations, while Tchaikovsky’s *1812 Overture* evokes Fourth of July fireworks. Entire styles of music have been linked in this fashion to various activities; for many in my grandparents’ and parents’ generations, jazz was and always will be the music of bars and brothels, and, therefore, unacceptable for Christian enjoyment. For nearly all of my students, though, it’s just another style to be explored and enjoyed. All of us, however, must recognize that these associations can be personally intense for some. In addition, it must be remembered by those holding personal views on what certain styles mean that even widely held
community associations may change over time as the circumstances previously linked with a piece or a style change. With concerted effort, associations may even be deliberately changed. Because of these factors, all of us must think and act charitably toward those with different associative constructs than our own. Doukhan aptly cites 1 Corinthians 8 in this regard, suggesting that substituting music-related terms for food-related ones is helpful for seeing the relevant application (122-123).

Having established that music or any of its constituent elements have no inherent moral qualities, but can be marshaled to reinforce either good or evil, Doukhan cites the varied efforts of church leaders through the ages to advance the gospel through music. She finds the most positive, energetic example in the ministry of Martin Luther. Luther used music for evangelism, worship, and community-building through his many chorales. Based almost entirely on pre-existing musical materials (only three of more than his nearly two-hundred compositions are original in both tune and text), Luther's chorales are predominantly upbeat, rhythmic, and joyous, with more than twenty-five percent containing syncopation (174). According to Doukhan, Luther had no concept of sacred or secular music—all music was potentially useful in spreading the gospel (181-182). While he retooled contemporary popular music for worship, he also vigorously held onto earlier church music, wanting to maintain connection with the church of the past.

In the final section of the book, Doukhan addresses the current state of church music, and offers helpful suggestions for churches wishing to maintain (or regain) a vibrant musical ministry. While much of the book lays the groundwork for accepting contemporary popular styles within the worship service, Doukhan is clear that she, like Luther, sees tremendous value in retaining traditional styles. Her experience resonates with my own in that while students enjoy and are blessed by contemporary worship music they do not want traditional music to be excluded. Too often those in charge of planning services, in a desire to be relevant, focus exclusively on contemporary styles. However, in their quest to break free from the “monotony” of traditional church music, they simply substitute one set of monotony for another. A blended service will meet the eclectic tastes of most youth, and give many older members opportunities to be gracious.

Doukhan examines several challenges for utilizing contemporary worship music, including a frequent lack of musical training, amateurish technological support, an ease of slipping into entertainment mode, the possibility of emotional manipulation, and the difficulty of keeping one’s attitude and ego in check. She also discusses the challenge of finding pieces that are “truthful”; i.e., music containing lyrics that not only have “theological correctness, but [also] depth, meaningfulness, directness, and poetic quality,” and music that is “well articulated, flowing freely, and able to carry a message clearly” (227, 229). The discrimination needed for making good choices is often in short
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 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


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