**CHAPTER 6**

**Models of Multicultural Worship**

 Searching for a new model for preaching and worship in multicultural contexts is not an effort to formulate one unique pattern universally applicable to all worship services. Instead, the process is open to a variety of new possibilities for the transformation of preaching and worship. In the process of searching for new possibilities, it is important to keep in mind that not every situation demands the same change in preaching and worship and not every change is constructive and productive to provide a more meaningful and memorable worship service. So, a paradigm change in preaching and worship requires of the preacher and worship leaders critical discernment for change.

In *Preaching in an Age of Globalization*, I introduced four different images for the negotiation of cultural diversity—the melting pot, the salad bowl, the mosaic, and the kaleidoscope—and explored them in terms of homiletical models.[[1]](#footnote-1) This chapter extends the conversation into liturgical models. The first section investigates the four cultural images in relation to developing models of multicultural worship. The second section proposes the new image of the metamorphosis with a possibility to be another model of multicultural worship.

Four Cultural Models

The four images—the melting pot, the salad bowl, the mosaic, and the kaleidoscope—represent different approaches to negotiating diverse cultures in society. In dealing with cultural diversity in liturgy, they are useful to articulate different cultural approaches to Christian worship. The four liturgical models evolved from the four cultural images are effective to critically evaluate current practices of worship in Christian churches and creatively think about the next level of change in the future Christian worship.

**The Melting-pot Model**: From the early history of immigration, the image of the melting pot has been used as a motto for dealing with cultural diversity. The original intention of this view was that “ethnic differences ‘melted’ into a single ‘pot’ would produce a synthesis—a new homogeneous culture that was not Anglo-Saxon, Jewish, Italian, nor Asian.”[[2]](#footnote-2) In reality, however, “[w]hat has happened in the melting pot conception of Americanization is that all varieties of ethnicities were melted into one pot, but the brew turned out to be Anglo-Saxon again.”[[3]](#footnote-3) In other words, contrarily to the ideal of the melting pot image, the racially and ethnically dominant culture absorbs other minority cultures in society and presents its cultural characteristics as the unified culture of society. As a result, racially and ethnically marginalized people are forced to reformulate their cultural identity by assimilating themselves into the dominant culture, in order to survive under the dominant cultural power.

When the melting-pot model is applied to worship, it can be explained as follows: An individual church or denomination has its dominant liturgical tradition rooted in its particular racial and ethnic history and tradition. The church seeks to keep them as its liturgical and cultural identity, regardless of demographic changes in its membership, and does not admit cultural diversity in worship. Just as the premodern understanding of culture presents clergy or elite culture as high culture and considers the congregation passive receivers, melting-pot worship takes the dominant liturgical culture as the high culture that people of other races and ethnicities in the congregation must passively receive as their new liturgical identity. In this model, the diversity of the congregational subcultures is ignored by exclusively adhering to the dominant cultural identity. The consequence is that the church practices monocultural worship in a multicultural context.

In the United States, it is not hard to find churches that practice melting-pot worship. Although churches in the US are gradually changing from racial segregation to integration in membership, many of them neither pay attention to changing congregational subcultures nor are sensitive enough to embrace cultural diversity among the worshipers to transform their liturgical culture. For example, many mainstream European American churches do not stretch their theological and liturgical concerns to racially and culturally different people, but understand their liturgical traditions as the best way to worship God. Ethnic minority Christians who worship in those churches as late comers are forced to accept the dominant liturgical culture as their new identity.

Melting-pot worship is also found in ethnic minority and immigrant churches. In racist America, traditional African American worship has provided African American worshipers with a cultural and spiritual identity through their unique songs, sermons, and other liturgical components. First generation Asian, Hispanic, African, and other immigrant congregations worship in their native languages in their unique cultural forms that they have used in their homelands as a way to preserve their racial and cultural identity in White-dominant American society. Their offspring born and raised in the US and their racially different spouses, extended families, and friends are excluded from their worship unless they agree to be coopted by the dominant immigrant liturgical culture. Such examples show that melting-pot worship makes the church stuck in the midst of the rapidly changing currents of the congregational culture. It unwittingly contributes to the segregation of worshipers based on their race, ethnicity, and culture.

**The Salad-bowl Model**: While the melting-pot model expresses the exclusive attitude against different liturgical cultures in the congregation, the salad-bowl model acknowledges the diversity of the congregational subcultures, to a certain extent. In a salad bowl, “each ingredient in a tossed salad retains its own color, texture, taste, individual identity.”[[4]](#footnote-4) This image of a salad bowl helps us understand multicultural society as one in which “the sum total of all the ingredients becomes a multi-ingredient national identity without the individual parts losing their identity.”[[5]](#footnote-5)

When the image of a salad bowl is applied to worship, it may be understood that worship leaders are aware of the diversity of the congregational subcultures and appreciate that racially and culturally different people come together and worship together with their distinctive cultural identity. It is important, however, to remember that the salad bowl is not served as it is. It needs a salad dressing to be served with the other ingredients. The salad dressing weakens the distinctiveness of each ingredient by blending it with other ingredients with the same flavor, taste, and color, in order to make the eater satisfied with the unique flavor and taste. The salad dressing needs to be considered seriously in the salad-bowl model of worship. Like the salad bowl, salad-bowl worship blends the distinctiveness of the cultural ingredients with a liturgical dressing. In other words, the congregants come to worship with the colorful diversity of their subcultures, which is visible, but their cultural distinctiveness is blended with the dominant flavor, taste, and color of the liturgy, e.g., the church’s dominant group’s worship style, liturgical tradition, and theological doctrine. Such liturgical dressings are so powerful that they dilute the unique colors and tastes of the congregational subcultures and contribute to the preservation of the unified liturgical culture of the church.

One of the examples of salad-bowl worship is with my worship experience at a Presbyterian church my family and I have attended for over a decade. The worship team seems to realize that about twenty percent of the congregation is composed of racially and ethnically different people and respect the diversity of the congregational culture. On a Christmas Sunday, for example, three congregants who were originally from Africa, Asia, and South America were invited to participate in preaching by sharing the stories of how Christmas was celebrated in their homelands; in every Easter Sunday worship, the pastor encourages the congregants to shout “the Christ is risen” in their native tongues. In addition, for Sunday services, once or twice a year, non-Western hymns are selected to be sung as congregational songs or special music. The liturgical order and cultural ethos of the church, however, is firmly rooted in mainline white Presbyterianism.

Another example of salad bowl worship is found in some joint worship services with subcongregations. These days, many churches in the US share their buildings with ethnic minority groups by using the facilities in different time-slots. Some conscious church leaders feel that it is necessary for the landlord and the tenant congregations to worship together occasionally as an opportunity to affirm that they are one in the family of God. The problem with their good intention is that they do not know how to create a worship service that both congregations fully appreciate. It is not easy to negotiate their cultural differences in worship, including language, music, the sermon style, symbols, theological orientations, etc. As a result, the salad-bowl model is often used as a best solution for the joint service, in which the landlord congregation prepares and leads the service and the tenant congregation is invited to participate in some parts of the liturgy, such as a special song or scripture reading in their native tongue.

Compared with melting-pot worship, salad-bowl worship is sensitive to the diversity of the congregational culture and intends to celebrate cultural diversity in worship by trying out some new liturgical elements. Yet, as long as the leadership of worship remains the same, the celebration of cultural diversity in worship remains at a superficial level, rather than bringing deep change into worship with the desire of ending racial and cultural prejudice and inequality. Just as the problem of salad-bowl preaching is ideological, as I explained in my previous book,[[6]](#footnote-6) so is that of salad-bowl worship. It leads the preacher and worship leaders to ask such critical questions as: Who has the power and authority to choose the liturgical dressing? Whose favorite is the dressing? What if some ingredients do not match with that dressing? These questions imply that worship is a political act practiced through power dynamics within the church.

**The Mosaic Model**: The image of a mosaic has been favored by many theologians and sociologists as an effective model for dealing with cultural diversity in the multicultural society. The mosaic, as a picture made of small, colored pieces of inlaid stone, glass, etc., gives an image of wholeness without any dominant centrality. According to this image, each racial and ethnic community is like a piece of the mosaic that is equally valued in achieving the overall harmony by coexisting with the others.[[7]](#footnote-7)

Based on the image of a mosaic, mosaic worship can be described in at least two dimensions—one in a social context and one in a particular local church context. In our multicultural society, racially and ethnically different churches are considered pieces of the mosaic. They represent their own unique cultural elements and liturgical traditions, while respecting other racial and ethnic churches as equally important for the entire picture of the Christian church. Their culturally distinctive worship services, such as African American worship,[[8]](#footnote-8) Asian American worship,[[9]](#footnote-9) and Hispanic American worship,[[10]](#footnote-10) contribute to completing the mosaic of Christian worship. Mosaic worship plays a major role in preserving the worshipers’ racial and cultural heritage and encourages the church to practice monocultural worship in a multicultural society. It sounds, however, unrealistic to assume that all American Christians go to their own ethnic churches to preserve their liturgical tradition and culture. Rather, an increasing number of believers search for worship places across their racial and ethnic boundaries, where they may experience meaningful and memorable worship.

In a local church context, the mosaic model is used as a way to handle cultural diversity within the congregation. Some local churches composed of more than one race and language are in a dilemma in preparing worship, because the preparation of the integrated service with different cultures and languages is neither easy nor convenient. Their worship leaders often give up offering an integrated service and, as a last resort, provide more than one service in different languages on Sundays in different times or places. For example, some urban white churches that have a substantial number of Spanish-speaking members hire a Spanish-speaking associate to offer the worship service in Spanish for that group. Moreover, most immigrant churches, though they are racially and ethnically homogenous, offer two separate worship services on Sundays, one in their native language for the first-generation immigrants, and one in English for their children who were born and raised in the US. The mosaic model convinces such churches that their separate services are like pieces of the mosaic that participate in completing the entire picture of their worship lives.

In many cases, however, separate worship services within a church results in separating the congregation, administratively and financially, as well as liturgically. One of the main reasons for the separation of the congregation is that the minor group does not want to remain in the marginal place under the supervision of the major group. In other words, those who are located in the margins of the mosaic want not to remain in their designated marginal places, but to freely move to different locations in the mosaic. In the mosaic model, however, dynamic interaction among culturally different worshipers is not supposed to happen. Just as the whole picture of a mosaic is already framed by a specific design that requires each piece to remain in its assigned place in order to complete the original design of the picture with its particular shape and color, mosaic worship does not attempt to create culturally integrated beauty crossing racial and ethnic boundaries.

This limitation of the mosaic model reminds me of a personal email I received from the senior pastor of a UMC church located in a university town in Ohio. In his church, about 100 out of 700 members are Korean college students. In order to provide a culturally relevant service to the Korean members, his church hired a Korean-speaking associate pastor and created Korean worship for them. But, the problem with this mosaic model, says the senior pastor, is that the two different worship services do not have interaction with each other, and his “continuous goal” is to create worship “fully embracing each other so as not to be two or three churches within a church.”[[11]](#footnote-11) What kind of liturgical model, then, might work for this goal? The kaleidoscope model seems to be more effective for the creation of culturally integrated worship.

**The Kaleidoscope Model**: In *Women Preaching: Theology and Practice through the Ages*, I explained the image of a kaleidoscope as a viable metaphor for describing the connectedness and diversity of women’s experience.[[12]](#footnote-12) In addition, I proposed the kaleidoscope model to be a new homiletical model for preaching in an age of globalization.[[13]](#footnote-13) The term “kaleidoscope,” combining three words in Greek, *kalos* (“beautiful”), *eidos* (“shape”), and *skopein* (“to look”),[[14]](#footnote-14) refers to a contoured optical instrument that illuminates beauty by a source of light. The kaleidoscope creates a multiplicity of symmetrical patterns from fragments of various materials through the use of mirrors and lenses set at different angles. “When the kaleidoscope rotates, each element produces beautiful, clear, and various patterns through convergence and by its interaction with the others and with the light. When all of the pieces shift, tones seem somehow different in the altered positions, and we recognize the newness of the pattern.”[[15]](#footnote-15)

When applying the image of a kaleidoscope to worship, kaleidoscope worship not only represents the cultural diversity of the worshipers, but also creates new experiences of worship through dynamic interaction with different liturgical cultures among the worshipers. As Marjorie Suchocki explains, when the kaleidoscope turns,

. . . not only do all of the pieces shift, but it even seems that some new ones have been added. There is familiarity and some continuity, for the colors are still there—but their tones seem somehow different in the altered positions, and while at first we try to see them in their familiar form, we nevertheless find ourselves struggling to express the difference in the way of seeing. Finally, we must recognize the newness of the pattern, and we reach toward a familiarity with the new that can be as assuring as that which we remember—or project—as belonging to the old. But the kaleidoscope will never repeat exactly the same pattern.[[16]](#footnote-16)

Like the kaleidoscope that does not repeat exactly the same pattern, but constantly shifts to a new pattern, kaleidoscope worship is dynamic, open to inclusiveness and creativity. Moreover, just as a kaleidoscope needs a light to create a beautiful panoramic picture, so kaleidoscope worship is not possible without the light, that is, the involvement of the Holy Spirit, to illuminate the beauty of diversity as the work of the Spirit. In order to create kaleidoscope worship, worship leaders need to increase their general and specific knowledge about and direct and indirect experience of other cultures. The kaleidoscope model also requires of them creativity and the skill to integrate different cultural elements of worship in harmony and beauty, since the ultimate goal of kaleidoscope worship is to reveal the intrinsic beauty of God, i.e., God’s benevolence, through the entire service. Through beautiful worship created by diverse cultural elements, the worshipers can appreciate the warm, personal loving-kindness and compassion of God; through beautiful worship, the spirits of the worshipers are connected to the divine Spirit that makes us live in unity-in-difference by building affinity and solidarity with others.

Kaleidoscope worship, creating kaleidoscopic beauty by using different cultural elements of Christian worship from different racial and ethnic groups, aims to be appreciated by all worshipers in many different ways and eventually configure the beauty of a shared identity with others in the Spirit of God. More precisely, by sharing cultural elements in worship, worshipers also share others’ suffering and pain and a common vision for the community and for the larger world beyond individual racial and ethnic groups’ vested interests. Through kaleidoscope worship, we experience that God is beautiful (benevolent) for us and are inspired to be beautiful for others.

Among the four cultural models, the kaleidoscope model seems to be the most effective tool to create a culturally integrated worship service in multicultural contexts. The convergence and integration of cultural elements of worship brings forth the ongoing transformation of worship and enriches liturgical experiences. One of the examples of kaleidoscope worship is the liturgy and the sermon that I prepared for the worship service for an assembly meeting of Denver Presbytery. They are used as an illustration of how to practice multicultural worship in ClassNotes 6.

Like other cultural models, however, the kaleidoscope model has its own limitation. When an artist makes a kaleidoscope, she has her own design and uses limited shapes and colors. As a result, the new patterns created in the kaleidoscope are limited to the original shapes and colors. Similarly, kaleidoscope worship represents only the limited number of different cultural components of Christian worship which have already been practiced in the Christian Church.

Can we imagine a radically different worship service beyond our current cultural practice of Christian worship? In other words, can we envision the future of Christian worship in a totally different model from the past and present practice of Christian worship? If so, what might it be like? I name this kind of visionary worship celestial worship and imagine it through the metamorphosis model.

The Metamorphosis Model

 While the four liturgical models are based on recapturing the past and present practice of cultural elements, the metamorphosis model aims to demonstrate radical change for the future of Christian preaching and worship. Nancy P. Greenman, an advocate for radical change in American education, wrote an intriguing essay, “Not All Caterpillars Become Butterflies: Reform and Restructuring As Educational Change.”[[17]](#footnote-17) In her essay, she explains “three types of change: old or intraparadigmatic change, transitional or interparadigmaic change, and new change or metamorphosis” and critically examines current practices of educational change, which are not so satisfactory to reform American education in our changing context. For her, change means “a making, or becoming, distinctly different,”[[18]](#footnote-18) rather than “partial or moderate change” or “mirroring the logic of the existing system,”[[19]](#footnote-19) and urges radical change, i.e., metamorphosis, in American education.

Greenman’s three types of change are applicable to understand homiletical and liturgical models in multicultural contexts. The melting pot, the salad bowl, and the mosaic models represent intraparadigmatic change, in which “the same elements are simply rearranged; their validity is never questioned,” while the kaleidoscope model illustrates interparadigmatic change that “contains elements of a new structure” through creative and integrative mutual interaction, “as parts of new and new part,” although “it is still anchored in the existing structure—the past”[[20]](#footnote-20) or present cultural practices.

The next level of change, which means metamorphosis or “transformation—a destructuring and restructuring to create a new level,”[[21]](#footnote-21) challenges preachers and worship leaders to consider significant, radical change in preaching and worship, beyond existing cultural patterns. According to Greenman, “metamorphosis is represented by the disintegration of the box or container, whether porous or nonporous, and by the creation of a new, differently shaped container from some of the pieces or the energy, infused with newly constructed pieces of different fabric, and with new energy and assumptions . . . or paradigm shift . . . .”[[22]](#footnote-22)

 The history of Christian preaching and worship that was reviewed in the previous chapter shows how radical change has happened in particular historical and liturgical situations. Radical change from synagogue worship through the house church style of Christian worship to the institutionalized formality of the Christian liturgy throughout the early and medieval period, from sacrament-centered worship to word-centered worship in the Reformation era, and from the head-oriented to the heart-oriented style of worship in the modern period illustrates how the metamorphosis model has brought about new experiences of Christian worship. Without envisioning the new level of preaching and worship totally different from the practice in the past and present, metamorphosis does not happen in Christian worship.

The metamorphosis model is possible when it begins with a new vision for preaching and worship. One of the historical figures who is helpful for us to learn about the practice of the metamorphosis model is Hildegard of Bingen. Hildegard, a twelfth-century German abbess, was a visionary. She began to experience visions from her early childhood until her death, through which she could “see hidden things and foretell the future.”[[23]](#footnote-23) She recognized that her experience of visions was a gift that was ineffable to explain to others. In her book, *Scivias* (“Know the Ways”), she said that what she spoke and wrote were “not by the invention of her heart or that of any other person, but as by the secret mysteries of God she heard and received them in the heavenly places.”[[24]](#footnote-24)

Hildegard tried to understand what her visions meant to the church and described them “as seeing the light of God through her five senses; sense of sight (*amat*), sense of hearing (*descernit*), the organs of taste (*sapit*), those of smell (*elight*), and those of touch.”[[25]](#footnote-25) Her works, including her music, paintings, and invented language, as well as her theological writings and sermons, present her life as a way of living on Earth with celestial visions. Her music is appreciated as a celestial chorus, her paintings as illustrations of the celestial terrain, and her invented language, *lingua Ignota* (“Unknown language”) as celestial words praising God. These are a few of the clues she provides us with to understand and practice heavenly worship on Earth.

One of the concrete examples is *Symphonia Armoniae Celestium Revelationum* (“Symphony of the Harmony of Celestial Revelations”), the collection of her seventy liturgical songs. All of the songs are her poems set to music,[[26]](#footnote-26) inspired by divine revelation. They were sung by the nuns in her monastery and provided them with spiritual guidance. These songs illustrate her creativity toward radical transformation in liturgy, by showing “a freedom of her ideas that went against the norm of music during that time.” According to Joanna Schllemat,

 Many of these songs were full of many musical elements such as contrast, unity, resemblance, dynamic tension, and response . . . . This made her musical work sound different to the normal music of that time. Her music grasped musical compounds and rarely did you see much text with the music . . . . Hildegard provided new concepts of melody as a movement of the voice . . . . In her antiphon, ‘O Successores’ from Symphonia she showed a lot of structural control . . . . Each of Hildegard’s antiphons was unique in many different ways, but each showed a drive towards to the climax. It is interesting to understand that a woman of that century could have a profound impact on the development of music during that time . . . .[[27]](#footnote-27)

Hildegard expressed the inspirations of her visions not only through music but also through paintings. The Choirs of Angels, which is one of 35 miniature illustrations included in her work, *Scivias*, describes her vision of celestial choirs as "armies arrayed like a crown," “a mandala-like image of nine concentric circles ranged about a void to signify the ineffable Presence.”[[28]](#footnote-28)Scholars of Hildegard’s works see this image as two-dimensional artwork and interpret the nine circles as the shapes of the hierarchical order of angels in heaven.[[29]](#footnote-29) When we imagine the circles of angels as three-dimensional or four-dimensional, however, we can see the heavenly angels, not in a rigid hierarchy, but in a flexible, non-ranked array, praising God freely in harmony and beauty: *“*And all these armies were singing with marvelous voices all kinds of music about the wonders that God works in blessed souls, and by this God was magnificently glorified.”[[30]](#footnote-30) For Hildegard, the divine vision was the source of inspiration to create radical transformation in liturgy.

It is also remarkable that Hildegard invented the “alternative alphabet” of *lingua Ignota*, a “form of modified medieval Latin, encompassing many invented, conflated and abridged words.”[[31]](#footnote-31)  She used it in her compositions for her lyrics and scripts. It seems that she intended to use it as an ideal language, that is, a spiritual or celestial language, in which all the worshipers could praise God together and increase solidarity among them.[[32]](#footnote-32)

Hildegard enlightens us, enabling us to see that radical change in preaching and worship comes from above—a vision of heavenly worship, rather than below—our past and present practice of worship. Our earthly practice of the vision of heavenly worship leads us to experience radical transformation or divine creativity that overcomes divisions on Earth.

While Hildegard lived during the highest peak of Christendom and interpreted her celestial vision of worship for Christian believers, we live in a very different world, a pluralistic, multicultural post-Christendom world. Our particular historical situation challenges us to consider whether a celestial vision of worship should be interpreted exclusively only for Christians or not. If God were the Creator of the universe, heavenly worship must not be owned by Christians. Contrarily, it might be worship for everyone God has created, regardless of religious and cultural differences. That reminds us of what the prophet Isaiah proclaimed in a vision of future worship, “. . . my house shall be called a house of prayer for all peoples” (Isaiah 56:7). It illumines that Christian worship should ultimately be transformed into worship for “all peoples” and that preachers and worship leaders who practice the metamorphosis model are called to become prophets and visionaries for this ultimate goal of Christian preaching and worship.

The metamorphosis model is open to the preacher’s and worship leaders’ vision for heavenly worship; the celestial vision may not be fully accomplished here and now;. But, like the scenes of Jesus’ transfiguration in the Gospels,[[33]](#footnote-33) the vision will function as a glimpse of the ultimate destination of multicultural worship, in which all peoples worship God together in harmony and beauty.

 Like the four cultural models, the metamorphosis model also has some problems when it is used for preaching and worship. One is that the term, metamorphosis, signifying change from a caterpillar to a butterfly, sounds too radical. In reality, radical change in preaching and worship often risks causing a high level of anxiety among the worshipers and confronts their stubborn resistance to that change with schisms and conflicts, rather than smooth transitions from the old practice to the new level of change. The tension between old mind-sets and a vision for the new practice of Christian preaching and worship challenges the church to take seriously how to bring radical change in a constructive way. Communicating the celestial vision of worship with the racially and culturally diverse worshipers and building a sense of common purpose of preaching and worship among them might be a few ideas to minimize the negative impact of congregational resistance. Such prerequisites for radical change call for preachers and worship leaders to have pastoral sensitivity to the power dynamics among the worshipers and leadership to help them transit from the old practice to the new level of change.

The other problem with the metamorphosis model is related to the image of metamorphosis. It gives an impression that transformation from a caterpillar to a butterfly happens once and for all. In like manner, people may understand that the purpose of the metamorphosis model is to develop the ideal practice of Christian preaching and worship and fix it “once and for all.” It is, however, unrealistic to assume that the ideal form of Christian preaching and worship exists, for our world is transient and there is a need for us to renew our practice of preaching and worship in order to make it relevant in our changing context. Therefore, the image of metamorphosis is supposed to be interpreted, not as the way to fix Christian preaching and worship once and for all, but as a symbol of continuous deep change mirroring the ideal form or a celestial vision for preaching and worship that cannot be fully accomplished on Earth. The vision can be expressed and practiced in many effective ways in different historical and cultural contexts. In this sense, the metamorphosis model is open-ended, a journey toward the ultimate eschatological destination of Christian preaching and worship. A variety of practices of the metamorphosis model are “a series of markers rather than fixed end points,”[[34]](#footnote-34) with “a leap of faith in possibilities—even if they do not appear to be possible from where we are standing.”[[35]](#footnote-35)

Conclusion

Once the preacher and worship leaders figure out where their worship is by examining how they worship in which model, they can think about the next level of their worship by considering strengths and weaknesses of each model. For example, the melting pot worship can be improved in relation to how the diverse cultural elements of the liturgical components can influence each other to make the unique flavor and taste of the congregational worship; the salad bowl worship can consider how the worshipers can share the variety of their liturgical salad dressings with others in balance; the mosaic worship can be alternated with the joint worship service in which racially and culturally different subcongregations worship together in unity-in-difference; the kaleidoscope worship can stretch its range of diversity beyond the diversity of the local congregational culture to more diverse colors and patterns in order to represent the diversity of the larger society; and the metamorphosis worship can be followed by education to help the worshipers envision their worship as an experience of heavenly worship which might be very different from their current experience of worship. Moreover, the five liturgical models are not mutually exclusive. For example, kaleidoscope worship carefully designed in a creative way may be experienced by the worshipers as metamorphosis.

Searching for a new paradigm for multicultural worship, therefore, is an ongoing challenge for preachers and worship leaders to imagine how their worship can be a manifestation of the glory and beauty of God. That means they need to be visionaries who can see the vision of celestial worship. Whatever their current liturgical model is, they are encouraged to strive to actualize the vision of heavenly worship on Earth, the eschatological destination of Christian worship.
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