Delaney, N. (1996). "Romantic Love and Loving Commitment: Articulating a Modern Ideal", in: *American Philosophical Quarterly* 33 (4), 339-356.

romantic love & loving commitment

What are the relevant attitudes, dispositions, and feelings?

What do we take them to be?

required: required: conceptual analyze ideals, analysis expectations

Not too sure about this.

I do this anecdotally/common-sensically!



I focus on Western culture, may not generalize.

Basic idea:

people want to a) form a distinctive kind of we, b) be loved based on certain properties, and c) generate & create a distinctive kind of commitment.

@a: generally accepted @b: hot issue

@c: under-rated, clarification needed

romantic love = wanting to form a we, to unite in profound physical &

includes identifycation with one's partner, their needs & interests (& desire that this

= adopt the partner's interests? That's too static, Roger! We want our lovers to

Though the desire to be

loved for properties

central to one's self-

conception is central to

the romantic ideal, we

(& those properties)

change over time!

improve be responsive

with & care partners

freely remain

vow of loyalty

for us as their

We want our lovers'

grounds for love to track how we change

understanding & support as we change

consideration of our (& joint) interests as they change

We want this to survive the loss of much or all of what grounds our lovers' love

sincere & renewed willingness to attend to the other's interests and needs

plasticity expressed as

needed: balance, ongoing realignment

reciprocity

vields: shared history and ongoing romantic exchange, ideally preserving the psychological intimacy characteristic of a healthy romantic we

loving commitment:

enduring interpersonal

commitment grounded

in and sustained by the

lover's romantic

attachment. (limited

unconditionality)

Pretty great stuff, but what about unconditional love? What's the alternative?

Idiosyncratic reciprocated physical delight and communication patterns springing from the desire for interpersonal closeness matter, too, for the we.

Loving relationships help us stabilize & reinforce our self-conception & grow into better versions of ourselves.



Clearly not ideal: we are

a) loved for peripheral properties,

b) our lover appreciates our

central qualities for very different

(e.g. instrumental) reasons.

The romantic ideal of the altruistic lover who truly desires me is just incoherent!

Because

sharing a

history

really

matters!

We want continuous discernment from our lovers, not uncon-

ditional love. Reflecting about

commitment brings this out.

A different (apparent) inconsistency in the

ideal is this: we want to be loved both

unconditionally and yet in a discerning way,

the latter partly because we want our

romantic love(r) to provide us with reasons

to love and feel good about ourselves.

Why am I not loved like you? A little selfishness doesn't hurt anyone! We do like being desired selfishly (a

Is it love, though, if we're loved for who we don't take ourselves to be?

Clearly, he

wants to be

loved as the bad

ass that he may

(not) in fact be.

Are we to take reasons talk seriously, then?

Nah, ideally, the right kind of (central) properties do the grounding. That counts.

People want to be loved for some qualities they take to be central to their self-conception.

ground loving attitude (love relates people, not properties)

Why not

just

commise-

rate with

them?

Distinguish:

a) people

b) their properties

I don't need to worry about this, remember?

Darling, please appreciate the right properties in the right kind of way, i.e., much like I appreciate them, at least eventually.

We don't care too much about what triggered our lover's love.

You a) are silly, b) really just complain that your properties are not wellappreciated, or c) (absurdly) want to be loved for your haecceity.

But at least love me for ME!



psychological ways.

be mutual)

Too much! Too little!

I only have a guess here: Lovers value a do less & < kind of trust, which includes being trusted by the beloved. Just like ideally, trust is mutual, identifying with the partner's interests is, too.

"I, too, want to be a significant and a significant equal source of support for at least some of my partner's interests; cheer them up (as opposed to their ex doing it!)"

needed: individual negotiation of the tension between intimacy & individuality (which arises for some, not all interests)

My partner does not need to have exactly my interests!

My partner should, for non-instrumental reasons, support me in my interests!



love = no difference between vour and my interests

Scruton & Montaigne, this is too much! Better think of such unions as merging of sovereign states into a republic!



If you want your beloved to value your pursuit of your interests for your own sake, it shouldn't matter to them how your pursuit affects them, right?

needed: mix of proper appreciation, support, nonappropriation of distinctly personal goals of the partner

If not, we No. Aristotle. undermine they should the idea of really see my success in pursuing my interests as good for

them also.

