

Reading Questions for October 12

These questions covers an article by Derek Matravers called “The Challenge of Irrationalism and How Not To Meet It.” The answers do not have to be turned in. You will probably have to read more than once to get the answers.

*Background:*

For today’s reading, we’re going to look at a response to the article we read on Friday. That article defended the view that emotional responses to fiction can be rational, this article criticizes that defense. While Matravers does a lot of different things in his article, we’re going to ignore most of them and instead pay attention to the way in which he responds to Gendler and Kovakovich.

*Questions:*

1. In the paragraph starting “One further strength ...” (256-7) Matravers offers a criticism of Gendler and Kovakovich’s view that has to do with an inability to make a distinction. What is his criticism? Do you think it is plausible?
2. In the paragraph starting “The same consideration ...” (260-1) Matravers criticizes Gendler and Kovakovich’s attempt to defend the view that reacting with emotion to fiction is rational. How does his criticism go? Is it plausible?