

Liturgia Latina

JUAN M. C. OLIVER*

The General Convention, meeting in July 2018, called for the inclusion of Latino liturgical resources in new BCP translations and revisions. Consequently, it seems right to reassess how we think about liturgy by, with, and among Latinos. In this article, the author proposes that liturgy entails, above all, signifying actions involving the whole congregation. Latinos are the people to whom these actions must signify, and worship must be incarnated or inculturated in Latino cultures in imitation of the incarnation, a theological foundation of liturgical theology and practice. The author concludes by pointing to the challenges in both practice and spirituality facing Anglicanism in the development of Latino Anglican liturgy.

La Convención General, en su reunión del 2018, autorizó la inclusión de materiales litúrgicos latinos en la nuevas traducciones y revisiones del LOC. Por tanto, parece apropiado, reconsiderar cómo pensamos sobre la liturgia por, entre y para latinos. En su artículo, “Liturgia Latina”, Oliver propone que la liturgia es mucho más que un texto, incluye, sobre todo, acciones significativas de parte de toda la congregación. De ahí pasa a explorar cómo somos los latinos, a quienes estas acciones deben significar, y la urgencia de que el culto esté encarnado o inculturado en las culturas latinas imitando la encarnación de la Palabra—fundamento teológico de la teología litúrgica y su práctica. Concluye señalando los retos tanto en la práctica como en la espiritualidad que confrontan al anglicanismo según desarrollamos liturgia anglicana latina.

* The Rev. Juan M. C. Oliver, PhD, is the Custodian of the Book of Common Prayer. He has written widely on the relationship between liturgy and cultures, and has served in a variety of ordained ministries as vicar, interim rector, acting Canon to the Ordinary, director and liturgics professor at the Mercer School of Theology, adjunct professor of liturgics at the General Seminary, and director of its Hispanic Program in Theology and Pastoral Ministry.

Since the official recognition of Latino ministry in the 1980s, the Episcopal Church has worked to both reach out to, and integrate, Latinos into the fabric of our church, joining us at all levels of governance, theology, worship, mission, and Christian formation. Most recently, our General Convention recognized for the first time in our history that the church wishes to include Latino liturgical resources among those to be gathered from many other cultures and languages. This is welcome news. In what follows, I explore several aspects of Latino liturgy and its development in the Episcopal Church, as well as in the broader Anglican spectrum. In light of the general movement toward inclusion, a reassessment of how we think about and practice liturgy by, with, and among Latinos seems rather urgent.

In what follows, I first propose that liturgy is much more than words on a page, but entails, above all, signifying *actions* involving the whole congregation. Then I explore Latinos as the people to whom these actions must signify, arguing that worship, as well as the whole life of the church, should be incarnated in cultures just as the Word was incarnated in first-century Israel, as this is a theological foundation of liturgical theology and practice. I will end with some thoughts on the challenges in both practice and spirituality facing Anglicanism in designing worship in, from, and by Latinos.¹

Liturgy Is Signifying Action

If we were to play a video of an Episcopal Latino liturgy in the United States and turn off the volume, it would probably look almost exactly the same as an Anglo liturgy. If we played a video of a Latin American liturgy in Latin America and turned off the volume, however, it would look and feel decidedly different. I mention this to underscore the inability of the church's dominant culture here to learn Latino ways, an inability that shows up most clearly, perhaps, in the design of our Latino worship—or lack of it. I say design, for worship does not grow on trees; it must be crafted as a human artifact, out of bodies moving in space, eating, bathing, anointing, laying hands, moving, gesturing, listening, sharing, processing, vesting, kneeling, standing, walking, sitting, and so on—all of these, I would hope, in *Latino*

¹ Gender disparity in Spanish grammar runs in such a deep structural way, as practically every noun is gendered, that to address the issue well requires writing in a completely different way from English. I have therefore resisted the attempt to address the issue by simply writing “Latinx,” opting for Latino instead.

ways. So, although we are just now waking up from the stupor of praying with a dull, literal translation of the BCP (help is on the way!), we still are very far from including all aspects of worship whenever we talk of Latino liturgy. So I must explore with you much more than language and translations.²

If worship consisted only of reading a book aloud to a gathering of people, we could stop at producing a professional translation. But worship is a series of symbolic, signifying, and therefore meaningful ritual actions, carried out by the whole congregation, led by specific ministers, both lay and ordained. In the Eucharist, for example, these signifying actions are gathering, listening to God, responding, praying, offering, giving thanks, eating together, and being sent.

These actions not only communicate an understanding to our minds, but also form us as they shape our dispositions, feelings, and attitudes in our bodies. For, as anthropologist Clifford Geertz explained, ritual forms in us both a worldview and an ethos, that is, a sense of what the world looks like to a Christian, and the flavor and style of living in it as one: "Sacred symbols function to synthesize a people's ethos—the tone, character, and quality of their life, its moral and aesthetic style and mood—and their world view—the picture they have of the way things in sheer actuality are."³

Except, of course, that Christian worship not only reflects the world as we see it, fallen and in need of redemption, but as God wishes it to be: ransomed, healed, restored, forgiven, the world as the kingdom or reign of God. This is a world of *shalom*, characterized by truth telling, justice doing, peacemaking, and love. The order is intentional, for love is impossible without peace, and peace without justice, and that without telling and hearing the truth.

In order to form us, liturgy engages in these actions in a rehearsal of the reign of God. The Eucharist, in its eschatological dimension, makes God's reign already present, bringing it here among us and forming us in ways appropriate for life in it by engaging us in a ritual enactment of life together with God in that reign. Worship does

² The General Convention of the Episcopal Church meeting in July, 2018, approved and budgeted work toward new translations of the Book of Common Prayer, 1979, into Spanish, French, and Haitian Creole (*Kreyol*). The Standing Commission on Liturgy and Music, through its Task Force for Liturgical Translations, is heading the effort, hiring professional literary translators and working with them.

³ Clifford Geertz, *The Interpretation of Cultures* (New York: Basic Books, 1973), 7.

this by engaging human bodies in a place, with a given architecture, decoration, movement, objects, food, music, silences, and, of course, words and lyrics. These building blocks work together to support a meaningful enactment of life in the reign. This insight also furnishes us with another measure for the evaluation of any liturgy and its details, besides the usual historical and theological criteria and beyond our personal taste: *Is this specific liturgy a meaningful enactment of the reign of God?*

Meaningful to whom? It is not enough to claim that a specific liturgical enactment is meaningful in general to generic human beings across cultures and languages, or that the meaningfulness found by Northern Europeans in their liturgical practice will be equally meaningful to Latin Americans. There are no generic human beings, only concrete men and women formed by their own culture, language, worldview, and ethos. Lutheran liturgist Michael Aune pointed out some years back that meaning is always “meaning to someone.”⁴ It does not exist in the ether, abstractly, but in a person’s conscious body and its expressions, both verbal and physical. We can, for example, go to the library and find the meaning of the Eucharist for St. Augustine; we can learn it, agree with it, and it may develop meaning for us (certainly a good thing), but it is Augustine’s—and maybe our—meaning. So meaning is first of all *someone’s* meaning. It does not exist disconnected from culturally situated subjects.

Through dialogue about our subjective meanings, though, we have developed widely shared, even official, understandings of eucharistic meaning to us as a community of faith over the centuries. And yes, these shared meanings are important. One would hope they are present in Latino liturgy, as well. That does not take away, however, the existential challenge that is the need for the actually culturally situated Latino subjects to find meaning in worship. For a Latino liturgy to be both expressive of the reign of God and formative in the art of living in the reign, it must be meaningful to Latino participants.

Who Are These Latinos?

Which Latinos? Recent immigrants from Mayan villages in Guatemala? Fourth-generation Puerto Ricans in New Haven? Middle-class

⁴ Michael B. Aune, “Worship in an Age of Subjectivism Revisited,” *Worship* 65, no. 3 (May 1991): 224–38.

Chileans? Families in New Mexico with five hundred years of history? Before we throw up our arms in despair and go home, let me reassure you that these very different people share some very fundamental experiences, both culturally and historically, that have formed who we are as a people and shaped our piety, our worldview, and our ethos over centuries.

All Latin Americans (that would be all humans south of the Rio Grande, as well as their Mexican cousins from the tip of Texas all the way to Oregon before the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo in 1848) and their descendants in the US have experienced five centuries of colonialism. By colonialism, I mean the takeover, by political, military and economic means, of a territory or nation by another, usually wealthier and more developed, for the purposes of territorial expansion and, often, exploitation of natural resources and labor to benefit the colonizing country.

In our case as Latinos, we experienced this throughout all our lands from the “discovery” by Christopher Columbus until the early nineteenth century’s wars of independence. Some of us, like the Americans of Puerto Rico, continue to live in a colonial situation, for the benefit of the United States and its corporate interests, which still rules and holds sway in much of Latin America to this day, ever since Spanish colonial efforts yielded to and increased American influence over the last two centuries.

But colonialism is not only economic and industrial exploitation. It works culturally as well, quickly forming in the colonized the “proper” values and behaviors of the colonizers’ cultures. As a result, colonized peoples end up sincerely believing that the culture of the colonizers is better, more advanced, and more desirable, than their own. We call this *internalized colonialism*.

Being exploited for the benefit of others has marked us, forming us to be more appreciative of everything “from the North” than of what is ours—*lo nuestro*. For us colonial subjects, the best is always from elsewhere, rather than from home. Even within The Episcopal Church, Latinos, both here and abroad, often settle for an imported, translated version of the Anglo church—not only its tastes, expressions, and values, but also its evangelism, stewardship, and organizational aspects, as well.

By contrast, in a decolonized Latino Anglicanism, the reign of God is a place where *lo nuestro* (our food, music, dances, costumes, slang, humor, and so forth) carries our identity, and is not the exception, but

the norm. That is, God's reign, that world of truth, justice, peace, and love, involves us as we are, without needing to pretend otherwise.

Along these lines, the work of Latino theologian Roberto Goizueta provides an important clarion call warning us of today's increasingly homogenized world, a world where the survival of cultures, like the survival of endangered species, is a very real challenge. Additionally, he points to the role of individualism, a path by which the Western person integrates as an individual through a certain distancing from community and its traditions, as underlying the importance of community and its ritualizations to Latinos.⁵

Born well before the Enlightenment, Latin American cultures have experienced an almost total absence of the worldview and individualistic values that came to our shores from Europe in the eighteenth century and first actualized in the American Revolution and its founding fathers. Instead, the Enlightenment took hold among our Latin American intelligentsia, the poets and revolutionaries and such, leading to the nineteenth-century wars of independence. In a sense, the Enlightenment stopped there. As a result, although individual freedom is valued, Latino culture continues to acknowledge inequality, hierarchy, and difference to this day. We do not share enlightenment assumptions about a generic Cartesian humanity consisting of interchangeable people, all "good savages" deep down.

And so, unlike eighteenth-century New England villagers, we do not easily understand that the church is us, and that it depends on us to exist. Instead, we think of church as an institution so strong that it will exist before and after us, like the government's ministry of religious affairs. This is a profound corruption of the New Testament theology of the church, which envisions a radical community of equals. It also explains why Latino stewardship can be a challenge while pointing to the urgent need for pastoral care and liturgy that are formative, shaping a body of worshipers that know, in their bones, that they are the church, the body of the risen Christ.

Suffering, Liberation, and Popular Religiosity

Instead, our Latino religious cultures were born in the cauldron of late medieval Roman Catholic piety coming face to face with

⁵ See, for example, Roberto Goizueta, "U.S. Hispanic Popular Catholicism as Theopoetics," in *Hispanic/Latino Theology: Challenge and Promise*, ed. Ada María Isasi-Díaz and Fernando F. Segovia (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1996) 282–83.

indigenous religions. For example, the late medieval emphasis on the suffering of Christ, a certain obsession with sin and death, and a very real fear of hell, found echoes in, and subverted, established indigenous religiosities that stressed the rhythms of nature and our continuity with all creation.

Further, this emphasis on suffering, of Christ, of God, quickly became meaningful to a suffering people as redemptive suffering, a place where God joins us in ours, and not in the Anselmian sense of paying God for our sins (though that was never far away), but in the Girardian sense: suffering that is liberating as it displays, for all to see, the scapegoating of the innocent victims, and therefore our worthiness as a colonized, exploited, and suffering people.⁶

In its Latino sense, then, the reign of God is not a world where we all smile contentedly, but rather the place where victims are vindicated; it is a new world where our suffering from discrimination, exploitation, violence, and militarism is revealed to be unjust, for God has taken our victimization into God's own body and raised it again as Christ's risen body, of which we are the limbs. The reign of God, already begun with Jesus's proclamation, ministry, death, and resurrection and the sending of the Spirit upon the church, is also imagined as the eschatological fulfillment of Easter: God's *si se puede!* God's blessing and vindication of the innocent, scapegoated victims, accepting and loving us for all to see.

This Latin American understanding of the human condition is not without its own sophisticated Christian theological foundations. In 1968, the Latin American Conference of (Roman Catholic) Bishops (CELAM), meeting in Medellín, Colombia in the wake of the Second Vatican Council, laid the foundations for a theological, mis-siological, and liturgical endeavor that informed all Latino theology, in Latin America as well as here in the United States ever since. Later, in its meeting in Puebla, Mexico in 1979, the conference further articulated the nature, mission, and challenges of Latin American Christianity.

It is no exaggeration to say that these two conferences began a new branch of theology: Latin American theology, also known as liberation theology. Now joined by ecumenical theological partners, and spread to all cultures, nationalities, and ethnic or gender identities,

⁶ For a concise treatment of the scapegoating mechanism by Renee Girard, see his *The Scapegoat* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1986).

liberation theology finds its methodological locus for theological activity in the lives and experience of actual people, rather than starting with a magisterial (European), top-down approach. An entire generation of Latino theologians has grown and developed under the influence of the ideas of Medellín and Puebla: Gustavo Gutierrez and Juan Luis Segundo, Leonardo Boff, Rubem Alves, José Miguez Bonino, Enrique Dussel, Ignacio Ellacuría and Jon Sobrino, and here in the US, Virgilio Elizondo, Justo González, Roberto Goizueta, Ana María Isazi-Díaz, and Orlando Espín, to name but a few.⁷

Among many other concerns, Medellín and Puebla addressed a key element related to Latino worship: the “popular religiosity” of our people:

By religion of the people, popular religiosity, or popular piety, we mean the collection of deep beliefs, imprinted by God; the basic attitudes that flow out of these convictions and the expressions that manifest them. It is the form or cultural being that religion adopts in a given people or nation. The religion of the Latin American people in its most characteristic cultural form, is an expression of Catholic faith. It is a popular catholicism.⁸

This popular religiosity often contrasts with official religion and liturgy, which expresses the interests and power of elites and colonizers. Additionally, as Anscar Chupungco points out, it is often quite different in style: “The language of the liturgy is generally sober, direct and linear, speaking more to the people’s intellect; while, in contrast, the language of popular religious ritual is florid, discursive, and vividly picturesque, normally appealing more to the people’s sentiments and emotions.”⁹

Embodiment and Popular Religiosity

Like all human beings, Latinos cannot leave aside our bodies. Our attitudes, hopes, complaints, our joys, exasperations, shames and guilts, are all expressed physically. Like everyone else, we are bodies

⁷ See especially Orlando Espín, “Popular Religion as an Epistemology (of Suffering),” *Journal of Hispanic/Latino Theology* 2, no. 2 (November 1994): 55–78.

⁸ CELAM, *Documento de Puebla*, 444. Translation mine.

⁹ Anscar Chupungco, *Liturgical Inculturation: Sacramentals, Religiosity, and Catechesis* (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press 1992), 112–15.

in movement: eyes looking, ears hearing, mouths singing, often hands clapping, feet dancing. It is not that we are more embodied than humans of other cultures, but perhaps that we relish our embodiment more. If for no other reason than this, our worship is therefore always embodied, and rarely abstract or didactic. We also live in a religious world of images and are suspicious of iconoclasm, finding it barbaric, for we see images and symbols not as idols, but as sacramental media, just as the Orthodox do. And, perhaps more importantly, we do not enthrone words (even God's!) over the senses. We would generally prefer to act out the passion of Jesus on the streets than listen to it in church, for example.

This tradition of physical worship is owned by the people, as anyone who has learned the Lord's Prayer sitting on grandma's lap knows. This means that at a very granular level, specific communities, even families, will have their own prayer traditions: familial, tribal, local traditions of prayer (and its ritualizations) that exist in counterpoint to the official Common Prayer of the church, more often than not owned and led by women.

Finally, though perhaps it should have come first, we are extended families. *Familia* does not mean a couple with two children. It means all who are connected by blood ties, as any Puerto Rican giving a Christmas party knows. This, in turn, promotes and sustains interdependence: witness the way several *padrinos* and *madrinas* take responsibility for the expenses of different aspects of the quinceañeras celebration. And, of course, this also reflects that we are much less individualistic than members of the dominant culture. So we do not segregate our children and elderly; they are always with us, and any rehearsal of the reign of God must be designed to include them as well.

All of these aspects are part of the Latino "who," across all the countries and cultures south of the Rio Grande and those here with roots there. It is to these people that Latino liturgical action must be meaningful.

The Incarnation of Worship in Latino Culture

There is, however, an even more foundational theological reason, besides anthropological and historical aspects, to take Latino cultures and their expressions seriously in the design of liturgy: the incarnation. Theologically speaking, it is no accident that worship must involve human bodies and material means. God incarnated among us

concretely and specifically as a first-century itinerant Galilean rabbi, rather than a Platonic, generic idea of a human being: a particular individual of a given culture, language, and place, who lived, moved, and had his being as a man there and then, announcing the good news of God in deeds and words: "The reign of God is very near: change your hearts and trust the good news" (Mark 1:15). Like Jesus, we, his risen body, cannot do less today, if for no other reason than there is no such thing as a generic human being.

The incarnation as theological foundation for the importance of the physical in all things religious, especially the liturgical, was perhaps best articulated by John of Damascus at the beginning of the eighth century in his *In Defense of the Holy Icons*. Echoing him, as they celebrate the victory over the iconoclasts, the Orthodox Church sings on the first Sunday in Lent:

No one could depict the Word of the Father;
but when He took flesh from you, O Theotokos,
He accepted to be depicted,
and restored the fallen image to its former beauty.
We confess and proclaim our salvation in words and
images.¹⁰

As iconic, significant action, worship can do no less if it wishes to communicate meaning. And as Anglicans, we too have a strong history of respect for material signs and symbols, through both our Laudian reforms and the Oxford Movement, strongly connecting worship, through the incarnation, to a seemingly disparate aspect of being the church: our ministries of social justice among the poor.

Thus the "theological locus" of Latin America theology and liturgy, its foundational datum of the exploitation and suffering of our people in our cultural particularity, is also the point of entrance into any discussion of Latin American liturgy. The incarnation of God's word demands it.

The church as body of Christ, that is, his extension in time, space, and cultures, has no choice but to incarnate wherever it finds itself, being made up of bodies who live, move, and have their being in specific cultures. This presents a very real challenge to a church that, being originally English, still confuses Anglican with Anglo.

¹⁰ Kontakion for the Feast of Orthodoxy in the Eastern Churches.

Incarnating ourselves in a different culture is not as rare as one might think. St. Paul, Origen and other Alexandrians, Cyril and Methodius, the Jesuits in China, even Mother Ann Lee and her Shakers, and more recently Roman Catholics in India and Chiapas, have all worked from the following incarnational premise: in order to communicate with the other, you must become like them.¹¹ One cannot very well say, "Look! I have wonderful good news of great joy to tell you, but first you must become like me!" Further, our consumerist culture in the United States has so infected the church that we easily think of ministry as something sold *to* people, not carried out *with* them. In this light, it is not surprising that some Anglo conceptions of Latino ministry boil down to doing something ministerial for Latinos as a clientele, mere recipients of ministry, to bring them into "our" otherwise Anglo church, rather than join them as ministers in their own right.

There is a theological term for the incarnation of worship in cultures: *the inculturation of worship*. Coined in 1978 by Fr. Pedro Arrupe, SJ, superior general of the Jesuits, inculturation, as he defined it, is "the incarnation of the Church's life and worship in a given culture in such a way that the culture may be honored and brought to be everything it can be, while at the same time confronting its sinful aspects."¹²

Anglicanism Need Not Be Anglo

But isn't Anglican liturgy, by definition, English? Well, yes, historically, since the sixteenth century. Before that, however, it was Roman in the use of Sarum, and before that, Celtic with Syrian influences, and before that, perhaps Antiochian, and before that, strictly

¹¹ For a deeper treatment of the history of efforts at inculturation, see Aylward Shorter, *Toward a Theology of Inculturation* (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis, 1988).

¹² He adds, in #4 of his letter to the "On Inculturation, to the Whole Society," "If we want to let ourselves be caught up in the process of inculturation, theory and study are not enough. We need the 'shock' of a deep personal experience. For those called to live in another culture, it will mean being integrated in a new country, a new language, a whole new life. For those who remain in their own country, it will mean experiencing the new styles of our changing contemporary world—not the mere theoretical knowledge of the new mentalities, but the experiential assimilation of the way of life of the groups with which we must work, the outcasts, Chicanos, slum dwellers, intellectuals, students, artists, etc." Pedro Arrupe, *Other Apostolates Today: Selected Letters and Addresses—III*, ed. Jerome Aixala (St. Louis: The Institute of Jesuit Sources, 1981), 171–81.

Galilean Jewish, until St. Paul had his way. So no, Anglican worship has not always been English, our roots are much deeper and wider.

More importantly, Anglican liturgy must not be English outside England, not only because the rest of the world is not English, but for two further reasons, one ecclesiological and the other ethical. If one must seem English in order to be Anglican, Anglicanism is not truly catholic, but rather a culture-bound tradition within the wider universal church. If so, the honest thing to do would be to simply recognize that we have no business doing Latino ministry and shut it all down. Moreover, Anglican liturgy has a long history as a tool for the colonization of darker, poorer, less educated peoples, imposing on us foreign forms of worship. The startling evidence of this to this day are Ugandan choirboys sweltering in red cassocks with ruffled collars, a situation made even worse when the congregation assumes that the only proper way to do Anglican liturgy is like the British. Foreign liturgical styles say loud and clear, "To approach God you have to be like us, the colonizers." They not only say that, they form people with that conviction—yes, even North American Anglos.

Practicing Inculturation

How might Anglican liturgy be truly catholic, decolonized, and inculturated? How do we design truly Latino, truly Anglican worship? Who makes the decision? That is, who is the agent of inculturation?

Although the canons of the Episcopal Church give the priest in charge the responsibility to design worship, what is a priest to do before a congregation of Latinos? I am often shocked by the degree to which my colleagues (of any cultural background) think the liturgy is supposed to be an expression of their *personal* piety. Liturgy is not supposed to be meaningful only to me, or to the reader, for that matter. Our individual tastes cannot be the criterion for evaluation of liturgies and their components—not because we do not have exquisite taste in liturgy (well, *I* do!)—but because you and I are not the only participants. Liturgy does not exist for our own individual satisfaction as clergy; rather, we as professionals are called to design worship that is meaningful to the participants, in this case, Latinos and Latinas, as together we enact our vision of the reign of God already here among us. So let me suggest that we regain a liturgical ecclesiology that understands the church as a community of equal persons, and our worship as an action of the whole assembly, not only the clergy.

Latinos know perfectly well how to pray from our own centuries-long experience in our family, neighborhood, and church. This means that we know how to make an altar for the Day of the Dead, how to wake up Our Lady of Guadalupe singing to her on December 12, how to put together a proper fifteenth birthday celebration, how to enact the passion in the streets on Good Friday, and much more. So why don't we? Why do we continue to assume that the church is the clergy and the laity are our customers or spectators, in defiance of the baptismal ecclesiology of our prayer book?

This attitude is often shared by both clergy and parishioners, especially among immigrants who must live tentatively, ever walking on eggshells, learning, every single day, how to live in Anglo ways in order to survive. Add to this the Latino high respect for education and knowledge, and the fact that we expect clergy to know more, and you have a terrible mix: overly self-assured clergy and overly insecure laity.

A shift of spiritual perspective might be needed. By their baptisms, the Latinos before us in church are Christ. Let us learn to have some reverence for them, seeing the risen Christ in them, with all the splendor and authority that this conveys. Bow to them interiorly, for example, as you put a piece of bread in their hands and say "body of Christ," as you are referring to both.

More practically, ask them often, saying things like, "You know, I am from Puerto Rico, not Mexico, and so I have no idea of how to celebrate Our Lady of Guadalupe. Would you help me? What did they do in your town back in Mexico? What did your grandma do?" You need not limit yourself to December 12. As clergy, we need to develop a very difficult skill set, which is especially difficult after we have spent at least three years in seminary making sure we know all there is to know about liturgy: we need to be able to say, "I don't know, how do you . . . help me. . . ."

Does this mean, then, that anything that Ms. Lopez, who perhaps had a background in *santería*, wants to do on the Day of the Dead should be permitted? That is where our theological training comes in. To be useful as leaders of worship, we have to know not only the rubrics, and how liturgy as human ritualization is put together, but most importantly, its theological foundations. We must know answers to questions like, What is it that all Eucharists, in any language, people, or nation, must make present to the participants? What is the relationship between the body on the altar and the body gathered around it? How does that come about? Only then can we learn the difference

between what is Anglo passing as Anglicanism and what is universally Anglican Christian worship, across cultures.

Latinos are not interested in whether we light candles at Morning Prayer, but be sure to be ready for them to bring flowers unannounced on Sunday. How will you integrate the flowers into the liturgy? Latinos find it hard to pledge, however little, but we love processions and offerings. The Eucharist includes a procession of the gifts every Sunday. Perhaps we can base our stewardship program on this embodied manifestation of stewardship? Latinos go everywhere with our children. How might we design worship so the children are fully included and engaged?

There are dozens and dozens of more examples. But in order to engage them, and to know when and why to stop this and encourage that, we need to know the difference between liturgical theology and culturally conditioned liturgical trivia. So let's not worry so much about having to buy linens and vestments from C. M. Almy. We have seamstresses! Carpenters! Bakers of great bread for Eucharist! Musicians! Grandmas that remember prayers! Worry instead about listening to Latinos' visions of the reign of God, and about engaging our skills in putting together its rehearsal in the worship of the people of God.

In sum, it is possible to craft liturgy that is both truly Latino and truly Anglican—if we control our clericalism and respect their wisdom and expertise by encouraging Latino congregants to share their liturgical knowledge and history, to bring in their traditions, and to actively help us craft *their* worship of God. In such a liturgy the gospel is embodied, the reign lived in already, and we experience ourselves as beloved of God, just as we are. As we try to do this more and more, we might profit from the regular exchange of ideas and practices, in “safe spaces” where we might explore together new truly Latino ways of worshiping as Anglicans.