

A Key Element for Human Well-Being: Ethical Love

Carmen Cozma

“Alexandru Ioan Cuza” University of Iași, Iași, Romania

A pillar of understanding and developing human well-being is, without a doubt, what we call *ethical love*, on which we dwell in this paper. Actually, we are attempting to argue for the philosophical-moral significance of love, disclosing its major role in our life—particularly in the current context marked by the extremely rapid process of the digitalization of existence. Fully aware not only of the undeniable benefits of what is already the fifth industrial revolution but also of the risks facing contemporary humans—caught in an astonishing process of alienation from their own humanity—we deem it essential to identify vital paths so that the necessary (yet so fragile) balance of specifically human existence not be lost. Given the stated purpose, our approach is supported by important contributions from the history of ideas regarding the extraordinary value of love, focusing on philosophical works ranging from the Presocratics to contemporary thinkers. Particular attention is paid to the types of love established in universal philosophy; each of these—and all of them combined—enabling the delineation and substantiation of the concept of “ethical love”—the concept we promote as representing a *sine qua non* condition for a meaningful human life.

Keywords: philosophy of love, human well-being, philosophical concepts of love, ethical love, meaningful life

Prelude to the Idea of Ethical Love

From a broader perspective—that of the “philosophy of love”—we bring to the fore an issue of major importance for modern man/woman: namely, what we term *ethical love*.

Without delving into the multitude of aspects¹ and modes—or fashions—of love (those “modas del amor” about which José Ortega y Gasset wrote (see Ortega y Gasset, 1926/1939, pp. 100-106) from a historical perspective—a realm for which fiction generally provides a rich and vivid picture—, we turn our attention to the *philosophical-moral concept of love*.

From the Presocratics—Pythagoras, Heraclitus, Parmenides, Empedocles—and, notably, through the classical Greek philosophers Socrates, Plato, and Aristotle, as well as the Stoic thinkers who established the triad of *érōs*, *philia*, and *agápē*, right up to 20th-century philosophers such as José Ortega y Gasset, Vladimir Jankélévitch, Simone de Beauvoir, and Erich Fromm, *love* has been the subject of major metaphysical and moral conceptions.

Carmen Cozma, Ph.D., Professor, Department of Philosophy, “Alexandru Ioan Cuza” University of Iași, Iași, Romania.

¹ The term in question here—which ceaselessly amazes us and challenges us to seek out its meaning—can be traced across various planes: from the “love between two lovers” to the “love of God”, “love of one’s country”, “love of nature”, “love of knowledge”, “love of wisdom”, “love of beauty”, or “love of the arts”. It manifests as “parental love”, “filial love”, and “fraternal love”. No less, as the “love between master and disciple”, and so on. It can also be identified in a variety of states, forms, and circumstances: as “fleeting love” or “lifelong love”; as “courtly love” (*l’amour courtois*), a defining feature of the troubadours’ repertoire and the narratives of chivalric romances; as “playful love” (among children and adolescents) as well as “love as a social game”. Just mention, also: “amusing love” or “downright odd love”—the kind of “funny love” satirized by Jane Austen in her novels and so prevalent in contemporary literature and cinema. Also, remind: “friendly love”; “romantic love”; “pragmatic love”; “love as a whim”; “love as passion”; “love as vanity”; “morbid love”, etc.

Naturally, the question arises: Why this particular focus on the *value of love* in our lives?

The quickest answer would be: because *love* proves to be a vital premise—*conditio sine qua non*—for attaining and maintaining a specifically *human state of well-being* (the ideal—or, to use a strong term, “happiness”—within the realm of moral philosophy), especially when we consider the multi-level crisis into which our world is sinking. Developments over the last four decades reveal an intense process of *human’s* degradation, marked by the erosion—and even destruction—of the benchmarks for a (broadly speaking) healthy life. And this is the result of widespread moral laxity—so “fashionable” nowadays—and the heightened artificiality of existence brought about by the fourth industrial revolution (alongside the rapidly emerging signs of the fifth industrial revolution). This revolution arrives not only with undeniable benefits but also with obvious risks, all while exacerbating the phenomenon of human alienation from one’s own nature and essence.

The reason of the present undertaking is the attempt to unveil and clarify—as much as possible—the *philosophical-moral concept of love* in its fundamental dimensions—simultaneously a source and a component, a perpetual catalyst and a solid anchor, as well as a guiding factor for wise choices *regarding the specifically human state of well-being*. This is framed by the age-old aspiration toward what the ancient Greeks termed *eudaimonía/εὐδαιμονία*: a state from which modern humanity, increasingly held captive in a chaotic world, finds itself drifting away at an alarming pace; often with a degree of recklessness driven by the allure of conveniences offered by digital devices continuously “optimized” with “Edge AI”.

Thus, our interest focuses on what the study of Ethics can provide—among other things—regarding the deepening of understanding and the internalization of the potential of *ethical love*. We highlight this concept for its stimulating value regarding *specifically human well-being*, while focusing on the role that education as a whole—and university education in particular—ought to play: to enable young people to continue learning and cultivating an attitude of *creating* and *giving meaning* to existence within a “chaotically mosaic” (a term we have used to describe the environment into which humanity has increasingly drifted in recent years) world (see Cozma, 2025); precisely, to avoid dissolution through self-alienation, and, ultimately, the squandering of human identity.

From an erotetic perspective—at once assertive and argumentative—, attention focuses on the potential, or the “gift”, implanted in the human being; a potential that must be discovered, revealed, and ceaselessly enriched, while also being shared with fellow human beings and with “everything-and-the All-that-is-alive”, so speaking in the language of Anna-Teresa Tymieniecka’s phenomenology of life (see Tymieniecka, 1988-2000). This is achieved through persevering effort—illuminated by elevated intention, thought, and feeling—that truly honors “a life worth living”, as Socrates urges us: a life grounded in reflection upon and the practice of self-knowledge, wisdom, and moral virtue (cf. Plato [397-396 BC] 2011, 38a 4-7). Within this framework, we highlight the significance of *ethical love* as the foundation of a *meaningful existence*—rather than mere survival (at best), a danger that lurks in an increasingly technologized and robotized world!

Our endeavor aims to be a plea for *living a meaningful life* by *affirming the humanity within us*—through formation, development, and expression in genuine freedom and dignity, connected to the value of *love*—while grounding ourselves in moral philosophy.

In our view, love is the essential element of our journey toward self-perfection—both within our profound intimacy, in the “inner life”—that of the Greek *nepsis/νῆψις*, namely the watchfulness and the wakefulness of the mind, upon which the Holy Fathers laid such stress (see *Philokalia*, [4th-15th centuries]

2017-2021)—, and in our relationships with others, whether fellow human beings, non-human creatures, or Nature in its entirety.

Manifesting through a multitude of “facets”—to use José Ortega y Gasset’s ([1926/1939] 1995, pp. 55-66) observation—, the *phenomenon of love* has been frequently debated throughout the history of ideas: from Plato, Aristotle, and the Stoics, through Augustine of Hippo and Thomas Aquinas—who, it is worth noting here, appropriated the Stagirite’s work via Avicenna (Ibn Sīnā)² and Averroes (Ibn Rushd)—, and Arab and Persian philosophers, including, alongside the two illustrious figures already mentioned, Al-Kindī, Al-Fārābī, and notably the “Spanish Arab” Ibn Hazm³ during the Middle Ages; passing through the modern thinkers Descartes and Spinoza; and continuing with the phenomenologists Alexander Pfänder and Max Scheler, contemporaries of the Spanish philosopher (see Ortega y Gasset, 1926/1995, pp. 115-129).

Exposing Love in a Philosophical-Moral Sense

Beyond the various approaches, *the concept of love* requires examination in a manner that is consistently rigorous yet fundamentally delicate; viewing *love* (as is most often attributed to it) as an authentic trait defining the human being, a magnificent vital movement that shapes the one’s own destiny, as well as a cosmic and creative force. We are concerned with *love* as an ontological and epistemological principle, placing particular emphasis on its content and its specifically moral functionality.

This begins with the very meaning ascribed to *love* in Socratic-Platonic thought: *érōs*/ἔρως and *philia*/φιλία, as well as *agápē*/ἀγάπη; viewing love as a longing directed toward wisdom and beauty, as the source of human virtues—the cardinal ones: *sophía*/σοφία and *phrónēsis*/φρόνησις (intellectual and practical wisdom); *dikaíosynē*/δικαιοσύνη (justice); *andreía*/ἀνδρεία (courage); and *sōphrosynē*/σωφροσύνη (temperance or moderation).

What is truly at stake is *love* as a constant encouragement for mental health, balance in action, and excellence of character; in short, an encouragement for *sōphrosynē*/σωφροσύνη, which is precisely the *temperance* that modern man/woman so sorely needs. We refer alike to *love* as *generation and elevation towards the beauty and the good*, as “procreation into spiritual (and attitudinal) beauty”: *tiktein en tō kalō*/τίκτειν ἐν τῷ καλῷ, and as fidelity to the eternal Good, a “striving for immortality”; including even the sense of love in relation to *theía manía*/θεία μανία, but obviously the beneficial *manía*, the so called divine madness, that manifesting in the form of *sacred inspiration* (see, mainly, Plato’s Dialogues: *Symposium*; *Ion*; *Lysis*; *Phaedrus*; *The Republic*; and *Critias*).

From the ancient Greeks to contemporary authors, *love* has been a key subject in the effort to grasp and articulate the nature of *specifically human well-being*. It is highly suggestive that philosophers of Greek antiquity introduced a multitude of concepts to describe, in all their depth and nuance, what we call *love* today, distinguishing between several different types of it. We shall now focus on some of these—naturally, without claiming to offer a complete and detailed picture, as each merits a standalone analysis.

² The renowned Peripatetic philosopher and physician Avicenna (Ibn Sīnā) is the author of a famous treatise on the essence of love, *Risalahfi l-‘ishq* [c. 1015], in which he delineates three levels of love: physical, spiritual, and divine. The latter is considered to be the ultimate goal for the human beings who succeed in forging their own version of “perfection” (*kamal*). In his view, love is the principle uniting the Creator with His creatures and the supreme element of the entire universe, inextricably linked to the “good and beautiful” aspects of the world.

³ The Andalusian scholar Ibn Hazm expounded his conception of the essence of love in the 1022 book titled *Ṭawq al-ḥamāma*—that Ortega y Gasset considers “the most renowned in Muslim civilization on the subject of love” (See Ibn Hazm, [1022] 1952/2012).

Thus, we distinguish: *agápē/ἀγάπη*—the highest form of love, the benevolence, as well as the Creator’s love for the created being and the latter’s love for the Creator (cf. Liddell & Scott, 1843/1996). This is a total, universal, and unconditional love that a person manifests not only toward human beings but also toward non-human beings, toward Nature, and toward *life* in its fullness and in every form in which It manifests.

In its natural, healthy form, there is also *epithumía/ἐπιθυμία*, meaning affinity, passion rooted in strong feelings, and spirited affection—essentially considered as the expression of fondness for something or someone, or a longing, yearning, or aspiration. It is positively oriented and not necessarily linked to any irrational attitude; even though—due to the root *thymós/θυμός* it contains—it most often acquires the connotation of craving, desire, or passion devoid of moderation.

A central place is held by *érōs/ἔρως*: a romantic, intimate, sensual, and physical love, which does not simply equate to *lagneíā/λαγνεία* that is concupiscence and/or lasciviousness, bordering on immorality. *Érōs* involves passion but also—and notably—communication (approaching true communion), thereby fostering mutual respect and trust.

Sparkling extensive discussion across realms ranging from philosophy—and fields as diverse as mythology, Christian theology, psychology, and psychiatry—, *philautía/φιλαυτία* asserts itself: self-love as the very root of love for those close to us (family, friends, lovers) or even for activities pursued for the sake of “moral beauty” (the Greek *kalón/καλόν*). *Philautía* is a concept devoid of vulgarity or excess—free from the taint of pathological egoism or narcissism—and instead defined by feeling and reason as a form of self-respect. It serves as both a starting point and a necessity for the very pursuit of happiness: *eudaimonía/εὐδαιμονία*.

In essence, *philautía* accounts for a person’s capacity to feel for others what they feel for themselves. And without self-love, how would love for one’s fellow beings be possible? How would it be possible to love everything—absolutely everything—is alive?

Clearly, what interests and matters to us is *philautía/φιλαυτία* in the sense highlighted by Aristotle—as a form of friendship rooted in goodness and “moral nobility”. We refer to *philautía* as a virtue, entailing self-discovery and self-mastery through “the most personal actions—those performed voluntarily and accompanied by reflection”; because “the virtuous man must therefore love himself; since, by practicing the good, he benefits both himself and others” (Aristotle, [c. 340 BC] 1988, IX. 1169a 10-15). *The virtuous person* prioritizes *moral beauty* above all other goods; indeed, he/she “will sometimes even yield to a friend the very opportunity to act, because giving a friend the chance to perform a noble deed is even more beautiful than performing it oneself” (IX. 1169a 33-35).

Let us simply recall that, for the Stagirite, the good man/woman

may be considered the “egoist” par excellence, yet one possessing a type of egoism distinct from the blameworthy kind—differing from it as much as a rational life differs from a passionate one, and as much as the aspiration toward the beautiful differs from the pursuit of self-interest. (IX. 1169a 5-7)

In its turn, *phília/φιλία*—a term generally denoting *friendship*—is a tender, unconditional affection directed toward the entirety of existence. It is the most elevated form of connection—one that is “lifelong” or endures for a lifetime—yet it is also the rarest; it is true, indeed “perfect”, love, as Aristotle explains; specifically,

the friendship between people of spiritual nobility—that is, those whose affinities spring from virtue. They desire the good for one another in the same way: as people of virtue; and people of virtue they are, in their very essence. (VIII. 1156b 4-10)

In this sense, as a virtue—being enduring—*philía* (the love as friendship) presupposes a certain dignity: It “requires time and shared habits, for, as the proverb says, people cannot know one another before having consumed together the ‘measure of salt’ mentioned therein”. It entails a likeness between the individuals, mutual affection and trust, and the sharing of common values, with friends being “pleasant in an absolute sense and pleasant to one another”, as well as “useful to one another” (VIII. 1156b 26-30; 1156b 16-20; 1156b 10-15).

Alongside love-*philía*, another important concept is *storgé*/στοργή. This term refers to the meaning of *familial love*. *Storgé* is that natural, instinctual affection between parents and children, as well as among family members. It is a strong, protective bond characterized by mutual support and assistance whenever needed—though *storgé* sometimes extends to relationships with very close friends as well.

Ancient Greek terminology offers other concepts for *love* as well, such as: *manía*/μανία—frequently translated as obsessive, uncontrollable, or pathological love, yet which, as we have seen, manifests as divine enthusiasm when it originates from the gods in its positive form; *pragma*/πράγμα, representing practical love based on long-term commitment—often, though not exclusively, grounded in material interests—which constitutes true, mature love rooted in shared experiences and sustained by the effort of those involved (whether a couple, a family, including the extended family, or a lifelong friendship); *xenía*/ξενία, denoting love for strangers, as well as the goodwill and care shown to guests.

In light of the foregoing, our emphasis on the *value of love* remains grounded in a complex, holistic, and dynamic *ethos*/ἦθος centered on *areté*/ἀρετή—a concept established by Aristotle, who paved the way for the most robust *definition of virtue*, one that is both integrative and nuanced. In fact, this is the great lesson to be mastered: “virtue is a kind of mean, aiming for the proper measure between two extremes... excess and deficiency belong to vice, whereas the middle path is proper to virtue” (II. 1106b 25-35). It is also a teaching to be put into practice when the matter is *ethical love*.

A reading of the *Nicomachean Ethics*—necessarily one that is constantly recontextualized—allows us to grasp the extraordinary significance of the *theory of the mean* regarding the *value of love*. We think it is fitting to position *love* as the “right measure” between indifference, on the one hand, and enmity or hatred, on the other. And just as ethical values have crystallized over time—values generated by, and in turn generating and shaping, a specifically human life in resonance with *love as an ethical virtue* (such as gracious greeting and welcome, politeness, sympathy, concord, devotion and generosity, goodwill, trust, honesty, mutual understanding and respect, care and empathy, gentleness, solidarity and reciprocal aid, moral responsibility, the fulfillment of duty toward the other, compassion, openness and communion, friendship, and *kindness*⁴)—, let us accord due recognition and appreciation to the superior value of love, which truly honors the human being. Proving itself to be a “praiseworthy *habitus*” (cf. Aristotle, [c. 340 BC] 1988), the *ethical love* is that essential element without which nothing of importance is born or develops.

⁴ Throughout the ages, from the ancients to the present, the philosophical-moral literature contains such thematizations. Among these from the 20th century and more recent, we mention a few works signed by: Max Scheler, 1913, *Zur Phänomenologie und Theorie der Sympathiegefühle und von Liebe und Hatz*; Edith Stein, 1917, *Zum Problem der Einfühlung*; Nell Noddings, 1986, *Caring: A Relational Approach to Ethics and Moral Education*; Anna-Teresa Tymieniecka, 1995, “Measure and the Ontopoietic Self-Individualization of Life”, *Phenomenological Inquiry*; Martha Nussbaum, 1996, “Compassion: The Basic Social Emotion”, *Social Philosophy and Policy*; Michael Slote, 2007, *The Ethics of Care and Empathy*; Kuangfei Xie, 2015, “Kindness Ethics: A Possible Approach to Virtue Ethics”, *Education Journal*; Sophie Bourgault and Elena Pulcini (Eds.), 2018, *Emotions and Care: Interdisciplinary Perspectives*; Olivia Bailey, 2022, “Empathy and the Value of Human Understanding”, *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research*, etc.

Ethical love demands knowledge and comprehension, learning grounded in balanced reason and good will, constant practice and unstinting effort, and the accumulation of experience; all of them being accompanied by *wisdom* (both intellectual and practical) so as to grasp the essence of the saying that “it is not enough to know it theoretically; rather, one must strive to possess and employ it—or any other available means—to become a good person”. Let us not overlook the fact that, as a *virtue*—a proper mean between two extremes, or two vices, as Aristotle teaches us—, the *ethical love* (hence the name) represents the “highest point” in relation to the “supreme good and perfection” (Aristotle, [c. 340 BC] 1988, X. 1179b; II. 1107a 5-10).

We have emphasized the term *virtue*, as we consider that *ethical love* is best understood as a human virtue—one that leads us to what we conceive as “the excellence in ethics: the proper mean”, a concept we articulated some years ago (Cozma, 2001, pp. 80-92). We fully align ourselves with an *ethics of the mean*, or of *moderation*—which has nothing to do with mediocrity; quite the contrary! The *theory of the mean* (or of the middle path/of the just measure)—spanning from Aristotle to Stéphane Lupasco, André Comte-Sponville, Shannon Vallor⁵, and others (limiting the scope to the Western world and the field of Ethics, while noting its validation through the transdisciplinary dialogue between Ethics and contemporary technoscience regarding *the concept of equilibrium/balance*⁶)—emphasizes the term of *areté/ἀρετή* as *mesótes/μεσότης*; that is, the excellence of the intermediate state or the “golden mean” (*aurea mediocritas*) found in the verses of Horace ([23 BC] 1923, II. 10.5). In other words, that *balance*—relative and fragile, yet optimal and, above all, necessary—determined by the activation of “practical wisdom”: *phrónēsis/φρόνησις* intimately related to “temperance”: *sōphrosynē/σωφροσύνη*. On this basis, we express the conviction that *ethical love* functions as one of the most powerful factors (if not even the most powerful factor) of specifically *human well-being*.

The concept we have sought to defend in this text is that *ethical love* appears to be a viable response to the upheavals of our time—upheavals stemming from a profound moral crisis, the risk of losing *our sense of be(com)ing* in this world, and the threat to our *human identity* posed by the rapid, aggressive, and (while tempting) perilous surge of emerging information and communication technologies and the integration of “artificial ‘intelligence’” into daily life; a situation in which we readily, and somewhat heedlessly, accept the status of being “captives of the internet” within a “new tech totalitarianism” increasingly populated by “technological entities”, so-called “autonomous agents”, and “new [allegedly] moral subjects” (cf. Larchet, 2016; Gray, 2019; Lüfter, 2023).

We think that it is worth—indeed, necessary—to pay closer attention to some of the particularities of the present in which we live. Thus, by consuming more and more time in “online connectivity”—that has nothing to do with true *communication as communion*—, and that no longer affords us the respite needed to reflect on what truly matters for *a specifically human life*, which means, among other things, “living in harmony with *nature*”—of which we, humans, are a part, and not outside it at all!—, we risk becoming consumed ourselves. We are more and more acutely aware that recent, impressive and no less unsettling developments are directly linked to phenomena of isolation and alienation, to the insecurity felt at both individual and societal levels, and to the anxieties and unease (escalating to the point of inducing a generalized psychosis) fomented by sensationalist “narratives” from the mainstream media (many of which later proved to be “fake news”, serving

⁵ See Stéphane Lupasco (1986), *L'Homme et ses trois éthiques*; André Comte-Sponville (1995), *Petit traité des grandes vertus*; Shannon Vallor (2016), *Technology and the Virtues: A Philosophical Guide to a Future Worth Wanting*.

⁶ See works published in the early 21st century—in philosophy and the sciences—adopting perspectives of complexity and transdisciplinarity regarding the concept of dynamic equilibrium (including its associated “illusion” and/or “enigmas”).

as illustrative case studies for a phrase obsessively bandied about by some). No less significant—or perhaps, first and foremost—is the widespread confusion linked to what clear-sighted contemporary observers realistically describe as the “insidious infiltration of the pseudo-values of a dystopia poised to overwhelm us” (Bădescu, 2026, pp. 146-147).

We are undoubtedly witnessing a palpable decline in distinctively *human well-being*, caught in a process of—above all—moral degradation. We are increasingly compelled, amidst the staggering pace of change, to adapt on the fly, as life is transformed from a natural marathon into an artificial sprint. Towards what?! And what for?!

In seeking solutions to what might lead to the total dissolution of *the human*, we consider that *ethical love* emerges as a force and a medium for its restoration. It represents the opportunity to bring the ideal of *eudaimonía/εὐδαιμονία* back to a state where it can illuminate our existence, grounded in a concern for the Good: “that to which all things aspire” (Aristotle, [c. 340 BC] 1988, I. 1094a).

What we specifically target is the human being as the creator and vehicle of the *meaning of life*—the being who “carries the sacred”, as Horia Bădescu writes—bearing in mind that man/woman “participates in the transcendence of the world, because he/she is part of a world that is value, an ontological value” (Bădescu, 2024, p. 112). And this holds true insofar as, according to the most important contributions in the Western history of Ethics, starting with Aristotle, the world possesses meaning only because (being malleable) it can be led toward a mode of higher and eternal existence, toward the Truth or the perfect Good, that gains consistence largely thanks to the *love* of which man/woman is capable.

Ethical love undeniably reveals the supreme strength we are able of; amidst the permanence and transience that accompany our striving to succeed in the realm of *self-transcendence*, the establishment of *meaning*, and the enrichment of *meaning* for a life lived in light, joy, and creativity, in the Good and the Beauty.

In essence, the theme addressed concerns *a culture of the Good*, founded on *an education centered on kindness and the joy of living*, and on *a creative Ethics*; one dedicated to *building up* and *elevating the humanity within us* (rather than degrading, debasing, or destroying it!).

What we have sought to articulate here ultimately concerns the very *responsibility of caring for one another, respecting one another, and empathizing with one another* as the authentic *human beings* we are (or we claim to be; or we aspire to become). It is also about *resonating with nature*—with all that constitutes life—by reasoning, feeling, making deliberate choices, and acting in *concord*, in that state of *homónoia/ὁμόνοια* so highly valued by the ancient sages; thereby establishing unity and order (of both mind and heart) for *the well-being of the individual and of the living whole*. It is about *living in consonance* (rather than dissonance!) with the *kósmos/κόσμος*, with its harmony, rhythm, circularity, and intrinsic proportions, and attuning ourselves to the generative “music of the spheres”, the *mousikē tōn sphairōn/μουσική τῶν σφαιρῶν*, as conveyed by Pythagorean (apud Diels & Kranz, 1952/1984, DK 14 A 21; Vlăduțescu, 2012, pp. 68-72; Roussell, 2016) and Platonic (in *Timaeus*, 47c-47e; 33b-34b) philosophy. Furthermore, by embracing the Stoic principle first articulated by Zeno of Citium in the 4th-3rd centuries BC, namely “to live a life of virtue in accordance with nature”, that *homologoumenōs tē physei zēn/ὁμολογουμένως τῇ φύσει ζῆν* (apud Diogenes Laërtius [c. 200-250] 1963, Book 7, LIII. 87-88); entering into and safeguarding the universal harmony.

On Ethical Love in a Nutshell

We conclude by reaffirming the interdependence of *ethical love* and *moral good(ness)* using a wording

from an illustrated book—seemingly for children, but in reality for all ages—titled *The Boy, the Mole, the Fox and the Horse*. When the boy is asked by one of the four characters of the book, specifically the “cake-loving, greedy” mole, “What do you want to be when you grow up?”, he simply replies, “Kind” (Mackesy, 2019).

This is a statement that says almost everything about what we have tried to set forth herein.

The term “kind” is to be understood in its moral sense; which necessarily implies *love*. More precisely, it is the *ethical love* playing a decisive role.

So, in our view, *ethical love* is a condition without which *human well-being* cannot truly be experienced. It is the very *conditio sine qua non* of fulfillment in our endeavor of self-becoming within the horizon of the *humanity* sown within us—a humanity that must, however, be continuously revealed and developed; and, at the same time, in our ceaseless endeavor of transcending towards the absolute.

References

- Aristotle. ([c. 340 BC] 1988). *Ēthika Nicomacheia/Hθikā Nikomácheia* (Romanian translation: *Etica Nicomahică*). Bucharest: Scientific and Encyclopedic Publishing House.
- Avicenna (Ibn Sīnā). ([c. 1015] 1945). *Risalahfi'l-'ishq* (English translation: A treatise on love by Ibn Sina). *Mediaeval Studies*, 7(1), 208-228. doi:https://doi.org/10.1484/j.ms.2.305973
- Bailey, O. (2022). Empathy and the value of human understanding. *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research*, 104(1), 50-65.
- Bădescu, H. (2024). *Proba oglinzii/The mirror test*. Cluj-Napoca: Școala Ardeleană Publishing House.
- Bădescu, H. (2026). *La răsărit de paradis. Cronica unui deceniu/East of paradise: Chronicle of a decade*. Cluj-Napoca: Școala Ardeleană Publishing House.
- Bourgault, S., & Pulcini, E. (Eds.). (2018). *Emotions and care: Interdisciplinary perspectives*. Louvain: Peeters Publishers.
- Comte-Sponville, A. (1995). *Petit traité des grandes vertus*. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France.
- Cozma, C. (2001). *Introducere în aretologie. Mic tratat de etică/Introduction to aretology: A short treatise of ethics*. Iași: “Alexandru Ioan Cuza” University Publishing House.
- Cozma, C. (2025). *Prolegomene la o etică aplicată cercetării științifice socio-umane în vremuri mozaicate haotice/Prolegomena to an ethics applied to socio-human scientific research in chaotically mosaic times*. Bucharest: Paideia Publishing House.
- Diels, H., & Kranz, W. (1952/1984). *Die Fragmente der Vorsokratiker, griechisch und deutsch* (English translation: *The presocratic philosophers: A critical history with a selection of texts*). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Diogenes Laërtius. ([c. 200-250] 1963). *Bioi kai gnōmai tōn en philosophia eudokimēsantōn/Bioi kai gnōmai tōn en philosophia eudokimēsantōn* (Romanian translation: *Despre viețile și doctrinele filozofilor*). Bucharest: Romanian Academy Publishing House.
- Gray, J. (2019). The new tech totalitarianism: When companies know more about us than we know about ourselves. *The New Statesman*. Retrieved from https://www.newstatesman.com/culture/2019/02/the-new-tech-totalitarianism
- Horace (Quintus Horatius Flaccus). ([23 BC] 1923). *Carmina (odes)*. (Romanian translation: *Odele și Epodele lui Horațiu*). Bucharest: “România Nouă” Publishing House.
- Ibn Hazm, A. M. A. ([1022] 1952/2012). *Ṭawq al-ḥamāma/El collar de la paloma*. Traducción, edición y notas de Emilio García Gómez. Madrid: Alianza Editorial.
- Larchet, J.-C. (2016). *Malades des nouveaux médias*. Paris: Cerf.
- Liddell, H. G., & Scott, R. (1843/1996). *Greek-English lexicon: With a revised supplement* (9th ed.). Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Lupasco, S. (1986). *L'Homme et ses trois éthiques*. Monaco: Rocher.
- Lüfter, R. (2023). New moral subjects: Walking the line between autonomy and automaton. *Philosophy Study*, 13(11), 463-467. doi:10.17265/2159-5313/2023.11.001
- Mackesy, C. (2019). *The boy, the mole, the fox and the horse*. London: Ebury-Penguin.
- Noddings, N. (1986). *Caring: A relational approach to ethics and moral education*. Berkeley/Los Angeles/London: University of California Press.
- Nussbaum, M. (1996). Compassion: The basic social emotion. *Social Philosophy and Policy*, 13(1), 27-58.
- Ortega y Gasset, J. (1926/1939). Para la historia del amor. *Estudios sobre el amor*. Buenos Aires: Espasa-Calpe Argentina.

- Ortega y Gasset, J. ([1926/1939] 1995). "Facciones del amor"; "Prólogo a 'El collar de la paloma' de Ibn Hazm de Córdoba". *Estudios sobre el amor*. Prólogo y cronología de José Luis Molinuevo. Madrid/México/Buenos Aires/San Juan/Santiago/Miami: EDAF.
- Philokalia/Φιλοκαλία (The Philokalia of the Neptic Fathers). ([4th-15th centuries] 2017-2021). Romanian translation: *Filocalia sfintelor năzuințe ale desăvârșirii*. Vols. 1-12. Bucharest: The Biblical and Orthodox Mission Institute Publishing House.
- Plato. ([c. 360 BC] 2026). *Timaios/Tίμαιος* (English translation: *Timaeus*). Retrieved from [https://en.wikisource.org/wiki/Timaeus_\(Jowett\)](https://en.wikisource.org/wiki/Timaeus_(Jowett))
- Plato. ([397-396 BC] 2011). *Apología Sokrátous/Απολογία Σωκράτους* (English translation: *Apology of Socrates*). Auckland, New Zealand: The Floating Press.
- Roussell, P. (Ed.). (2016). *The complete Pythagoras*. Retrieved from <https://archive.org/details/TheCompletePythagoras/mode/2up>
- Scheler, M. (1913/1970). *Zur Phänomenologie und Theorie der Sympathiegefühle und von Liebe und Mitleid* (English translation: *The nature of sympathy*). Hamden, CT: Archon Books.
- Slote, M. (2007). *The ethics of care and empathy*. London: Routledge.
- Stein, E. (1917/1989). Zum Problem der Einfühlung (English translation: On the problem of empathy). *The collected works of Edith Stein*, Volume 3. Washington, DC: ICS Publications.
- Tymieniecka, A.-T. (1988-2000). *Logos and life*. Books 1-4. Dordrecht/Boston/London: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Tymieniecka, A.-T. (1995). Measure and the onto-poietic self-individualization of life. *Phenomenological Inquiry*, 19, 26-51.
- Vallor, S. (2016). *Technology and the virtues: A philosophical guide to a future worth wanting*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Vlăduțescu, G. (2012). *Limbaajul filosofilor greci. Presocraticii/The language of the Greek philosophers: The presocratics*. Bucharest: Romanian Academy Publishing House.
- Xie, K. F. (2015). Kindness ethics: A possible approach to virtue ethics. *Education Journal*, 4(5), 189-193.