

Urth Digest, Vol 76, Issue 9

The Urth list — 1 messages, 1 voices, 02 Dec 2010

<https://urth.darkrealm.vip/thread/urth/5796>

Exported from an unofficial mirror of a public mailing list. Copyright in each message remains with the person who wrote it. Email addresses are obscured as `user at host`, the form the original archive published. This file was rebuilt from parsed fields rather than retained headers, so it is faithful in content but not byte-exact.

Nick Lee — 02 Dec 2010, 19:26

Thu, 02 Dec 2010 10:41:10 -0600 James Wynn <crushtv at gmail.com>

I think the Logician term for that is "tit for tat". And here is an applicable opportunity to address the motives of a writer to understand his text. It would be a valid refutation of Wright's arguments to say that it is circular and that there is a reasonable probability that it exemplifies what he attempts to debunk. That would have been a good argument from the vantage of hindsight.

I'm not entirely sure what you're saying here. "Tit for tat" is a strategy in game theory (which I haven't studied much) rather than classical logic, but I don't think it applies here. Unless I'm missing something? It's kind of a complicated concept. I suppose the difficulty is in deriving your antecedent for "that" (not "tat").

Accusation of circular reasoning is not always a way to refute the argument, because circular reasoning can be valid. You'd have to explain precisely how Wright's argument is circular in order to ascertain its fallaciousness. In any case, Wright's reasoning is more complex than that, as others have testified.

Wright doesn't argue that *Sun* has no religious or moral interpretations. He instead asserts that different reader expectations, religious and mythic, prevent them from noticing the physicalist details, and that Wolfe plays (preys?) on this tendency. I don't see how his reasoning is circular. Not to speak for Wright, but knowing something about reader response theory, I think he would say that a religious interpretation of Wolfe is valid as long as it still takes the subtext into account, i. e. the hierogrammates' conspiracy.