

I don't always know how you came up with your theory T, what evidence you have for it, and so forth. That you have predicted rather than merely accommodated some surprising data can provide evidence for *me* to increase my estimate of the quality of evidence that *you* possess for T and hence enhance the credibility of T for *me* (because "evidence of evidence is evidence"). But what about in my own case? I possess all the relevant evidence for my theory and may know perfectly well what that evidence is. Should my own success at prediction (as opposed to accommodation) strengthen my conviction in my own theory? I once argued so, but I think too hastily. I revisit the issue here in more detail, tying it in with recent epistemological debates about "higher-order" evidence. I still defend a modest form of predictivist prejudice, but I hope a better understanding emerges.