INTO THE DEEP: NAVIGATING FROM LONELINESS TO INFINITY

Joseph Wong Shun Yip, SJ

"*The soul that sees beauty may sometimes walk alone.*"

— Johann Wolfgang von Goethe

Isolation – the very experience highlighted by the pandemic – is the space where I journeyed throughout the years of my philosophical studies. By chance or by grace, philosophy became one of my walking companions as I went through these moments of confinement where I often asked myself, "What does isolation bring forth?"

There are some benefits to isolation. It provides more personal time and space for reflection. I have the leisure to stop amidst the daily routine, the space to pay attention to what is going on around me, and the opportunity to ask questions about the mundane, search for the essentials, and clarify the obscure. Isolation provides me the fertile ground for the act of philosophizing.

If Thales became the laughing stock because he fell into the well while he was thinking about what happened in the sky, it is no longer the case when we take time to reflect and seek meaning from our pandemic experiences. The pandemic tells us the same message Socrates had more than two thousand years ago, "The unexamined life is not worth living."

Isolation does not only open the door to philosophical reflection but also draws on the limit situation we confront.

https://publications.lst.edu/

Nothing stands out more vividly than the experience of loneliness – community lockdown, self-quarantine, or social distancing. Physical isolation also leads to social and psychological isolation. From time to time, we experience being alone, left out, alienated, separated, lost, and thus, lonely.

However, loneliness does not emerge only from a pandemic. At some point in our life, we all experience loneliness. We are born into the world as an individual. We live the challenges and triumphs in our life mostly on our own. We face our death alone. Being lonely is indeed a fundamental human experience. As the Beatles' song goes, "Look at all the lonely people!"

If wonder motivated the Pre-Socratics to question the origin and order of the world, faith moved Augustine and Aquinas to reason about the nature of God, doubt drove Descartes to seek a clear and distinct understanding of what can be known, and fear and anguish irritated the existentialists to inquire the meaning of being human, it was the experience of loneliness that pushed me to question.

What is loneliness? What does it mean when I say that I am lonely? How does philosophy help me understand the original experience of loneliness? Is it only a negative notion? What can be drawn out from loneliness? Where does loneliness lead to?

Disquieting as they may appear, our questions represent a passion – a passion to know and to love. The same passion has propelled the philosophical adventure of countless thinkers over time. As a philosophy student, I do not go on this journey alone. *Philosophia*, the passion for wisdom, pushes me to put out into the deep unknown, to journey to the periphery ever changing, and to explore the horizon ever new. Meanwhile, the wisdom of passion inspires me to navigate from loneliness to infinity.

https://publications.lst.edu/

A Quest for Human Flourishing

Loneliness often comes when we are alone. It appears as a discomfort like living in a prison cell. But loneliness does not equate to being alone. I can enjoy being alone – whether listening to music, reading, writing, and reflecting – and the most extreme case is the monk who prays and works all day long in a hut of his own. I am content to stay with the aloneness, which is called solitude.

The song "Shallow" by Lady Gaga and Bradley Cooper well expresses what loneliness is. It is an experience of "falling" in which we either fear or want change. As human beings, we have a quest for the deep. "I'm off the deep end, watch as I dive in. I'll never meet the ground. Crash through the surface, where they can't hurt us. We're far from the shallow now…" Loneliness is discontent with shallowness. In loneliness, I feel discomfort with not being in touch with deeper reality, including the innermost part of myself. There is a desire to "crush through the surface" of routine and superficiality and to "dive in" the deep to know and make meanings.

Socrates was the pioneer against shallowness. He refused to take everything for granted, to accept what the majority says, to listen to beautiful but empty words from those who called themselves wise. Socrates was lonely because he sought to attain wisdom through vigorous investigation and dialogue . His way to break the shallowness was to question, refute, and examine every argument. He challenged the common beliefs and prejudices of Athens in the marketplaces, until he was put to death - alone.

The wisdom he attained in these conversations was nothing but humility – to know that I do not know. Shallowness can sometimes be a cover-up for ignorance but wisdom requires

of me the humility to acknowledge my limitations in order to gain deeper insight . As my teacher in Philosophy of the Human Person said, "To have a point of view is first that you are able to go out of your point of view." This movement of going out is dramatically portrayed in Plato's *Allegory of the Cave*. As the only man who escapes from the narrow cave and sees the enlightened reality has his eyes burned and is eventually persecuted, the journey to go against shallowness is paradoxically a lonely path.

And yet shallowness is not only related to what one knows about reality but also one's purpose. Despite any measure of accumulated knowledge, a person remains shallow when he cannot answer the questions "Who am I" and "What am I living for?" Something is lacking in his life. Thus, he feels that "I'll never meet the ground."

Aristotle was well aware of this problem. Therefore, he posed the question of the ultimate purpose of human life. I can have many purposes in my life, such as pleasure, honor, health, and wealth, but what is the self-sufficient, final, and attainable end of human living? Aristotle thought that it was happiness (in Greek, *eudaimonia*). Rather than a static state of pleasure, *eudaimonia* is the lifelong process to attain excellence (*arête*) of our human nature. In other words, human beings aim toward flourishing.

But what is human nature? For Aristotle, human beings are rational, which differentiates us from other animals. Yet, he acknowledges that we also have biological needs and passions. The latter can even influence our actions. For example, a celebrity can slap a person out of anger and a politician can lie to gain power. The uniqueness of being human is to exercise rationality to direct our impulses and guide our

https://publications.lst.edu/

actions. Thus, the end of human beings is to attain excellence in their intellectual capacity.

Aristotle was very practical. He knew that we do not live in the realm of ideas, but actions. We can only attain virtues through our actions, that is, as we often say "learning by doing." In order to do this, we have to cultivate both intellectual and moral virtues. While intellectual virtue is the pursuit of knowledge and truth, moral virtue is developed through the habitual practice of seeking the mean (*mesotes*) between excess and deficiency. Thus, I can only acquire virtuous living by choosing the appropriate response in every situation guided by reason . This appropriate response is the middle ground between the extremes, for example, courage between rashness and cowardness, moderation between self-indulgence and insensibility. While there is no absolute answer for different situations, I can build up my virtuous character only through continuous practice.

Nothing can put down a virtuous person since his sense of purpose and way of life are built-in instead of an add-on. He can continue to choose his means followed by his reason even if he is in a distress situation like loneliness. Is this not the same challenge the pandemic posed to us? Every day I discern the middle ground of prudence between social distancing and freedom, of charity between self-preservation and solidarity with the poor, and of truthfulness between easy answers and research-based decisions.

Reason Out in Solitude

Loneliness is not only experienced in isolation but also amidst the crowd. For example, when I become functional in the workplace, when I talk about many topics rather than myself in a conversation, or when I move in and out of my

apartment without any interaction with the neighbors. I can live as an apathetic and impersonal being.

One of the iconic paintings that capture the modern landscape of loneliness is Edward Hopper's "Nighthawks." It portrays a brightly lit diner with four people within. While each person does not seem to connect, they fall into endless questioning in solitude. It presents the two ways we try to escape from loneliness.

In loneliness, we experience boredom. While some people choose to act out and find refuge in all kinds of sensory pleasure, such as alcohol, drugs, gaming, and sex, others retreat inwardly to the mind. Our human mind has the unrestricted drive to know about everything,[1] and thus, fulfills our desire to connect with everything outside. Loneliness can motivate our drive for knowing, questioning, and doubting.

Who else, but Reńe Descartes, was so fascinated with doubting in his philosophical enterprise? He does not doubt in order to destroy but to seek what is true. Doubting is a method for him. He thinks that everything can be doubted except the act of doubting. In other words, I can doubt everything, even my body, but not the mind that doubts. Thus, he reaches a foundation of *cogito*: I think, therefore I am.[2] I am a thinking being.

Descartes started the revolution to turn the world upside down. Reality is no longer perceived as how it appears to the mind, but as what the mind can know – those which are clear and distinct. Thus, he separates the knower as the subject and the known as an object. The subjective mind which doubts,

1 Norris Clarke, SJ, The *One and the Many: A Contemporary Thomistic Metaphysics* (Indiana: University of Notre Dame Press, 2001), 29.

2 Reńe Descartes, *Meditations on First Philosophy: With Selection from the Objection and Replies,* trans. Michael Moriarty (New York: Oxford University Press, Inc., 2008), 17-24.

https://publications.lst.edu/

understands, wills, and imagines treats everything as an impersonal object; and n ot only the external reality, but we can also conceptualize the internal experiences, including loneliness. By adopting this scientific thinking, I can deduct my mental experiences into limited concepts.

Immanuel Kant further suggested that all knowledge is the active construction of the mind to the external reality. Knowing is no longer an act of receiving but perceiving. I organize what I perceive into different categories in my mind. Everything is in the mind, everything is *a priori*. The Matrix world is possible! I shall be skeptical about all things that cannot be validated by the mind.

Following this scientific mindset, I then understand loneliness as the "affective and cognitive discomfort or uneasiness from being or perceiving oneself to be alone or otherwise solitary."[3] Loneliness can thus be defined as an emotion in our affectivity and perception in our cognition.

Loneliness, as an emotion, is a rather broad concept to describe the feeling of distress in being alone. It covers the feelings of sadness, grief, fear, anxiety, and hopelessness. Loneliness for a widow is felt in the sadness of losing a lifelong companion and being alone. Loneliness for a newcomer in high school is felt in the fear and anxiety of not being able to make new friends and being alone in class. Loneliness for a president who faces a war is felt in the helplessness of lack of support from other countries and fighting alone. If we only see loneliness as an emotion, it means a lot of very different experiences.

3 American Psychological Association, "Loneliness", *APA Dictionary of Psychology,* https://dictionary.apa.org/loneliness (accessed April 8, 2022).

Loneliness, as a perception, is about the cognitive distress of the discrepancy between our perception and reality. In other words, I perceive being alone whether I am alone or immersed in a crowd. For example, a foreigner comes to another country. He may live with the local people but think that he is alone and left out because neither does he fully understand the local language and culture nor do the people around him understand his culture and worldview well. He may perceive this as a dangerous and stressful situation. While it describes the invisible barrier between the self and others, it does not touch the essence of loneliness.

Although these categories are helpful to grasp what the internal experience of loneliness means, they have their limitations. They cannot explain the total experience of loneliness. Edmund Husserl, on the other hand, provides another way to understand loneliness as a subjective experience through his phenomenology.

Rather than treating reality as a mere object, Husserl suggested that we go "back to the things themselves" (In German, *das Ding an sich*),[4] that is, to return to the phenomenon, that which presents itself to us. In other words, I try to see things as they are, free from any prejudice. How can I do that? First, I have to "bracket" my natural attitude towards the object I want to know. I have to be aware of the lens I wear in seeing things outside me.

Many people equate loneliness to a negative and unpleasant situation that needs to be avoided. It is even described as "social pain," which people hesitate to talk about. Moreover, loneliness is seen as a sickness, which can lead to depression and eventually death. The former U.S. Surgeon General Vivek

4 Manuel Dy, "The Phenomenological Method", in *Philosophy of Man: Selected Readings* (Second Edition), ed. by Manuel B. Dy, Jr. (Makati City: Goodwill Trading Co., Inc., 2012), 43-50.

https://publications.lst.edu/

H. Murthy declared a "loneliness epidemic" in 2017 while the British government appointed a "Minister of Loneliness" in 2018 to tackle loneliness. Some even say chronic loneliness is like "smoking 15 cigarettes a day."[5] Loneliness may kill, and thus, turns to terror. The pandemic just intensifies the fear. But I have to set aside these negative notions about loneliness before I go further to investigate what insights I can extract from the experience.

On the other hand, knowing is not only the mind's active construction of what I am conscious of but also the inherent relationship between the knower and the known. Husserl calls it the intentionality of consciousness. I am always conscious of something other than my consciousness. There is no object without the subject. The world is meaningless without man and there is no man who is outside of the world. Human beings are embodied spirits. In other words, knowledge is always limited, incomplete, and perspectival. I am always like the blind men appraising the elephant in the Asian parable. To know is to understand things in context. To know about loneliness, I do not only ask what it is but also how it relates to me in my experience.

Encountering the Face of the Other

If we put loneliness into context, we can only echo what John Donne exclaimed, "No man is an island."[6] Human beings are not only rational animals but social beings. Knowing cannot satisfy loneliness in the end. If knowing is synthetic, it is always egocentric. Because knowing as a process of synthesizing is to totalize the external world as the "same" as

5 Jill Lepore, "The History of Loneliness," *The New Yorker Magazine,* April 6, 2020, https://www.newyorker.com/magazine/2020/04/06/the-history-of-loneliness (accessed April 8, 2022).

6 John Donne, *Devotions upon Emergent Occasions,* 1923.

what my mind constructs; it turns everything into the self. I eventually come to face being imprisoned alone in my being. On the other hand, the feeling of loneliness is a call to escape from the imprisonment of the self in being.

For Emmanuel Levinas, nothing but the *Other* can escape from the imprisonment of the self in being shallow and impersonal, which he named as *there is* (in French: *il y a*).[7] In the state of *there is*, one is terribly fixated on the impersonal being where it is totally impossible to escape. The exit is through the relationship with the *Other*.

The *Other* is alterity to the self. When another person stands in front of me, it is necessary to ask the question "Who are you?" The *Other* is unknown to the I. I cannot assume anything that the *Other* shares the same with me. Even if I have known a friend for some time, perhaps I only know 2 percent about him. I cannot put the *Other* into my boxes. I cannot even push the *Other* to reveal himself. The *Other* is always a surprise to me.

It is more outstanding when talking with a child. They always give astonishing answers and questions. Once I was on the bus with my 5-year-old cousin and we passed by a cemetery. He suddenly asked me, "What is a cemetery?" I answered, "It is a place for the dead." He instinctively responded, "Why do we still need a place to live if we are dead?" I can never imagine a 5-year-old child would ask such a deep question!

The *Other* cannot be conceptualized but appears to me through the *Face*. The *Face* does not only signify physical appearances, gestures, and expressions but the whole of the *Other*. Even if twin sisters, who share similar physical features,

7 Emmanuel Levinas, *Ethics and Infinity: Conversations with Philippe Nemo,* trans. R.A Cohen (Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania: Duquesne University Press), 47-52.

https://publications.lst.edu/

live and grow together, they are not the same. The *Other* is always another being different from the I.

Yet, the *Other* is also vulnerable because my egocentric mind can easily kill the otherness through assimilation to the I. I can treat the *Other* as an object rather than a subject. Thus, the *Face* of the *Other* is a command to the I that "thou shalt not kill."[8] I have to respect the *Other*, not simply because of the otherness, but the unique subjectivity of the *Other*. Therefore, the I has total responsibility for the *Other* when the I realizes that the *Face* represents the resistance to my powerful ego. It orders and ordains me to stop clinging to the self, but to be being-for-the-*Other*.[9]

It is interesting to examine the phenomenon of wearing face masks during the pandemic. Despite the good reasons to wear a face mask, it imposes a buffer for the immediate command of the *Other* on me. While I desire to take off the mask, is not the mask also calling out my resistance to allowing the *Other* to communicate with me? Yet, the sick, poor, homeless, and lonely continuously command me beyond their masks! The *Other* said, "You are not the only lonely being." It orders me to step into the loneliness of the *Other*.

Can I request the *Other* do the same to me? The *Other*-I relationship is not reciprocal but asymmetrical. For Levinas, the *Other* is always before the I. When I say, "Here, I am," it implies that I am here to listen to the *Other* and bear the responsibility to serve the *Other*. I am the hostage of the *Other* and nobody can replace my responsibility.[10] Such responsibility does not only have interpersonal implications but socio-ethical-political consequences. It is in this spirit

8 Levinas, *Ethics and Infinity,* 86-88.
9 Ibid., 51-52.
10 Ibid., 95-101.

J.F. Kennedy said, "Ask not what your country can do for you – ask what you can do for your country."[11]

The relationship with the *Other* unavoidably leads to the phenomenon of love. Loneliness, eventually, is about our desire to love. Its here that Max Scheler may not agree with Levinas in treating every relationship as ethical. For him, i t is loving which is more fundamental to the human person because, apart from the reasoning of the mind, there is a reasoning of the heart.[12] One does not love another person for any reason, including values or benefits that can be had from the other. These may be the results of love, but not the cause of loving. Love is not a rational but primitive human response to the essence of other persons and things.

What is love then? Loving is indeed "manifested more by deeds than by words."[13] We cannot define it, but we can understand it through the act of loving. For Scheler, love is first an intentional movement. When I love someone, I see the values in the other. Yet, I do not love a person because of her values. I love a person who is valuable. Love does not create values for the other. Love also does not promote the higher values of the other. Love only brings out the higher values of the other. Thus, love is an intentional movement from the

11 J. F. Kennedy, "President John F. Kennedy's Inaugural Address," *John F. Kennedy Presidential Library and Museum,* https://www.jfklibrary.org/learn/about-jfk/historic-speeches/inaugural-address (accessed April 8, 2022).

12 A priori for Max Scheler does not limit to the intellect but intuition. His phenomenology is influenced by Blaise Pascal's order of the heart *(ordre du coeur, logique du coeur)* that "the heart has its reasons of which reason knows nothing." One of the things the heart knows is the movement of love.

13 Ignatius of Loyola, *The Spiritual Exercises of Saint Ignatius,* trans. George E Ganss, SJ (St. Louis: The Institute of Jesuit Sources, 1992), 94, no. 230.

https://publications.lst.edu/

lower value to the higher value of the beloved.[14] A child is always precious in the eyes of his parents. The parents do not only see what good qualities the child has, but the potential, or the higher possible values, in the child. Out of love, the parents accept the whole person of their child.

Moreover, love is not limited to persons, but also includes other things. Scheler is not allergic to being attached to the self because love entails freedom. Everybody and everything can bear values. When I love someone or something, I am moved to see these values of the beloved person and thing, e ven if these values may not be realized. For example, I love theater art. I simply fell in love with this art form by an attraction and fascination. Later, I discovered its values - the beauty, the powerful expression, and the dynamic energy. But not every play I have watched embodies these values. There are bad performances, but they cannot reduce my love for theater.

Therefore, I can genuinely love myself, not because of my ego-centeredness, but the recognition that I am valuable. In this sense, love cannot be conditional. Loneliness may push me to reach out to others, but I cannot love others and anything out of feeling lonely. Loneliness calls out our capacity for love in acceptance and self-giving. The fundamental expression of oneself is not about my self-knowledge, but my very self. Loneliness asks of my creativity to express my appreciation and love for others. Are we not moved by the generosity and selfless giving of the health workers, the caring neighbors, and the ordinary folks who continue to serve our everyday needs during the pandemic? Love will eventually bring out the good.

14 Manuel Dy, "Max Scheler's Phenomenology of Love," in *Philosophy of Man: Selected Readings,* Second Edition, ed. by Manuel B. Dy, Jr. (Makati City: Goodwill Trading Co., Inc., 2012), 229-236.

https://publications.lst.edu/

Towards the Unreachable Infinity

While love itself is unconditional, it does not mean that loneliness will disappear. We may experience loneliness, despite being fulfilled in life, being peaceful in mind, doing good to others, and engaging in loving relationships. It is the kind of loneliness one experiences in front of crisis and death, the so-called "existential loneliness." It is also a spiritual experience for people of faith, often called the "desert experience." Loneliness expresses the ultimate concern of human beings in our finite existence within the world and seeking for the Infinite, which some name God.

Existential crisis often comes unpredictably when we contend with the way we are. It comes as a danger that shakes the foundation of our life. It came as restlessness to Augustine, fear and trembling to Kierkegaard, a cannonball to Ignatius, the pandemic to some of us. Facing the overwhelming sense of losing oneself pushes us to ask , "What is this all about?"

Yet, this cannot be just a speculative question. It is not about what caused all these to happen. It is rather about the whole of reality, the ultimate context of our experience, or existence itself . A crisis is an opening for our being to dive into the deep. Thus, it is the narrow and lonely path one has to go through on one's own.

For Anselm of Canterbury, it came as an alternating conversation, and even struggle, between the heart and the head, faith and reason, prayer and philosophical argument. Moved by his desire to know more about God, he came to a concept of God 'that than which nothing greater can be conceived (in Latin: *id quo majus cogitari nequit*).[15] His faith

15 Anselm of Canterbury, "Proslogion," *In Complete Philosophical and Theological Treatises of Anselm of Canterbury,* trans. Jasper Hopkins and Herbert Richardson (Minneapolis: Banning Press, 1986), 93.

https://publications.lst.edu/

moved him to seek more understanding of the Infinite One whom he loved. Although what he had was a limited concept, which cannot prove the existence of God, Anselm's effort demonstrates through his argument that faith is reasonable. What he started has brought forth a series of conversations that still engage both believers and non-believers today.[16] Paradoxically, our finiteness is like the deepest cry to the Infinite space. Its echo from the Infinite will bounce back and amaze us to continuously question the mystery of being.

Absurd as it is, the existential experience is often expressed in a story or a narrative. One of my favorites is "Life of Pi," in which a spiritual Indian boy, Pi, is left with a ferocious Bengal tiger named Richard Parker on a lifeboat and stranded in the Pacific Ocean. After experiencing his life-and-death struggle with the wild tiger and a near-death starving, through the eyes of Richard Parker, Pi looks into the depth of a solitary sea. He then sees the diversity of all living beings together in one unity.

Perhaps, this is the same vision Thomas Aquinas saw when he contemplated the question of being as one and many. He was astonished at how every single being could be unique and different from each other, even while they exist harmoniously as one among themselves. How could this be?

16 Kant critiques Anselm's argument that existence is a predicate rather than a concept, which means that something that exists in the mind does not necessarily exist in reality. Another contemporary argument is the "Invisible Gardener" by Antony Flew. Flew thinks that Anselm's ontological proof of God's existence is like an invisible gardener, that no conceivable event is a sufficient reason for withdrawing their assertion about God. However, we can also read Anselm's argument in philosophical hermeneutics in order to understand the saying rather than the said, in order words, the intentions and insights of Anselm beyond his literal argument. (See Anthony Flew, et al.; Paul Ricoeur.)

https://publications.lst.edu/

For Aquinas, every being is living in tension metaphysically. While each being is active in nature pouring out its energy to and receiving from others, they are interconnected with each other as a community of beings. While each being is active in nature pouring out its energy to and receiving from others, they are interconnected with each other as a community of beings. However, their ways of participation are limited by their unique modes.[17] A tree exists in a tree way and a human exists in a human way. Yet, all beings are united as one family and share in the same source of life. We belong to each other!

In loneliness, I find out my uniqueness in all creation and no other being is the same as me. I realize that I cannot escape from the fact of being alone because I am given my individuality. I am free to know, act, and love. I am responsible for my response to the situation of loneliness. Meanwhile, I also discover that my individuality is limited. The experience of loneliness says that I am not self-sustained. It humbles me and silences me.

Loneliness tells me that I am not supposed to be alone as my faith reveals , "It is not good for the man to be alone."[18] If I take the leap of faith, loneliness will bring me into dialogue with the Infinite. It asks me to put myself at the mercy of others. Loneliness, at last, is an invitation to surrender oneself to the greater reality and God the Infinite. I am not alone but in total reliance on the Other. As Gabriel Marcel said, to exist is to co-exist (in Latin: *esse est co-esse*) and participate in the life of others.[19] This sense of belonging is the ultimate

17 Norris Clarke SJ, *The One and the Many: A Contemporary Thomistic Metaphysics* (Indiana: University of Notre Dame Press, 2001), 72-91.

18 Cf. Genesis 2:18.

19 Clarke, *The One and the Many,* 72-91.

https://publications.lst.edu/

encouraging word from the Infinite to the being who feels lonely in its finitude.

No wonder after the vision and a scary thunderstorm in which Pi begs for God's mercy, he arrives at a floating island full of meerkats and interconnected trees. At the center of the island is a freshwater pool nurturing all living beings, saving the dying Pi and Richard Parker. Sometimes, God seems absent in the ordinary to make space for us, yet He remains imminently present in the hiddenness.

Epilogue

"Alone and on foot" – this is how Ignatius describes himself after his studies intersect with moments of trial and imprisonment in Alcala and Salamanca.[20] In solitude, Ignatius begins to reflect and put his spiritual encounter into words. Thus, he comes to his *Principle and Foundation* – "Human beings are created to praise, reverence, and serve God our Lord…we ought to use everything to the extent that they help us toward our end, and free ourselves from them to the extent that they hinder us from it."[21]

Loneliness, as a point of departure, launches my philosophical journey from the self to the mind, to the Other, and towards the Infinite. It does not necessarily lead to destruction but *magis* – to look for the more, the wider, the farther, and the deeper. Yet, after all the efforts of navigation and exploration, the insights bring me back to "the richness of reality," as Fr.

20 Luis Goncalves De Camera, SJ, *A Pilgrim's Journey: The Autobiography of Ignatius of Loyola,* trans. Joseph Tylenda, SJ (Wilmington: Michael Glazier, Inc., 1985),

21 Ignatius of Loyola, *Spiritual Exercises,* 32, no. 23.

https://publications.lst.edu/

Roque Ferriols, SJ wisely said.[22] The way of return is another pilgrimage towards the *magis* Ignatius envisioned! It is worth trying, as T.S. Eliot beautifully wrote:

> *We shall not cease from exploration*
> *And the end of all our exploring*
> *Will be to arrive where we started*
> *And know the place for the first time.*
> *Through the unknown, unremembered gate*
> *When the last of earth left to discover*
> *Is that which was the beginning;*
> *At the source of the longest river*
> *The voice of the hidden waterfall*
> *And the children in the apple-tree*
> *Not known, because not looked for*
> *But heard, half-heard, in the stillness*
> *Between two waves of the sea.*[23]

22 Roque Ferriols, SJ, "Insight," in *Philosophy of Man: Selected Readings,* Second Edition, ed. by Manuel B. Dy, Jr. (Makati City: Goodwill Trading Co., Inc., 2012), 3-6.

23 Excerpt from T.S. Eliot, *Little Gidding*, 1942.

https://publications.lst.edu/