1. Record Nr. UNINA9910450817103321

Autore	Barnes Eric C (Eric Christian), <1959->
Titolo	The paradox of predictivism / / Eric Christian Barnes [[electronic resource]]
Pubbl/distr/stampa	Cambridge : , : Cambridge University Press, , 2008
ISBN	1-107-18389-8 1-281-37079-7 9786611370794 0-511-39441-1 0-511-48733-9 0-511-39243-5 0-511-39506-X 0-511-39110-2 0-511-39372-5
Descrizione fisica	1 online resource (x, 265 pages) : digital, PDF file(s)
Disciplina	501
Soggetti	Science - Philosophy Science - Forecasting
Lingua di pubblicazione	Inglese
Formato	Materiale a stampa
Livello bibliografico	Monografia
Note generali	Title from publisher's bibliographic system (viewed on 05 Oct 2015).
Nota di bibliografia	Includes bibliographical references (p. 249-257) and index.
Nota di contenuto	Cover; Half-title; Title; Copyright; Dedication; Contents; Acknowledgments; CHAPTER 1 The paradox of predictivism; CHAPTER 2 Epistemic pluralism; CHAPTER 3 Predictivism and the Periodic Table of the Elements; CHAPTER 4 Miracle arguments and the demise of strong predictivism; CHAPTER 5 The predicting community; CHAPTER 6 Back to epistemic pluralism; CHAPTER 7 Postlude on old evidence; CHAPTER 8 A paradox resolved; Glossary; Bibliography; Index
Sommario/riassunto	An enduring question in the philosophy of science is the question of whether a scientific theory deserves more credit for its successful predictions than it does for accommodating data that was already known when the theory was developed. In The Paradox of Predictivism, Eric Barnes argues that the successful prediction of evidence testifies to the general credibility of the predictor in a way that evidence does not

when the evidence is used in the process of endorsing the theory. He illustrates his argument with an important episode from nineteenth-century chemistry, Mendeleev's Periodic Law and its successful predictions of the existence of various elements. The consequences of this account of predictivism for the realist/anti-realist debate are considerable, and strengthen the status of the 'no miracle' argument for scientific realism. Barnes's important and original contribution to the debate will interest a wide range of readers in philosophy of science.