

**I. Overview: competing accounts of laws of nature**

Weinert, "Laws of Nature-Laws of Science," Weinert (ed.), *Laws of Nature. Essays on the Philosophical, Scientific and Historical Dimensions* (de Gruyter, 1995), 1-52.

**II. The origins of the modern concept of laws of nature**

Zilsel, "The Genesis of the Concept of Physical Law," *Phil. Rev.* **3** (1942) 245-279.

Ruby, "The Origins of Scientific 'Law'," *J. Hist. Ideas* XLVII (1986) 341-359. Reprinted in Weinert (ed.), 289-315.

Milton, "Laws of Nature," in Garber and Ayers (eds.), *The Cambridge History of Seventeenth-Century Philosophy* (Cambridge University Press, 1998), 680-701.

**III. Regularity accounts****A. Naive regularity account**

Swartz, "The Neo-Humean Perspective: Laws as Regularities," in Weinert.(ed.), 67-91.

Armstrong, *What Is a Law of Nature?* (Cambridge University Press, 1983), Chs. 2-4.

**B. The sophisticated regularity account**

Ramsey, "Law and Causality," *Foundations: Essays in Philosophy, Logic, Mathematics and Economics* (Humanities Press, 1978).

Lewis, *Counterfactuals* (Harvard UP, 1978), 72-77.

Halpin, "Empiricism and Nomic Necessity," *Noûs* **33** (1999), 630-643.

Roberts, "'Laws of Nature' as an Indexical Term: A Reinterpretation of the Best-System Analysis," *Phil. Sci.* **66** (1999) 3(supplement), S502-S511.

van Fraassen, *Laws and Symmetry* (Oxford University Press, 1989), Ch. 3.

**IV. Must laws be Humean supervenient?**

Maudlin, "Why Be Humean?" pre-print.

Lowerer, "Humean Supervenience," *Phil. Topics* **24** (1997) 101-126.

Earman and Roberts, "Contact with the Nomic: Two Challenges for Deniers of Humean Supervenience Laws of Nature," pe-print.

Lewis, "Humean Supervenience Debugged," *Mind* **103** (1994) 473-490.

Halpin, "Legitimizing Chance: The Best System Approach to Probabilistic Laws in Physical Theory," *Aust. J. Phil* **72** (1994) 317-338.

**V. Necessitarian accounts****A. Logical necessitation**

Ewing, *Idealism: A Critical Survey* (Meuthen, 1974).

**B. Essentialist necessitation**

Shoemaker, "Causality and Properties," in van Inwagen (ed.), *Time and Cause* (D. Reidel, 1980).

Swoyer, "The Nature of Natural Laws," *Aust. J. Phil.* **60** (1982) 203-223

Bigelow, Ellis, and Lierse, "The World as One of a Kind: Natural Necessity and the Laws of Nature," *Brit. J. Phil. Sci.* **43** (1992) 371-388.

Ellis and Lierse, "Dispositional Essentialism," *Aust. J. Phil.* **72** (1994) 27-45.

Leckey and Bigelow, "The Necessitarian Perspective: Laws as Natural Entailments," in Weinert (ed.), 92-119.

**C. Contingent necessitation****(1) Popper and Kneale**

Kneale and Popper debate: reprinted as "Modern Necessity Theories" in Beauchamp (ed.), *Philosophical Problems of Causation* (Dickenson, 1974) 36-73 (Includes

Kneale, "Natural Laws and Contrary-to-Fact Conditionals," *Analysis* **10** (1950) 121-125; Popper, "A Note On Natural Laws And So-Called 'Contrary-To-Fact Conditionals'," *Mind* **58** (1949) 62-66; Popper, "Appendix \*X," *Logic of Scientific Discovery*; Kneale, "Universality and Necessity," *Brit. J. Phil. Sci.* **12** (1961) 89-102; Nerlich and Suchting, "Popper on Law and Natural Necessity," *Brit. J. Phil. Sci.* **18** (1967) 233-35; Popper, "A Revised Notion of Natural Necessity," *Brit. J. Phil. Sci.* (1967) **18** 316-21. Also Molnar, "Kneale's Argument Revisited," *Phil. Rev.* **78** (1954) 79-89; reprinted in Beauchamp (ed.), pp. 106-113.

(2) Relations between universals

Dretske, "Laws of Nature," *Phil. Sci.* **44** (1977) 248-268.

Armstrong, *What Is a Law of Nature?* Chs. 6 and 11.

Tooley, "The Nature of Laws," *Can. J. Phil.* **4** (1977) 667-689.

van Fraassen, *Law and Symmetries*, Ch. 5.

D. Modal realism

Pargeter, "Laws and Modal Realism," *Phil. Stud.* **46** (1984) 335-347.

Vallentyne, "Explicating Lawhood," *Phil. Sci.* **55** (1988) 589-613.

Mormann, "Accessibility, Kinds, and Laws: A Structural Explication," *Phil. Sci.* **61** (1994) 389-406.

V. **Laws as inference rules**

Alexander, "General Statements as Rules of Inference," *Minnesota Studies in the Philosophy of Science*, Vol. 2.

Sellars, "Inference and Meaning," *Mind* (1953) 313-338.

Musgrave, "Wittgensteinian Instrumentalism," *Theoria* **46** (1980) 65-105.

Lange, "Lawlikeness," *Nous* **27** (1993) 1-21.

Lange, *Natural Laws in Scientific Practice* (Oxford University Press, 2000).

VI. **Resiliency accounts**

Skyrms, *Causal Necessity* (Yale UP, 1980).

Skyrms and Lambert, "The Middle Ground: Resiliency and Laws in the Web of Belief," in Weinert (ed.), 139-156.

VII. **Epistemic accounts**

Urbach, "What Is a Law of Nature? A Humean Answer," *Brit. J. Phil. Sci.* **39** (1988) 193-210.

Hitchcock, "Urbach on the Laws of Nature," *Analysis* **52** (1992) 61-64.

Urbach, "Reply to Hitchcock," *Analysis* **52** (1992) 65-68.

VIII. **The imputation account**

Rescher, *Scientific Explanation* (Free Press, 1970).

IX. **The "no laws view"**

Giere, "The Skeptical Perspective: Science Without Laws of Nature," in Weinert (ed.), 120-138.

Giere, *Science without Laws* (University of Chicago Press, 1999), Ch. 5 ("Science without Laws") and Ch. 6 ("The Cognitive Structure of Scientific Theories").

Van Fraassen, *Laws and Symmetry*, Ch. 8 ("What if There Are no Laws? A Manifesto").

## X. Ceteris paribus laws

- Schiffer, "Ceteris Paribus Laws," *Mind* **100** (1991) 1-17.  
 Lange, "Natural Laws and the Problem of Provisos," *Erkenntnis* **38** (1993) 233-248.  
 Pitroski and Rey, "When Other Things Aren't Equal: Saving Ceteris Paribus Laws from Vacuity," *Brit. J. Phil. Sci.* **46** (1995) 81-110.  
 Earman and Roberts, "Ceteris Paribus There Are No Provisos," *Synthese* **118** (1999) 439-478.  
 Plus selection from a forthcoming special issue of *Erkenntnis* on ceteris paribus laws.

## XI. Are there laws in biology?

- Beatty, "The Evolutionary Contingency Thesis," in Wolters and Lennox (eds.), *Concepts, Theories, and Rationality in the Biological Sciences* (Universitätsverlag Konstanz/University of Pittsburgh Press, 1995).  
 Carrier, "Evolutionary Change and Lawlikeness," *ibid.*  
 Schaffner, "Comments on Beatty" *ibid.*  
 Lange, "Are There Natural Laws Concerning Particular Biological Species?" *J. Phil.* XCII (1995) 430-451.  
 Beatty "Why Do Biologists Argue Like They Do?" *PSA 1996*, Vol 2. S432-44  
 Brandon "Does Biology Have Laws: The Experimental Evidence," *PSA 1996*, Vol 2. S444-58.  
 Sober, "Two Outbreaks of Lawlessness in Recent Philosophy of Biology," *PSA 1996*, Vol. 2. S458-468.  
 Mitchell, "Pragmatic Law," *PSA 1996*, Vol 2. S468-79.  
 Waters, "Causal Regularities in the Biological World of Contingent Distributions," *Bio. Phil.* **13** (1998) 5-36.

## XII. Laws, symmetries, and conservation principles in physics

- Van Fraassen, *Laws and Symmetry*, Ch 10 ("Symmetry Arguments in Science and Metaphysics") and Ch. 11 ("Symmetries Guiding Modern Science").  
 Morrison, "The New Aspect: Symmetries as Meta-Laws," in Weinert (ed.) 157-188.  
 Kosso, "Symmetry Arguments in Physics," *Stud. Hist. Phil. Sci* **30** (1999) 479-492.  
 Kosso, "The Empirical Status of Symmetries in Physics," *Brit. J. Phil. Sci.* **51** (2000) 81-98.  
 Earman, "Once More General Covariance," pre-print.  
 Nozick, *Invariances: The Structure of the Objective World* (Harvard University Press, 2001).