

Review of: "Spirituality of Pilgrims on the Camino de Santiago: Existential Questions and the Meaning of Life"

Judith King

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

The impact of the Camino de Santiago on the search for meaning, that enduring existential quest of the human being through all time, is of deep interest to me, and I am therefore glad to read of others' thoughtful considerations of it. The author has already received a number of very helpful, and indeed, many constructive critiques, and I would concur with some of the suggestions in a number of them. Let me indicate a couple of such examples. I would concur with the suggestion of adding Charles Taylor's work, except that I would go beyond the cited text to include some of his other work on the contemporary search for meaning. I would also concur with the suggestion that the author elaborate more on the 'the world is as it should be' concept, as it is so important to not only the author's stance but to their conclusions. I would also concur that overall, the discussion elements of the paper need more elaboration to give the findings more traction.

Notwithstanding the need for more discussion, I commend the way the author structured a lean presentation of their findings and thoughts in what I might call the co-ordinates of the existential map - Time, Space, Identity, etc. The Human section, however, was particularly bereft of substance, and yet the cited elements of it - as indicated by the Table - are so potentially rich. The most important quote of this section seems to come from the author's own work, which undermines the section further, I would suggest.

I would also suggest that the essay lacks an Introduction which might settle some of the lacunae. And one other suggestion would be to clarify the narrative voice. In one paragraph, the author speaks as a 'we,' but in subsequent paragraphs - when describing the research method - the 'I' voice is dominant.

I think the author has no option but to address the very significant challenges of at least two of the other reviewers. The more critical one is that which accuses the author of merely "using" the findings of Schnell and Pali and yet not doing as good a job overall. It is perhaps possible to do this not by way of a rebuttal charge by charge, but by way of a serious revision of the author's essay that discerns well the many valuable and helpful comments in the reviews.