

~~_____~~ The previous chapter looked at the development of the rite of baptism and the influence of other religious traditions and elements that were added to the rite. This was followed by the missionary travels of Matteo Ricci and Roberto di Nobili which served as examples of inculturation. Both missionaries mastered the languages of the Chinese and Indian cultures along with an understanding of the religious and civil customs of the people. This knowledge ~~of the language and customs, of China and India,~~ allowed both missionaries to accept and incorporate elements of ~~the Chinese and Indian~~ these cultures into the Christian tradition. While their efforts at inculturation created controversy and ecclesial investigations, they were eventually affirmed by ~~eventually their efforts at inculturation were affirmed by~~ Church leadership. The chapter concluded with the exploration of various ~~principle~~ principles of inculturation that could be supportive of an ~~interreligious paraliturgical~~ prayer service including: dynamic equivalence, organic progression, creative assimilation, and creative liturgies.

~~_____~~ This chapter explores different paradigms of ~~interreligious~~ prayer services; ~~as proposed~~ proposed by Douglas Pratt (1997, 1998, 2006) ~~that include~~ including: three modes of ~~interreligious~~ prayer; two modes of responsiveness and two modes of hospitality that are constitutive ~~dimensions of interreligious~~ dimensions of such prayer. ~~The modes of prayer of~~ Pratt's paradigms will be juxtaposed against various modes of prayer developed by Thomas Ryan in his book ~~Interreligious Prayer~~ (2008), and Jacques Dupuis ~~in his book~~ whose book *Christianity and the Religions* (2002) ~~who offers~~ offers theological considerations that support both ~~interreligious prayer and~~ and common prayer ~~in his chapter on~~ Interreligious Prayer.

After addressing ~~the modes~~ these different modes of interreligious prayer, the discussion will turn to Michael Amaladoss's book *Beyond Inculturation: Can the Many be One?* (1998) and ~~proposed by Pratt, Ryan, and Dupuis~~ the issue of syncretism will be examined from the work of Michael Amaladoss in his book *Beyond Inculturation: Can the Many be One?* (1998), as well as and the work of Jeannine Hill Fletcher Hill-Fletcher's work on hybridity in her book *Monopoly on Salvation? A Feminist Approach to Religious Pluralism* (2005). Fletcher ~~looks upon everyone~~ regards all individuals as hybrids based on the many influences that shape ~~our~~ individual identity. The following section will include an examination of different Historical-historical periods ~~are explored~~ in which a diversity of religious traditions lead to a creative assimilation ~~of diverse~~ of different religious elements ~~that include~~. This discussion will include the work of Matteo Ricci and Roberto di Nobili ~~from chapter three~~

~~Following this examination of syncretism, the~~ The four days of Prayer for Peace that took place at Assisi, ~~are analyzed~~ will then be analyzed. ~~These days of prayer~~ This event is dichotomous as it was praised for encouraging interreligious paraliturgical services at the same time it was criticized ~~are significant because of the role they played in both encouraging interreligious paraliturgical services, and resisting such gatherings as~~ as an example ~~examples~~ of syncretism and relativism. The chapter concludes with the application of principles of inculturation ~~explored in~~ chapter three ~~chapter 3~~ and the revelatory nature of these services ~~as~~ they relate to ~~chapter two~~ chapter 2.

— In ~~the article~~ his article *Interreligious Prayer: Prospects and parameters* (2006), Douglas Pratt speaks of interreligious prayer as being “comparatively novel and relatively fare” However, in the past year, this researcher has attended, or been part of, the planning of many interreligious paraliturgical services that are the impetus of this research. The four Assisi gatherings convened by St. John Paul II and Pope Benedict XVI have brought both support and resistance to interreligious paraliturgical prayer services.

— Yet, in his article *Parameters for Interreligious Prayer: Some Considerations* (1997), Pratt mentions a joint consultation on interreligious prayer that took place in Bangalore, India in July 1996. He makes the following observation ~~The following perception was made, supporting this research, that~~ “[interreligious prayer] “is not an optional activity restricted to an elite group but an urgent call for a growing number of Christians today” (Pratt 1997, 1). In both his 1997 and 1998 articles, Pratt identifies three modes of interreligious prayer: a multi-religious act, a united act, and a coherent interreligious prayer service. In *Interreligious Prayer: Prospects and parameters* (2006), he identifies four modes: a shared multi-religious act, a contiguous multi-religious act, a combined multi-religious act, and a coherent-integrated interreligious prayer (Pratt 2006, 2-3).

— Pratt ~~also identifies~~ also discusses four modalities of encounter and engagement identified as the *responsive type* and *hospitality type* that are additional models of interreligious prayer. The *responsive type* consists of events ~~that are responding~~ that respond to a communal crisis or tragedy and those that are civic celebrations. The *hospitality type* provides the dynamics of being a host and guest at an interreligious event. He uses the metaphor of the culinary openness of a gourmand that

~~results in~~ ~~ith an excellent metaphor and analogy using cuisine and culinary openness~~
~~resulting in~~ “a wider appreciation of a diversity of nourishment and enrichment” ~~and~~
~~interreligious prayer resulting~~ Such openness to spiritual diversity and other religious
traditions only enhances our spiritual being. ~~in our spiritual being enhanced through a~~
~~wider diversity of enrichment as found in the various religious traditions.~~

— In his book *Interreligious Prayer* (2008), Thomas Ryan identifies different forms of ~~interreligious~~ prayer: just being there, ~~multireligious~~ ~~multireligious~~ prayer, integrative religious prayer and leadership of prayer at an ~~interreligious~~ gathering. These are ~~compared to~~ compared with Pratt’s models. The next section explores each of the modes of ~~interreligious~~ prayer.

~~The Multi-Religious Act or Shared Multi-Religious Act~~

— For Pratt (2006, 2), the ~~multi-religious~~, or ~~shared multi-religious~~ act (~~Pratt 2006, 2~~) involves presentations from a number of participating religious traditions in a planned order of service (Pratt 1997, 1). He evaluates this kind of service as lacking ~~ee-~~ ~~ordination~~ coordination and any particular level of mutual acceptance or agreement. Each of the contributions from the different religious traditions are observed rather than received. Some would describe this observation without reception as *religious voyeurism*.

While a common theme or occasion might be the purpose for the gathering, ~~there does not seem to be a theme~~ it does not seem to be an event that is coordinated, thematically, critically ~~and intentionally~~ or intentionally planned (Ibid., 1-2). He describes it as “a spiritual or liturgical ‘pot-luck’ as to the smorgasbord-like spread of differently sourced religious items contributed to the event” (Ibid. 1-2).

~~The United Act or Combined Multi-Religious Act~~