

¹For a number of compelling (and heartbreaking) narrative accounts of this phenomenon, see Barbara Ehrenreich and Arlie Russell Hochschild, eds., *Global Woman: Nannies, Maids and Sex Workers in the New Economy* (New York: Henry Holt and Company, 2002).

²Gloria Albrecht, *Hitting Home: Feminist Ethics, Women's Work, and the Betrayal of "Family Values"* (New York and London: Continuum, 2002), 139.

³Albrecht, 83.

⁴Eva Feder Kittay, *Love's Labor: Essays on Women, Equality, and Dependency* (New York and London: Routledge, 1999), 117-118 (italics in original).

⁵Deborah Stone, "Why We Need a Care Movement," *The Nation*, 13 March 2000, 13-16 (italics in original).

⁶Kittay, 103.

⁷Outka, *Agape: An Ethical Analysis* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1972), 9.

⁸Outka, *Agape*, 11-12, quoting Karl Barth, *Church Dogmatics IV/2*, tr. G. W. Bromiley (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1958), 745.

⁹Gene Outka, "Universal Love and Impartiality," in Edmund M. Santurri and William Werpehowski, eds., *The Christian Love Commandments: Essays in Christian Ethics and Moral Philosophy* (Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press, 1992), 1-103.

¹⁰Gene Outka, "Comment on 'Love in Contemporary Christian Ethics,'" *Journal of Religious Ethics*, 26/2 (Fall 1998): 438.

¹¹See, for example, Robert O. Johann, S.J., *The Meaning of Love: An Essay towards a Metaphysics of Intersubjectivity* (Westminster, Maryland: Newman Press, 1959); Jules Toner, *The Experience of Love* (Washington/Cleveland: Corpus Books, 1968); and Martin D'Arcy, S.J., *The Mind and Heart of Love: Lion and Unicorn: A Study in Eros and Agape* (New York: Meridian Books, 1956).

¹²Feminist thinkers have been appreciative of Outka's inclusion of the self in the scope of humanity deserving of "equal regard," in contrast to thinkers who see self-sacrifice as the core of Christian love. See, for example, Barbara Hilkert Andolsen, "Agape in Feminist Ethics," *Journal of Religious Ethics* 9:1 (1981): 69-83; and Christine Gudorf, "Parenting, Mutual Love, and Sacrifice," in Barbara Hilkert Andolsen, Christine E. Gudorf, and Mary Pellauer, eds., *Women's Consciousness, Women's Conscience: A Reader in Feminist Ethics* (San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1985), 175-192. Still, Outka's work requires more rigorous critique from a feminist perspective, which I am trying to provide here.

¹³Outka, *Agape*, 269.

¹⁴Outka, *Agape*, 272.

¹⁵See, for example, Stephen G. Post, *A Theory of Agape: On the Meaning of Christian Love* (Lewisburg, PA: Bucknell University Press, 1990), and *Spheres of Love: Toward a New Ethics of the Family* (Dallas: Southern Methodist University Press, 1994).

¹⁶See, for example, Don S. Browning, Bonnie J. Miller-McLemore, Pamela D. Couture, K. Brynolf Lyon, and Robert M. Franklin, *From Culture Wars to Common Ground: Religion and the American Family Debate*, 2nd ed. (Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox, 2000) (1997). The authors advocate "the committed, intact, equal-regard, public-private family" (2). Although they engage Outka and others on the nature of Christian love, their use of "equal regard" is not equivalent to his. In particular, they do not insist on the feature, central for Outka, that "equal regard" will prescind from attention to the attractiveness or particular qualities of the loved one. Rather, "equal regard" for Browning et al. seems to mean something like a basic equality of respect between husband and wife, and is almost interchangeable with "mutuality." This is one reason why they can use the term precisely to define an ideal form of a "special relation." For Outka, equal regard does not preclude mutuality and the other-regard involved in equal regard may even help bring about mutuality; but equal regard in itself is defined by its fidelity even without mutuality.

¹⁷Pope, "'Equal Regard' or 'Special Relations'?: The Inclusiveness of Agape," *Journal of Religion* 77:3 (July 1997): 354.

¹⁸See Luke 10:25-37.

¹⁹John R. Donahue, S.J., *The Gospel in Parable* (Fortress Press: 1990), 130.

²⁰William C. Spohn, *Go and Do Likewise: Jesus and Ethics* (New York: Continuum, 2000), 91.

²¹Sally Purvis, "Mothers, Neighbors, and Strangers: Another Look at Agape," *Journal of Feminist Studies in Religion* 7:1 (Spring 1991): 19-34.

²²*Ibid.*, 31.

²³ Ibid., 32.

²⁴ Outka, *Agape*, 270. In a similar vein, see page 262, where the “particularity” that Outka says *agape* may attend to without violating equal regard is assimilated to “achievements” and “excellences.”

²⁵ Outka, “Universal Love and Impartiality,” 90.

²⁶ Allan Silver, “Friendship in Commercial Society: Eighteenth-Century Social Theory and Modern Sociology,” *The American Journal of Sociology* 95:6 (May 1990): 1474-1504.

²⁷ Outka, *Agape*, 22.

²⁸ Outka, “Universal Love and Impartiality,” 18-44. Here Outka is discussing the work of Paul Ramsey, among others; thus it is interesting that he does not follow Ramsey in recognizing that we live “in a world where *there is always more than one neighbor* and indeed a whole cluster of claims and responsibilities to be considered.” Paul Ramsey, *Basic Christian Ethics* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1950), 42. Ramsey still considers the standard for Christian ethics to be that which would be demanded of us in a purely dyadic self-other situation, which is problematic from the point of view developed in this paper; but he recognizes that such dyadic situations do not exist in the world as it is.

²⁹ Outka, *Agape*, 273.

³⁰ Outka, “Universal Love and Impartiality,” 2-3.

³¹ There is some indication that Outka himself has come to recognize this problem. Recently, he has stated the following in an exchange with Stephen Pope: “I think now that we require an account of love that draws on *both* differences *and* points of correspondence between God’s action and our own. For we move between attesting to God’s sovereignty and grace and covenant love, and actively corresponding to this, on our own level and with our own capacities. We may genuinely follow God, in the pattern our own attachments, kinds of action, and virtues assume. Yet we follow at a distance, a distance that God’s alterity and our creatureliness, including our finitude and the corruption under which we now labor—combine to effect. To do greater justice to both differences and points of correspondence suggests the center of gravity to which I hope to adhere in future discussions.” Outka, “Comment on ‘Love in Contemporary Christian Ethics,’” 439.