

# Typicality-Based Chance

Isaac Wilhelm  
Quantities Workshop  
July 9, 2024

Typicality-Based Chance: to be a chance is to be typically approximated by possible frequencies.

## Typicality

### Typical Property

Property  $P$  is typical in set  $\Gamma$  (relative to measure  $M$ ) if and only if  $M(\Gamma_P)$  is very close to  $M(\Gamma)$ .

- $\Gamma_P$ : set of all elements in  $\Gamma$  which have  $P$ .
- $M$ : finite measure over an algebra of sets which contains  $\Gamma_P$ .

### Typical Property

Object  $x$  in set  $\Gamma$  is typical with respect to property  $P$  (relative to measure  $M$ ) if and only if

- (i)  $P$  is typical in  $\Gamma$  (relative to  $M$ ), and
- (ii)  $x$  has  $P$ .

## The Functional Characterization of Chance

### Typicality-Based Chance

For  $p_E$  to be the chance of  $E$  just is for it to be the case that for all  $\epsilon$  greater than 0,

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} M_E \left( \left\{ \omega \in \Omega_E \left| \left| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n X_i^E(\omega) - p_E \right| < \epsilon \right. \right\} \right) = 1 \quad (\text{LLN})$$

- $E$ : event.
- $\Omega_E$ : set of all infinite sequences whose members are  $E$  and  $\neg E$ .
- For each  $i$ ,  $X_i^E$ : random variable encoding whether, given  $\omega$  in  $\Omega_E$ , the  $i$ th place of  $\omega$  is  $E$  or  $\neg E$ .
- $M_E$ : finite measure defined over algebra of subsets in  $\Omega_E$ .
- $p_E$ : the chance of  $E$  obtaining.

## Justifying the Measure

The Justification Question: for a given event  $E$ , what justifies a specific choice of the typicality measure  $M_E$  which figures in Typicality-Based Chance?

Here is how to answer this question in a given, particular case. Let  $c$  be a coin, and let  $E_c$  be the event of  $c$  landing heads after being flipped. Suppose we do not know the chance  $p_{E_c}$  of  $E_c$ .

Make some reasonable assumptions about how to model, mathematically, the physical system in which  $c$  is flipped many times. Choose experimental error parameter  $\epsilon = \frac{1}{20}$ ; note  $\epsilon$  will be used to quantify closeness between the actual observed frequency of  $E_c$  and future guesses of the chance of  $E_c$ . Let  $\Omega_{E_c}$  be the set of all possible infinite sequences of flips for  $c$ . And for each  $i$ ,  $X_i^{E_c}$  says whether the  $i$ th flip lands heads.

The Goal: figure out both (i) the typicality measure  $M_{E_c}$ , and (ii) the chance  $p_{E_c}$  of  $E_c$ .

Towards that end, perform 1000 flips of  $c$ , and record the outcome of each flip. Let  $\alpha_{1000}$  be the finite sequence encoding the outcomes, and let  $\alpha$  be whichever sequence in  $\Omega_{E_c}$  is actual – so  $\alpha$  is the physical possibility corresponding to the actual world.<sup>1</sup> Suppose that in total,  $c$  lands heads 519 times and tails 481 times. So the relative frequency of heads, in this first series of experiments, is  $\frac{1}{1000} \sum_{i=1}^{1000} X_i^{E_c}(\alpha) = \frac{519}{1000} = .519$ .

Now make the ‘Unspecial Assumption’: the observed frequency is typical. More precisely, the unspecial assumption is that whatever the right typicality measure  $M_{E_c}$  might be, and whatever the right chance might be,

- (i) the property  $P_{1000}^{.05}$  of having a relative frequency of heads—in the first 1000 flips—which is within  $\epsilon = .05$  of  $p_{E_c}$ , is typical in  $\Omega_{E_c}$  (relative to  $M_{E_c}$ ), and
- (ii)  $\alpha$  is typical with respect to  $P_{1000}^{.05}$  (relative to  $M_{E_c}$ ).

A natural measure which respects both (i) and (ii): the measure  $M_{E_c}$  which, for each  $i$ , assigns a size of  $\frac{1}{2}$  to every set of possible infinite sequences in which the coin lands heads on the  $i$ th flip. We can check that this is, indeed, the right measure, by performing more flips, and seeing if the quantity

$$M_{E_c} \left( \left\{ \omega \in \Omega_{E_c} \left| \left| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n X_i^{E_c}(\omega) - \frac{1}{2} \right| < .05 \right. \right\} \right)$$

gets closer and closer to 1 as the number of flips  $n$  grows from 1000 to 2000, to 3000, and so on – as the law of large numbers requires.

---

<sup>1</sup>Here we make several simplifying assumptions. For instance, we make the assumption, common in mathematical modeling, that  $c$  is flipped infinitely many times in the actual world.