

I: INTRODUCTION

In a previous paper (Gottlob, 2004) some inconsistencies in the formalism of the modern Bayes' Theorem (BT) were noted. These and other inconsistencies triggered further investigations leading to a new formalism that will be derived in this paper. BT was regarded to be the only method available for increasing the probability of a hypothesis due to some new evidence (C. Glymour, 1980, p. 91). The same author conjectured that "there must be relations between evidence and hypotheses that are important to scientific argument and to confirmation but to which the Bayesian scheme has not yet penetrated". J. Earman, author of an encompassing treatise on Bayes' Theorem (*Bayes or Bust?*, 1992) confessed on p.1 that he was a Bayesian on Mondays, Wednesdays and Fridays, however, that the rest of the week, he had doubts about the viability of the system as the basis for analysing scientific inference. Nevertheless, I am aware of the fact that BT was generally in use for about seven decades and that but a tiny minority of the huge number of users uttered objections. Therefore, I start right here with an example that will show that with the Bayesian formalism not everything can be in perfect order:

According to a rule that is considered to be an important part of BT, if a hypothesis (H), implies some evidence, (E), the probability $P(H|E)$ will be $P(H) / P(E)$.

However, from this follows the absurd conclusion that if the evidence is certain, $P(H|E)$ will be $P(H) / 1 = P(H)$. In other words: Certain evidence will not be able to confirm a hypothesis to any degree. Almost certain evidence [$P(E)$ close to 1], will contribute but minimally to confirmation. Here, a practical *Example*:

A doctor sees a patient suffering from high fever. He assumes 'malaria', however, other febrile states cannot be excluded. The doctor assigns his hypothesis (H) the probability .5. He decides to examine several blood smears and assigns a positive result (plasmodia in blood cells) probability 1. And really, he finds plasmodia, germs that are causing the disease, but are not found in healthy persons. One might object that in BT, E indicates the *antecedent* probability of evidence, a prediction that is experimentally confirmed later. However, such time dependence will not help in our example. The doctor assigns the evidence (plasmodia in the blood if it is malaria) probability 1 *before* examination of the blood smear.

Should the probability of malaria after detecting plasmodia be $.5 / 1 = .5$?¹ Because of the above mentioned absurdity, a completely new scheme, the rMPE-Method, mainly based on three principles so far not sufficiently considered by Bayesianism, was designed. These principles are: (i): The cMPE-Method for additions of probabilities in spite of their non-linearity (Gottlob, 2000, 2003, 2004); (ii): A thorough distinction between weight-bearing and extensional evidence (Gottlob, 2004), and (iii) avoiding increasing probabilities by divisions by variables that might distort the result. With this method, we can assign any hypothesis the probability according to the contemporary *actual* evidence. If the actual evidence is 1, this will cause an increase of H to $P(H) + P(H)$, i.e., $P(H)$ added to $P(H)$, however allowing for the non-linearity of the system. The criticism of BT will consist in

- (i) The absurdity outlined in Example 1.
- (ii) The lacking differentiation between 'weight-bearing evidence (E_W)' and 'extensional evidence' (E_{EXT}) in BT. (See also Gottlob, 2004).
- (iii) The necessity in BT to increase probabilities by *divisions*, whereby the divisor is a variable. This procedure causes additional non-linearities to the

¹ This example cannot be disconfirmed by C. Howson's (1984, 1985) reply to similar objections, e. g., by C. Glymour (1980) and by R. Campbell and T. Vinci (1983). Howson claims that in BT, $P(e)$ should not be relativized to the whole background knowledge K, but only to $K - \{e\}$ — See D. Christensen, 1999 for a reply.

probability systems that are non-linear by nature and causes diminished probability results. Divisions by constant divisors do not yield these drawbacks.

Of lesser or undefined importance may be:

- (iv) The derivation of BT from the conjunctive axiom that in turn is derived from a *descending* formula.
- (v) The impossibility (or at least difficulty) to check the correctness of probabilistic hypotheses or algorithms by internal proofs or by proofs according to reality
- (vi) Tacit conditions that are not reflected by the BT formalism.

Some notations and definitions:

$P(H)$ The probability of hypothesis H. $P(H|E)$: The probability of H given E.

As evidence E, the evidence that actively supports or inhibits some probabilities, e.g., of hypothesis H, whereby the evidence for existence of E may be relevant, too.

$P(A) + P(B)$; $P(A) - P(B)$: Addition, respectively, subtraction of the probability of A by the probability of B, however, taking into account the non-linearity. The probabilities of error, $1 - P(A)$, $1 - P(B)$, the complements of $P(A)$ and $P(B)$, are also notated as $P(\neg A)$ and $P(\neg B)$ or $P(A^c)$ and $P(B^c)$.

All probabilistic reasoning must allow for our background knowledge. For sake of clarity this is dropped in our formulas, however always considered tacitly.

In Ch. II the cMPE-Method is briefly described. Ch. III will be devoted to the criticism of BT. In Ch. IV, the rMPE-Method will be derived. In Ch. V, a general discussion and the description of some special applications will follow.

II: THE cMPE-METHOD

was derived for increasing probabilities by addition, however allowing for their non-linearity. As the method is already described (Gottlob, 2000, 2003, and in arXiv 2004) I shall mention here only what is necessary for understanding the principle.

a) *The non-linearity of probabilities*

Probabilities can range only between 0 and 1. Thus simply adding probabilities, e. g., $.4 + .7$ cannot be carried out. Various probabilities may belong to quite different sample spaces containing, say, the inhabitants of a village and of a whole country. In this case, no simple addition is feasible, even if the sum would be below 1. There must also be a greater difference between probability .9 and certainty than between probabilities .8 and .9. Fig. 1 will show these differences (see also Fig. 4 in Gottlob, 2004). — Only a minority of probability operations works in a linear way. The precondition therefore is: Belonging to one sample space and, accordingly, real or possible sums not exceeding 1. These conditions are met by *disjunctions*.

b) *The Principle of Complementarity.*

By multiplications of numbers <1 we arrive at products that are smaller than the factors. Besides simple addition there are two possibilities for arriving at results that exceed the premises: (i) *Divisions*. As will be shown in Ch. IV, Fig. 6, such divisions cause non-linearities, even, if the dividend remains constant and the divisor increases linearly. This is different in multiplications that, in the bargain, have the advantage of commutability. (ii) An alternative would be the multiplication of the complements of various probabilities. Hereby, the product will be smaller than the factors; however, by subtracting the product from 1, the difference will be larger than any of the

original probabilities. By this multiplicative procedure, no additional non-linearity is caused (see Fig. 6, below).

Thus we may add two or more probabilities by multiplying their complements and by subtracting the product from 1. A precondition is that the probabilities support one another. One more precondition is semantic independence: All added probabilities must differ by the way of observation, (e.g., by different sense organs) by being based on different scientific methods, by being characterized by different properties, by being observed by independent witnesses, or being supported by different circumstantial facts. Only the conclusion, they support must be common (See Fig. 7, below, for a model of semantic independence). Of course, if not the whole probability supports the other, only the active part of that probability may enter into the calculation.

On the other hand, there might be other influences that inhibit the support. Here, the most important may be pieces of evidence E, that are not related to our hypothesis but are found anywhere else, too: $P(E|\neg:H)$.

c) Derivation of the MPE-Method.

The probability of the occurrence of two or more completely independent events by sheer chance is

$$P(A \& B \& \dots \& N) = P(A) \times P(B) \times \dots \times P(N) \quad (1)$$

This is the special multiplication rule. The general multiplication rule for two probabilities reads:

$$P(A \& B) = P(A) \times P(B|A) = P(A|B) \times P(B) \quad (2)$$

(2) is valid for conditional probabilities, e.g., $P(A|B)$, where $P(A) \neq P(A|B)$.

Both, (1) and (2) are *descending* formulas, because due to the coincidence, the resulting chance is smaller than the initial values. Therefore, these formulas cannot be applied, if A, B or more events support (corroborate) one another. In this case, the final probability must be greater than the probability of the single event, and (1) or (2) will be of no use. Only by the cMPE-Method we may add probabilities, taking into account their non-linearity and avoiding sums >1 .

For computing 'ascending' probabilities, we may first multiply the probabilities of error, $P(A^c)$ and $P(B^c)$. This, again, is a descending operation. The product of $P(A^c) \times P(B^c)$ or of more probabilities of error becomes smaller than the premises. The decrease in probability is caused by multiplying numbers < 1 .

$$P(\neg A \& \neg B \& \dots \& \neg N) = P(A^c) \times P(B^c) \times \dots \times P(N^c) \quad (3)$$

I named (3), the 'MPE-Method' (**M**ultiplication of the **P**robabilities of **E**rror). This method may play an important role in our everyday cognitions. If we see, smell, and taste an apple, all sensations support one another and the probability of error becomes smaller, almost vanishing. As already mentioned, a basic requirement is that $P(A)$, $P(B)$ etc. are semantically independent.

d: Derivation of the cMPE- Method.

If we subtract the result of the MPE- Method from 1, we arrive at the common probability of our cognition or of the occurrence of some events that support one another. For indicating an ascending calculation, we notate the support between the items by a superscript $+$

$$P(A)^+ P(B) = 1 - P(A^c) \times P(B^c) \quad (4a)$$

For more evidential facts, supporting one another, and of course, if no counterexample is known, we have:

$$P(A)^+ P(B)^+ \dots^+ P(N) = 1 - P(A^c) \times P(B^c) \times \dots \times P(N^c) \quad (4b)$$

If we carry out the multiplication in (4a), we arrive at (4c):

$$P(A) + P(B) = P(A) + P(B) - P(A) \times P(B). \quad (4c)$$

By the MPE-Method probabilities are added, however, allowing for their non-linearity.² Here, for a proof of (4a) I shall limit myself to Fig. 1:




Fig. 1: Abscissa and ordinate indicate probabilities that are added. Continuous lines: cMPE-values. Broken lines: Linear additions of probabilities.

In Fig 1 we see that by linear adding of the probabilities indicated on the abscissa to the probabilities indicated on the ordinate (broken lines) straight parallel lines are generated that may intersect the horizontal 1 line at different points. Adding non-linearly probabilities to one of the probabilities indicated on the ordinate, generates straight lines that converge at 1.0. The non-linearity is indicated by different slopes. The graph may be regarded as proof for a non-linear addition, because the lines start at the point $P(A) + 0$, their course must be straight, because of one factor remaining constant, and must end at 1, where all lines must converge, even if probability 1 is added. If one term of the sum, say $P(B)$ is assumed to be zero, the result will equal the other term, $P(A)$: $P(A) + 0 = P(A)$.

In Table 1, P.8 will be added by the MPE-Method to various probabilities.

² For further proof, the reader is referred to Gottlob (2003, 2004), where also the difference of (4c) from the probability that at least one event of a multitude of events must occur is discussed. Transformations of cMPE-operations into percentage operations were treated in 2003, where also a percentage formula of P.O. Ekelöf (1964) and a severe criticism by L.J. Cohen (1976, 1977) is discussed.

Table 1
.8 is added to the Initial value

<u>Initial Value</u>	<u>Sum</u>	<u>Initial Value</u>	<u>Sum</u>
.1	.82	.9	.98
.3	.86	.99	.998
.5	.9	.999	.999 8
.8	.96	.9999	.999 98

We see in Tab. 1 that the impact of adding .8 by a nonlinear method to various probabilities decreases strongly with increasing initial value and that the resulting probabilities approach 1 asymptotically. Probability 1 can be reached only, if 1.0 is added.

For completeness, in (5), the formula for non-linear *subtraction* (DPE-Method, Division of the Probabilities of Error) will be stated, whereby the superscript ⁻ again indicates non-linearity:

$$P(A)^{-} P(B)^{-} P(C)^{-} \dots P(N)^{-} = 1 - P(A^c) / P(B^c) \times P(C^c) \times \dots \times P(N^c) \quad (5)$$

Now we may compute the difference between .999 98 and .999 8. Linearly we arrive at .000 18, however, by the DPE-Method we arrive at $1 - .00002 / .0002 = .9$, the 5000fold value.

Because of this non-linearity, we must doubt, that the support-function, S, frequently mentioned in literature, e.g. “ $S(H,E) \equiv P(H|E) - P(H)$ ” can be correct. Here, the DPE-Method should be applied: $P(H|E)^{-} P(E)$ will reveal the real difference.

Fig. 2 will show the ascending operation (4a – c) as opposed to the descending operation (1).




Fig. 2. **a:** Premises, $P(A) = .4$, $P(B) = .7$, $P(C) = 0$.
b: cMPE-Method. Both of the premises support C. C becomes .82, — an ascending operation.
c: Coincidence by sheer chance. $P(A \& B) = .28$, a descending operation.

III: THE NEO-BAYESIAN THEOREM AND ITS CRITICISM

a) The Theorem.

Originally (6a) was deduced from (2), the conjunctive axiom. According to Russell (1948, p. 364), from this follows the 'principle of inverse probability' (6a):

$$P(H|E) = P(H) \times P(E|H) / P(E) \tag{6a}$$

Frequently, especially in papers of earlier decades, (6a) is also called Bayes' Theorem. In this equation an increasing $P(E)$ already reduces the probability, however, if $P(E)$ is 1, $P(H|E)$ becomes $P(H)$. Another fundamental drawback of this formula consists in its not allowing for the probability of evidence, found under the condition of $\neg H$. This drawback could be remedied by considering the total probability in the denominator. We shall discuss here the most simple case that $P(H|E)$ is just calculated by the prior: $P(H)$, the likelihood $P(E|H)$, $P(E)$ and the probability of $P(E|\neg H)$. In this case (6b) reads:

$$P(H|E) = P(H) \times P(E|H) / [P(H) \times P(E|H) + P(\neg H) \times P(E|\neg H)] \tag{6b}$$

If H implies E , $P(E|H)$ becomes 1 and (6a) becomes (6c):

$$P(H|E) = P(H) / P(E) \tag{6c}$$

b) Criticism

(i) The absurdity that in (6c), $P(H|E)$ cannot be increased, if $P(E) = 1$ was already mentioned.

(ii) An important point is the lacking differentiation between extensional evidence (E_{EXT}) and weight-bearing evidence (E_W) in (6a) and in (6c). These different concepts of evidence were dealt with in Ch. V of Gottlob (2004). Here, I shall explain these concepts by Fig. 3.




Fig. 3. **a:** H implies E ; **b:** $P(H)$ and $P(E_W)$ is seen; **c:** $P(E) = P(H)$, $P(E_W) = 1$.

In Fig. 3 **a**, we see the implication of E by H according to the conventional assumption. [$P(H|\neg E) = 0$, $P(E|H) = 1$, $P(H|E) = P(H) / P(E)$]. However, the large zone of $P(E_{EXT})$ must also contribute to the increase of $P(H)$. This can be taken into account as indicated by the brick pattern: $P(E_W)$ may be a part of $P(E_{EXT})$ as in **(b)** or may exceed $P(E_{EXT})$ and become 1, as shown in **c**.

In Fig. 3, $P(H)$ is weight-bearing by itself and this capacity is increased by $P(E_W)$. On the other hand, $P(E_{EXT})$, especially with its part $P(E|\neg H)$ reduces $P(H|E)$, (metaphorically spoken), ‘by dilution’ (see Fig. 5 in Gottlob, 2004). These differences are allowed for in (6b), where $P(E|\neg H)$ is part of the denominator, but not in (6a) and not in (6c), where $P(E_W)$ and $P(E_{EXT})$ are just represented by ‘ E ’. If $P(E_W)$ equals or almost equals $P(E_{EXT})$, $P(E_W)$ as well as $P(H|E)$ become 1 or almost 1, as shown in Fig. 3c.

(iii) The necessity in BT, to increase probabilities by *division*. True, by divisions by numbers <1 , the quotient increases. However, there might arise some inconsistencies by the natural differences between divisions and multiplication. Unlike in multiplications, the constituents of divisions are non-commutative and the quotients, obtained from linear series of divisors are non-linear. Example: Dividend: .8; divisors; .2, .4, .6, .8. The respective quotients are .4, 2, 1.33, 1. In addition, the positive role of $P(E_W)$ and the negative role of $P(E_{EXT})$ in increasing $P(H)$ to $P(H|E)$ is not specified.. We shall come back to the problem of non-linear quotients in Ch. IV, Fig. 6.

(iv) (6a – c) are derived from the conjunctive axiom (2). This axiom, also called the ‘general multiplication rule’ indicates a descending operation, $P(H) \times P(E|H)$ or $P(H|E) \times P(E)$ are both smaller than the factors and this decrease is due to the multiplication of numbers < 1 . The decrease is understandable, because it expresses changes by chance. However, for $P(H|E)$ with few exceptions, we want to compute the *increase* of $P(H)$ due to “*active support*”, and therefore we apply a completely different algorithm, based on the ascending cMPE-operation.

(v) In contradistinction to the rMPE-method, to be described below, a convincing proof of the result of the Bayesian operations is impossible. True: If $P(H)$ implies $P(E)$ and both probabilities are equal, $P(H|E)$ by laws of mathematical logic must become 1, and this is correctly the case for (6a, b, c). However, at the other end, [$P(E) = 1$], we have the difficulties described. Checking the results by experiments in reality is theoretically possible but extremely difficult and checking ‘from within’ is not feasible. In contradistinction thereto, the cMPE – and the rMPE-Method may be checked by a graphical proof, in a way, a proof ‘from within’.

(vi) There are tacit conditions that are not reflected by the formalism, e.g., concerning background knowledge ‘ K ’, such as not allowing “relativizing the probabilities in the support definition to the entire set K [...] including [evidence] e , whereas they should be relativized to $K - \{e\}$ ” (C. Howson, 1985). And the stipulation that “the Bayesian assesses the contemporary support E gives H by how much the agent would change his odds on H were he now [counterfactually] to come to know E ” (C. Howson, 1984) [brackets added by R.G].-

These here criticized features of Bayesianism can be overcome by the rMPE-Method described in Ch. IV.

IV: CONSTRUCTING AN ALTERNATIVE ALGORITHM BASED ON THE COMPLEMENTARITY- PRINCIPLE AND ON ASCENDING PREMISES, HOWEVER, AVOIDING DIVISIONS.

The inventors of the modern BT had to resort to divisions, because by multiplications of probabilities, the result will be reduced instead of being increased and no method for adding probabilities, in spite of their non-linearity, was known. However, the ‘principle of complementarity’ described above, permits to add probabilities by multiplying their complements and subtracting the sum from 1, according to (4 a – c). For simplicity, we start with implication.

a) Implication of E by H.

The rMPE-Method is demonstrated by Figg 4 – 7.




Fig. 4: Derivation of the rMPE-Method for implications of E by H.

As we saw in Fig. 3,

$$P(H|E) = P(H) + P(E_w) \tag{7a}$$

In Fig. 4, we let P(H) be .4. This must be accounted for in all cases (broken lines). Of interest is the difference between P(E) and P(H), because $P(E_w) = 1 - [P(E) - P(H)]$, as indicated on Fig. 4. $P(E) - P(H)$, on the left border of Fig. 4, = 0, because there P(E) and P(H) are equal. Therefore, P(E_w), the weight-bearing part of P(E) is necessarily 1, — (i) because no addition to a probability can result in probability 1, unless probability 1 is added and (ii) because P(E) implies P(H) and P(H) implies P(E), P(H|E) must be 1, P(E|¬H) must be 0 and $P(E_w) = 1 - 0 = 1$. Thus, if P(E) = .4, $P(E) - P(H) = P(E|¬H) = 0$ and $P(E_w) = 1 - 0 = 1$ and P(H|E) = 1. If P(E) = .6, $P(E) - P(H) = P(E|¬H) = .2$ and $P(E_w) = 1 - .2 = .8$. and P(H|E) = .88. If P(E) = .8, $P(E) - P(H) = P(E|¬H) = .4$ and $P(E_w) = 1 - .4 = .6$ and P(H|E) = .76. If P(E) = 1, $P(E) - P(H) = P(E|¬H) = .6$ and $P(E_w) = 1 - .6 = .4$ and P(H|E) = .64 and P(H|E) necessarily equals P(H) + P(H).

From these considerations, we may construct the formula (7b) for P(H|E):

This can be achieved by cMPE-addition of P(H) to 1 - P(E|¬H) because the latter difference is also P(E_w). Thus. $P(H|E) = 1 - P(H^c) \times 1 - 1 - P(E|¬H)$ so that

$$P(H|E) = 1 - P(H^c) \times P(E|¬H) \tag{7b}$$

In (7b), P(H) increases and P(E|¬H) decreases the result, however, the latter factor contains also an increasing activity, because P(E|¬H) is 1 - P(E_w) and this is contained in (7b) as complement, so that it contributes positively to P(H|E).

A further illustration of (7b) is given by Fig.5a – c. There we may see that $P(E_W)$ is the main factor which influences $P(H|E)$ and that $P(E_W)$ may become $\gg P(H)$ and $\gg P(E_{EXT})$.




Fig. 5: $P(H) = .4$. **a:** $P(E_{EXT}) = P(E) = 1$, $P(H|E) = P(H) + P(H)$; **b:** $P(E_{EXT}) = .8$; $P(E_W) = .8$. **c:** $P(E_{EXT})$ equals $P(H)$; $P(E_W) = 1$, $P(H|E) = 1$.

The important advantage of (7b), as compared with the BT-implication formula (6c) is that $P(E) = 1$ increases the probability of $(H|E)$. Indeed, if we assume that in Fig. 5a, the impact of E on $P(H) = [1 - P(E|\neg H)] = .4$, then, according to (7a), $P(H|E)$ must be $.4 + .4 = 1 - .36 = .64$. — It may be asked, why in this case, linear subtractions are permissible. The answer must be that here the numbers represent disjunctions, belonging to the same sample space. — That (7b) is not only valid for $P(H) = .4$, may be seen on Fig. 6, where a multitude of rMPE-calculations is plotted and also the difference between the rMPE-Method and the conventional formula for implications (6c) will be demonstrated.




Fig:6: Implication of E by H. The broken lines indicate $P(H) / P(E)$ according to (6c). The continuous lines indicate the rMPE-Method according to (7b). All lines have their origin at the top.

Examples: (The conventional results of BT for implication in cornered brackets):
 $P(H) = .3, P(E) = .4. P(H|E) = 1 - .7 \times .1 = .93; [P(H) / P(E) = .75]$
 $P(H) = .6, P(E) = .8. P(H|E) = 1 - .4 \times .2 = .92; [P(H) / P(E) = .75]$
 All values of $P(H)$, with $P(E) = 1$, result in $P(H) + P(H)$, e.g.: $P(H) = .5, P(E) = 1,$
 $P(H|E) = 1 - .5 \times (1 - .5) = 1 - .5 \times .5 = .75. -$

Again, we may use the results achieved in Fig. 6 as a graphic proof of the method. The initial values of $P(H|E)$ are 1 (as proved in Fig. 4) because there $P(H)$ and $P(E)$ are equal. That the end points equal $P(H) + P(H)$, was explained by Figg. 4 and 5a; the straightness of the lines follows from one factor in the multiplication being kept constant.

In contrast to the computation according to (6c), the broken lines in Fig. 6, resulting from the division of $P(H)$ by $P(E)$, are curved and non-linear, in spite of the dividend in each curve being kept constant. The non-linearity is caused by different divisors. Please note that for implications, all results of BT are considerably lower than the results of the rMPE-Method for the same initial $P(H)$ value. This is true also for higher values: If $P(H) = .7$ and $p(E) = 1$, we obtain by BT .7 and by the rMPE-Method .91, a remarkable difference.

b: H implies several pieces of evidence that beyond H do not overlap.

In Gottlob, 2004, I found some inconsistencies in the procedure put forward by C.D. Broad (1918). The latter procedure consists in dividing probability H by various evidential data. The denominator, according to Broad, reads:

$c_1 c_2 \dots c_n / f = c_1 / f \times c_2 / c_1 f \times c_3 / c_2 c_1 f \times \dots c_n / c_{n-1} \dots c_1 / f$. In this denominator $c_1 c_2$ are propositions that are implied by a hypothesis. 'f' indicates background knowledge.

As already remarked by J. Earman (1992, p. 107), any additional c decreases the denominator, which eventually may become smaller than the whole fraction, and probabilities >1 may be obtained. In the first version of my 2004 paper, I relied upon divisions for increasing probabilities and on the cMPE-Method for adding probabilistic data. As shown in this paper, because of drawbacks with divisions by variables, I now recommend applying the rMPE-Method for these cases. Fig. 7 will explain the new procedure.




Fig. 7: $P(H) = .32$ is supported by $E_1 = .48$, $E_2 = .4$, and $E_3 = .56$. The $P(E_i|\neg H)$ are respective $.16$, $.08$ and $.24$. The $P(E_{1,2,3})$ are independent beyond H , however completely superimposed on H . —The figure illustrates the principle of semantic independence.

According to (7b) we calculate: $P(H|E_1, E_2, E_3) = P(H^c) + P(E_{w1}) + P(E_{w2}) + P(E_{w3})$. And as a general formula we write for $P(H)$ and $P(E_1), P(E_2), \dots, P(E_n)$, whereby the $P(E_{1,2,\dots,n})$, beyond H , must not overlap:

$$P(H|E_1, E_2, \dots, E_n) = 1 - P(H^c) \times P(E_1|\neg H) \times P(E_2|\neg H) \times \dots \times P(E_n|\neg H) \quad (7c)$$

And for the data, contained in Fig. 7, we compute: $P(H|E_1, E_2, E_3) = 1 - .68 \times .16 \times .08 \times .24 = .998$.

At first blush, $.998$ appears rather high. However, we must consider that $P(H)$ is supported by three semantically independent probabilities.

c: Conditional probabilities without implication.

These may be easily transformed into probabilities with implication, as is shown by Fig. 8:




Fig. 8: Transforming conditional probability calculations with $P(E|H)$ into implications.

For BT, (6b), there must be given: (i) The prior $P(H)$, (ii) the evidence $P(E)$, (iii) the likelihood $P(E|H)$, and (iv) $P(E|\neg H)$. For the rMPE-Method, we multiply $p(H)$ by $P(E|H)$ and arrive at ' Y ', as shown in Fig. 8. Because Y implies $P(E)$, we may calculate according to (7b): $P(H|E) = 1 - Y^c \times (P(E|\neg H))$. Thus (7d) reads:

$$P(H|E) = 1 - [P(H) \times P(E|H)]^c \times P(E|\neg H) \quad (7d)$$

One could object that $P(H) \times P(E|H)$ is a descending formula, however, in (7d), it is embedded in a complementary account.

Taking the numbers, contained in Fig. 8, we calculate: $1 - .6 \times .2 = .88$.

According to BT we would arrive at $.8 \times .5 / .6 = .67$ or just $.4 / .6 = .67$.

Again are the values, arrived at by BT considerably lower than the rMPE-values.

This finding is concordant with the above claimed flaw of (6b).

V: DISCUSSION AND SPECIAL CASES.

a: The following flaws or inconsistencies in BT could be avoided;

- (i) If H implies E , according to (6c), $P(E) = 1$, no longer fails to support the hypothesis, but confirms it according to $P(H) + P(H)$.
- (ii) It is clearly differentiated between the concepts of $P(E_w)$ and of $P(E_{EXT})$, concepts that are to a great part antagonistic.
- (iii) Divisions by variable divisors that aggravate the natural non-linearity of probabilities are avoided.
- (iv) The method is based on ascending operations (as it should be), viz.: on the cMPE Method and not based on descending procedures, such as the conjunctive axiom. Descending probabilities may be converted into ascending ones by embedding them into complements and subtracting the result from 1.
- (v) The formulas derived for the rMPE-Method can be proved graphically by drawing straight lines from a starting point at $P(H|E) = 1$, where $P(H) = P(E)$, to a logically determined end point, whereby the straightness of the lines is given by necessity. This 'internal proof' is not feasible with BT.
- (vi) Besides semantic independence, no special tacit rules that are not supported by the formalism must be observed. There is no time factor and no counterfactual assumption prescribed. Any knowledge available at the time of calculation may be used for computing the final probability.

b: A drawback of the cMPE-Method remedied.

By the cMPE-Method the important $P(E|\neg H)$ could not be allowed for 'without further ado'. By the rMPE-Method $P(E|\neg H)$ is considered automatically.

c: Application in practical and theoretical science.

In combination with the cMPE-Method, in all fields of science common probabilities of semantically independent data may be evaluated. This may be useful in practical science as well as in Theory of Science. By the cMPE-Method, two or more synergistic probabilistic data (say, the impact of air humidity and of temperature, elevated above average values, on the incidence of thunderstorms) may be added and hereby evaluated without any likelihood ($P(E|H)$) known (See Gottlob, 2004 for more examples). Generally, the rMPE-Method may be applied for all questions that until now were tried to be solved by BT. Besides many advantages, the rMPE-Method described here, is easily manageable and the probabilities arrived at will be considerably higher than the results, obtained with BT.

d: Astonishing or surprising evidence.

A classic example: B. Russell (1948, p. 365) mentions the confirmation of the law of gravitation. There were seven planets known. However, because of some anomalies in the orbit of Uranus, an eighth planet was assumed and its localisation predicted. Indeed, Neptune was found exactly at the site determined beforehand. How can these findings be accommodated to our formalism? Astronomers subdivide the heaven by rectascensions and declinations into $360 \times 180 = 64\,800$ areas. Thus, the chance of finding — without the theory of gravitation — another planet in a certain area, $P(E|\neg H)$, was $1 / 64\,800 = .000\,0156$, and the already very high probability of the theory, of gravitation, say, .999 9, becomes according to (7a) $1 - .000\,0156 \times .999\,9 = .999\,999\,99$ or $1 - 10^{-8}$. —These and other considerations favour the assumption that the psychological moments of surprise or astonishment, because hardly numerically recordable, are of less importance than the improbability of finding the facts in question. In other words: Astonishing things are astonishing, because of the small $P(E|\neg H)$, the small chance of encountering them, unless H were true.

d: The old evidence problem.

A possible solution of this problem by the cMPE-Method and by the DPE-Method was briefly outlined by R. Gottlob (2004). This question will be dealt with in extension elsewhere.

e: Multiple evidence.

According to the rMPE-Method (7c) and as shown in Fig.7, the $P(E|\neg H)$ of multiple pieces of evidence that are semantically independent are multiplied in the course of processing and thereby are vigorously reduced. Any new factor will cause additional reduction. After subtraction of the product from 1, the resulting probabilities may be high and frequently, no longer distinguishable from 1 for all practical purposes.

REFERENCES

- Broad, C.D.(1918) On the Relation between Induction and Probability. *Mind* (NS) 108 388 – 404
- Campbell , R. and Vinci, Th. (1983) Novel Confirmation *Brit. J. Phil. Sci* 34, 315 – 341
- Cohen, L.J. (1986) How one Testimony Corroborates Another? In R.S. Cohen, F.K. Feyerabend and M.W. Wartofsky (eds.) *Essays in Memory of Imre Lakatos*. Pp. 65 – 78 Reidel Dordrecht/ Boston
- Cohen, L.J. (1977) *The Probable and the Provable*, Clarendon Press, Oxford.
- Christensen, D. (1999) Measuring Confirmation *J. Philosophy* XCVI 137 - 61

- Earman, J. (1992) *Bayes or Bust?* Bradford Book, MIT-Press(2. Ed.) Boston, Mass.
- Ekelöf, P.O. (1964) Free Evaluation of Evidence *Scandinavian Studies in Law*. 8, 47 - 65
- Glymour, C. (1980) *Theory and Evidence*, Princeton, Princeton Univ. Press.
- Gottlob, R. (2000) New Aspects of the Probabilistic Evaluation of Hypotheses and Evidence. *International Studies in the Philosophy of Science*, 14, 147 – 163
- Gottlob, R.(2003) Algorithms for Addition and Subtraction of two or more Non-conditional Probabilities by the MPE- or DPE-Method and for Calculating Probabilities by Percentages.
www.mathpreprints.com/math/Preprint/Gottlob/2003.2/3
- Gottlob, R. (2004) Bayes Theorem and the cMPE-Method: Differences, Complementarities and the Importance of Discerning between Weight-Bearing and Extensional Evidence. <http://arxiv.org/abs/math.PR/0406090>
- Howson, C. (1984) Bayesianism and Support by Novel Facts, *Brit. J. Phil. Sci.* 35, 245 – 251
- Howson, C. (1985) Some Recent Objections to the Bayesian Theory of Support. *Brit. J. Phil. Sci.* 36 305 – 309
- Russell, B. (1948) *Human Knowledge, its Scope and Limits*. Allen and Unwin, London.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT: The author feels highly indebted for many enlightening discussions to Prof. Viktor Scheiber, former head of the Institute of Medical Statistics, Vienna University.

Author's E-Mail: rainer.gottlob@univie.ac.at

This document was created with Win2PDF available at <http://www.daneprairie.com>.
The unregistered version of Win2PDF is for evaluation or non-commercial use only.