

# CONTENTS

PREFACE . . . . .	v
H. FREUDENTHAL: REALISTIC MODELS IN PROBABILITY . . . . .	1
DISCUSSION:	
P. SUPPES: Some remarks on the application of probability and the concept of model . . . . .	15
Y. BAR-HILLEL: Freudenthal contra methodologos . . . . .	17
H. FREUDENTHAL: Reply . . . . .	22
W. C. SALMON: THE JUSTIFICATION OF INDUCTIVE RULES OF INFERENCE . . . . .	24
DISCUSSION:	
I. HACKING: One problem about induction . . . . .	44
W. C. KNEALE: Confirmation and rationality . . . . .	59
J. W. N. WATKINS: Non-inductive corroboration . . . . .	61
Y. BAR-HILLEL: Inductive logic as 'the' guide of life . . . . .	66
D. W. MILLER: On the subjective interpretation of probability . . . . .	69
H. E. KYBURG: Detaching estimates . . . . .	72
W. C. SALMON: Reply . . . . .	74
H. E. KYBURG, Jr.: THE RULE OF DETACHMENT IN IN- DUCTIVE LOGIC . . . . .	98
DISCUSSION:	
Y. BAR-HILLEL: On alleged rules of detachment in inductive logic . . . . .	120
P. SUPPES: Two rules of detachment in inductive logic . . . . .	129
K. R. POPPER: On rules of detachment and so-called inductive logic . . . . .	130
W. C. SALMON: Who needs inductive acceptance rules? . . . . .	139
J. HINTIKKA: The possibility of rules of acceptance . . . . .	144
R. CARNAP: On rules of acceptance . . . . .	146
Y. BAR-HILLEL: The acceptance syndrome . . . . .	150
H. E. KYBURG Jr.: Reply . . . . .	161

R. C. JEFFREY: PROBABLE KNOWLEDGE . . . . .	166
---	-----

## DISCUSSION:

L. HURWICZ: Richard Jeffrey on the three prisoners . . . . .	181
P. SUPPES: Rational changes of belief . . . . .	186
R. C. JEFFREY: Reply . . . . .	189

J. HINTIKKA: INDUCTION BY ENUMERATION AND INDUCTION BY ELIMINATION . . . . .	191
---	-----

## DISCUSSION:

J. R. LUCAS: Does Hintikka's system represent our actual inductive procedures? . . . . .	217
R. CARNAP: The concept of constituent-structure . . . . .	218
M. B. HESSE: Enumeration, elimination, and analogy . . . . .	220
J. HINTIKKA: Reply . . . . .	223

M. B. HESSE: CONSILIENCE OF INDUCTIONS . . . . .	232
--	-----

## DISCUSSION:

L. J. COHEN: An argument that confirmation functors for consilience are empirical hypotheses . . . . .	247
J. L. MACKIE: A simple model of consilience . . . . .	250
W. C. KNEALE: Requirements for consilience . . . . .	253
M. B. HESSE: Reply . . . . .	254

R. CARNAP: INDUCTIVE LOGIC AND INDUCTIVE INTUITION	258
--	-----

## DISCUSSION:

M. BUNGE: Induction, a motley assembly . . . . .	268
J. W. N. WATKINS: Hume, Carnap and Popper . . . . .	271
Y. BAR-HILLEL: Bunge and Watkins on inductive logic . . . . .	282
K. R. POPPER: Theories, experience, and probabilistic intuitions . . . . .	285
J. HINTIKKA: Conditionalization and information . . . . .	303
R. CARNAP: Reply . . . . .	307

I. LAKATOS: CHANGES IN THE PROBLEM OF INDUCTIVE LOGIC . . . . .	315
--	-----