



OXFORD JOURNALS  
OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS

ANALYSIS

---

Subjective Probability and Indifference

Author(s): Roy A. Sorensen

Source: *Analysis*, Vol. 43, No. 1 (Jan., 1983), p. 15

Published by: Oxford University Press on behalf of The Analysis Committee

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3327795>

Accessed: 03/11/2009 17:49

---

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>. JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use provides, in part, that unless you have obtained prior permission, you may not download an entire issue of a journal or multiple copies of articles, and you may use content in the JSTOR archive only for your personal, non-commercial use.

Please contact the publisher regarding any further use of this work. Publisher contact information may be obtained at <http://www.jstor.org/action/showPublisher?publisherCode=oup>.

Each copy of any part of a JSTOR transmission must contain the same copyright notice that appears on the screen or printed page of such transmission.

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).



Oxford University Press and The Analysis Committee are collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Analysis*.

<http://www.jstor.org>

## SUBJECTIVE PROBABILITY AND INDIFFERENCE

By ROY A. SORENSEN

IN 'Is Epistemic Preferability Transitive?' (ANALYSIS 41.3, June 1981), I attack the following axiom appearing in Chisholm's and Kiem's 'A System of Epistemic Logic' (*Ratio*, December 1972):

$$(A2) \quad (\sim(pPq) \ \& \ \sim(qPr)) \supset \sim(pPr)$$

This axiom is read: If it is not the case that  $p$  is epistemically preferable to  $q$ , and it is not the case that  $q$  is epistemically preferable to  $r$ , then it is not the case that  $p$  is epistemically preferable to  $r$ . Peter Millican has pointed out that my argument against (A2) is unsound if epistemic preferability is given a probabilistic interpretation ('On the Transitivity of Epistemic Preferability', ANALYSIS 42.2, March 1982). Nicholas LaPara gives such an interpretation in 'Chisholm, Kiem, Preferability' (*Ratio*, June 1975). In the following two paragraphs I provide another counterexample to (A2) that also shows that epistemic preferability cannot be given a probabilistic interpretation.

Suppose there are 21 buckets of water  $b_1, b_2, \dots, b_{21}$  such that bucket  $b_i$  contains water at  $i$  degrees centigrade. Jim makes pairwise comparisons between  $b_i$  and  $b_{i+1}$  where  $1 \leq i < 21$  by putting his hands in the appropriate buckets. Since Jim cannot discern a temperature difference of 1 degree by this method, he is epistemically indifferent between propositions  $p_i$  and  $p_{i+1}$  where ' $p_i$ ' reads 'The bucket containing water of the highest temperature of all 21 buckets is bucket  $i$ '. So if the epistemic indifference relation is transitive, Jim should be indifferent between  $p_1$  and  $p_{21}$ . However, Jim can discern a temperature difference of 20 degrees and so he is not indifferent between  $p_1$  and  $p_{21}$ . Therefore, epistemic indifference is not transitive. Since (A2) implies the transitivity of epistemic indifference, this example shows that (A2) is false.

The above argument also shows that epistemic preferability cannot be given a probabilistic interpretation. If ' $pPq$ ' is read as ' $p$  is more probable than  $q$ ' then the standard definition of indifference as  $\sim(pPq) \ \& \ \sim(qPp)$  forces us to read ' $pIq$ ' as ' $p$  and  $q$  are equiprobable'. It would then follow that the epistemic indifference relation is transitive. Since this relation has already been shown to be nontransitive, the probabilistic interpretation of epistemic preferability must be rejected.

*Michigan State University,*  
*East Lansing, Michigan 48823, U.S.A.*

© ROY A. SORENSEN 1983