

# Philosophical law in recessive theological acceptation

Ştefan Grosu, Graduated of Biblical Sciences  
Faculty of Didactic Theology  
The Catholic Theological Institute Of Bucharest

## Abstract

In the acceptation of Mircea Florian's recessive philosophy, "the violence-love dualism resumes the significance of human life"<sup>1</sup> and thus, the philosopher establishes that there are:

- 1) the law of love and
- 2) the law of violence<sup>2</sup> which become the key of the morality.

Through the theory of the recessivity, (from *recidere*= to come after), the thinker arrives at the conclusion of the good which "is positiv"<sup>3</sup> and the bad which "is negative"<sup>4</sup>. Then, it results a philosophical given of the conscience through its passage from good to bad but there is an *ab initio stricto-modo moral law* "and in Mircea Florian's vision, the moral law is the law of love"<sup>5</sup> which is seen in the role of man transformation<sup>6</sup>.

The precedent words illustrate the motivation of the chosen theme, called "philosophical law in recessive acceptation", in the conditions of "the moral crisis abdication"<sup>7</sup>. The modern society "appears as a shamed moral regression"<sup>8</sup> and then, as Mircea Florian points out, is needed "an ideal"<sup>9</sup>, which offers a direction through which a man "can morally work"<sup>10</sup>.

**Keywords:** the Law of Love, the Law of Violence, the Dualism Love-Violence, Philosophical Law, Mircea Florian, Morality, Recessivity, Revelation.

---

<sup>1</sup> Mircea Florian, *Recesivitatea ca Structură a lumii*, Eminescu, Iași, 1987, p. 9.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibidem*.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibidem*, p. 9.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibidem*.

<sup>5</sup> Adrian Michiduță, *Filosofia recesivității*, doctoral dissertation, manuscript, The Library of Faculty of Philosophy, Bucharest, 2008, p. 301.

<sup>6</sup> Mircea Florian, *Arta de a suferi*, Garamond, Bucharest, 2000, pp. 58-59.

<sup>7</sup> Florian, *Recesivitatea ca Structură a lumii*.

<sup>8</sup> *Ibidem*.

<sup>9</sup> *Ibidem*.

<sup>10</sup> *Ibidem*.

### *I. General Presentation of the Law - From Religion to Philosophy*

*Dharma, Maat, Me, Tao, Torah, Law of Christos* are seen, in the philosophy of religion as laws with divine laws (to mention that *Torah* and *Law of Christos* are, in Christian acceptations, revealed Laws and from the perspective of the philosophy of religion they are also sacred elements in other religions). These are not simple terms or words, but true concepts. From the philosophical point of view, they are processes through which the phenomenal evolution goes to the crystallized morality and the philosophy of religious and laic law.

For a better understanding of the concept, the definition of law in the acceptation of philosophy is imposed. The Law represents a needed, general, relative report, generally established between the inside parts of the same objects which belong to the same object or phenomenon or to different phenomena and objects. From the point of view of the religion, it refers to the manifestation of a divine, supra-natural and spiritual force. In science, the law represents models of studying the nature and the society. The law, in Florian's acceptation, is inscribed in the domains of philosophy and religion because the philosopher begins from the existence of a dualism:

- 1) the Law of Violence and
- 2) the Law of Love.<sup>11</sup>

But there is also a philosophical classification, in function of the degree of generality:

- the objective ones which act in the whole nature (for example, the Law Of Action and Reaction, the Law of Gravity etc);
- the general ones which act and manifest thorough the specific ones but without substituting them (for example, the correlation between philosophy, theology and science);
- the particular ones, specific to a field of activity (for example, specific to geological measures).

A classification according to causal relations can also be made:

- the dynamic, causal and mechanic ones which are applied to isolated processes (for example, Kepler's Laws about the Movement of Planets in the Solar System);

---

<sup>11</sup> *Ibidem.*

- statistics, which is applied to integrative or open systems (for example, the behaviour of micro-processes in physics, the value of the offer-request in economics).<sup>12</sup>

From a simple analysis which is done to the precedent definition, it results that there is a nucleus of objective, universal, valid in any times and every space laws, so in a philosophical approach it must be a point of transcendent marker which, in Mircea Florian's acceptation, is the law of love, which is the given in the philosophy of recessivity, but it does not belong to this world, so it is "a sublime law which does not emanate from our world, but is the world of the sky"<sup>13</sup>.

## *II. The Recessive Law*

Law has its etymology in the Latin *Lex* and can be defined from a lot of points of view:

1) in law and politics, there is a compulsory rule, which is established by the sovereign authority which governs the reports between men who are anchored in society;

2) in the philosophy the rule of action, it is needed by man for the moral god (according to Kant);

3) according to the science and epistemology, there is a report of measure which is universally and constantly established between the natural phenomena, for example, the Law of Fall of the Corps)<sup>14</sup>.

The T Law, seen from a juridical and moral point, inaugurates an obligation and has a significance and a rule but, as a scientific acceptation is only a relation which does not allow any exception, it has a meaning of necessity. The generality of the moral law and implicitly of the juridical law exists only in the measure of being more than a simple care decree and has a character of generalization and abstraction, similar to the scientific one. In this respect, there are some examples of moral and juridical laws: do not steal or do not murder because you will suffer the punishment of the human law, but there are also more terrible punishments in religious laws of every religion in the world and penalties can go until the lost of the eternal life.

From a philosophical point of view, there are two key texts:

---

<sup>12</sup> *Dicționar Enciclopedic de Filosofie*, All Internațional, Bucharest, 1999, p. 399.

<sup>13</sup> Florian, *Recesivitatea ca Stuctură a lumii*.

<sup>14</sup> *Ibidem*.

- the first belongs to Rousseau (the Seventh Chapter from his work called *The Social Contract*), where the law is general through its object, which is not established for an individual, and becomes generally because it is applied to everybody's social life and its source, which is neither the result of an individual, nor of a majority, but is personified by everybody's will and it does not defer to their private interests;

- the second one is Kant's work, which shows that the law has a degree of universality and it does not prescribe any particular duty and for it is the practical reason itself, in the acceptation of being imposed to the man as a principle through its form, and thus it becomes universal ("Act so that the maximum of your will can ever value in the same time as a principle of universal legislation", The First Part, *The Critics of the Practical Reason*, Book number I).<sup>15</sup>

It results that the degree of generality can be determined from a scientific perspective, but the generalization of the moral law cannot be determined, because it depends on people's freedom.

*But while the universality which characterizes the law in its scientific meaning is a given universality, the universality which keeps the moral law can only be asked, containing the possibility of its transfiguration. This happens because the scientific law depends on the nature field and the human law depends on the freedom field<sup>16</sup> (there is a thirst of human nature, as Mircea Florian points it).*

But the pure freedom and the thirst for power of the man is, in fact, abhorrent for society and science because it often makes what it is unpleasant to the others, and the state where this happens cannot be named state of law and thus, a man is free to the extent to which he does what the law does not forbid<sup>17</sup>.

We can go further and arrive to the free will and the original sin and then to the world not destroyed by Cain's sin and thrown into the chaos of the violence from which it can be saved, in Florian's acceptation, only by love. Following the law, the man can chose good or bad. But there are limits of the civil law in the sense that there are foresights which permit the abortion (in some countries there is even the euthanasia and the clonation), but from the point of view of the Religious Law and the philosophical principles, this is anti-ethic, but it is ethic for the civil

---

<sup>15</sup> Rousseau and Kant apud Florian, *Recesivitatea ca Stuctură a lumii*.

<sup>16</sup> Florian, *Recesivitatea ca Stuctură a lumii*, p. 9.

<sup>17</sup> Rousseau and Voltaire apud Florian, *Recesivitatea ca Stuctură a lumii*, p. 9.

society. So, from the human point of view, neither objective laws to be respected in a state of law and nor moral laws to govern the usual life can be established. The human reasons try to make an objective character of the law and freedom which has no object. So the settlement of an absolute morality from the human point of view becomes a very difficult problem and maybe even impossible to contour, but it must be said that there are some trials in this respect.

*There are a lot of theoreticians who continue to offer causes for what is good or bad from a moral point of view. Some of them began with the religion; others took as basic principle human wishes and interests. Finally, others approached the things in an abstract way. Immanuel Kant, for example, was asking what maxims could admit a universal generalization for the whole people of all times. Some modern theoreticians that work with the theory of decision argued ... a mathematic theory of preference. Taken as a whole, the theories (...) of the moral judgment have difficulties (...) but none of them congregate the universal accord (...). But there is a consolation in a more optimistic sense (...), the accord of the fundamental moral affairs is large, and transmitted thanks to the natural selection.<sup>18</sup>*

The arguments invoked by Quine manage to establish, on the intrinsic spirit of the paper to the existence of some sources, a morality which governs the world. As regards the meaning of the precedent concept, he appears as a commentator who mentions the works about the philosophy of law in his way of establishing the human morality. Mircea Florian begins with “the dualism of violence-love”<sup>19</sup> which “expresses the two poles of human life”<sup>20</sup> and so the philosopher looks for “the deep meaning of human life or... briefly ... the key of morality”<sup>21</sup>. It has to be said about Florian that there are “in the same human being, who is qualified superior to the others, can cohabit the most abject starts, the sky and the hell, the light and the dark”<sup>22</sup>. Through this cohabitation we arrived to “the explanation fatality of the bad”<sup>23</sup>. In this sense is reached the finding of the Italian criminology that the normal man “is the one who occasionally commits bad

---

<sup>18</sup> W. I. Quine, *Tesătura opiniei*, Paralela 45, Pitești, 2008, p. 154 .

<sup>19</sup> Florian, *Recesivitatea ca Stuctură a lumii*, p. 9.

<sup>20</sup> *Ibidem*.

<sup>21</sup> *Ibidem*.

<sup>22</sup> *Ibidem*.

<sup>23</sup> *Ibidem*.

actions”<sup>24</sup>. In society, having this marks is ascertained then “the crisis of the morality”<sup>25</sup>, which means that life is confronted to “the crisis of morality as science”<sup>26</sup>, because “in front of the wave of immoral contemporary morality, the ethic thought could not succeed to discover the solid fundamant of Good, the moral justice of the Moral Merit”<sup>27</sup>. So it appears to be “a moral back formation”<sup>28</sup> which is anchored in the context of the modern war characterized by destructions “of the material buildings but also of the moral ones”<sup>29</sup>. It results that is kept “the mysticism of violence until hysteria”<sup>30</sup> and in this framework, “everyone looks to get rid of a bored action and to burke the germ of love as being a physical debility”<sup>31</sup>. In this conditions, Mircea Florian’s conclusion delineates “the necessity of the morality, the need of the ideal”<sup>32</sup>.

The following step of the philosopher is to establish a moral position which is seen as equivocal, whereas it has a double valence:

1) “firstly, the morality is the most intimate factor of the human life, it is the voice of conscience”<sup>33</sup> and

2) “secondly, it seems to be a factor, a superior principle of life, a transcendental imperative which does not come from our world and it is the voice of the sky”<sup>34</sup>.

The human life, in Florian’s conception, “is moved between the immoral law which is the law of the violence, and the law of love, which is recessive”<sup>35</sup>. To its place, the dualism of violence-love is also recessive and can be generally seen as a relation of conflict-harmony<sup>36</sup>. The conflict is dominant and the harmony is recessive<sup>37</sup>.

---

<sup>24</sup> *Ibidem.*

<sup>25</sup> *Ibidem.*

<sup>26</sup> *Ibidem.*

<sup>27</sup> *Ibidem*

<sup>28</sup> *Ibidem.*

<sup>29</sup> *Ibidem.*

<sup>30</sup> *Ibidem.*

<sup>31</sup> *Ibidem.*

<sup>32</sup> *Ibidem.*

<sup>33</sup> *Ibidem.*

<sup>34</sup> *Ibidem.*

<sup>35</sup> *Ibidem*, p 10.

<sup>36</sup> *Ibidem.*

<sup>37</sup> *Ibidem.*

To find how the love-violence dualism can be in the world, Mircea Florian makes an incursion in the history of philosophy by applying the old proceeding of Plato, which shows there are:

- 1) “a sensible, irrational, inferior component”<sup>38</sup> and
- 2) “an intelligible, rational, superior, divine component”<sup>39</sup>.

Among all thinkers, Florian quotes Fr. Nietzsche because of “the cruel exposure of hypocrisy (...) of false devout pretences of morality and religion”<sup>40</sup>. But he reproaches to Nietzsche that “he did not succeed to find a formula ... which explains the cohabitation of violence and love”<sup>41</sup>. Nietzsche considers the man as being “a brute, disgraced by Cain’s sin”<sup>42</sup>. But Nietzsche is sustained to a violent reality to create a human hierarchy while Christos goes in the direction of love. However, Plato and Christos do not find the salvation in this world but in “other world, of perfection”<sup>43</sup>, which is transcendent. The violence predominates in this world but the recessive world of love is flowing from the transcendent and restored the moral ideal<sup>44</sup>.

In human life, the law of violence brings the bad and the law of love brings the good. Through the theory of recessivity, Mircea Florian notes “the theory according to which the good is positive, and the bad is negative”<sup>45</sup>.

After preliminary concerns and incursions in the history of philosophy, Mircea Florian establishes “the clearing of the rapport of recessivity between the law of violence and the law of love, terms used by Tolstoi”<sup>46</sup>, with the mention that he only borrowed the terms. Human life is seen as a permanent oscillation “between the law of the violence where immoral facts stay together and the law of love, the only fundament of morality”<sup>47</sup>. The human characters which define this oscillation proved to be the power and the love which “have been present since the

---

<sup>38</sup> *Ibidem.*

<sup>39</sup> *Ibidem.*

<sup>40</sup> *Ibidem*, p. 11.

<sup>41</sup> *Ibidem.*

<sup>42</sup> *Ibidem.*

<sup>43</sup> *Ibidem.*

<sup>44</sup> *Ibidem.*

<sup>45</sup> *Ibidem*, p. 19.

<sup>46</sup> *Ibidem*, p. 30.

<sup>47</sup> *Ibidem.*

“appearing of the man as rational being”<sup>48</sup> but self-consciousness is considered as a subject because “without self-consciousness there is no subject”<sup>49</sup>.

So it appears, taking into consideration the law of violence and the will of power there is “the man of power”<sup>50</sup> that exists “in every men”<sup>51</sup>. This will of power has an old history being “a familiar notion for the sophists until Schopenhauer and especially Nietzsche”<sup>52</sup>. Thence the human existence becomes governed by some sort of thirst for power which “stays in structure of the will which actions in the name of individual self-consciousness being”<sup>53</sup>. This will is the cause of war and determinates the violence. Mircea Florian shows, in these meanings, that he is interested to study “the human aggressiveness..., *the war associated with violence*”<sup>54</sup>. The cardinal problem is constituted to define what is war, in its deep significance and to determine if it is a present permanent phenomenon in human history which “was, is and will be forever”<sup>55</sup>.

Then there are different acceptations about war. The fight for existence cannot be only seldom a war because it is not a face-to-face fight but “only a fight to find food”<sup>56</sup>. The war is seen as a bloody fight between human groups being present in the animal world beginning “from sociable insects—some species of bees and especially ants”<sup>57</sup>. But the war cannot be a value object in human life because “it devalues not only the personality of the man but also the life itself, because it imposes that man should kill man”<sup>58</sup>. The war arrives to exert a regressive influence, as Florian shows that the man goes back to “the primitive beast”<sup>59</sup>. It results that the violence has a negative function and then, the philosopher concludes, we must find the power to see “the violence which accepts the recessive rapport of Love and Reason”<sup>60</sup>.

---

<sup>48</sup> *Ibidem.*

<sup>49</sup> *Ibidem.*

<sup>50</sup> *Ibidem.*

<sup>51</sup> *Ibidem.*

<sup>52</sup> *Ibidem.*

<sup>53</sup> *Ibidem*, p. 2.

<sup>54</sup> *Ibidem*, p. 33.

<sup>55</sup> *Ibidem.*

<sup>56</sup> *Ibidem.*

<sup>57</sup> *Ibidem*, p. 34.

<sup>58</sup> *Ibidem*, p. 35.

<sup>59</sup> *Ibidem.*

<sup>60</sup> *Ibidem*, p. 38.

A historical incursion shows that the slavery is a step further in the phase of human productivity but is also an expression of dominated society. At the origin of the human being, the law of violence is predominant, but Mircea Florian shows it is recessive corrected by “the antithetical law of love”<sup>61</sup> and it results that the dominated society is not absolute and exclusive because “it is recessive and accompanied by the coordinative law which is the law of love”<sup>62</sup>. With the mention that the inside voice or the conscience and the laic and religious moralities are seen as imperatives which determine the man to go thorough the way of the love<sup>63</sup>.

Against individual aggressiveness there is, in society, a way of pressure exerted by the upper class that is the oligarchy through which is made the social power called “the law of little number”<sup>64</sup> but there is also “a law of the big number”<sup>65</sup> composed by electors. In this respect, Mircea Florian makes an appeal to the political philosophy and shows he is the partisan of democracy and of the peaceful society where the perceptions of Machiavelli do not dominate<sup>66</sup>.

Thus, the necessity of establishing the law of love as a predominated factor in the human society and following Florian’s recessive reason, it results that the law of love is defined to be a given which is an intrinsic component of the human conscience.

### *III. Conclusion*

The philosophy of Florian’s recessivity, applied in the domain of law establishes as a given the law of love. The demarche is realized by an incursion in the history of philosophy but also in the proper history of the humanity beginning with the primitive wildness where was imposed the law of the hardest trough the law of violence. So it is observed that together with the law of love there is also the law of violence. The conclusion is optimist because from the inside voice of the human conscience and the religious perceptions, the law of love is imperatively affirmed. But the philosopher proves to be preoccupied by the future and then he

---

<sup>61</sup> *Ibidem*, p. 42.

<sup>62</sup> *Ibidem*. p. 43.

<sup>63</sup> *Ibidem*, pp. 44-43.

<sup>64</sup> *Ibidem*, p. 43.

<sup>65</sup> *Ibidem*.

<sup>66</sup> *Ibidem*.

wonders: “What will dominate in the future: the love or the violence ...?”<sup>67</sup> As a prime condition of human progress there is the “inflorescence of an authentic morality of love”<sup>68</sup>. So, without the existence of love from the philosophy and religion, demonstrates Florian, the humanity would fall in the chaos of primitive wildness and the civilization would pass away.

### **Bibliography:**

1. *Dicționar Enciclopedic De Filosofie*, All Internațional, Bucharest, 1999.
2. <http://www.rightwords.ro/imgupl/author/t-600x600/mircea-florian--3640--t-600x600-rw.jpg>, 4/10/2008, 1:47:07 PM.
3. [http://www.intelepciune.ro/poze/Mircea\\_Florian.jpg](http://www.intelepciune.ro/poze/Mircea_Florian.jpg), 10/04/2008, 1:46:43 PM.
4. [http://1.bp.blogspot.com/\\_PKs53736B-A/SfQWP3PTnvi/AAAAAAAk0BoqLwHC6Uw/s320/Mircea+Florin+B%C4%83tr%C3%A2n.JPG](http://1.bp.blogspot.com/_PKs53736B-A/SfQWP3PTnvi/AAAAAAAk0BoqLwHC6Uw/s320/Mircea+Florin+B%C4%83tr%C3%A2n.JPG), 4/10/2008 1:46:18 PM.
5. Florian, Mircea, *Recesivitatea ca structură a lumii*, Eminescu, Iași, 1987.
6. Florian, Mircea, *Arta de a suferi*, Garamond, Bucharest, 2000.
7. Quine W.I, *Tesătura opiniei*, Paralela 45, Pitești, 2008.
8. Michiduță, Adrian, *Filosofia recesivității*, Doctoral Dissertation, manuscript, the Library of Faculty of Philosophy, Bucharest, 2008.

---

<sup>67</sup> *Ibidem*, p. 11.

<sup>68</sup> *Ibidem*, p. 13.