Review of: "[Research Note] A note on Hempel's paradox"

Stephen Francis Mann[1]

1 University of Barcelona

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

The research note is a brief encapsulation of the author's solution to Hempel's paradox. It's nice to see something short and self-contained that nevertheless describes a philosophical problem and outlines a resolution with a reasonable amount of detail.

As a reader from a general philosophical background who is not an expert on Hempel's paradox, I greatly benefitted from reading a couple of internet resources explaining some of the finer points that the research note touches upon. The author might consider including some of these references in a small bibliography.

The following suggestions are geared towards improving readability and clarifying the argument:

1. In the paragraph that begins "Let's imagine that…" you could say explicitly that the reason Hempel's paradox is a paradox is that the conclusion that seeing a black raven inductively confirms the generalization "All swans are white" is counterintuitive. You could even set up an inconsistent triad, as the relevant Wikipedia article does.
2. "It is to be considered that in whatever inductive inference, it is an obvious requirement that the set of premises must remain the same." It's not totally clear what this means. Do you mean the premises must remain the same during a *single event* of inductive inference? Or that the premises must remain the same during a *sequence* of inductive inferences derived from multiple observations? Presumably the first, so I would reword this to be more explicit.
3. The very next sentence is "In an Aristotle's syllogism, for example, if I add new premises, all the same the previous syllogistic inference is certainly still correct" – but this seems to be *contrary* to what you are saying in the previous sentence. If you are trying to *contrast* an Aristotelian syllogism with inductive inference, you should say "by contrast" instead of "for example". This will help the reader to understand that you are contrasting these two cases.
4. You could add a link to a definition of monotonicity, e.g.https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Monotonicity_of_entailment.
5. You could specify more precisely the form of an inductive inference.Routledge encyclopedia says: "According to a long tradition, an inductive inference is an inference from a premise of the form 'all observed A are B' to a conclusion of the form 'all A are B'."
6. "For this reason. we should say that the inductive inference taking as its premise "black (a) Λ raven (a)" is exactly a different inference from the one taking as it premise "non-white (a) Λ non-swan (a)"". It looks as though your solution falls into the class of solutions that Wikipedia calls Rejections of Hempel's equivalence condition. There are several other sub-solutions in this category, and it might help your reader navigate the (rather vast) logical space to mention this. It could be that your version of this solution is novel; I confess I am not qualified to assess that.