A Rose By Any Other Name: Attempts at Classifying North American Protestant Worship

By Lester Ruth

Excerpted from Todd E. Johnson, ed., *The Conviction of Things Not Seen: Currents in Protestant Christianity in the Twenty-First Century* (Grand Rapids: Brazos Press, 2002), 33-51. Used here by permission of the publisher. Not to be reprinted or distributed.

How would you classify the worship of your church or parish? It is "contemporary" or "traditional"? Are those terms too limited? Would the terms found in some recent youth ministry training materials be more helpful? In that case, would you classify your worship as "linear" or "organic"?[1] Are you still at a loss for the right classification? Would these terms from a recent online worship forum be more accurate: "multi-sensory worship," "indigenous worship," "innovative worship," "transformation worship," "blended worship," "praise services," "spirited traditional," "creative," or "classic worship"?[2] Or would ethnic or racial designators be more descriptive of your service's character? Is it helpful to label your worship service as "African-American," "Hispanic," "Euro-American," or by some other similar designation?[3]

Has the exactly right term not been mentioned yet? If so, then how about "multi-media worship," "authentic worship," "liturgical worship," "praise and worship," or "seeker services"?[4] Perhaps terms rooted in various intended "audiences" would be better: "believer-oriented worship," "believer-oriented

---

[1]As found in recent Youth Specialties training material. Cited by permission of Dan Kimball, Santa Cruz Bible Church, Santa Cruz, California in an email to the author, 14 March 2001. The terms refer to the logical sequencing of actions within worship. Organic provides opportunity for multi-layering of actions.

[2]As used in July and August, 2000 on the online forum accessed through <www.easumbandy.com/forums.htm>.

[3]Kathy Black, *Worship Across Cultures: A Handbook* (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1998). Black analyzes worship in Southern California in twenty-one different ethnic groups.

[4]For "multi-media worship," see Paul Franklyn, "Tech-Knowledge for Ministry: Multimedia Worship," *Net Results* (1997): 4; for "authentic worship," Sally Morganthaler, "Out of the Box: Authentic Worship in a Postmodern Culture," *Worship Leader* (May/June 1998): 24-32; for "liturgical," "praise and worship," and "seeker," see Andy Langford, *Transitions in Worship: Moving from Traditional to Contemporary* (Abingdon, 1999), 18.

1

worship made visitor-friendly," or "visitor-oriented worship."[5] Some now advocate classifications by generations. And so is your worship service "boomer," "buster," "Gen-X," or "millenials' worship"?

As you can see, there exists a dizzying array of terms and classifications for worship. This diversity of classification schemes reflects the current state of Protestant worship in North America. A cacophony of terms describe the wide range of worship services. Even single resources can contribute to the Babel of classification schemes. In one recent anthology on worship, for example, the titles for the various essays showed designations derived by stylistic, theological, ethnic, and age-specific considerations.[6]

Is it possible to find some resemblance of order within these widely different taxonomies for worship? To do so here, the first step will be to take a look at four current taxonomies, recognizing their strengths and limitations. Then, building on some of these taxonomies and filtering the usable data through some categories derived from Robert Webber, I hope to suggest some ways of classifying North American Protestant approaches to worship that are true to their breadth. While the new schemes do not exhaust all possible taxonomies, hopefully they will offer some helpful designations. The suggested taxonomy will use classifications based on the nature of liturgical commemoration (what is remembered over time from worship service to service?), the dominant sacramental principle in a congregation's worship (what is the primary way worshipers assess God's presence in worship?), and liturgical polity (what is the method by which worship is planned in individual congregations?). These taxonomical categories are suggested because they are broad enough to be able to be applied to all North American Protestant worship and yet are important enough to show true differences among these Christians' worship today.

A Popular Scheme: The Traditional/Contemporary/Blended Worship Taxonomy

---

[5]Timothy Wright, *A Community of Joy: How to Create Contemporary Worship* (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1994), 57.

[6]*Experience God in Worship* (Loveland, CO: Group Publishing, Inc., 2000). The categories used included "convergence," "liturgical," "contemporary," "evangelical," "African-American," "Charismatic," and "Gen-X."

One of the most used classification schemes today is this set of terms: "traditional," "contemporary," and "blended worship." Among American Protestants, these terms are pervasive in conversations, in popular literature, and, unfortunately, in "worship wars." A sizable number of Protestant churches have moved to offering multiple worship services every week, distinguishing between services by these labels.

Despite their pervasiveness and some kind of assumption about general meaning, the terms' specific meanings are unclear. Very often they are code words. "Traditional" designates "what we have been doing," usually meaning a way of mainstream Protestant worship reflecting practices of the mid-twentieth century with roots in the Victorian Era. "Contemporary" typically designates "what we could or should be doing." Often what is in mind is worship with some combination of these "contemporary" characteristics: worship attuned to popular culture, particularly in entertainment forms; use of music which is highly repetitive, syncopated, and reflective of pop music; a reliance upon electronic technology; a quick pace and rhythm in the service; minimal ceremonial; an informal style of leadership; and the use of worship leaders to demonstrate the physical and emotional dimensions of worship.[7] In popular usage "blended worship" tends to refer to worship using a variety of types of music, that is, both "traditional" hymnody and "contemporary" choruses.[8] While some—most notably theologian Robert Webber[9]—have a more sophisticated, nuanced use of the term, the term frequently amounts to little more than an quota system for music and dramatic skits.

All these terms, "traditional," "contemporary," and "blended worship," have severe limitations and should be rejected in any serious taxonomy of worship. Simply put, as commonly used, they are too general of terms for too limited a phenomenon.

---

[7]Compare the characterization in Daniel T. Benedict and Craig Kennet Miller, *Contemporary Worship for the 21st Century: Worship or Evangelism?* (Nashville: Discipleship Resources, 1994), 10-16 and 120.
[8]See, for example, Eva Stimson, "Praise God with Guitars and Organ?" *Presbyterians Today* (September 1998): 12.
[9]See Robert Webber, *Signs of Wonder: The Phenomenon of Convergence in Modern Liturgical and Charismatic Church* (Nashville: Abbott Martyn, 1992); republished as *The Worship Phenomenon: A Dynamic New Awakening in Worship is Reviving the Body of Christ* (Nashville: Star Song, 1994); republished as *Blended Worship: Achieving Substance and Relevance in Worship* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1994). See also Webber's *Renew Your Worship: A Study in the Blending of Traditional and Contemporary Worship* (Hendrickson, 1997), *Planning Blended Worship: The Creative Mixture of Old & New* (Abingdon, 1998), and Robert Webber et al., *Renew! Songs & Hymns for Blended Worship* (Carol Stream, IL: Hope Publishing Company, 1995).

For one thing, their limited usefulness is seen in that many of the works that seek to explore how to do contemporary worship sometimes include within "contemporary" what might be popularly designated as "traditional." For example, one recent writer includes as one of the types of contemporary worship what he calls "liturgical."[10] What he describes as "liturgical worship," however, others would label as "traditional." If the terms are that fluid, what real meaning do they have?

The traditional/contemporary taxonomy suffers other serious limitations. Given worship's inherent conservatism (over time congregations tend to stabilize and maintain patterns, even if newly created), eventually the term "contemporary" must fall out of usage or churches will end up with the oxymoron of "traditional contemporary" worship in a few generations.

In addition, those who use traditional/contemporary language usually have too limited a historical horizon. From one angle, "contemporary worship" really is not. When I reviewed the multiple orders of worship for so-called "contemporary worship" on an online forum, for instance, all the orders reflected a very "traditional" order of worship featuring proclamation as the climatic act. Such an order of worship with a different stylistic veneer has been the mainstay of much American Protestant worship for a couple of centuries. Other than a change in the stylistic veneer, what is truly contemporary about that? Similarly, using a longer historical horizon, "traditional worship" really is not. By "traditional" most do not have in mind deep worship traditions, whether those of the early church or of originators of various Protestant movements like Luther or Wesley.

Consequently, the traditional/contemporary taxonomy is inadequate for describing certain whole approaches to worship, whether denominationally or congregationally. For example, how should we classify a vibrant congregation of Quakers worshiping in complete silence until they receive the Holy Spirit's unction to leave. Is this "traditional" because it follows a classic Quaker approach having a long history back to the seventeenth century? Or it is "contemporary" because the worshipers might be wearing casual clothing? Since there is no music at all, musical style cannot be the key to classifying this service. And what about an African-American congregation using a Black Gospel setting for a classically structured eucharistic service? Is it "contemporary" because the music has been composed recently and has a beat? Or is it "traditional" because many of the texts can be traced back to the patristic era as can the basic order

---

[10]Langford, *Transitions in Worship*, 18. See also Benedict and Miller, *Contemporary Worship for the 21*[st]

of worship? Similarly, what about the two Episcopal churches close to my home using their Book of Common Prayer eucharistic services albeit with a praise team leading the music while the congregation follows the service on PowerPoint projections? Is this "traditional" or "contemporary"? Is it "blended" even though there is only one style of music and leadership?

Seeing the limitations in the terminology, some scholars show signs of moving away from the traditional/contemporary taxonomy. Leonard Sweet is one. Seeking a term that speaks more of worship emerging from a worshiping people rather than merely being imitated from elsewhere, he prefers the term "indigenous" over "contemporary."[11] Others reject the all-too-often antagonistic positioning of the terms (traditional vs. contemporary), noting that each speaks of qualities desirable for all worship services:

…attempts to reform worship that (relay (*sic*) or rely) exclusively on either traditional or contemporary models are not adequate solutions to our longing for more faithful worship. This is actually a false dichotomy since authentic Christian worship is by necessity both contemporary and traditional. It is traditional because it must continue the story of Jesus Christ in the world in history, and it is contemporary because it must be engaged with the present, with actual people who live in particular cultures.[12]

Even the "blended worship" term is too limited for serious use since too often it just describes a kind of quota system to worship. As one scholar recently lampooned: "[In] many congregations…we'll do a traditional hymn, then we'll do a praise song. We'll have the classic structure, but we'll spice it up with skits. A little of this and a little of that, and everyone will be happy."[13] Such an approach to blended worship tends to deal only with the surface of worship performance without dealing with more substantial issues of worship's structure, content, and purpose.[14]

Given that these terms—"traditional/contemporary/blended"—are too ill-defined and are likely to pass away from usage, a comprehensive taxonomy for North American worship must be found elsewhere.

Century.

[11]Leonard Sweet, *SoulTsunami: Sink or Swim in New Millennium Culture* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1999), 390-1.

[12]L. Edward Phillips and Sara Webb Phillips, *In Spirit & Truth: United Methodist Worship for the Emerging Church* (Nashville: Discipleship Resources, 2000), 30. See also Thomas G. Long, *Beyond the Worship Wars: Building Vital and Faithful Worship* (The Alban Institute, 2001), 3 and Marianne Sawicki, "How Can Christian Worship Be Contemporary?" in *What is "Contemporary" Worship?*, ed. Gordon Lathrop (Minneapolis: Augsburg Fortress, 1995), 27.

[13]Long, *Beyond the Worship Wars*, 12.

A Polemical, Apologetic Scheme: The Taxonomy of William Easum and Thomas Bandy

In this section I critique severely the polemical taxonomy of these Church Growth consultants. Their taxonomy uses terms which reflect their caricatures of how people respond to various styles of worship.

An Evangelical, Pastoral Scheme: The Taxonomy of Paul Basden

In this section I discuss the limitations of the taxonomy from Baptist author Paul Basden who provides a taxonomy in a recent book.[15]

A Thorough Historical Scheme: The Taxonomy of James White

In this section I review James White's taxonomy that he prints in several sources. I suggest that his well-known labels (Anglican, Lutheran, Reformed, Methodist, Anabaptist, Puritan, Frontier, Pentecostal, and Quaker) are best used for describing the origins of various Protestant ways of worship rather than in distinguishing current approaches..[16]

Suggestions for a new taxonomy

---

[14]Constance Cherry, "Blended Worship: What It Is, What It Isn't," *Reformed Worship* 55 (March 2000), 6-8.

[15]Paul Basden, *The Worship Maze: Finding a Style to Fit Your Church* (Downers Grove: InterVarsity Press, 1999).

[16]James White's earliest attempt came in the mid-1970s: "Traditions of Protestant Worship," *Worship* 49, 5 (May, 1975): 272-281. This article was substantially reproduced in *Christian Worship in Transition* (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1976), 61-75. Refinement continued in the 1980s: *Introduction to Christian Worship*, 1st ed. (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1980), 41-3; "Creativity: The Free Church Tradition," in *Liturgy: a Creative Tradition*, Concilium, vol. 162, ed. Mary Collins and David Power (New York: Seabury Press, 1983), 47-52; "The Classification of Protestant Traditions of Worship," *Studia Liturgica* 17 (1987): 264-272. In 1989 a mature form of the taxonomy became the basis for a whole book: *Protestant Worship: Traditions in Transition* (Louisville: Westminster/John Knox Press, 1989), 21-4.

Where does that leave us? If we desire a taxonomy that is simple enough to distinguish basic differences among Protestant churches yet broad enough to cover the full range of current North American practices, whose taxonomy offers the most guidance? The popular traditional/contemporary/blended taxonomy is hopelessly simplistic. Easum's and Bandy's taxonomies are too polemical; they provide more information about the agenda of these two men than they do about the true range of Christian liturgical practices. Basden's taxonomy has some helpful points but is too narrow and, at times, inaccurate. James White's taxonomy is the most thorough, well-developed, and historically sound. It is strongest, however, as a *historical* taxonomy for Protestant worship. Its categories are not as helpful in distinguishing the variety of approaches to Christian worship at the present time.

All is not lost with these taxonomies. I believe it is possible to take the root information behind White's taxonomy—his notion of various liturgical ethos—and combine it with some insights from Robert Webber in order to achieve the goal of a simple, accurate, yet broad set of classifying terms for Christian worship in North America today.[17] First, the insights of Webber.

In speaking about the planning of worship, Robert Webber often makes a distinction between content, structure, and style in worship.[18] This framework is itself a helpful step in that it takes us beyond just looking at stylistic issues, which is where some popular taxonomies stop. In fact, I suggest that it is the two other elements (content and structure) that offer the most help areas for developing categories to classify worship. This takes Webber's terms beyond what he himself does with them. For Webber, who tends to advocate a certain approach to worship in his publications, the content and structure of worship should remain fairly steady. The content and structure he suggests is derived from the Bible and based on deep historical norms.[19] The fact that he must *advocate* certain classic content and structure in worship highlights the fact, I believe, that it is precisely here on these crucial matters that diversity abounds in Christian worship.

And so, taking White's notion that different liturgical approaches can be defined by ethos differences and Webber's distinctions between content and structure, I suggest two initial ways for

---

[17]To a lesser degree Basden's analysis of the inner character of different liturgical approaches is also helpful.

[18]Robert Webber, *Planning Blended Worship*, 20. See also Robert Webber, *Worship Old & New*, Rev. Ed. (Zondervan, 1994); 149-51 and *Renew Your Worship*, 32.

[19]See, for example, Webber, *Worship Old and New*, 149-50.

classifying worship today. One deals with the question of content. Specifically, what is the content of a

church's worship in terms of whose story is told. No one service or Sunday is likely to disclose fully how

to classify a congregation. This must be assessed over a longer period of time, evaluating the worship from

week to week. In terms of classifying by content, I suggest two categories: personal-story churches and

cosmic-story churches. There are churches whose worship over time is most focused on the personal

stories of the worshipers and how God interacts with their stories. In contrast there are churches whose

worship over time unfolds a more cosmic remembrance of the grand sweep of God's saving activity. The

goal here will be to show how worshipers have a share in salvation history.

Personal-story churches and cosmic-story churches can be distinguished by how their worship

answers this question: what needs to be remembered corporately in worship? The different answers may

not be readily identifiable in a single element in a single congregation. Rather, over time, one must assess

how a church selects the Scripture it will read, what the normal purpose of the sermon is, the regular

content of prayers and music, the nature of any dramatic presentations, and what special holidays are

observed. Evaluate, for example, the content of a church's worship music. Over time, are the main

metaphors and content relational, emphasizing our relationship to a wonderful God? Are there few

references to a historical man Jesus or to biblical stories of God acting within human history? In

comparison, is the content mainly historical, using this remembrance to make statements about a saving

God? One could look at even how the congregation primarily explains the meaning of baptism and the

Lord's Supper. Are these about each one's personal experience of a gracious God who has given us life

abundant or are they signs by which, to use the language of the newest United Methodist baptismal service,

we are "incorporated into God's mighty acts of salvation"?[20]

A few examples may clarify the difference in personal-story and cosmic-story churches. An

example of the former is a church that plans its worship on themes of particular interest to the worshipers.

This approach usually creates personal-story based worship, particularly if the church is intentional about

identifying its participants' "felt needs." Ginghamsburg United Methodist Church in Ohio represents this

approach. Worship planning begins with naming a felt need as perceived in the church's target audience.

From that worship planners develop a theme and a metaphor that serves as the root visual image for the

---

[20]*The United Methodist Book of Worship* (Nashville: The United Methodist Publishing House, 1992), 87.

8

service. Everything else is selected on that basis.[21] In contrast, the worship of a Methodist church strictly

following the Revised Common Lectionary operates on a much different basis. If all the musical texts,

prayers, readings, and sermon content were connected to the lectionary texts, the result would be a telling

of a very different story than Ginghamburg's.

Another way for classifying worship deals with different structures for worship services. When

Webber discusses the structure, he usually is advocating a four-fold order rooted in the services of the early

church.[22] I do not intend such a narrow focus here in using different structures as a key to classifying

different kinds of worship. I intend structure in a broader sense to designate the organizing principle in a

congregation's worship. Put more specifically, where is the most time and energy spent within a service

and what gets the most prominent space and most expensive furnishings and equipment? When these

questions are answered I believe that most North American worship services can fall into one of three

categories: music-organized, Word/preaching-organized, or Sacrament-organized (meaning the Lord's

Supper). In other words, one of these usually serves as the dominant aspect of worship around which other

things orbit.

I also suggest that these three categories—music, Word/preaching, and Sacrament—are not just

the main organizing principles in what gets the most time, energy, and dominant position in the order of

worship. These three, I believe, also serve as the primary sacramental principles at work in different

approaches to North American worship today. In other words, one of these three is usually the normal

means by which a congregation assesses God's presence in worship or believes that God is made present in

worship. This assessment or belief does not have to be at the level of formal theology. It can be at the

level of popular piety. The point is the same. A congregation will devote time, energy, attention, and

money to the worship activity where the people find God present.

I am not the first to suggest this three-fold approach to different sacramental principles. Reformed

liturgical scholar John Witvliet has suggested a similar thing:

Worshipers in nearly every Christian tradition experience some of what happens in worship as divine
encounter. Differences in Christian worship arise not so much whether or not God is understood to be
present, but rather in what sense. Those who mock supposedly simplistic theories of sacramental realism at

---

[21]Kim Miller et al., *Handbook for Multi-Sensory Worship* (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1999), 9.
[22]For an example, see Webber, *Signs of Wonder*, 37.

the Lord's Supper wind up preserving sacramental language for preaching or for music. Speaking only somewhat simplistically: the Roman Catholics reserve their sacramental language for the Eucharist, Presbyterians reserve theirs for preaching, and the charismatics save theirs for music. In a recent pastors' conference, one evangelical pastor solicited applications for a music director/worship leader position by calling for someone who could 'make God present through music.' No medieval sacramental theologian could have said it more strongly." [23]

I suggest that Witvliet's description of different approaches to sacramentality is accurate enough that it can form the basis for a new kind of liturgical taxonomy, although Witvliet himself does not take it that far. Everyone speaks of encounter with God's presence in worship. The difference, which can offer categories for a liturgical taxonomy, is how and where they expect to have that encounter in worship.[24]

Some may be surprised by attaching a notion of God's presence to music itself although they understanding doing so to the Word of God or the Lord's Supper. Such a connection to music, however, is quite prevalent in some current approaches to worship. It is the basic premise, for example, in any praise and worship service based upon a typology of the Old Testament temple. In that case, music is the vehicle which moves worshipers into the holy of holies of God's presence.[25] One book based on this approach states the matter bluntly in its title: *God's Presence Through Music*.[26] Even the very recent sociological study from the Hartford Institute for Religion Research suggests a connection between a stronger sense of the "immediacy of the Holy Spirit" and those churches using newer musical styles and electronic instrumentation.[27] These are often the churches having a central role for extended music in their services.

The categories in this taxonomy can be overlaid on White's chart in order to update it. One could place the music-organized, Word/preaching-organized, and Sacrament-organized categories on top of his chart. The result would show tendencies in North American worship today. Traditions on the right-hand side of the chart tend to have worship which is Sacrament-organized. Centrist traditions' worship tend to

---

[23]John D. Witvliet, "At Play in the House of the Lord: Why Worship Matters," *Books & Culture* 4, 6 (November/December 1998), 23. For a popular description of the same thing, against which Robert Webber reacted negatively, see Robert Webber, "Reducing God to Music?" *Leadership* (Spring 1999): 35.
[24]Could the internal fights many congregations have over worship style actually be disputes about different approaches to liturgical sacramentality, not about the styles themselves?
[25]John D. Witvliet, "The Blessing and Bane of the North American Mega-Church," *Jahrbuch für Liturgik und Hymnologie* (1998): 201-2. Witvliet provides an extensive bibliography in note 15 of the same article.
[26]Ruth Ann Ashton, *God's Presence Through Music* (South Bend, IN: Lesea Publishing Co., 1993).
[27]Carl S. Dudley and David A. Roozen, *Faith Communities Today: A Report on Religion in the United States Today* (Hartford, CT: Hartford Institute for Religion Research at Hartford Seminary, March 2001), 12 July 2001 <http://fact.hartsem.edu/Final%20FACTrpt.pdf>, p. 40.

be Word/preaching-organized. Left-hand traditions is where one tends to find music-organized services and the emphasis on music-as-sacrament.

Such a scheme is too simple, however, in two respects. For a more accurate picture, this kind of taxonomy must take into account the diversity whether within denominations or White's traditions. Yet even then this classification scheme can be helpful. For one thing, I suggest that churches at either end of an expanded version of White's chart are more likely to be in line with the tendency for that end of the sacramental-principle spectrum. Thus Pentecostal churches currently are more likely to have music-organized services but not exclusively so. Lutheran and Anglican churches, in contrast, are more likely to have Sacrament-organized services but not exclusively so. This sacramental-principle spectrum can suggest what is likely to be the second most likely kind of service. In other words, a Pentecostal church is more likely to have a Word/preaching-organized service than it is a Sacrament-organized one. Similarly, one is more likely to find a Word/preaching-organized service in a Lutheran or Anglican setting than a music-organized one. An example would be an Episcopal church I once attended whose services had no music at all. For White's centrist traditions, particularly Methodist and Reformed, this sacramental-principle spectrum suggests the true diversity—and fights—which now takes place within these traditions. Within these centrist traditions some forces are pulling churches toward a music-sacramentality while some pull toward a sacramentality finding God's presence most acutely in the Lord's Supper. Thus it is currently possible to find services within these centrist traditions any place within the spectrum of sacramentalities.

In addition, to show the true diversity within Christianity, this scheme must take into account combinations of sacramental principles.[28] In other words, there are churches whose services balance a music-organized and Word-organized sacramentalities and churches whose services balance a Word-organized and Sacrament-organized sacramentalities. Less likely are churches who combine music-organized and Sacrament-organized sacramentality. Less likely, too, are churches who combine all three. These combinations suggest a difference meaning for the term "blended worship." Rather than referring to

---

[28]To be truly accurate two other possibilities for different kinds of sacramentality must be included: fellowship-organized and aesthetics-organized. In the former the emphasis is placed on the community by itself as the locus of God's presence. This is how classic Quaker worship might be identified. In aesthetics-organized sacramentality, the worship environment itself is how the worshipers sense God's presence.

a blending of music or even worship style, perhaps it is a term better used to describe congregations which sense God's presence in worship in a variety of means.

Finally, I would like to suggest another set of classifying labels for North American worship today that are rooted in White's assessment of different ethos but are not connected to Webber's. I believe that one of the aspects White identifies as distinguishing different ethos still serves as a clear and crucial element in classifying worship today. The particular element in question is whether a church in its liturgical planning operates as an independent congregation or starts with the assumption that it will use resources common to its tradition or denomination.[29] The first approach I call "congregational" and the second "connectional." (Non-Methodists must excuse my selecting a term with long roots in my Methodist heritage for the second term.) Of course, there is a third option: churches that are officially connectional but actually operate as autonomous congregations. (I could point to my own my Methodist church.)

This classification is a useful one for understanding how it is that single congregations are likely to make worship decisions. I believe, for example, that the literature on liturgical inculturation can be separated along this congregational/connectional divide. There is one set of writings on how we should adapt worship to fit different cultures that presumes a connectional method. In this perspective, the goal is to take a common resource, whether created by the denomination or derived from history, and then adapt is to different cultural groups. Most of the literature from Anglican, and Lutheran sources fits this approach. In contrast, literature on culturally-adapted worship from Church Growth experts, including Easum and Bandy, emphasize the absolute autonomy of local congregations in creating new worship forms.

This classification scheme can line up generally with White's chart, too. Churches on the left-hand side of his chart will tend to have a congregational liturgical method whereas churches on the right will have a connectional one. As before, the centrist traditions will be split. Individual denominations there might officially be connectional but truly act congregationally.

Conclusion

---

[29]White, *Traditions in Transition*, 22.

And so, back to the original question. How would you classify your church's worship? Using these new classifying terms I have suggested, does it usually tell a personal-story or a cosmic-story? How do people organize the worship service and assess God's presence? Is your service music-organized, Word-organized, or Sacrament-organized? How do people expect to encounter God in worship? Is it in the music, in the preaching, or in the Lord's Supper? And, finally, was your church's worship planned using a method that is congregational or connectional in its approach?

Given the variety of liturgical taxonomies now in use, it is a daunting task to suggest another scheme. Hopefully, the categories given in this new taxonomy can provide some real insight about the substance and diversity of North American worship today.

Find similar artists to A Rose, By Any Other Name and discover new music. Scrobble songs to get recommendations on tracks, albums, and artists you'll love. Josh Scogin is an American musician, best known as being the vocalist for the American mathcore band, The Chariot, he originally gained recâ€¦ read more. Josh Scogin is an American musician, best known as being the vocalist for the American mathcore band, The Chariot, he originally gained recognition as the vocalist and founding member of the band Norma Jean, after recording two full lengâ€¦ read more. 'Tis but thy name that is my enemy; Thou art thyself, though not a Montague. What's Montague? it is nor hand, nor foot, Nor arm, nor face, nor any other part Belonging to a man. O, be some other name! What's in a name? that which we call a rose By any other name would smell as sweet; So Romeo would, were he not Romeo call'd, Retain that dear perfection which he owes Without that title. Romeo, doff thy name, And for that name which is no part of thee Take all myself. The Rose was a local rival to his Globe Theatre and is reputed to have had less than effective sanitary arrangements. The story goes that this was a coy joke about the smell. This certainly has the whiff of folk etymology about it, but it might just be true. See other phrases and sayings from Shakespeare. North Dakota (41) Northern Ireland (36) Norway (109) Nova Scotia (68) Nurses (157) Nursing Home (30) Office (1981) Office Supply Store (144) Ohio (567) Oklahoma (214) Omaha (43) One-Liner (58) Online (329) Ontario (863) Optometrist/Optician (81) Oregon (371) Orlando (85) Ottawa (66) Outdoors/Outside (541) Overheard (71) Overtime (34) Parents (13) Parents/Guardians (1472) Paris (25) Park (199) Parking (143) Party. View by Month May 2020 April 2020 March 2020 February 2020 January 2020 December 2019 November 2019 October 2019 September 2019 August 2019 July 2019 June 2019 May 2019 April 2019 March 2019 February 2019 January 2019 December 2018