

# Nature's Metaphysics

Laws and Properties

Alexander Bird

CLARENDON PRESS • OXFORD

2007

## CONTENTS

|          |  |    |
|----------|--|----|
| <b>1</b> | <b>Introduction—laws and properties</b>                        | 1  |
| 1.1      | Laws of nature and natural properties                          | 1  |
| 1.2      | An outline of this book  | 5  |
| <b>2</b> | <b>Dispositions</b>  | 9  |
| 2.1      | Properties   | 9  |
| 2.1.1    | Natural properties   | 9  |
| 2.1.2    | Nominalism and realism   | 15 |
| 2.2      | Dispositions   | 18 |
| 2.2.1    | Multi-track dispositions                                       | 21 |
| 2.2.2    | The conditional analysis of dispositions                       | 24 |
| 2.2.3    | Finkish dispositions   | 25 |
| 2.2.4    | Lewis's reformed conditional analysis                          | 26 |
| 2.2.5    | Antidotes  | 27 |
| 2.2.6    | The intrinsic dispositions thesis                              | 29 |
| 2.2.7    | Defending Lewis's Reformed Conditional Analysis?               | 31 |
| 2.2.8    | Repairs to the Conditional Analysis?                           | 36 |
| 2.2.9    | The Conditional Analysis revisited                             | 38 |
| 2.3      | Conclusion   | 41 |
| <b>3</b> | <b>Dispositional essentialism and the laws of nature</b>       | 43 |
| 3.1      | How dispositional essentialism accounts for the laws of nature | 43 |
| 3.1.1    | Dispositional essentialism and potencies                       | 43 |
| 3.1.2    | Deriving the laws of nature from dispositional essentialism    | 46 |
| 3.1.3    | The laws of nature are necessary                               | 48 |
| 3.2      | Strong necessitarianism  | 50 |
| 3.2.1    | Strong necessitarianism and properties                         | 51 |
| 3.2.2    | The instantiation condition                                    | 51 |
| 3.2.3    | Strong necessitarianism with instantiated properties           | 56 |
| 3.2.4    | Evaluating strong necessitarianism                             | 58 |
| 3.3      | <i>Ceteris paribus</i> laws                                    | 59 |
| 3.3.1    | Dispositional essentialism and <i>ceteris paribus</i> laws     | 59 |
| 3.3.2    | Finks at the fundamental level?                                | 60 |
| 3.3.3    | Antidotes at the fundamental level?                            | 62 |
| 3.4      | Conclusion   | 64 |
| <b>4</b> | <b>Categoricalism</b>  | 66 |
| 4.1      | Categoricalism about properties and laws                       | 66 |
| 4.2      | What is wrong with categoricalism about properties             | 70 |
| 4.2.1    | Quidditism   | 70 |
| 4.2.2    | Against quidditism—(QA1)                                       | 73 |

|          |  |     |
|----------|--|-----|
| 4.2.3    | Against quidditism—(QB1)   | 76  |
| 4.3      | What is wrong with categoricism about laws—regularity                            | 81  |
| 4.3.1    | The regularity view of laws and Humean Supervenience                             | 81  |
| 4.3.2    | The regularity view of laws and explanation                                      | 86  |
| 4.4      | What is wrong with categoricism about laws—nomic necessitation                   | 91  |
| 4.4.1    | Does necessitation entail regularity?  | 92  |
| 4.4.2    | Does necessitation merely imply regularity?                                      | 93  |
| 4.4.3    | Simple universals and Independence   | 94  |
| 4.4.4    | Nomic necessitation contradicts categoricism                                     | 96  |
| 4.5      | Conclusion   | 97  |
| <b>5</b> | <b>Dispositional essentialism, modality, and intentionality</b>                  | 99  |
| 5.1      | Potency and its being  | 99  |
| 5.2      | Too little actuality   | 100 |
| 5.3      | Too much potentiality  | 104 |
| 5.3.1    | No possibility in, no possibility out  | 105 |
| 5.3.2    | The <i>tu quoque</i> TMP argument—unrealized possibilities in categoricism       | 106 |
| 5.3.3    | The type-level response  | 106 |
| 5.4      | Armstrong, modal realism, and actualism  | 108 |
| 5.5      | There are unrealized possibilities   | 111 |
| 5.6      | Dispositional essentialism and intentionality                                    | 114 |
| 5.6.1    | Do potencies explain intentionality?   | 115 |
| 5.6.2    | Compositional properties   | 116 |
| 5.6.3    | Intentionality is non-compositional  | 117 |
| 5.7      | Are potencies intentional?   | 118 |
| 5.7.1    | The marks of intentionality  | 119 |
| 5.7.2    | Does intentionality* have the marks of intentionality?                           | 120 |
| 5.8      | The manifest image   | 126 |
| 5.9      | Conclusion   | 129 |
| <b>6</b> | <b>The regress objection</b>   | 132 |
| 6.1      | Two unsuccessful regress arguments   | 132 |
| 6.1.1    | Incoherence  | 132 |
| 6.1.2    | Swinburne's epistemological argument   | 133 |
| 6.2      | Regress, circularity, and identity   | 135 |
| 6.2.1    | The advantages of categorical monism and the mixed view                          | 138 |
| 6.3      | Responding to the regress objection  | 138 |
| 6.3.1    | Reflexive potencies and the asymmetric manifestation relation—loops and digraphs | 141 |
| 6.3.2    | Further constraints  | 143 |
| 6.3.3    | Essential stimuli  | 144 |
| 6.4      | Conclusion   | 145 |

|           |   |     |
|-----------|---|-----|
| <b>7</b>  | <b>Structural properties</b>  | 147 |
| 7.1       | The Mellor–Prior debate   | 148 |
| 7.1.1     | Testing for potency   | 149 |
| 7.1.2     | Complications for the conditional test for potency                                  | 150 |
| 7.1.3     | Rules of the debate   | 153 |
| 7.2       | The case of triangularity   | 154 |
| 7.2.1     | Locating dispositions   | 156 |
| 7.2.2     | Properties and geometries   | 158 |
| 7.3       | Background-free physical theories   | 161 |
| 7.3.1     | Displacement as a multi-track disposition   | 161 |
| 7.3.2     | Background structures and substantivalism versus relation-<br>alism                 | 162 |
| 7.3.3     | Dispositional essences and background-free physical the-<br>ories                   | 164 |
| 7.4       | Extrinsic structural properties?  | 166 |
| 7.5       | Conclusion  | 167 |
| <b>8</b>  | <b>The illusion of nomic contingency</b>  | 169 |
| 8.1       | The illusion of contingency of laws   | 172 |
| 8.1.1     | Imagining necessary falsehoods  | 172 |
| 8.1.2     | Epistemic possibility   | 175 |
| 8.2       | The unreliability of our intuitions concerning the contingency of<br>laws of nature | 176 |
| 8.3       | Kripke's strategy and the illusion of contingency                                   | 179 |
| 8.3.1     | Kripke's strategy for identity generalized  | 179 |
| 8.3.2     | The strategy applied to laws of nature  | 181 |
| 8.3.3     | Modifying Kripke's strategy   | 182 |
| 8.4       | Imagination and possibility   | 186 |
| 8.5       | Conclusion  | 187 |
| <b>9</b>  | <b>Are there any laws, and if so what are they?</b>                                 | 189 |
| 9.1       | There are no laws?  | 190 |
| 9.1.1     | Mumford's lawlessness argument in summary   | 190 |
| 9.1.2     | Must laws govern?   | 191 |
| 9.1.3     | Could laws be or supervene on potencies?  | 195 |
| 9.1.4     | Conclusion—are there laws?  | 197 |
| 9.2       | Does science use laws?  | 198 |
| 9.3       | What laws are   | 200 |
| 9.4       | Conclusion  | 202 |
| <b>10</b> | <b>Concluding remarks</b>   | 204 |
| 10.1      | Review  | 204 |
| 10.2      | Further work—natural kinds  | 208 |
| 10.3      | Further work—problems from physics  | 211 |
| 10.3.1    | The problem of fundamental constants  | 212 |

|                   |   |     |
|-------------------|---|-----|
| 10.3.2            | The problem of conservation and symmetry laws | 213 |
| 10.3.3            | The problem of least-action principles        | 214 |
| 10.3.4            | The problem of mass                           | 215 |
| 10.4              | Final comments                                | 215 |
| <b>References</b> |   | 219 |
| <b>Index</b>      |   | 226 |