

Сведения о переводчике

**КОЧНЕВ Роман Леонидович**, учебный мастер кафедры «Философия и социальные коммуникации».

SPIN-код: 7887-8053

AuthorID (РИНЦ): 961891

Источник перевода: S. Protasi. Loving people for who they are (even when they don't love you back) // European Journal of Philosophy. 2014. Vol. 24, Issue 1. P. 21 – 23. DOI: 10.1111/ejop.12077.

Ссылка на полный текст статьи: <https://philpapers.org/rec/PROLPF>

Адрес для переписки: [r-kochnev@mail.ru](mailto:r-kochnev@mail.ru)

Для цитирования

С. Протаси. Любить людей за то, кто они есть (даже если они не любят нас в ответ) = S. Protasi. Loving people for who they are (even when they don't love you back) / пер. Р. Л. Кочнева // Омский научный вестник. Сер. Общество. История. Современность. 2018. № 3. С. 65–78. DOI: 10.25206/2542-0488-2018-3-65-78.

Статья поступила в редакцию 03.08.2018 г.

© С. Протаси

UDC 177.61

DOI: 10.25206/2542-0488-2018-3-65-78

**S. PROTASI**

University of Puget Sound,  
Tacoma, USA

## LOVING PEOPLE FOR WHO THEY ARE (EVEN WHEN THEY DON'T LOVE YOU BACK)

**The debate on love's reasons ignores unrequited love, which—I argue—can be as genuine and as valuable as reciprocated love. I start by showing that the relationship view of love cannot account for either the reasons or the value of unrequited love. I then present the simple property view, an alternative to the relationship view that is beset with its own problems. In order to solve these problems, I present a more sophisticated version of the property view that integrates ideas from different property theorists in the love literature. However, even this more sophisticated property view falls short in accounting for unrequited love's reasons. In response, I develop a new version of the property view that I call the experiential view. On this view, we love a person not only in virtue of properties shaped by and experienced in a reciprocal loving relationship, but also in virtue of perspectival properties, whose value can be properly assessed also outside of a reciprocal loving relationship. The experiential view is the only view that can account not only for reciprocated love's reasons, but also for unrequited love's reasons.**

**Keywords: reciprocated love, unrequited love, property view, relationship view, perspectival properties.**

### References

1. Singer I. The Nature of Love. Vol. 1. Plato to Luther. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1984. 396 p. (In Engl.).

2. Singer I. The Nature of Love. Vol. 2. Courtly and Romantic. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1984. 513 p. (In Engl.).

3. Singer I. The Nature of Love. Vol. 3. The Modern World. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1987. 496 p. (In Engl.).

4. Helm B. Love // The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy (Fall 2013 Edition) / Ed. E. N. Zalta. URL: <http://plato.stanford.edu/archives/fall2013/entries/love/> (accessed: 09.07.2018). (In Engl.).

5. D'Arms J., Jacobson D. The Moralistic Fallacy: On the «Appropriateness» of Emotions // Philosophy and Phenomenological Research. 2000. Vol. 61, no. 1. P. 65–90. DOI: 10.2307/2653403. (In Engl.).

6. D'Arms J., Jacobson D. The Significance of Recalcitrant Emotions (or Anti-Quasi Judgmentalism) // Royal Institute of Philosophy Supplement. 2003. Vol. 52. P. 127–145. DOI: 10.1017/S1358246100007931. (In Engl.).

7. LaFollette H. Personal Relationships: Love, Identity, and Morality. Hoboken: Blackwell Press, 1996. 240 p. (In Engl.).

8. Kolodny N. Love as Valuing a Relationship // The Philosophical Review. 2003. Vol. 112, no. 2. P. 135–189. DOI: 10.1215/00318108-112-2-135. (In Engl.).

9. Thomas L. Reasons for Loving. The Philosophy of (Erotic) Love. Lawrence: Kansas University Press, 1991. 536 p. (In Engl.).

10. Frankfurt H. Reasons of Love. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2006. 112 p. (In Engl.).

11. Delaney N. Romantic Love and Loving Commitment: Articulating a Modern Ideal // American Philosophical Quarterly. 1996. Vol. 33, no. 4. P. 339–356. (In Engl.).

12. Keller S. How Do I Love Thee? Let Me Count the Properties // *American Philosophical Quarterly*. 2000. Vol. 37, no. 2. P. 163–173. (In Engl.).
13. Nozick R. Love's Bond // *The Examined Life: Philosophical Meditations*. NY: Simon & Schuster, 1989. P. 68–86. (In Engl.).
14. Badhwar N. K. Love // *Practical Ethics*. NY: Oxford University Press, 2003. P. 42–69. DOI: 10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199284238.003.0003. (In Engl.).
15. Kraut R. Love De Re // *Midwest Studies in Philosophy*. 1986. Vol. 10, no. 1. P. 413–430. DOI: 10.1111/j.1475-4975.1987.tb00549.x. (In Engl.).
16. Soble A. *The Structure of Love*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1990. 247 p. (In Engl.).
17. Solomon R. C. Reasons for Love // *Journal for the Theory of Social Behaviour*. 2002. Vol. 32, no. 1. P. 1–28. DOI: 10.1111/1468-5914.00173. (In Engl.).
18. Rorty A. O. The Historicity of Psychological Attitudes: Love Is Not Love Which Alters Not When It Alteration Finds // *Midwest Studies in Philosophy*. 1986. Vol. 10, no. 1. P. 399–412. DOI: 10.1111/j.1475-4975.1987.tb00548.x. (In Engl.).
19. Nussbaum M. C. Love and the Individual: Romantic Rightness and Platonic Aspiration // *Love Analyzed* / Ed. R. E. Lamb. Boulder: Westview Press, 1997. P. 1–22. (In Engl.).
20. Lamb R. E. Love and Rationality // *Love Analyzed* / Ed. R. E. Lamb. Boulder: Westview Press, 1997. P. 23–47. (In Engl.).
21. Wong D. The Different Faces of Love in a Good Life // *Moral Cultivation and Confucian Character: Engaging Joel J. Kupperman* / Eds. C. Li, P. Ni. Albany: SUNY Press, 2014. P. 97–125. (In Engl.).

---

About the translator

**KOCHNEV Roman Leonidovich**, Educational Master of Philosophy and Social Communication Department.  
SPIN-code: 7887-8053  
AuthorID (RSCI): 961891  
Address for correspondence: r-kochnev@mail.ru

**For citation**

Protasi S. Loving people for who they are (even when they don't love you back) / trans. R. L. Kochnev // *Omsk Scientific Bulletin. Series Society. History. Modernity*. 2018. No. 3. P. 65–78. DOI: 10.25206/2542-0488-2018-3-65-78.

**Received 03 August 2018.**

© S. Protasi