Religious education at school should be more than just the acquisition of knowledge. It should not only provide cognitive facts on how religious people act according to their moral and religious convictions, but also on how learners can gain as much profit as possible from these facts in order to build their own identity as religious ‘tourists’. Good religious education challenges them also to become ‘pilgrims’ and to allow the ‘slow questions’ of religion to enter into their own life, in all their vulnerability and provisionality. This paper discusses the recent orientation towards religious experience in religious didactics in Western Europe and makes out a case for a mystagogical-communicative or ‘narthical’ approach to religious learning. This argument is presented against the background of individualisation, pluralisation and detraditionalisation of religion, which is the typical context for young people in their search for meaning today.
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Religious perplexity in the classroom

The modern multi-cultural and multi-religious environment has a pervasive influence upon the moral and spiritual mindset of young people today. Pursuing an emancipatory concept of education my position is that young people have the right to gain insight into the diversity and complexity of the religious phenomenon: what religion does with people and what people do with religion. The school is the place par excellence to learn, to observe and to interpret this impact of religion on moral and spiritual convictions, decisions and practices in contemporary society and culture. ‘Religious literacy’ in combination with the formation of a ‘religious self’, a sort of pivotal point of reflection, evaluation and communication within the learner, seems to be the generally accepted goal of religious education in recent theory development. One could argue that this hermeneutic-communicative concept, based on observation/interpretation and communication about and from religion, is also the leading concept on which teacher training programmes in Western Europe are built (to mention only a few: Hermans 2003; Jackson 1997; Lombaerts and Pollefeyt 2004; Mette 2000; Roebben 2001; Schweitzer 2006; Ziebertz 2003).

However, there are indications that this approach is reaching an impasse. In observing and discussing religion in the classroom, it could be the case that the
underlying religious experience is not accessible to learners because of their deep-rooted ignorance of the topic. This is not only so in secondary education, but even in teacher training programmes in higher education. In modern secularised societies not only the grammar but also the ‘lived’ or experiential language of religion is increasingly lacking. Detraditionalisation, combined with individualisation and pluralisation of religion, often causes perplexity in the classroom. ‘What in heaven’s name are they talking about?’ is then a frequent question. ‘What do you personally think?’ is then a sort of final appeal to the teacher’s wisdom when the atmosphere becomes too emotional. The teacher often turns out to be as dumb-struck as the pupils.

Three different observations are underpinning this view. They emerge from recent developments in religious educational theory, accelerated and challenged by the very spiritual experiences of children and young people today. First of all, it seems more and more the case that a detached religious studies approach in the classroom cannot but lead to issues of personal meaning giving (Bowman 2006; Simmons 2006). The passion of religious people can after all be spread to the novice and can encourage expectations such as: ‘Can I also get a taste of that experience?’ A second development is appearing in the field of inter-religious dialogue and inter-religious learning: in order to become fully involved in this dialogue the learner needs to be able to speak from some personal stance, however minimal. Without an initial ‘thick’ description of one’s own position or without an insight in the lived theology of the particular tradition to which one belongs (Hussain 2004), the learner is not motivated enough to engage in a tolerant exchange of ideas and practices (Schweitzer 2007). What is needed is ‘a re-defining and a re-dignifying’ of one’s own spiritual home (Halsall and Roebben 2006, 448), a ‘re-cognition’ of one’s own religious experience in a provisional framework, not as an undeniable certainty but as something to put to the test during the encounter. And thirdly, the whole field of ‘children’s spirituality’ (in German: Kindertheologie) is raising new thoughts about the radical (some even argue the ‘infinite’) openness of children to the world of the sacred. Their uninhibitedness towards other spiritual beings, their ‘relational consciousness’ of the world and their spontaneous childish attitude of living a life of dedication and expectation provide a critique of the ‘culturally constructed forgetfulness’ of spirituality in modern forms of education, even of religious education, which cannot be ignored (Hay and Nye 1998).

These three observations, critically reframed by the latest developments in theory, make us aware of the challenges to religious education. My point of departure is not the deficiency of the modern hermeneutic-communicative concept of religious education, but its potentiality. Or, the perplexity can be a surprising starting point for the communication on religious experience on a deeper level. Young people are open to this quest, because they do not carry any burden of proof for the old system. They want to get involved and are waiting for someone who leads them into unexplored land. In the following paragraphs, I invite the professional reader to rediscover the dynamic of the hermeneutic-communicative model of religious education and to go beyond it, in order to uncover the original religious experience that lies underneath it. I invite the reader to participate critically in the way of the pilgrim and to explore the metaphorical language of this essay. What counts for children in the classroom, could also count for the professional and the teacher: ‘Through the challenge of “unpacking” another worldview one can, in a sense, become a new person’ (Jackson 1997, 130–1).
The pilgrim’s way of learning

You can travel like a tourist: consuming, greedy and always demanding. You can also travel like a pilgrim: contemplative, open to surprises and taking time to digest the experience quietly. In post-modern culture, travelling is often thought of and perceived as a tourist event: you ‘book’ a trip (and not a journey), ‘do’ some sightseeing, ‘arrange’ an insurance, etc. Maybe it cannot be otherwise, considering the hastiness of our time (Bauman 1996). Travelling is affected by our consumer culture: travelling people often fall victim to a competitive spirit and supermarket behaviour. To illustrate this with an example: recently I learned that sherpas collected four tons of tourist garbage on Mount Everest.

The true challenge of travelling, however, is to be open and receptive to what you encounter on the way and what rearranges your course of life. True travellers notice differences and become conscious of significant things that were missing in their frame of reference and of which they were previously not aware. Journeying people are open to others and to circumstances that are different. Travelling like a pilgrim supposes the willingness and the skills to change one’s perspective on the road. True travellers are at home on the road. Like pilgrims they feel like a fish in the water when they have to experience the elements of nature and culture and rearrange them in view of their own path of life. The challenges of their journey, being so close to the elements, help them to be continuously aware of this transformation process. Anyone who has never had blisters on their feet from walking, or strained calves from cycling, who, in other words, has not experienced the elements, has never really travelled at all. Experience (comes from the Latin experire which means: to go outside) is breaking out of yourself and being moved by other things that inspire you, mentally as well as physically, and to stand still and listen to them.

Is this travelling also possible in a purely mental form? Is it conceivable to travel between four walls, such as in a classroom? Can an intentional learning process evoke the same experiences as those of a pilgrim? These are difficult questions. Some will say that the learning experience of the pilgrimage cannot be attained at school. Children would no longer be sensitive to casual observations, they would rather be inclined to react to immediate and radical sensations they experience. Schools should therefore be suppliers of ‘travel kicks’, which use every means to let children experience new matters. In this way, children learn about the latest material equipment, have exciting adventures and visit exotic destinations, but they do not learn what it means to enrich themselves and to be absorbed on the road. Learning in this way is artificial; it is too smooth and too soft and it lacks the challenging predicament of a continual search and discovery, such as is shown by a pilgrim.

Young people long for life perspectives that are consistent and meaningful and which truly deal with something. They want to travel, but they also want to reach a home. Restlessness is in all the ages: each generation wants to rearrange reality in accord with its own visions. The question of young persons today, however, is whether or not they should take the effort to bother at all. The essentialism of meta-narratives is over. It is not present any more in the mindset of young people. They have not experienced these narratives and they are unaware of the accompanying emancipating process. Their key question today is: How to cope with plurality and profusion without becoming violent or depressed? Is there a horizon of
meaningfulness that fills our search with sense and sensitivity? Are there images of successful lives that can inspire us? Or do we have to find out everything ourselves? Travelling and being on the road seem to be the current keywords for a vital and resilient attitude towards life, but do young persons truly possess sufficient guarantees to be “at home on the road”?

Post-modern religious education and the discovery of meaning

Religious education encompasses meaning giving. This is a modern and active term: it supposes a high degree of thoughtfulness and stems from the idea of creating your own life journey and destination. It sometimes happens that from this perspective religious education unintentionally receives the status of a tourist event: teachers go on a journey with their students and show them the different ways in which people give meaning to their lives. At home again, they invite the students to make a choice. The danger of this approach lurks around the corner: young people do not feel involved and will in the long run show a tendency to escape – looking for distraction and non-commitment.

Receiving meaning is a good term to describe the pre-modern process: the meaning of life was imposed upon people; it was described and defined by church and state. In the past, ‘travelling’ was not an option during religious education. There you learned that the world outside was in agreement with the world inside. You learned that a world of difference did not exist, unless someone deviated from the right doctrine – an expression of behaviour that was not permitted in those times and that could result in radical exclusion.

What can be considered as the post-modern alternative, in correspondence with the longing of young people today? I propose the term discovery of meaning. During religious education classes, young people learn the skill of re-reading reality from a philosophical and religious point of view. That perspective is handed over to them through the life stories of others who themselves dealt creatively with reality. They discover the concept of their lives by making a detour through these stories. Nobody has been given the ability to directly observe the meaning of life (the pre-modern perspective). A merely descriptive analysis of possible perspectives of meaning (the modern perspective) is considered to be insufficient. A literary ‘detour’ (a term of Paul Ricoeur, quoted by Streib 1998) could be an alternative and is like a thought experiment: it challenges young people to reconsider their own stories from a different angle, from the possibility of ‘it could as well be otherwise’. That confrontation is always surprising (‘I have never seen it that way before’) but never alienating.

This type of ‘discovering’ learning does not provide ultimate answers but opens the hermeneutic space in which seeking can be transformed into a meaningful and fulfilling practice. By means of stories of good and deepened life young people learn to discover that these stories could make a difference in their lives as well. The fundamental question is not whether schools should translate and customise religious traditions into a perfectly fitting lifestyle for the young or that they should leave their traditions as they are. The question is whether schools are able to apply the communication of religious tradition in such a way that it inspires and moves young people to deepen their lives and to discover the very meaning of them.
A hermeneutic-communicative approach to religious education

‘Most trains ride along the back of life’, thus sings the Dutch theatre performer Herman van Veen. This is a striking image of religious education. Students are taken along on a journey, gathered in a train (communicative) where they can learn from each other and from the stories from outside, how to understand and to cope with reality in view of the reconstruction of a sense of meaning for their own lives (hermeneutic). This approach assumes that it is possible to invite young people in a communal quest in which a profusion of alternative life views and clear-cut communication contribute to an elucidation (if not enlightenment) of one’s own position and opinion. In this respect, religious education wants to give young people the opportunity to formulate and justify their religious origins and future. The objective is not to initiate them into one particular worldview, but to make them aware of the diversity that surrounds them and to hand them skills to deal with this abundance. The point of departure is that there is a correlative effect on a pedagogical level between the themes of life that tend to puzzle young people and the (many and possible) answers that have been generated through religious traditions in time, and which today are presented by the teacher, the fellow learners, the curriculum, the handbook, etc. Meaningful words and gestures that could contribute to their own meaning giving process are revealed to young people. Or put differently, young people discover new meaning in old stories and traditions and learn precisely through this religious appropriation how to define themselves.

Stories form the access road to this learning experience: small stories which show the back of life and which have not yet been flattened out by the big overruling scripts of market and media. Children and young people will not be left to their fate. They will be taken on a detour and safely brought to meaningful contexts and perspectives, where meaningful words are spoken and meaningful actions are undertaken. The teacher is willing to uphold their learning environment with new impulses, unsuspected views and sometimes even raw and uncensored reality. Thus, there will be discussions about what is and what could be. This concrete utopia is what stimulates and compels religious educators to be at home on the road. In this ‘pilgrimage’, they are leading their students.

A mystagogical-communicative approach to religious education

This correlation between what actually is and what proactively could be is of a pedagogical nature. Young people are enabled to make the mental detour, to broaden their perspective and to ask critical questions of the material at stake. They develop their interpretive competence in the dynamic tension between available knowledge and newly presented interpretation schemes (Roebben 2001, 263–5; Schweitzer 1999, 205–7). This correlation, however, initially is not of a theological nature, which refers to the interaction between experience and revelation. The model of the correlation didactics, grounded in a correlation theology, was successful in Roman Catholic religious education in Belgium, Germany and the Netherlands until the late 1980s. On the basis of a relatively solid religious socialisation at home, the teacher used to disclose theological contents by referring to the related religious practice in everyday life. Moreover, there was the conviction that divine intervention was effected in this process as a solid answer to the needs of the searching religious individual. This particular religious background can no longer be assumed. Children enter the classroom without language, tradition and community (hence without the
possibility of theological correlation) but their questions of life remain, often unspoken and sky high.

I am strongly convinced that something ‘strange’ happens to these children when they are brought into the hermeneutic-communicative process of religious self-enlightenment and are invited to ‘co-express’ themselves with the meaning-exploring stories of the other side. The pedagogical correlation (which they request for: listen carefully to our needs so that you can guide us on our journey and can support us with your insights) can erupt into a new theological correlation (where do I find new life for my soul?). Those who introduce young people to an environment impregnated with strong and meaningful didactical impulses, those who escort them into the powerful space between human ambivalence and the longing for wholeness that evolves out of this ambivalence cannot but admit that questions will emerge like water from a fountain. Those who, for example, come up during the class conversation on ‘loyalty towards your parents’ with the story of Isaac’s relation with Abraham are assured of a weighty discussion. And this will be likewise in the case of Job’s story considering ‘suffering’ and Moses’ story regarding the question of ‘vocation’.

These questions are near and related to the turbidity within learners themselves who abide between longing and perspective. These questions are powerful because they refer to the ultimate questions to which religious traditions and people time after time have formulated meaningful answers by ways of contents (dogmatics) and lifestyles (ethics). Those teachers who during these important learning moments restrict themselves to offering information and encouraging communication cause, in my opinion, serious damage to the religious learning process of modern young people. Indeed, they offer an overview of the digestive system (Biesinger and Lott 1998), but they tend to forget (or are afraid to admit or cannot bear the thought) that young people crave for soul food. In this process of dealing with perplexity, one does not have to be afraid to catechise or to encourage the young to formulate a confession of faith. Catechesis after all presupposes pre-catechesis which in turn presumes religious socialisation. And this is no longer available. Young people often appear empty-handed in the classroom. Are schools courageous enough to critique their overemphasis on didactical organisation ‘in religiosis’? Are they brave enough to participate in the religious ‘empty-handedness’ of young people, trusting therein that new spiritual experiences originate when young people experientially learn to redefine and re-dignify themselves through religious traditions?

I plead for a willingness to leave behind a religious education in which young people are just ferreting tourists who – however well intended it may be – learn to functionally deliberate every possibility in consideration of their identity formation. Religious traditions do not solely function as ‘identity providers’. Rather, they are sources of wisdom that quench the thirst of the soul. Of course this supposes a critical reading of those sources and a condemnation of a fundamentalist use of sources, an application that defiles the soul and fills it with hatred. A virtuous religious education justifies the genuine language game of religion. And this language game is referring to what is unsystematic, ironic, subversive, indefinite – and in that sense open for the indefinite, the undefined, the a-functional (Roebben 2004, 223–7). I plead for a religious education that is explorative and informative, which learns to discern congealed traditions in ‘key stories’ (pedagogical: hermeneutic-communicative) and which also and foremost learns to ‘de-congeal’ or ‘to liquefy’ these traditions (Roebben 2007, 121–40, 169–73), so that the original ‘key experience’ and underlying ‘key question’ (Schweitzer 1999,
This mystagogical approach (in combination with the label ‘communicative’ because of the need for exchange between pupils, teachers and classroom materials) is grounded in the positive anthropology that the human being is radically open for the mystery (from the Greek: *musterion*) of existence. The soul after all is susceptible to the mystery of reality as it unfolds itself in the life of the human person. In the learning process, the soul can be encouraged to reveal itself to the learning person. In this perspective, the teacher is acting (from the Greek: *agogein*) as a midwife who time and again helps the learner to give birth to new insights (pedagogical) and to new life (theological). After the deductive model of ‘kerugma’, after the silent death of the inductive model of theological correlation in the late 1980s (Englert 1993) and new pedagogical forms of correlation theories in the late 1990s within the context of religious modernisation (such as the abductive correlation theory, see Prokopf and Ziebertz 2000), there is a new interest in religious experience in the realm of religious education praxis and theory (Schambeck 2006; van den Berk 1999). This approach makes us aware of the paradox of education in general and of religious education in particular. Education as the didactical organisation of ‘practices of dispossession’ remains unexplainable (Geerinck 2004).

**Narthical religious learning**

The pedagogical space between longing and perspective, the passage between the searching of the learner and the proposal of the teacher to undertake a mental ‘detour’ can bring about a dynamic which exceeds the learning process. To describe this unforeseen ‘teachable moment’ within the intentionally organised learning zone, I use the metaphor of the narthex. Its original meaning refers to the entrance hall of the church, the buffer zone between the outside world and the inner sacred space. The narthex, in its metaphoric sense, is both a pedagogical and a theological place of confrontation. In the learning process, a space can be offered for what cannot be learned but only can be ‘received’. In the narthex, we can come to understand that we cannot ground our own existence, that we are not the source of our thoughts, that in our search we have already been found and that we never revert to definitive senselessness when we might get lost or lose sight of the track. The German theologian and educationalist Helmut Peukert calls this ‘transformative learning’ (in contrast to most of the learning forms which he calls ‘cumulative learning’) and considers this the educational method of the future: losing oneself in the encounter with the Other (or the other) to experience oneself in a completely different way as ‘being found’ (Peukert 2002). According to the author, churches and moral communities especially have to fulfil a unique role in this ‘new learning’ since they represent traditions of openness that teach people to deal faithfully with situations of radical transformation (like healing after breakage, forgiveness after sin, life after death, etc.).

Religious education then can become a pilgrimage. The learning span could then be compared to the situation of pilgrims who find themselves craving for water and coolness on their journey and who are confronted with something completely different from what they had expected and hoped for in the narthex of the church building. A perfect example of this learning span is the narthex of the Madeleine church in Vézelay, France. On their journey through the Burgundian hills, along one of the four central axes of the French route to Santiago de Compostella, pilgrims turn into two-legged
shambling creatures craving refreshment. Is there anybody who can quench their thirst and offer them a cooling breeze? Something extraordinary happens when entering the narthex: their entreaty for refreshment is answered with beautiful sculptures of the Christian salvation history. The triumphing Christ wants to offer them ‘inspired water’, something completely different to what they expected and hoped for. But at the same time a sigh of recognition resounds in their souls. They let go of their overarching search for salvation and let themselves be found (in this case by Christ). The quest receives new meaning, the longing is rearranged, questions that have been asked along the way are not solved but rephrased. Life receives new meaning: a new sense (pedagogically) and a new direction (theologically).

**Implications for religious education**

The metaphor of the narthex is vulnerable. It could be misinterpreted and to some extent it invites misinterpretation. The narthex as universal symbol is (literally) connected to a singular church building which represents a particular faith tradition. The danger therefore exists that the narthex will be considered an anthropological stepping stone for the ‘real deal’ in the sacred space of one particular faith tradition. The metaphor, however, by no means intends to uphold the narrowness of such a stringent view. I use the image to explain that the existential question will only be recognised in the feeding of the tension of longing and perspective. Religious experience will only appeal to the imagination (as a possible answer to that existential question) when this tension is conceptualised; in other words, when the human longing comes across words and images that intrinsically elucidate and renew. This encounter between longing and perspective is, as has been said, doubly layered: the pedagogical handing over of new insights for the developing narrative identity of the pupil (‘Who can I become?’) can give rise to another more radical longing to tackle the mystery of who one really is (‘Where do I belong?’). What are the implications of this metaphor?

1. As a religious educator one does not need to be worried about a ‘hidden curriculum’ of catechesis or confession of faith. Catechesis after all supposes pre-catechesis, based on the explicit request to become a member or participant of a faith community. Within the narthalic learning model I assume that many no longer adhere to that idea – they may have been baptised but in practice that means very little. I assume that a lot of children and young people today have not experienced a religious socialisation at home and that a pre-catechetical ‘longing’ therefore is out of the question. The longing that I am talking about in this narthalic learning paradigm is of a totally different nature. It resonates in the question that children ask their teacher: ‘Do you truly believe yourself what you are telling us? What does having faith mean to you? How does it work for you?’ The longing is therefore open and unbiased, a typical situation that in a post-secular living environment is increasingly gaining ground. The question therefore is whether or not contemporary religious education has the courage to cultivate this space and to show how concrete religious people and groups engage in the clarification of that space of existential longing. The narthex for that reason must not be misunderstood, in the literal sense of the word, as a pre-catechetical portal of which the outside door is closed like a barrier once people have set foot in the ‘keel’ of the church, in the intimate (read: liturgical-sacramental-catechetical) part of the church.
(2) This model bridges the ‘classic’ division of sacred church versus secular world as prescribed in ‘modern’ secularisation theories. The profane after all can manifest itself in the inner space of the church and the sacred can be disclosed outside of the church. In the thoroughfare of the narthex both worlds meet thereby mutually affecting each other. That this approach requires new demands of Christian theology scarcely needs saying. An exciting task for future theological reflection is to ask whether and how the sacramental experience of wholeness, characteristic of a good liturgy, rises in the ‘ordinariness’ of human existence.

(3) Within the narthex it is necessary to awaken and nurture the already present ‘transcendental openness’ of the tension between immanence and transcendence, so that learners think of themselves as open questions and hope to find fertile and steady ground to answer this existential question. This implies that narthical teachers must carefully listen to what the longings of (young) contemporaries are and that they must be able to voice the often unarticulated issues in their lives. Moreover, they need to encourage them in their effort to articulate their own experiences. For that reason they must constantly enter the market place of life to observe conscientiously the longing of contemporaries for life fulfilment and to (help them) conceptualise this.

(4) Another aspect in the bipolarity of narthical leadership is, besides the observation of longing, the cultivation of perspective – or in other words, the maintenance of the ‘religious backpack’. What should it contain? What kind of provision do teachers take with them for along the way? The answer to this question requires a lot of hermeneutic sensibility. Which biblical key stories are able to illuminate and illustrate the existential questions of today’s contemporaries? What is of eminent importance? Which ‘hierarchy of truths’ prevails? Which central ideas of salvation deserve to be conceptualised today? And what can we leave behind as lumber? I strongly believe that this line of thought implies a renewed engagement of academic theology with the religious–educational discourses of today. There is a desperate need for biblical, ritual–liturgical, political–ethical and cultural–religious focal points to help understand and stimulate the quest of our young contemporary fellow sense-seekers.

(5) The narthical space is also a place of encounter where one has the freedom to theologise. Many kinds of questions and experiences after all can come up within the continuum of immanence–transcendence. Some will talk about the radical ‘alteriority’ in their lives, while others will tell about a life in human solidarity. New traditional patterns, interpretations and even contents will originate in this creative encounter. It is obvious that (religious) traditions within the narthical space will be reanimated and reactivated, if young people are given the chance to acquire them, however, irreverent this may seem to the ‘traditionalist’ who hides in every teacher!

(6) ‘Learning by doing’ is an important principle within the narthex. I believe that a merely educational and didactical approach to religious education has put the cognitive competencies to the forefront. Modern religious education needs to stimulate ‘thoughtfulness’ and aims to teach children how to phrase effectively and view their own religious identity. But religious literacy in my opinion surpasses the reason of this rational approach. It is also a matter of taste and inner (and internal) familiarity. In the fear of indoctrinating young people, we no longer dare to initiate them into the religious experiences of actually lived
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faith through symbolism, rituals, church social welfare work and tangible encounters with believers and faith communities.

(7) The narthical perspective ultimately confronts us with the inevitable question of energetic communities. Do they still exist? And if they do, are they correlative and narthical enough? What about their spiritual undertow or zest? Isn’t it true that we often have to conclude that religious communities fail to address the need of today’s sense-seekers, the ‘believing without belonging’, because they themselves are so soulless and their members so ‘belonging without believing’? Is there anybody home in the inn? Is there life in the inn? Is anything ‘cooking’ in there? Or has the last person already turned off the light and closed the door behind them?

Conclusion

In the context of the increasing mobility of young people and the growing number of diaspora communities, of syncretism and religious tourism (Cohen 2006, 148–50), the narthical approach is more than worth examination (Engedal 2006). In the meantime, the great religious traditions leave their traces on the contemporary longing for meaning. A pilgrim’s image that illustrates this impact marvellously is from the Dutch novelist and journalist Herman Vuijsje, who walked the Camino, the pilgrim’s road, in the opposite way, from Santiago de Compostella to Amsterdam. He writes:

All those kilocalories that fell down from the pilgrims through the ages, where have they gone? On the Camino. After the Middle Ages they remained there unused, nobody noticed them: a layer of pure energy, compressed and crystallised under the feet of thousands of new pilgrims. Now the pilgrimage is moving up again, after all these centuries, and old routes are rediscovered, they are woken up out of their slumber and they offer the pilgrim in our days unsuspected power. (Vuijsje 2003, 159, translation by author)
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