

# Finite frequentism explains quantum probability<sup>§</sup>

Simon Saunders\*

Abstract: I show that frequentism, as an explanation of probability in classical statistical mechanics, can be extended in a natural way to a decoherent quantum history space, the analogue of a classical phase space. The result is a form of finite frequentism, in which Gibbs' concept of an infinite ensemble of gases is replaced by the quantum state expressed as a superposition of a finite number of decohering microstates. It is a form of finite and actual (as opposed to hypothetical) frequentism insofar as all the microstates exist, even though they may differ macroscopically, in keeping with the decoherence-based Everett interpretation of quantum mechanics.

## 1. Introduction

Frequentism in philosophy of probability holds that the probability of an event is its relative frequency of occurrence in a suitable ensemble. Of its many champions, perhaps the most prominent was von Mises. For him the ensembles were finite and actual, but as such they were vulnerable to the *reference class problem* -- the problem of *which* ensemble, as generally there are either too many, or too few. Von Mises himself recommended pluralism: there is no such thing as *the* probability of an event, only probabilities relative to different reference classes – and for too rare an event, it may be, no probability at all (as lacking a reference class). But that proved unpersuasive. Finite frequentism as a philosophy of probability is today routinely dismissed as unworkable.<sup>1</sup>

However, the relevant ensembles in von Mises' sense were collections of events in a classical world. In the real world we find the quantum. Quantum mechanics is the most prolific, most accurate, and most unificatory theory in all the long history of physics, but also, astonishingly, now after more than a century, the most controversial. It is seemingly incapable of a realist reading -- hence the repeated attempts to add to or modify the formalism, despite its empirical success. The main difficulty is the quantum measurement problem, which concerns the way probability is usually introduced into quantum mechanics using the Born rule: a rule that puzzlingly seems always to involve the notion of 'observer' and 'observation', however indirectly.

The one clear realist reading of standard quantum mechanics takes seriously the idea that the superposition principle has unlimited validity and that the Schrödinger equation can be applied to macroscopic bodies. It takes serious the reality of quantum states, including when entering into superpositions. It is otherwise conservative, leaving quantum

---

<sup>§</sup> To appear in the *British Journal for the Philosophy of Science* (2024).

\* University of Oxford and Merton College, Oxford.

<sup>1</sup> As in Rowbottom (2015 p.112), La Caze 2016), Myrvold (2016). A particularly influential critique is Hájek (1996). For a dissenting voice, see Hubert (2021). (Here I put to one side Humean best-system accounts of probability, which are sometimes considered sophisticated forms of actual frequentism.)

mechanics unchanged. The result is realism about superpositions of states that differ macroscopically, as arise in quantum measurements given only the Schrödinger equation. With no theoretical resource for picking out one rather than another outcome as actual, all the outcomes are actual, in a grand superposition. This the reasoning that leads to many worlds, otherwise known as the Everett interpretation of quantum mechanics, as first introduced in Everett (1957).

No wonder, if this is on anything like the right lines, the controversy over quantum mechanics has been unending; and very likely, if anything like this is on the right lines, it *will* be unending: for the worlds remain unobservable. Once formed, short of super-technology or Poincaré recurrence, the states that arise on measurement, and the states that arise from them in turn on further measurements, will never interfere with one other. But this is the only way states *can* interact with one another, in a linear theory; so once formed, each state evolves as if all the others were not there. This explains the appearance of quantum jumps and collapsing wave-packets.

The picture is challenging to say the least, but the question is whether it succeeds on its own terms, and nowhere more so than when it comes to probability. The Born rule involves the squared amplitudes of macrostates produced by measurements: It is not obvious how, with all else unchanged, differences in amplitudes yield differences in probabilities,. Attention in recent years to the decision-theory approach of Deutsch (1999) and Wallace (2010) has for some only reinforced the worry: for if the Born rule is explained in terms of rational agency – if it is, indeed, rationally forced, as claimed, for agents knowledgeable of the superpositions of macrostates produced by measurements -- then it may be that *entirely* accounts for probability, with no residue to be explained.<sup>2</sup> Or rather, there remains one small residue: the relative frequencies of macrostates (experimental outcomes) on repeated measurements. But a rule based on these, as in Graham (1973), contradicts the Born rule, and so was of no use in explaining quantum probability. On the contrary, it posed only a further difficulty.

The situation, however, is quite different when branches are defined in decoherence theory.<sup>3</sup> Branching, still in Everett's sense, for macroscopic bodies, now takes place at the level of differences in molecular configurations and momenta. At ordinary temperatures and pressures in ordinary matter, branching takes place all the time, and with extreme rapidity (much faster than thermal relaxation times). It is taking place in an experiment even if the apparatus just sits there and doesn't measure anything -- reflected only in all those minute differences in thermal molecular motions, invisible to the eye.

From this perspective, the old branch-counting rule is simply an aberration: the point is to count the relative numbers of microstates for the various experimental outcomes, not the numbers of outcomes. And yet, until very recently, no new rule was forthcoming based on that idea. To the contrary, standard wisdom has it that decoherence is an inherently messy, approximate affair, and that branches themselves are emergent entities, too poorly

---

<sup>2</sup> According to Deutsch (2016), Brown and Porath (2020), this is a virtue of the approach, not an objection.

<sup>3</sup> Following Joos and Zeh (1985), Tegmark (1993), Saunders (1993); it was hinted in Gell-Mann and Hartle (1990).

defined to have any precise boundaries – so that ultimately, branch number makes no physical sense.<sup>4</sup>

Yet this consensus may be challenged. The theory of decoherent histories, as introduced in Gell-Mann and Hartle (1990)), provides a common language for decoherence theory, including master equations for the reduced density matrix.<sup>5</sup> It further *does* permit a precisification of microstates, cunningly shifting the approximation away from the states and onto the no-interference condition: branches may be well-defined, yet only approximately decohere (and residual but tiny interference is just fine for Everettians, as may usefully lead to observable effects). The upshot: there may be no point at which a unique notion of branch number can be defined, but well away from that point, *ratios* in branch numbers may yet make physical sense.

It is more than a hope. As Saunders (2021) shows, when the decoherent history space involves a continuous dynamical variable (like position or momentum), a branch-counting rule can be defined that for finite ensembles approximately agrees with the Born-rule. The rule counts microstates parameterised by histories of events, up to time  $t$ , the total number, up to that time, and those that contain event  $E$ , at some earlier time  $t' \leq t$ . The ratio of the two is the probability (relative frequency) of  $E$ . The rule has a ready extension to an infinite ensemble by taking the limit  $t - t' \rightarrow \infty$  (assuming branching is unending). In that limit the relative frequency of  $E$  equals the Born rule probability of  $E$ , to which relative frequencies for finite  $t - t'$  are approximations (what I called ‘rounding errors’). The rule is, moreover, traceable to Boltzmann’s microstate counting rule on classical phase space, so it is scarcely ad hoc, replacing Liouville measure by the Hilbert-space norm.

There are, however, certain negatives to this approach. Its dependence on the infinite time-limit is troubling: is there no precise notion of quantum probability in a recollapsing universe subject to Poincaré recurrence? Yet it is not obvious, absent the infinite time limit, what ‘approximation’ (and ‘rounding error’) really mean -- or not in terms of frequentism. One might further have thought the physical chances are local to the events they control. And the parallel between Liouville measure and the Hilbert-space norm is hardly new; it was first drawn in Everett (1957).

In what follows I propose a different strategy: a purely synchronic microstate-counting rule, restricted to finite ensembles throughout.<sup>6</sup> Decoherence is still important (and remains an intrinsically diachronic concept), but for our purposes its role can be limited to the definition of the parameter space (the ‘decoherence basis’). The comparison with the methods used in classical statistical mechanics is now direct – and shows that the relevant connection of the Hilbert space norm is not to Liouville measure, rather, it is to Gibbs’ concept of density-in-phase.

---

<sup>4</sup> As argued, among others, by me, in Saunders (2005). See also Wallace (2012 p.99-100).

<sup>5</sup> See Kiefer (1996) for an overview. For realistic cases, involving macroscopic numbers of particles, decoherent history spaces are quasiclassical domains, in Gell-Mann and Hartle’s sense, depending on the Hamiltonian, degrees of freedom involved, and initial quantum state.

<sup>6</sup> Stoica (2022) also proposes a synchronic rule, but involving an infinite ensemble (see also the conclusion of §8).

Boltzmann's rule, accurately taken over to quantum mechanics, yields a new and different branch-counting rule that we will also consider. It is similar to Graham's rule in treating 'non-zero amplitude' as a sufficient as well as a necessary criterion for the existence of branches: a branch is a certain sort of state, and it exists if and only if it has non-zero amplitude (whereas on the Gibbs approach, as we shall see, the amplitude is used to define the branch). But regardless of motivation, the rule fails as a synchronic probability rule. Simple alternatives are also considered and similarly fail. They fall victim to the reference-class problem – the problem of reconciling different relative frequencies for an event when referred to different but equally permissible ensembles.

In contrast, the Gibbs rule passes this test. The relative frequencies defined by distinct admissible ensembles necessarily agree, and agree too with the Born rule. The ensembles are invariably finite. Finite frequentism would thus appear to explain quantum probability quite generally – and, in view of the universality of quantum mechanics, probability in the objective or physical sense in its entirety.

Or so I claim, embracing realism about decohering microstates, when the ensembles involved are actual as well as finite. Different ensembles are different ways of parcelling up the same total state, with respect to the same decoherence basis, into finitely-many parts. Might antirealists about macroscopic superpositions make use of this method as well? For them, like Gibbs, the ensembles will be imaginary, but still finite: that may be viewed as an improvement on hypothetical frequentism, where the ensembles are usually infinite. But as we shall see, permissible ensembles, for any event  $E$ , will in general include Schrödinger-cat states for  $E$  – states that are superpositions of states in which  $E$  occurs and states in which  $E$  does not occur. Because included in ensembles, such states have non-zero relative frequency, and so non-zero probability. That is unlikely to be acceptable to sceptics about macroscopic superpositions, since presumably they then have a chance of being actual. Nevertheless, there is a possible extension of the Gibbs quantum rule to contexts where decoherence does not occur, at the microscopic level proper, and that may yet interest them.

Pilot-wave theory (a.k.a. Bohmian mechanics) adds additional 'hidden' degrees of freedom, but otherwise preserves the Schrödinger equation with the same initial state: it therefore contains the same ensembles of decohering microstates. It does both better and worse than antirealism: better, in that those microstates have some kind of reality, if only as guiding ('piloting') the values of the hidden-variables; worse, in that on introducing those additional variables, once assigned with definite values, the statistical patterns we are considering become only a part of a larger physical picture, that may tell a quite different story about probability.<sup>7</sup>

A last question, now, for the Everett interpretation. Might the new rule, in avoiding the usual pitfalls of finite frequentism, be too good to be true? Perhaps it isn't a form of frequentism at all, but a new and sui generis theory of physical probability. The epistemology, in particular, seems quite different from anything in von Mises' writings, as the ensembles are in practise unobservable.

---

<sup>7</sup> For example, a non-equilibrium story, as introduced in Valentini (1991), the reason too for rejecting the 'Everett in denial' criticism of pilot-wave theory (Valentini 2010). On the general point, see Hawthorne (2010).

I refuse to be so flattered. The origins of the new rule lie squarely in the ideas of Boltzmann and Gibbs, and they were surely frequentists. They employed imaginary, infinite ensembles, so for them too the ensembles were unobservable -- indeed, unobservable in principle. Others too, of that period, considered ensembles of possibilities, again unobservable in principle).<sup>8</sup>

There follow two pieces of stage-setting, the first on frequentism in classical statistical mechanics, and the second on decoherent histories theory in quantum mechanics. Readers familiar with both may jump directly to §4, where the two quantum rules are defined. §5 introduces the key idea of interval probability, replacing the notion of approximate probability, and defined in purely finitary terms. With that it is possible to define a general consistency requirement. The Boltzmann rule is shown to fail this test, and Gibbs rule succeed, in §6 and §7 respectively. The two remaining sections are given over to more general philosophical questions, including the epistemology of probability .

## 2. Microstate counting in classical statistical mechanics

The key idea in Boltzmann (1877) was to partition the accessible phase space for a gas into a finite number of cells, all of the same size, and to consider the relative numbers of such cells consistent with one macrostate (in which the gas has a certain pressure and volume, for given total energy), in comparison with another. The macrostate with the greatest number relative to all the others is the equilibrium state – therefore, according to frequentism, the most probable state. In this way Boltzmann was able to compute the equilibrium entropy and obtain the equation of state for the ideal gas. In all this the concept of equiprobability and ensemble probability fit together seamlessly; if the probability of  $E$  is the relative frequency of  $E$  in an ensemble, the ensemble elements must all have the same probability; and conversely, if all the elements in an ensemble have the same probability, then the relative frequency of  $E$  in the ensemble must be its probability.

The size of a cell  $\gamma \subseteq \Gamma$ , where  $\Gamma$  is classical phase space, is given by its Liouville measure  $\sigma: \Gamma \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$ . For  $N$  particles, in rectilinear coordinates  $\langle p_1 \dots p_{3N}; x_1 \dots x_{3N} \rangle$ , it is:

$$\sigma(\gamma) = \int_{\gamma} dp_1 \dots dp_{3N} dx_1 \dots dx_{3N}. \quad (1)$$

To ensure that the choice of partitioning into cells  $\{\gamma\}$  is irrelevant, Boltzmann took the infinite limit  $\sigma(\gamma) \rightarrow 0$ , where in this limit microstates are points in  $\Gamma$ . This solved the reference-class problem, at the price of passing over to infinite (and imaginary) frequentism. Meanwhile the entropy of a macrostate was proportional to the logarithm of its probability ('thermodynamic probability'). Irreversible behaviour in thermodynamics, Boltzmann reasoned, is to be understood as involving an increase in total entropy -- from less probable to more probable states, from smaller to larger volumes of phase space explored by the gas, to macrostates that include or are realised by the greatest number of microstates.

This idea of probability as relative frequency proved immensely important to the subsequent history of discovery of quantum mechanics, first in the work of Planck, in his

---

<sup>8</sup> For example von Kries (1886). Everett's branches have been understood in terms of possible worlds in Wilson (2020) (although embracing a form of modal realism), and in terms of perspectives on a single world in Barrett (2011).

attempt to ground the new black-body radiation law on the Boltzmann entropy, as defined by ratios in numbers of microstates, and then in Einstein's 1905 calculations, that Planck in deriving the equilibrium entropy density from the radiation law and showing it behaved under fluctuations as if an ideal gas (but working only from the Wien limit of Planck's law). Einstein later, in one of the few places where he returned to his early work on quantum theory, highlighted its importance:

On the basis of the kinetic theory of gases Boltzmann had discovered that, aside from a constant factor, entropy is equivalent to the logarithm of the "probability" of the [macro]state under consideration. Through this insight he recognized the nature of the course of events which, in the sense of thermodynamics, are "irreversible". Seen from the molecular-mechanical point of view, however, all courses of events are reversible. If one calls a molecular-theoretically defined state a microscopically described one, or, more briefly, microstate, then an immensely large number of states belong to a macroscopic condition. [This number] is then a measure of the probability of a chosen macrostate. This idea appears to be of outstanding importance also because of the fact that its usefulness is not limited to microscopic description on the basis of [classical] mechanics. (Einstein 1949 p.43).

What is more, the idea led to the discovery of quantum mechanics precisely by *not* taking the  $\sigma(\gamma) \rightarrow 0$  limit (this was Planck's daring step in 1900, departing from Boltzmann's method). It was finite frequentism indeed.<sup>9</sup>

Boltzmann's ideas are today still familiar, but mainly for what they say about entropy. Except for special cases, like equilibrium states for finite-dimensional Hilbert spaces, the link with frequentism has been forgotten.<sup>10</sup> Classically, microstate-counting is seen as little more than a calculational device; conceptually, since dependent on a volume measure  $\sigma$  on  $\Gamma$ , it seems more straightforward to identify the thermodynamic probability of a macrostate outright with ratios in volumes. But the very term 'thermodynamic probability' is suspect; as argued by Albert (2000), Liouville measure enters in two quite distinct ways, the first in defining the Boltzmann entropy of a given macrostate (logarithm of accessible phase-space volume) and the second in defining a probability distribution over microstates. The sense in which the Boltzmannian entropy of a closed system will only *probably* increase is made out with respect to the second. And even talk of 'probability' has been dispensed with, to be replaced by the concept of typicality, especially in the adjacent literature on probability in pilot-wave theory<sup>11</sup>. Everett too spoke of typical branches and observers rather than probable ones.<sup>12</sup> In contrast, moving to the quantum analogue of Boltzmann's rule, we will hold fast to the notion of a finite partitioning of state space.

Now for the background to our second rule, based on Gibbs' concept of probability. Like the entropy, this is defined in terms of a new notion introduced on phase space, foreign to Boltzmann's writings – the *density-in-phase* function  $D: \Gamma \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$ . This was used to define a

---

<sup>9</sup> As involving the dimensionality of certain finite-dimensional Hilbert spaces, and a completely degenerate initial state (density matrix).

<sup>10</sup> Even by those, like Myrvold, who know this history well: in the chapter on frequentism in Myrvold (2021) it goes unmentioned.

<sup>11</sup> Beginning with Dürr et al (1992); see Goldstein (2001), Myrvold (2016).

<sup>12</sup> Barrett (2016), and, for a defence of Everett's treatment of probability, Lazarovici (2023).

probability density on phase space (what Gibbs called a ‘coefficient of probability’). The approach was still frequentist -- it was Gibbs who coined the term ‘statistical mechanics’ – but abjured appeal to finite ensembles (we will modify his approach accordingly, to bring it more into line with Boltzmann’s procedure). He defined various equilibrium ensembles, each with a different density-in-phase function (microcanonical, canonical, and grand canonical), depending on the external constraints (on total energy, temperature, and particle number). He was explicit on the status of members of these ensembles: they were ‘creatures of the imagination’ (Gibbs 1902 p.188); so again this was hypothetical (imaginary, infinite) frequentism.

If we follow Boltzmann’s procedure by coarse-graining a Gibbs ensemble into a finite collective of equiprobable microstates there is now a clear alternative to the equivolume rule. Cells should be equiprobable using the density-in-phase  $D$ , where  $D(q)d\sigma$  is the number of imaginary gases in the ensemble in the infinitesimal neighbourhood  $d\sigma$  of  $q \in \Gamma$ . We go over to finite ensembles of equi-probable microstates by choosing a partitioning  $\{\gamma\}$  of phase space where each cell has the same fraction of the ensemble as determined by  $D$  – that is, equality in the quantities:

$$\int_{\gamma} D(q)d\sigma \tag{2}$$

rather than equality in (1) – or more precisely, since Gibbs thought the numbers involved may all be infinite, equality in the ratios of (2) with the same integral now extended to the whole of  $\Gamma$ .

Here, in his own words, is how Gibbs made the connection with probability:

Now, if the value of  $D$  is infinite, we cannot speak of any definite number of systems, within any finite limits, since all such numbers are infinite. But the ratios of these infinite numbers may be perfectly definite. If we write  $N$  for the total number of systems, and set

$$P = \frac{D}{N},$$

$P$  may remain finite, when  $N$  and  $D$  become infinite. The integral

$$\int_{\gamma} P d\sigma$$

taken within any given limits, will evidently express the ratio of the number of systems falling within those limits to the whole number of systems. This is the same thing as the *probability* that an unspecified system of the ensemble (i.e. one of which we only know that it belongs to the ensemble) will lie within the given limits. The product  $Pd\sigma$  expresses the probability that an unspecified system of the ensemble will be found in the element of extension-in-phase  $d\sigma$ . We shall call  $P$  the *coefficient of probability* of the phase considered. (Gibbs 1902 p.16).

The procedures of Boltzmann and Gibbs give the same results for the equilibrium states of isolated gases of non-interacting particles, like the ideal gas and black-body radiation (when  $D$  is uniform), but they differ for non-ideal material gases and for non-equilibrium systems, of the sort relevant to quantum measurements.

### 3. Decoherent history space

A decoherent history space is a structure  $\langle \mathcal{M}, \lambda, |\psi\rangle, \hat{H}, \mathcal{H} \rangle$ , where  $\mathcal{M}$  is a parameter space, the analogue of phase space (in the simplest case defined in terms of the spectra of some set of commuting self-adjoint operators),  $\lambda$  is an additive, dimensional measure on  $\mathcal{M}$  (the analogue of Liouville measure),  $\hat{H}$  is the Hamiltonian, containing the dynamics, and  $|\psi\rangle \in \mathcal{H}$  is the total ('universal') state in the Hilbert space  $\mathcal{H}$ . We further assume that  $\mathcal{M}$  includes the spectrum of at least one continuous operator (like position or momentum). This is physically reasonable; all events take place in space, and the spectrum of the position operator is continuous.<sup>13</sup> We further assume  $\mathcal{M}$  is bounded,  $\lambda(\mathcal{M}) < \infty$ .<sup>14</sup>

More is needed to define quantum histories, notably a discretisation of the time,  $\{t_k\}, k = 1, \dots, n$ , from which  $n$ -step histories can be defined. But we will not need histories here: our approach is synchronic, and we may make do with the structure  $\langle \mathcal{M}, \lambda, |\psi\rangle \rangle$ , to be compared to a classical probability space  $\langle \Gamma, \sigma, \mu \rangle$ , where  $\Gamma$  is an event space, equipped with an additive measure  $\sigma$  (this could be phase space and Liouville measure respectively, so we use the same symbols) and an additive probability function  $\mu$ .

As before we call the elements  $\{\alpha_k\}$  of a partitioning *cells*, and as before, for the continuous part of  $\mathcal{M}$ , we assume the cells are connected. In comparison to the classical case, the main novelty is the mapping from  $\gamma \subseteq \mathcal{M}$  to (vector) states  $P_\alpha |\psi\rangle \in \mathcal{H}$ , where projectors  $P_\alpha$  and the measure  $\lambda$  come by construction of  $\mathcal{M}$  (via Stone's theorem) from some commuting family of self-adjoint operators. In this way algebraic operations involving projectors mirror set-theoretic operations on  $\mathcal{M}$ , in that for disjoint  $\alpha, \alpha'$ , projections onto unions go over to sums of projectors:

$$\alpha \cap \alpha' = \emptyset \Rightarrow P_{\alpha \cup \alpha'} = P_\alpha + P_{\alpha'} \quad (3)$$

and projections onto intersections of  $\alpha, \alpha'$ , now without restriction, go over to products:

$$P_{\alpha \cap \alpha'} = P_\alpha P_{\alpha'} = P_{\alpha'} P_\alpha.$$

It follows that if  $\alpha, \alpha'$  are disjoint, meaning  $\sigma(\alpha \cap \alpha') = 0$ , the states  $P_\alpha |\psi\rangle, P_{\alpha'} |\psi\rangle$  are (exactly) orthogonal. For a classical probability space  $\langle \mathcal{M}, \sigma, \mu \rangle$ , in place of the canonical map  $\alpha \rightarrow P_\alpha$  from cells of  $\mathcal{M}$  to projection operators and states, we have the map  $\gamma \rightarrow \mu(\gamma)$  of cells in  $\Gamma$  to probabilities. Eq.(3) is then additivity of  $\mu$ , and has to be assumed separately.

Consider now some finite partitioning  $\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \dots, \alpha_s$  of  $\mathcal{M}$ , where  $\alpha_j \cap \alpha_k = \emptyset$  for  $j \neq k$ , and  $\bigcup_k \alpha_k = \mathcal{M}$  (were  $\mathcal{M}$  a discrete space, these could be eigenvalues of the associated operators). Since  $P_{\mathcal{M}}$  is the identity, it follows, at any time  $t$

---

<sup>13</sup> As Bell (1987) argued in defence of pilot-wave theory, all experiments ultimately involve position measurements, although the claim has been challenged, for example, in Albert (1992 Ch.5).

<sup>14</sup> This could be relaxed to require only that the support of  $|\psi\rangle$  on  $\mathcal{M}$  is bounded, but anyway it only plays a role in the Boltzmann case, so long as states are vectors in Hilbert space, so have finite norm. Following Gibbs, extensions of quantum mechanics in which states may not be normalisable may yet be treated by our methods.

$$|\psi\rangle = P_{\cup_k \alpha_k} |\psi\rangle = \sum_{k=1}^s P_{\alpha_k} |\psi\rangle.$$

In this way the total state  $|\psi\rangle$  at  $t$  is represented as a superposition of finitely-many states  $P_{\alpha_k} |\psi\rangle$ , complete with their amplitudes and phases. The state  $|\psi\rangle$  we are interested in is that at time  $t$  following a measurement process, as evolved under the Schrödinger equation, where states  $P_{\alpha_k} |\psi\rangle$  may differ macroscopically (in particular, as to experimental outcome at  $t$ ). However, they may not be decohering states; for this some coarse-graining is always necessary. We assume this from now on. These are the ingredients, pending specification of the partitioning  $\{\alpha_k\}$ , of our two microstate-counting rules.

The one further input still needed, from the underlying physics, is that in macroscopic experiments decohering microstates may provide considerable microscopic detail at molecular, and even at atomic scales, for ordinary matter at ordinary temperature. The development of superpositions of states like these over time under the Schrödinger equation will be rapid and quite uncontrollable.<sup>15</sup> Quantum jumps, in other words, are everywhere. There are of course limits, as Schrödinger, in this Journal, famously argued<sup>16</sup> -- these showing the need for some coarse-graining. But those limits may be respected and yet the ensembles be large. Of course *small* ensembles may also be considered, for coarse-graining always preserves decoherence; relative frequencies as defined in small ensembles had better make sense, just as in large ones, so long as the ensembles conform to the same definite rule. But which rule?

#### 4. The new microstate-counting rules

In light of §2, there are the two obvious candidates for counts of quantum microstates: one, following Boltzmann, based on the idea of cells of equal Liouville measure at an instant in time, accessible to the individual gas; and the other, following Gibbs, based on the idea of an ensemble endowed with a density-in-phase function  $D$ , and cells containing equal fractions of the ensemble, as defined by  $D$ .

It might be thought that there is a third option: why not count branches *simpliciter*, without appeal to a partitioning of  $\mathcal{M}$  at all? But the idea is confused. At best it amounts to ‘count non-zero eigenstates of some self-adjoint operator’. But as noted, even were  $\mathcal{M}$  a discrete manifold, with the  $P_{\alpha_k} |\psi\rangle$ ’s eigenstates of operators, they will not in general decohere. Some coarse-graining is needed. As Wallace puts it:

[T]here is no sense, in which these phenomena lead to a naturally discrete branching process: as we have seen in studying quantum chaos, while a branching structure can be discerned in such systems, it has no natural “grain”. To be sure, by choosing a certain discretisation of (configuration-) space and time, a discrete branching structure will emerge, but a finer or coarser choice would also give branching. And there is no “finest” choice of

---

<sup>15</sup> For quantitative estimates, see Tegmark (1993) and, for a case of special interest, Tegmark (2000). The reason localised states decohere is because entanglement with the environment is mostly produced by local (electromagnetic) couplings, the main insight in Zurek (1981).

<sup>16</sup> Schrödinger (1952): ‘quantum jumps’ cannot be occurring at the level of *coherent* interactions between molecules, involving individual electrons, for they are needed to explain the physics of ordinary matter.

branching structure: as we fine-grain our decoherent history space, we will eventually reach a point where interference between branches ceases to be negligible, but there is no precise point where this occurs. (Wallace 2012 p.99-100).

Counting numbers of eigenstates, with  $\mathcal{M}$  a purely discrete manifold, is not to count decohering states. In any case, in realistic cases,  $\mathcal{M}$  involves a continuous space, so there is no 'natural grain'; that is our assumption here.

We have the two methods as stated. They each promise a reductive account of probability insofar as the reductive base is defined independent of probabilistic concepts. For the first method, where the cells are fixed in size, we suppose the idea 'accessible cell' is made out in terms of *cell of non-zero amplitude*. This seems the most natural requirement, once the cells are fixed, and it is the one used in Graham's branch-counting rule, when the cells were operationally defined in terms of measurement outcomes. Since the cells all have the same finite size, and given that  $\mathcal{M}$  is bounded, it follows that ensembles are always finite.

For the second method we need the analogue of Gibbs' ensemble and its associated density in phase. To see what this should be, observe that we are replacing Gibbs' infinite collection of classical (pointlike) microstates, each the state of an imaginary gas, equipped with a density in phase function  $D$ , by an ensemble of microstates complete with their amplitudes and relative phases, comprising -- superposing to give -- the total quantum state. Rather than dividing up the classical ensemble into microstates each with equal fraction of the ensemble, as defined by the density in phase, *we divide the quantum state into microstates each with equal fraction of the total state*, as quantified by the Hilbert-space norm. That is, we divide up the quantum state into branches of equal amplitude.

Equivalently, if an additive quantity is wanted (corresponding to a density which can be integrated, as in (2)), so that the fractions add, we divide the quantum state into microstates of equal *squared* amplitude. But the two methods are the same, as amplitudes are non-negative real numbers; equality in amplitude and in squared amplitude are interchangeable, and that is the only condition we shall use.

Gibbs' density in phase as a non-negative function on  $\Gamma$  is thus identified with the squared norm of the quantum state as a function on  $\mathcal{M}$ . Whereas for an infinitesimal neighbourhood  $d\sigma$  of a point  $q$  in phase space,  $D(q)d\sigma$  is the fraction, or relative number, of the ensemble in the neighbourhood  $d\sigma$  of  $q$ , we now have  $\psi(q)d\lambda := |\langle q|\psi\rangle|^2 d\lambda$  as the fraction, or relative amount, of the wave-function in the neighbourhood  $d\lambda$  of  $q \in \mathcal{M}$ .

Branches thus defined had better correspond to cells of non-zero measure  $\lambda$ . This follows more or less automatically: if  $\lambda(\alpha_k) = 0$  then  $P_{\alpha_k}|\psi\rangle = 0$  for any reasonable volume measure  $\lambda$  on  $\mathcal{M}$ . But it gives pleasing symmetry to the two branch-counting rules to make this explicit: the one, following Boltzmann, counts cells of equal volume that have non-zero amplitude, whilst the other, following Gibbs, counts cells of equal amplitude that have non-zero volume.

With that it is clearer that *both* rules are in question as reductive accounts of probability in quantum mechanics. For of course 'amplitude' in ordinary quantum mechanics *does* have a connection with probability, through the Born rule -- the only place where probability enters the picture. 'Non-zero amplitude' means 'non-zero probability', and 'equiamplitude' means 'equiprobable'.

Yet that is not quite right, as on the Boltzmann rule, equivolume cells with non-zero amplitude are equiprobable, not just of non-zero probability. But the Gibbs rule looks more vulnerable. For some macrostate  $\beta$ , the quantity

$$\frac{\int_{\beta} |\psi(q)|^2 d\lambda}{\int_{\mathcal{M}} |\psi(q)|^2 d\lambda} \quad (4)$$

is just the Born-rule probability for  $\beta$ ; it corresponds to Gibbs' expression:

$$\frac{\int_{\beta} D(q) d\sigma}{\int_{\Gamma} D(q) d\sigma} . \quad (5)$$

As Gibbs said, this is 'the *probability* that an unspecified system of the ensemble' will be found in  $\beta$ . Yet recall *why* he said that: it is because this expression 'will evidently express the ratio of the number of systems falling within those limits to the whole number of systems', and immediately following, '....this is the same thing as the *probability*....'. The interpretation of the expression (5) in terms of probability is to follow from frequentism, it is not assumed by it. If, indeed, it made sense to speak of the wave-function as made up of infinitely many parts, the argument would be identical. Instead we speak of finitely-many equal parts – entities given, not sui generis (or as creatures of the imagination), but by use of a sortal ('of equal amplitude'). We are building up a notion of probability, not building one in, and only later, and in a partial sense, do we recover an interpretation of Eq.(4) in terms of probability.

As for the concept of amplitude, it is clearly intelligible in contexts that have nothing to do with probability. Like phase, it is a new physical primitive of quantum theory. But there remains the concept of *branch*, or decohering microstate. Does decoherence theory depend, in its formulation or derivation from the Schrödinger equation, on probabilistic reasoning or justification? It is usually *interpreted* in terms of probability, and its practitioners, when pressed as to the meaning of given expressions, may well appeal to the Born rule and operational definitions. It is a defensive move, and probability is not always explanatory, not least for the decoherence condition itself. The central concept 'interference' was never happily explained in terms of 'probability waves', whatever they might be; but it is immediately intelligible in the cancelling or reinforcing of physical quantities that take positive and negative values, as in any wave theory involving amplitude and phase. We do not need probability to understand interference. I distinguish it from an interference *effect*, whereby interference is made observable, so that measurement, arguably, is involved; then, it may be granted, in ordinary quantum mechanics, we make explicit or implicit use of the Born rule; but (at least for realists about states) interference takes place at the locus of the screen even when the screen is removed and no observation is made.

To say more on this topic would take us in two different directions, one technical, involving more decoherence theory, and one philosophical, and the need in the physical sciences, if it is a need, for operational justifications for approximations, model-building, and representation. I forego both expeditions, noting that the same issues arise for the decision-theoretic argument of Wallace (2010, 2012), which first attracted this kind of

criticism.<sup>17</sup> They even arise for Deutsch (1999), and Everett (1957), although both were innocent of decoherence theory; as Everett (1973) clearly stated, the abstract model of Everett (1957) needed to be backed up with a concrete model, that demonstrably behaves as the abstract one as follows from the Schrödinger equation alone (to ensure that the abstract treatment is not ‘vacuous’). To that end Everett (1973 p.86-90) sketched a mechanical model of a measuring apparatus, but that involved approximations, so is subject to the same critique.

I conclude there is a *prima facie* case that ‘amplitude’ and ‘branch state’ are intelligible physical notions that need have nothing to do with probability. It follows that *both* branch-counting rules promise to provide reductive theories of quantum probability. However, they cannot both be true (except, perhaps, in special cases), and perhaps neither is satisfactory.

## 5. Consistency

Because of the decoherence condition, on either the Boltzmann or Gibbs rule we are limited not just to finite partitionings of  $\mathcal{M}$  at any time (that follows from  $\lambda(\mathcal{M}) < \infty$  and  $\|\psi\| < \infty$  respectively), but to partitionings that cannot be arbitrarily large. Very often in the sequel we will work with small ensembles. But there is no conflict with Kolmogorov’s axioms. On the contrary, probabilities defined as relative frequencies in a finite ensemble are automatically additive, normalised, and contained in the interval  $[0,1]$ . Conditional probabilities, defined as ratios of rational numbers, remain rational. As one of the many attractions of frequentism, Kolmogorov’s axioms are derived and not assumed.<sup>18</sup>

However, having defined the kind of ensemble (equiamplitude or equivolume), there are still infinitely many precisifications available, as we are assuming  $\mathcal{M}$  varies continuously. It is the reference-class problem: to which ensemble, exactly, should a macrostate be referred? Our strategy is similar to von Mises’: *any* admissible ensemble should be acceptable, and yield, for any macrostate, a perfectly meaningful relative frequency, save only that some may be more informative than others (we shall see how this works in a moment). The crucial difference from von Mises’ approach is that we require all the relative frequencies thus defined to be mutually consistent with one another.

To make this precise, we need to use a definite rule, as the details vary in the two cases. But not by much, so it will be enough to use just one rule; the arguments are similar, and the consistency conditions we end up with are the same. We use the equivolume rule.

Suppose  $\{\alpha_k\}$  is a partitioning of  $\mathcal{M}$  into  $s$  cells,  $n$  of which have non-zero amplitude. Let macrostate  $\beta$  represent an experimental outcome – say the configuration of a Stern-Gerlach apparatus, on obtaining the outcome ‘spin-up’ – and suppose further that  $\beta$  is exactly partitioned by  $\{\alpha_k\}$  – that is, for some index set  $K$ , we have  $\beta = \bigcup_{k \in K} \alpha_k$ , where  $K$  has cardinality no greater than  $s$ . Then for any state  $|\psi\rangle$  there will be an integral number  $n_\beta$  of microstates in the macrostate  $\beta$ , where  $n_\beta \leq n$ , out  $n$  in total. The probability of  $\beta$  is then (exactly)  $n_\beta/n$ .

---

<sup>17</sup> For example, by Kent (2010), Dawid and Thèbault (2015); for replies see Saunders (2022), Franklin (2024).

<sup>18</sup> Admittedly *countable* additivity, Kolmogorov’s main innovation, requires more, but we make no use of that here. Note also that Kolmogorov took conditional probability as a derived notion, as do we, not as an axiom.

Our first consistency condition is that (for the same state  $|\psi\rangle$  and decoherent history space) every admissible partitioning that exactly partitions  $\beta$  yields the same ratio. If on a new exact partitioning of  $\beta$  there are  $n_{\beta}'$  spin-up branches out of  $n'$  in total, we require  $n_{\beta}/n = n_{\beta}'/n'$ .

The question now arises: What if  $\beta$  is *not* exactly partitioned by the  $\{\alpha_k\}$ ? Indeed, unless  $\lambda(\beta)/\tau$  is an integer, there can be no index set  $K$  with the required properties. One might hope to vary  $\tau$  to obtain an exact partitioning of  $\beta$ , but that trick only works once; since  $\mathcal{M}$  is exactly partitioned, this is only possible if  $\lambda(\beta)/\lambda(\mathcal{M})$  is rational. For a simple illustration, see Fig.1.




Fig 1

A bounded 2-dimensional continuous state space  $\mathcal{M}$  and macrostate  $\beta$ , shaded. On any equi-area partitioning of  $\mathcal{M}$ , whatever the shapes of the cells, at least one cell,  $\alpha$ , will straddle the boundary of  $\beta$ , unless the ratio of the areas of  $\mathcal{M}$  and  $\beta$  is rational.

Failing this condition, evidently  $\beta$  cannot be exactly partitioned whatever the shapes of the cells – some cells will neither be contained  $\beta$ , nor in its complement. If of non-zero amplitude, the associated microstates will be superpositions of  $\beta$  and its complement: we shall say they are *indefinite* on  $\beta$ .

I take it that macrostates in  $\mathcal{M}$  are in general defined independent of any partitioning.<sup>19</sup> Is the accompanying inevitability of indefinite microstates a difficulty? But indefiniteness per se is hardly novel, for it arises in a classical probability space  $\langle \Gamma, \sigma, \mu \rangle$ . If we understand events in terms of sentences, a union of disjoint cells goes over to a disjunction of contradictory sentences, and intersections go over to conjunctions. Any sufficiently coarse-grained description will fail to specify some macroscopic property (will be indefinite on that property) – meaning, it will be disjunctive in the relevant sense. But further, classically, the disjuncts will be assigned exact probabilities under  $\mu$ , and the sum of the probability of the disjuncts will equal the probability of the disjunction, as follows from the additivity of  $\mu$  at that finer-grained level.

<sup>19</sup> Might macrostates not be definable in  $\mathcal{M}$  at all? If so, we have the wrong decoherent history space (as specific to degrees of freedom, Hamiltonian, and state).

In the quantum case there is no fixed, background probability measure  $\mu$ , and we have only families of finite ensembles, families of relative-frequency probability distributions. But we require the same condition: the probability assigned to a non-zero amplitude cell  $\alpha$  indefinite on  $\beta$ , referred to any admissible ensemble, where  $\alpha = \gamma \cup \gamma'$  and  $\gamma$  is contained in  $\beta$ , whilst  $\gamma'$  is disjoint, is the sum of the probabilities of  $\gamma, \gamma'$ , referred to any other admissible ensembles.

The associated microstates also have relative frequencies (if  $\alpha$  is a non-zero amplitude cell of an admissible ensemble). If the microstate

$$P_\alpha|\psi\rangle = P_\gamma|\psi\rangle + P_{\gamma'}|\psi\rangle,$$

and  $\gamma, \gamma'$  are also each exactly partitioned in some other (not necessarily the same) admissible ensemble, then the probability of the superposition should equal the sum of the probabilities of the microstates superposed. Given these conditions, the probability of the Schrödinger cat microstate will be the sum of the probabilities of the live and dead cat microstates.

Evidently this is a special case of the consistency condition already given. Observe also that were there a unique ‘finest’ partitioning of  $\mathcal{M}$ , from which all others are constructed by sums, the consistency condition would follow automatically from additivity of probabilities at that finest level -- where the latter, in turn, follows from frequentism. The consistency condition as stated has teeth only if there is no such finest, unique, partitioning, from which all other partitionings are defined by sums.<sup>20</sup> But where  $\mathcal{M}$  has a continuous parameter, there is no such ur-partitioning – and note, for future reference, that this would still be the case even if we removed the constraint that microstates decohere, and allowed cells  $\alpha$  to have arbitrarily small sizes, so long as  $P_\alpha|\psi\rangle \in \mathcal{H}$ .

The key point is that there is nothing *incorrect* or *approximate* in the probability assigned to a cell  $\alpha$  indefinite with respect to some macrostate  $\beta$ . If  $P_\alpha|\psi\rangle$  is itself a member of an admissible ensemble of  $n$  microstates, its probability is  $1/n$ , end of story, Schrödinger-cat state or no. The difficulty is rather that such a microstate, if present in an admissible ensemble and indefinite on  $\beta$ , counts neither positively nor negatively to the relative frequency of  $\beta$ . There is, however, an obvious way of dealing with this. We can still define an *interval* for the probability of  $\beta$ : a lower bound, on counting branches in  $\beta$ , *discarding* all the indefinite cases (branches  $P_\alpha|\psi\rangle$  that are not eigenstates of  $P_\beta$ ); and an upper bound, on counting branches in  $\beta$ , *including* all the indefinite cases. So, if there are  $n$  branches in all, of which  $m$  are in  $\beta$  whilst  $r$  are indefinite on  $\beta$ , the probability of  $\beta$  lies in  $\left[\frac{m}{n}, \frac{m+r}{n}\right] \subset \mathbb{R}$ . Call probabilities of this kind *interval probabilities*, as not rational numbers, but closed intervals of real numbers bounded by rational numbers.<sup>21</sup>

---

<sup>20</sup> Khawaja (2024) proposes to define such a finest partitioning on the basis of a supervaluationist approach to precisification, using the non-zero amplitude definition. Detail, however, is lacking.

<sup>21</sup> Why not intervals of rational numbers? No reason, save as a matter of technical convenience, as we will later want to relate interval probabilities to Born rule quantities.

Probabilities of this kind have been introduced before, but mainly in connection with epistemic, agent-specific probabilities.<sup>22</sup> In that context, whether they can be understood as a generalisation of the concept of probability is in question, for they do not in general satisfy additivity. However, in our case they do, in the following sense.

For any given ensemble  $E$  of microstates, let  $\mu_E$  give the associated interval probabilities,  $\mu_E: \mathcal{M} \rightarrow [p, q], p \leq q \leq 1$ . Exact probabilities are as before the special case when  $p = q$ . The addition and multiplication of intervals is defined in the obvious way:

$$[p, z] + [p', q'] = [p + p', q + q']; [p, q] \cdot [p', q'] = [p \cdot p', q \cdot q'].$$

In general, additivity in the sense of the Kolmogorov axioms fails: disjointness of  $\beta, \beta'$  is not enough to ensure

$$\mu_E(\beta \cup \beta') = \mu_E(\beta) + \mu_E(\beta') \quad (6)$$

(see Fig 2b for a counterexample). But there is a natural generalisation of additivity that does hold automatically, namely:

$$\mu_E(\beta \cup \beta') \subseteq \mu_E(\beta) + \mu_E(\beta'). \quad (7)$$

It is natural, for we are replacing probabilities as numbers by intervals, and it is a generalisation of additivity, because (7) reduces to (6) when  $\mu_E(\beta), \mu_E(\beta')$  are exact probabilities, with no Schrödinger-cat microstates for  $\beta$  or  $\beta'$ . In fact (7) reduces to (6) when there are no microstates in  $E$  which are superpositions of  $\beta$  and  $\beta'$ ; see Fig.2.




Fig 2a

Fig 2b

We assume every cell has non-zero amplitude (so  $E$  consists of  $n = 30$  microstates). Evidently  $\mu_E(\beta') = \mu_E(\beta'') = [3/30, 9/30]$ . In Fig 2a no microstate is a superposition of  $\beta$  and  $\beta'$ , and Eq.(6) is satisfied. In Fig 2b three microstates are superpositions of  $\beta$  and  $\beta''$ :  $\alpha_1$  and  $\alpha_2$  are eigenstates of  $P_{\beta \cup \beta''}$ , so are definite for  $\beta \cup \beta''$  (whereas they are indefinite for  $\beta \cup \beta'$ ), whilst  $\alpha_3$  remains indefinite. Nevertheless,  $\mu_E(\beta \cup \beta'') \subseteq \mu_E(\beta) + \mu_E(\beta'')$ .

<sup>22</sup> An exception is Walley and Fine (1982), which makes use of a propensity interpretation. The concept appears to go back to Smith (1961), Good (1962); see also Huber (1973). (My thanks to Jacob Barandes for alerting me to this literature.)

There is no requirement of additivity across different ensembles: Kolmogorov's axioms, and the generalised additivity property, hold for each ensemble considered separately. But as with exact partitionings, there is a natural extension of the consistency condition across ensembles. We read an interval probability for  $\beta$  in  $E$  as an estimate of the probability of  $\beta$  simpliciter, without mention of an ensemble; we require that such estimates, for every admissible ensemble, may all be conjointly true – requiring, that they all have non-zero intersection. This is our second consistency condition: for any macrostate  $\beta$ , all interval probabilities, obtained on every admissible partitioning, must have non-zero intersection. If  $\beta$  has an exact probability, that should be contained in that intersection too. Nor need it be restricted to macrostates.

The two consistency conditions just adduced are similarly motivated and apply equally in the case of the equiamplitude rule. Writing exact probabilities  $p$  as  $[p, p]$ , we see that the former condition is a special case of the latter. And there is no reason to require consistency only for macrostates; we require the same for any region of  $\mathcal{M}$ , macrostate or no.

To summarise, and to keep the discussion as elementary as possible, to state it in finitary terms:

**Consistency:** For any  $\gamma \subseteq \mathcal{M}$ , let  $\mathcal{F}$  be any finite family of admissible ensembles. Then:

$$\bigcap_{E \in \mathcal{F}} \mu_E(\gamma) \neq \emptyset. \quad (8)$$

Unlike generalised additivity Eq.(7), satisfied by both microstate counting rules, consistency in the sense of (8) is not. We take the two rules in turn.

## 6. The equivolume rule

It will be enough to consider exact probabilities. Let  $\{\alpha_k\}$  partition  $\mathcal{M}$  into three equi-volume cells  $\alpha_k$ , with microstates  $P_{\alpha_k}|\psi\rangle \neq 0$ ,  $k = 1,2,3$ . Consider the macrostate  $\beta = \alpha_1$ : it is exactly partitioned by  $\{\alpha_k\}$ , with probability  $1/3$ . Consider the new partitioning  $\{\alpha'_k\}$ , with  $\beta = \alpha'_1 = \alpha_1$ , so that  $\alpha_2 \cup \alpha_3 = \alpha'_2 \cup \alpha'_3$ . Evidently at least one of  $P_{\alpha'_2}|\psi\rangle$  and  $P_{\alpha'_3}|\psi\rangle$  must be non-zero, since

$$P_{\alpha'_2}|\psi\rangle + P_{\alpha'_3}|\psi\rangle = P_{\alpha'_2 \cup \alpha'_3}|\psi\rangle = P_{\alpha_2 \cup \alpha_3}|\psi\rangle = P_{\alpha_2}|\psi\rangle + P_{\alpha_3}|\psi\rangle \neq 0;$$

but there is no reason at all why both should be non-zero. For example,  $|\psi\rangle$  might vanish outside of  $\alpha'_1 \cup \alpha'_2$ , even though non-zero outside  $\alpha_1 \cup \alpha_2$  (see Fig.3b). In that case,  $\beta$  is exactly partitioned in a new ensemble containing just two branches,  $P_{\alpha'_1}|\psi\rangle$  and  $P_{\alpha'_2}|\psi\rangle$ , so has (exact) relative frequency  $1/2$ , not  $1/3$ . Contradiction.<sup>23</sup>

The rule delivers inconsistent probabilities for the same macrostate, referred to different ensembles. Can it be modified to escape this conclusion? Here is an alternative: apply the

---

<sup>23</sup> The argument is in effect a synchronic version of the one mounted against Graham's branch-counting rule concerning diachronic consistency; see Saunders (1998 p.388-9), Wallace (2012 p.120).

rule only to the region of  $\mathcal{M}$  on which  $|\psi\rangle$  (as a wave-function in  $L^2(d\lambda, \mathcal{M})$ ) is non-zero;<sup>24</sup> that would seem to exclude the kind of counterexample just given. The proposal is that the support of  $|\psi\rangle$  on  $\mathcal{M}$ , the set  $\mathcal{D}_{|\psi\rangle} = \{q \in \mathcal{M}; \langle q|\psi\rangle \neq 0\}$ , is to be divided into equivolume cells, whereas before it was  $\mathcal{M}$  that was so divided, with everything otherwise proceeding the same. Any cell wholly contained in the support of  $|\psi\rangle$  on  $\mathcal{M}$ , of whatever size or shape, will have non-zero amplitude, so branch-counting reduces to cell-counting in  $\mathcal{D}_{|\psi\rangle}$ . As such, it will be fully determined by the additive volume measure  $\sigma$ ; plausibly, consistency is then ensured.




Fig 3a

Fig 3b

The support of the wave-function is shown in blue; in Fig 3a, macrostate  $\beta$  in green is exactly partitioned by  $\{\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \alpha_3\}$  (it coincides with the cell  $\alpha_1$ ); since all three have non-zero amplitude the probability of  $\beta$  is  $1/3$ . In Fig 3b,  $\beta$  is unchanged, and is again exactly partitioned by  $\{\alpha'_1, \alpha'_2, \alpha'_3\}$ , with  $\alpha'_1 = \alpha_1 = \beta$ ; but now only two cells have non-zero amplitude,  $\alpha'_1$  and  $\alpha'_2$ , so has probability  $1/2$ , contradiction.

The suggestion is ingenious but fails on what looks like a technicality. The set of points  $\mathcal{D}_{|\psi\rangle} \in \mathcal{M}$  will not in general be a connected sub-manifold of  $\mathcal{M}$ ; excising points  $\{q \in \mathcal{M}; \langle q|\psi\rangle = 0\}$  can leave as complicated a pattern of disconnected components imaginable. In general, no exact partitioning of even two components will be possible, for the same reason as before (see Fig.1). What then is the status of a cell  $\alpha$  borderline, in this sense, on a component of  $\mathcal{D}_{|\psi\rangle}$ ? Cells like this threaten to be ubiquitous. Since  $\alpha \not\subseteq \mathcal{D}_{|\psi\rangle}$ , by the amended rule,  $P_\alpha|\psi\rangle$  does not count as a microstate, yet by assumption  $\alpha \cap \mathcal{D}_{|\psi\rangle} \neq \emptyset$ , so  $P_\alpha|\psi\rangle \neq 0$ , so it is not nothing, either. Before we considered cells of non-zero amplitude indefinite on a macrostate; that did not impugn their status as microstates, as we took pains to explain. The new sort of indefiniteness is more akin to indefiniteness as to *belonging to an ensemble*. For borderline  $\alpha$ ,  $P_\alpha|\psi\rangle$  is a superposition of a state belonging to an ensemble, and one not belonging to it - but 'belonging to an ensemble' is not a macrostate.

Maybe sense can be made of the idea, maybe not; either way, there remains the question of how cells borderline, in this new sense, are to contribute – or not contribute – to relative frequencies of macrostates. One strategy is to include them all, but that can immediately be dismissed, for it simply returns us to the previous rule – which, as we have just seen, is inconsistent. But to exclude all borderline cells also leads to inconsistency. In

<sup>24</sup> My thanks to an anonymous referee for this suggestion.

illustration, see Fig.4, where  $\mathcal{D}_{|\psi\rangle}$  is the elliptical region shaded, and the rectangle in its interior is the macrostate  $\beta$ . Two equivolume partitionings are shown, yielding contradictory relative frequencies for  $\beta$ .

One could hope to use a mix of the two, and define a new kind of interval probability, with lower bound obtained by counting all the borderline cells in the, the upper bound by excluding them. But doing this in the general case there will be no exact probabilities at all – and worse, in general, the widths of interval probabilities thus introduced will be large, as the relative frequency of borderlines in the new sense may well be large, depending on the details of the quantum state and partitioning.




Fig 4a

Fig 4b

Two exact partitionings  $\{\alpha_k\}, \{\alpha'_k\}$  are shown for the same macrostate  $\beta$ , shaded green; the support of  $|\psi\rangle$  on  $\mathcal{M}$  is shaded in blue. In Fig 2a no cell disjoint from  $\beta$  is contained in the support of  $|\psi\rangle$ , so the admissible ensemble consists of a single microstate  $\alpha_1$ , contained in  $\beta$ , and its probability is unity. In Fig 2b there is such a cell  $\alpha'_3$ , with 2 microstates  $\alpha'_1, \alpha'_2$  in  $\beta$ ; the ensemble consists of 3 microstates so the probability of  $\beta$  is  $2/3$ , contradiction.

Might we simply insist  $\psi(q)$  be non-vanishing everywhere on  $\mathcal{M}$ , with the possible exception of sets of zero  $\lambda$ -measure? With that all these difficulties disappear. Take the original state  $|\psi\rangle$ , and add to it any analytic  $L^2$ -function on  $\mathcal{M}$  with a sufficiently tiny amplitude: the resulting state can be as close as you like to the original, in the norm topology, yet be non-zero everywhere except for sets of measure zero. But it is a pointless exercise. Combined with the non-zero amplitude condition, it ensures that the state is entirely irrelevant to the probabilities, for they will then be determined by  $\beta$ ,  $\mathcal{M}$  and  $\lambda$  alone. In effect, it is to take the  $\lambda$ -measure as a probability measure, an admission of complete defeat.

## 7. The equiamplitude rule

We choose instead partitionings  $\{\alpha_k\}$  in such a way that decohering microstates  $P_{\alpha_k}|\psi\rangle$  all have equal amplitude, denote  $\omega$ . Since  $\| |\psi\rangle \| = \sqrt{\langle \psi | \psi \rangle} < \infty$ , it follows that  $\omega$  is restricted to the values  $\omega(n) = \| |\psi\rangle \| / \sqrt{n}$ , where  $n$  is an integer (the number of branches). Here and here alone squares of amplitudes enter the picture, and with them square roots, traceable to the fact that Hilbert space is an inner-product space, equivalently, for an infinite-dimensional Hilbert space, an  $L^2$  space.

We should be sure that partitionings like this can always be found when  $\mathcal{M}$  includes a continuous variable. To see this, consider again the case where  $\mathcal{M}$  is a connected region in  $\mathbb{R}^2$ , equipped with Lebesgue measure. For any  $n$ , and any function  $f(x, y) \in L^2(\mathcal{M}, dx dy)$ , we may always partition  $\mathcal{M}$  into connected regions  $\alpha_k, k = 1, \dots, n$ , where  $\bigcup_k \alpha_k = \mathcal{M}$ , such that

$$\int_{\alpha_1} |f|^2 dx dy = \int_{\alpha_2} |f|^2 dx dy = \dots = \int_{\alpha_n} |f|^2 dx dy.$$

It follows that the functions  $\chi_{\alpha_k}(x, y)f(x, y), k = 1, \dots, n$ , where  $\chi_{\alpha_k}$  is the characteristic function of  $\alpha_k$ , are all orthogonal and have equal amplitude, where

$$f(x, y) = \sum_{k=1}^n \chi_{\alpha_k}(x, y)f(x, y)$$

is an expansion into  $n$  equiamplitude states. The example is in fact quite general, for any  $\mathcal{M}$  that contains a continuous parameter space with the same continuity properties as the reals.

As with the equivolume rule, the larger the number of branches, the smaller the cells  $\alpha_k$ , so that eventually the decoherence condition will not be met. It follows that the number of equiamplitude branches cannot be taken as arbitrarily large. But as with the Boltzmann rule, there are uncountably many equi-amplitude ensembles, for each  $n$ , as the above example shows.

The consistency condition remain as before. Consider first the counter-example to the Boltzmann rule, just given. Let  $\mathcal{M}$  be partitioned into three cells  $\alpha_k, k = 1, 2, 3$ , as before, save now they have equal amplitude rather than equal  $\lambda$ -measure. It follows that  $|P_{\alpha_k}|\psi\rangle| = \omega(3)$ . As before, we suppose that  $\beta = \alpha_1$ ; it follows  $\beta$  has (exact) probability  $1/3$ . Let  $\{\alpha'_k\}$  be a new equiamplitude partitioning into  $n'$  branches of amplitude  $\omega(n')$ , with  $\beta = \alpha'_1$ , as before. Then  $P_{\alpha_1}|\psi\rangle = P_{\alpha'_1}|\psi\rangle$ , so their amplitudes are equal, so  $\omega(n') = \omega(3)$ . Therefore  $n' = 3$  and the relative frequency of  $\beta$  in the new ensemble is  $1/3$ . No counter-example is possible.

The proof generalises, but there is another way to prove consistency of exact probabilities. Suppose that for given  $|\psi\rangle$  a macrostate  $\beta$  is exactly partitioned by equiamplitude cells  $\{\alpha_i\}$ ,  $n$  in total. It follows that for some finite index set  $K$ :

$$P_\beta = \sum_{i \in K} P_{\alpha_i}. \quad (9)$$

Let the cardinality of  $K$  be  $n_\beta$ . Therefore the relative frequency of  $\beta$  is  $n_\beta/n$ . Since by assumption  $\sum_{j=1}^n P_{\alpha_j}|\psi\rangle = |\psi\rangle$ , from the definition of  $\omega(n)$  it follows:

$$\langle \psi | \psi \rangle = \langle \psi | \left( \sum_{i=1}^n P_{\alpha_i} \right) \left( \sum_{j=1}^n P_{\alpha_j} \right) | \psi \rangle = n\omega(n)^2.$$

Further, from (9)

$$\langle \psi | P_{\beta} | \psi \rangle = \langle \psi | \left( \sum_{i=1}^n P_{\alpha_i} \right) \left( \sum_{k \in K} P_{\alpha_k} \right) \left( \sum_{j=1}^n P_{\alpha_j} \right) | \psi \rangle = n_{\beta} \omega(n)^2.$$

Taking the ratio:

$$\frac{\langle \psi | P_{\beta} | \psi \rangle}{\langle \psi | \psi \rangle} = \frac{n_{\beta}}{n}. \quad (10)$$

The LHS is the Born rule quantity for  $\beta$ . The agreement is exact; no approximation is involved. The same exact agreement with the Born rule follows for any other exact partitioning  $\{\alpha_i'\}$  of  $\beta$  with index set  $K'$  and  $n'$  branches (the argument is identical). Since the LHS of (10) is the same in each case, the RHS is too; therefore  $n'_{\beta}/n' = n_{\beta}/n$ .

In the case of a macrostate  $\beta$  defined independent of any partitioning, a similar argument shows that the Born rule quantity for  $\beta$  is contained within the limits of any (hence every) interval probability for  $\beta$ ; therefore the intersection of interval probabilities for  $\beta$  for any finite collections of ensembles must be non-empty, and the consistency condition is satisfied in full. I forego the proof.

## 8. Arguments against finite frequentism

Stepping back from the details, the Gibbs equi-amplitude rule appears to be a fully reductive analysis, defined in terms of primitives that are widely used, in contexts that need have nothing to do with probability. The ensembles are actual (at least for Everettians) as well as finite, so unlike the decision-theory approach to probability, it is clearly about the world (or rather worlds), independent of mind. It is evidently inspired by actual scientific practise and theory – not just quantum mechanics, but by ideas of Boltzmann and Gibbs on probability in classical statistical mechanics. It is independent of metaphysics, except for realism about the state; it is independent, for example, of questions of personal identity, or self-locating uncertainty, or language use, or mind.

It appears, in short, to have (almost) all the virtues of finite frequentism as advertised in Hájek [1996 p.72]:

Any aspiring frequentist with serious empiricist scruples should not give up on finite frequentism lightly. The move to hypothetical, frequentism say, comes at a considerable metaphysical price, one that an empiricist should be unwilling to pay. Finite frequentism is really the only version that upholds the anti-metaphysical, scientific inclination that might make frequentists of us in the first place. In any case, at first blush, it is an attractive theory. It is a reductive analysis, whose primitives are well understood; it apparently makes the epistemology of probability straightforward; unlike the classical and logical theories of probability, it appears to be about the world; and it seems to be inspired by actual scientific practice.

The exception is the epistemology of probability, the subject of the section that follows. In compensation, one surprisingly missed off: finite frequentism also explains Kolmogorov's axioms, including additivity in the generalised sense for interval probabilities. In this sense it satisfies Salmon's 'admissibility' criterion (Salmond (1964, p.64), one of three criteria for what we want from an interpretation of probability: that the elementary axioms and their consequences follow from 'the meanings assigned to the primitive terms in the interpretation'.<sup>25</sup>

However Hájek (1996) goes on to give fifteen numbered arguments against finite frequentism, that were found widely persuasive. Although, or rather because, they presuppose a single world, they repay summary. The first and second were the most important and directly concerned the reference-class problem. I take it that problem has been comprehensively solved: the relevant reference classes are physically tied to the concrete experiment and the residual freedom in choice of ensemble yields probabilities that are all consistent with one another. Naturally, one can raise questions about probabilistic processes absent any experimental apparatus, which are of course (according to Everettians) happening everywhere and all the time in the terrestrial environment, but experiment remains the locus of interest, because of its connection with epistemology.

The third and fourth involve the idea that probabilities of local events should be counterfactually independent of distant events, so the relevant ensembles should likewise be local. Yet there typically are no such local ensembles, in one-world terms. There are for us: all the microstates in a superposition produced by a single local experiment exist at the same local place at the same local time.

Hájek's fifth argument is that actual frequentism is ontologically over-burdened. It implies that for an event to have an objective probability at all, there must be multitudes of other events among which it is situated. The result is 'a surprisingly rich ontology'. Guilty as charged. But it is not new ontology, on the Everett interpretation, it is ontology that is already there.

Argument 8 concerns attributes that have no occurrences, whereupon the relative frequency is  $0/0$ , and can have no determinate value. Yet the outcomes of a chance set-up should have objective probabilities, in some sense, even if no trials take place. They should be meaningful even if not actually realised, as in, measured. But it cannot be that the chances of outcomes are the relative frequencies that *would* be realised, were the trial to take place, without also specifying that number of would-be trials. It seems that when I wonder about the chance that my Ming vase, if dropped, would break, I am really wondering about the fraction of an entire collection of Ming vases, that on dropping break, an apparent absurdity. But that is exactly the lesson of unitary quantum mechanics: the Ming vase on falling will evolve into a vast superposition of states in some of which it is broken, and in some of which it is whole. But it is just the one vase to begin with – it is this very vase, that has the probabilities.

A different kind of argument is as follows (#10): a notion of objective probability may attach to statements about laws, or existence claims like 'there exist tachyons', and failing

---

<sup>25</sup> Cited with qualified approval in Hájek (2023). Salmon's two other criteria are also satisfied.

something like relative frequencies across possible worlds, it seems frequentism can give no leverage on these.

Guilty as charged (for the possible worlds are not among quantum mechanical branches). But this marks a difference in aim. We are seeking an interpretation of probability in terms of a physical theory, not proposing, as Hájek takes himself to be countering, a universal theory of objective probability, to apply regardless of the physics. But oddly, our claim *is* universal, but in a different way, as applying, in principle, to all of physics – because quantum mechanics is a universal theory, on the Everett interpretation. And many unsympathetic to Everett’s ideas will agree that where the world is chancy in itself, it is because somewhere, at some level, possibly some time in the past, quantum mechanical indeterminacy was in play. But this kind of universality does not extend to so-called ‘contra-legals’, in modal laws, where different fundamental physical laws are in play.

I conclude with one further argument (#14): finite frequentism can only deliver probabilities as rational numbers. What of continuously-valued probabilities – giving the example of the Born rule quantities.

At one level the answer is straightforward: we have already accounted for quantum probabilities, but as given by relative frequencies (and interval probabilities), not by the Born rule. True, the Born rule quantities must always be contained in every interval probability (and equals any exact probability), but they are not themselves probabilities.

A rather different answer is possible if, following Stoica (2022), we are prepared to allow that microstates need not be branches in Everett’s sense; if it is enough that they be orthogonal and written in the basis for  $\mathcal{M}$ , in which case cells  $\gamma \subseteq \mathcal{M}$  can be arbitrarily fine-grained, and ensembles defined for any finite number  $n$  of equiamplitude microstates. In that case the Born rule quantities can be understood as the limits of interval probabilities – not themselves relative frequencies, not themselves probabilities, but limits of such, as irrational numbers are limits of rational numbers. Only the latter are relative frequencies.

The price that is paid is that such microstates no longer are correlated with earlier ones, and histories made up of such microstates strongly interfere with one another. Such microstates are no longer dynamically autonomous, a criterion often used, as in Wallace (2012), for entities to count as worlds. A similar qualification attends the attempt to extend the equi-amplitude rule to any parameter space  $\mathcal{M}$ , whether or not picked out by decoherence. Indeed, if the bases of the equi-amplitude ensembles can change, then the rule can be extended to discrete parameter spaces. As a synchronic rule, nevertheless, our consistency condition is maintained: every interval probability for  $\beta$ , no matter the basis of different ensembles (so long as comprised of equi-amplitude states), will contain the Born rule quantity for  $\beta$ , so must have non-zero intersection.

## 9. Epistemology

The epistemology of probability is supposed to be straightforward in actual frequentism, in one-world terms. Is it, in our quantum form? Is it, even, in one-world terms?

The link is certainly simple for some kinds of empiricists -- those who, correctly insisting that only observed statistics provides an empirical basis for inferences about probabilities, wrongly identify those probabilities with those self-same statistics. Realists will insist that

*all* extant statistics of the relevant sort, whether or not observed, determine the probabilities. So in a single world, chances are determined by ensembles of events spread out over all of time, or up to the present time, or all of space, and so on. It is to *those* relative frequencies that realists wish to infer, on the basis of local, observed data, for those are the real chances. But as soon as the observed ensemble is different from the inferred ensemble, the epistemology of probability seems far from straightforward.

In the quantum case, at first glance, it seems even worse. We face the apparently unnerving scenario that only a *single* microstate is ever observed, by any given observer (or local epistemic community), from the relevant ensemble. Ordinarily, with the ensemble spread out over space and time, we assume we (somehow) make multiple selections from that one ensemble at different places and times. But this comes at a certain price. The chance set-ups will not be *precisely* the same, on each trial; the ensemble is cobbled together out of several trials, only more or less physically similar to each other, and of course at most one outcome can be observed for each trial. It is the cobbled-together ensemble that is supposed to define the physical probability (in terms of statistics), one member for each trial; of which a sub-ensemble is actually observed, involving a certain selection. Both target ensemble and observed ensemble involve these ambiguities.

In contrast, in the quantum case, the ensemble arises for each individual trial. The chance set-up for each member of the ensemble, prior to branching, is identically the same.<sup>26</sup> No cobbling-together of approximately similar trials is needed to define the objective chances, for any single trial. But just because, for any given observer or community, only one element of the ensemble is observed, to obtain observed statistics, repeated trials at different places and times are needed, with outcomes recorded and made available at the end. In this way we are back to the same problem of cobbling together similar-enough and actively performed trials.

In brief: the epistemology of probability encounters much the same difficulties, whether in one-world or in many-world frequentism, and is not at all straightforward on either account of probability; but is somewhat simpler in the latter, where at least the objective chances are unambiguous, even if not themselves observable.

This same distinction is important to answering Hájek's remaining arguments against finite frequentism, postponed until now. The sixth is that the actual relative frequencies produced by a series of trials may depart from the chances. An improbable sequence of outcomes is yet possible. A fair coin, tossed a dozen times and then destroyed, may yield a relative frequency of tails different from  $\frac{1}{2}$ ; tossed an odd number of times agreement is impossible. That is true here, but only concerning the observed relative frequencies. It is more than a possibility: necessarily, there will be 'anomalous branches', as they are called, in the Everett interpretation – branches recording a relative frequency of  $E$  different from the Born rule quantity for  $E$ . For large numbers of repetitions, however, of sufficiently similar trials, concluded by some time  $t$ , the relative frequency of branches at  $t$  recording anomalous statistics will be vanishingly small, among the ensemble of all branches at  $t$  – this the law of large numbers, for the physical probability.

---

<sup>26</sup> The initial state of the apparatus and state-preparation device can even be taken as a microstate, so long it is decohering.

A related argument is as follows. Chance is supposed to explain relative frequencies. ‘Why do we believe in chances? Because we observe that various relative frequencies of events are stable; and that is exactly what we should expect if there are underlying chances with similar values. But there is no explaining to be done if chance just is actual relative frequency: you can’t explain something by reference to itself’ (Hájek 1996 p.219). The distinction between observed ensembles of repeated trials, and the unobservable ensembles produced on each trial, to the rescue again. The chance of  $E$  for a given trial, is the relative frequency of  $E$  in the microstates produced by that trial. If the trials are sufficiently similar, the relative frequencies will be similar too. The observed statistics are stable (for the vast majority of observers – see the above); what explains this stability is that the relative frequencies on each trial are indeed similar; that the chances are the same on each trial. The explanans and the explanandum are not the same.

And so to the last of Hájek’s arguments: ‘non-frequentist considerations enter our probabilistic judgments: symmetry, derivation from theory....’. Indeed. But for us, no sharp separation exists between the two, as symmetry and theory are involved in our frequentist considerations from the beginning. The relevant distinction is between probabilistic *judgment* (agent-specific, epistemic, or subjective probability, or credence), and the probabilities themselves (physical or objective probability, or chance). So suppose the relative frequencies of  $E$  in admissible ensembles are known: what credence should we form for  $E$ ?

There is of course the question of what credence even *means*, in the face of branching, when all the relevant details are known in advance, but the answer to this question has been well-rehearsed in the decision-theory literature: regardless of one’s views on personal identity, or self-locating uncertainty, or language use, agents confronted with different branching scenarios must still choose among actions, even if only to curl up in a ball and hide. These actions, even no action (for time is money), involve the allocation of precious present resources -- and therein lies the meaning of credence. In the one-world case, for this calculus among competing actions to have any meaning, uncertainty about future scenarios with respect to existence is needed; for if there is none such, why consider scenarios that we know will not arise? In the many-world case, in contrast, it is precisely *because* we are certain of the existence of those competing future scenarios that we must take them into calculation – because we *know* they will all arise.<sup>27</sup> They compete for our present resources, not for existence among themselves.

The question is then how, exactly, that calculation goes. It is clear what we want to end up with (and here I put interval probabilities to one side):<sup>28</sup> Lewis’ Principal Principle (roughly, that if agents know the probabilities for various scenarios, then their credences in those scenarios should be weighted accordingly). Of course we could simply *use* the Principal Principle, as we do in conventional quantum mechanics, conforming credence in  $E$  to the Born rule quantity for  $E$ , but now that we have an independent account of physical

---

<sup>27</sup> For a similar argument in terms of behaviour, see Saunders (2021 p.233).

<sup>28</sup> There is a large literature on how this works in the case of interval probabilities, usually under the rubric of ‘imprecise probabilities’ (Bradley 2019), but in practise, for ensembles produced in quantum measurements, the widths can be taken as extremely small (much smaller than experimental uncertainties in the values of the Born rule quantities).

probability we should aim higher: *why* ought an agent's credence in E match the relative frequency of E in an admissible ensemble?

I offer two answers. First, because it is *prima facie* reasonable. What better reason to give one eventuality more weight in our deliberations than another, when all else being equal, it is much more frequent than the other? That does not mean we should be careless of those relatively few eventualities with very large negative utilities – again, just because, for an Everettian, those eventualities, though rare, are still there. (To those branches we funnel compensation, siphoned off from those that are not so afflicted, otherwise known as ‘taking out an insurance policy’.) And all else surely *is* equal: there is an important symmetry operating in the equi-amplitude rule, namely that an agent, prior to measurement, bears exactly the same physical relations -- in space, time *and* amplitude – to every element in every admissible ensemble produced by the measurement.<sup>29</sup>

My second answer is that it is reasonable that credence match relative frequency insofar as the axioms of the Deutsch-Wallace decision-theory approach are reasonable. For their remarkable theorem shows that agents who are reasonable in the latter sense will conform their credences to the Born rule quantities. So they do likewise to the relative frequencies, for the two agree.

However, those axioms are not entirely self-evident. Again, one may hope to do better. For at the core of the decision-theory derivations are just those symmetries of equiamplitude states, but now having to be realised at the level of observably distinct macrostates that agents can bet on or receive rewards, suitable for an operational characterisation of credences. Obtaining the latter, for a given initial state and kind of experiment, requires meticulous engineering of the apparatus. Several of the axioms used by Deutsch and Wallace are directed to underwriting an agent's indifference to this kind of fine-tuning. But on the present account, following a measurement (any measurement) equiamplitude microstates, albeit differing in unobservable ways, are already there for the taking, along with their symmetries, with no contrived experiments needed to reveal them. It may be they can be exploited more directly, abjuring operationalism.<sup>30</sup>

## Acknowledgments

My thanks to two anonymous referees for helpful suggestions and criticism.

## References

Albert, D. [1992], *Quantum Mechanics and Experience*, Harvard University Press, Cambridge.

-- [2000], *Time and Chance*, Harvard University Press, Cambridge.

---

<sup>29</sup> Differences in phase, properly speaking, reduce to phase relations among the branches, not between the agent prior to branching and the individual branches (because of the irrelevance of the overall phase).

<sup>30</sup> I make some brief suggestions on how this may go in Saunders (2021). Short (2023), viewed as a derivation of an agent's credence function rather than physical probability, is a further step in this direction (with his ‘invariance’ condition following from frequentism).

Barrett, J. [2011] 'Everett's pure wave mechanics and the notion of worlds', *European Journal of Philosophy of Science* **1**: 277-302.

-- [2016], 'Typicality in pure wave mechanics', *Fluctuation and Noise Letters* **15**, 1640009.

Bell, J. [1987], *Speakable and Unspeakable in Quantum Mechanics*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Boltzmann, L. [1877], 'Über die Beziehung zwischen den zweiten Hauptsatz der mechanischen Wärmetheorie und der Wahrscheinlichkeitsrechnung, respective den Sätzen über das Wärmegleichgewicht', *Kaiserliche Akademie der Wissenschaften (Wien), Proceedings*, **76**, 373-435. Translated by K. Sharp and F. Matschinky in *Entropy* **17**, 1971-2009 (2015).

Bradley, S. [2019], 'Imprecise probabilities', *Stanford Encyclopaedia of Philosophy* (Spring 2019 Edition), Edward N. Zalta (ed.), published online at <https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/imprecise-probabilities/>

Brown, H., and G. Porath [2020], 'Everettian probabilities, the Deutsch-Wallace theorem, and the principal principle', in M. Hemmo and O. Shankar, *Quantum, Probability, Logic: the work and influence of Itamar Pitowsky*, Springer, Berlin.

Dawid, R., and K. Thébault (2015), 'Many worlds: decoherent or incoherent?', *Synthese* **192**, 1559-80.

Deutsch, D. [1999], 'Quantum theory of probability and decisions', *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London* **A455**, 3129-37.

-- [2016], 'The logic of experimental tests, particularly of Everettian quantum theory', *Studies in History and Philosophy of Modern Physics* **55**, 24-33.

Dürr, D, S. Goldstein, and N. Zanghi [1992], 'Quantum equilibrium and the origin of absolute uncertainty', *Journal of Statistical Physics* **67**, 843-907.

Einstein, A. [1949], 'Autobiographical notes', in *Albert Einstein, Philosopher-Scientist, Library of Living Philosophers*, P. Schilpp (ed.), Open Court, Chicago.

Everett III, H. [1957], "'Relative state'" formulation of quantum mechanics', *Reviews of Modern Physics* **29**, 454-62.

-- [1973], 'Theory of the universal wavefunction', in DeWitt, B and N. Graham (eds) *The Many-Worlds Interpretation of Quantum Mechanics*, Princeton University Press, Princeton pp.3-140.

Franklin, A. [2024], 'Incoherent? No, just decoherent: how quantum many worlds emerge', *Philosophy of Science*, forthcoming.

Gell-Mann, M., and J. Hartle [1990] 'Quantum mechanics in the light of quantum cosmology', in *Complexity, Entropy, and the Physics of Information*, W.H. Zurek (ed.), Addison-Wesley, Reading.

Gibbs, J. [1902], *Elementary Principles in Statistical Mechanics*, Yale Centenary Publications, New Haven.

Goldstein, S. [2001], 'Boltzmann's approach to statistical mechanics', in *Chance in Physics: Foundations and Perspectives*, J. Bricmont, D. Durr, M. Galavotti, G. Ghirardi, F.

Petrucione, and N. Zanghi, *Lecture Notes in Physics 574*, Springer-Verlag, Berlin (2001).

Good, J [1962], 'Subjective probability as themeasure of a non-measurable set', in E. Nagel, P. Suppes, and A. Tarski (eds.), *Logic, Methodology and Philosophy of Science*, pp. 319-329, Stanford, Stanford University Press.

Graham, N. [1973], 'The measurement of relative frequency', in DeWitt, B and N. Graham (eds) *The Many-Worlds Interpretation of Quantum Mechanics*, Princeton University Press, Princeton, pp.229-53, (1973).

Hájek, A. [1996], "Mises redux'-- redux: fifteen arguments against finite frequentism', *Erkenntnis* **45**, 209-227.

-- [2023], Interpretations of Probability", *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy* (Winter 2023 Edition), Edward N. Zalta & Uri Nodelman (eds.). Published online at <https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/win2023/entries/probability-interpret/>

Hawthorne, J. [2010], 'A metaphysician looks at the Everett interpretation', in Saunders et al (2010 pp.144-153).

Hubert, M. [2021], 'Reviving frequentism' *Synthese* **199**, 5255–5584.

Joos, E., and H. D. Zeh [1985], 'The emergence of classical properties through interaction with the environment', *Zeitschrift für Physik B Condensed Matter* **59**, 223–243.

Khawaja, J. (2024), 'Conquering Mt Everett', *British Journal for the Philosophy of Science*, forthcoming.

Kent, A. [2010], 'One world versus many: The inadequacy of Everettian accounts of evolution, probability, and scientific confirmation', in Saunders et al (2010 pp.307-54).

Kiefer, C. [1996], 'Consistent histories and decoherence', in D. Giulini, E. Joose, C. Kiefer, J. Kupsch, I.-O Stamatescu, and H.D. Zeh, *Decoherence and the Appearance of a Classical World in Quantum Theory*, Springer, Berlin (1996).

La Caze, A. [2016], 'Frequentism', in A. Hájek and C. Hitchcock, (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Probability and Philosophy*, pp.341-59, Oxford University Press, Oxford.

Lazarovici, D. [2023], 'How Everett solved the probability problem in Everettian quantum mechanics', *Quantum Reports* **5**, 407-17.

Myrvold, W [2016], 'Probabilities in statistical mechanics', in A. Hájek and C. Hitchcock, (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Probability and Philosophy*, pp.341-59, Oxford University Press, Oxford.

-- [2021], *Beyond Chance and Credence: a theory of hybrid probabilities*, Oxford University Press, Oxford.

Rowbottom, D. [2015], *Probability*, UK Polity Press, Cambridge.

Salmon, W. [1966], *The Foundations of Scientific Inference*, Pittsbrugh: Pittsburgh University Press.

Saunders, S. [1993], 'Decoherence, relative states, and evolutionary adaptation', *Foundations of Physics*, **23**, 1553-1585.

-- [1998], 'Time, quantum mechanics, and probability', *Synthese* **114**, 373-404.

- 2005 'What is probability?', in *Quo Vadis Quantum Mechanics*, A. Elitzur, S. Dolev, and N. Kolenda, (eds.), Springer, Berlin.
- [2020], 'The concept 'indistinguishable'', *Studies in History and Philosophy of Modern Physics* **71**, 37–59.
- [2021], 'Branch-counting in the Everett interpretation of quantum mechanics', *Proceedings of the Royal Society A* **477**,\_20210600.
- [2022], 'The Everett interpretation: probability', in E. Knox and A. Wilson, *The Routledge Companion to Philosophy of Physics*, Routledge, Abingdon.
- Saunders, S., J. Barrett, A. Kent, and D. Wallace [2010], *Many Worlds? Everett, quantum theory, and reality*, Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- Schrödinger, E. [1952], 'Are there quantum jumps?', *British Journal for the Philosophy of Science* **3**, 109-123, 233-242.
- Short, A. [2023], 'Probability in many-worlds theories', *Quantum* **7**, 971.
- Smith, C. [1961], 'Consistency in statistical inference and decision. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society B* **23** 1-25.
- Stoica, C. [2022], 'Born rule: quantum probability as classical probability', available online at <https://arxiv.org/pdf/2209.08621.pdf>
- Tegmark, M. [1993], 'Apparent wave function collapse caused by scattering', *Foundations of Physics Letters* **6**, 571-590.
- [2000], 'The importance of quantum decoherence in brain processes', *Physical Review E* **61**, 4194–206.
- Valentini, A. [1991], 'Signal-locality, uncertainty, and the sub-quantum H-theorem', *Physics Letters A* **156**, 5-11.
- [2010], 'De Broglie-Bohm pilot-wave theory: many worlds in denial?', in Saunders et al (2010), pp.477-509.
- von Kries, J. [1886], *Die Principien der Wahrscheinlichkeitsrechnung*. J. C. B. Mohr, Frankfurt.
- Wallace, D. [2010], 'How to prove the Born rule', in Saunders et al (2010 pp.227-263).
- [2012], *The Emergent Multiverse: Quantum theory according to the Everett Interpretation*, Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- Walley, P., and T. Fine [1982], 'Towards a frequentist theory of upper and lower probability', *The Annals of Statistics* **10**, 741-761.
- Wilson, A. [2020], *The Nature of Contingency: quantum physics as modal realism*, Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- Zurek, W. [1981], 'Pointer basis of quantum apparatus: Into what mixture does the wave packet collapse?', *Physical Review D* **24**, 1516-25.