

Contents

1	Introduction	1
2	Meta-philosophical Preliminaries	5
1	Describing Biological Practice	9
1.1	Descriptive Adequacy	9
1.2	Methodological Naturalism	10
1.3	Bottom-up Philosophy of Science	12
1.4	The Data to Be Captured.....	13
2	Descriptive vs. Normative Projects in Philosophy of Science	14
3	Why Pure Description Is Not Enough	19
3.1	Focusing on Relevant Data	20
3.2	Explicating Underlying Assumptions	20
3.3	Establishing Coherence.....	21
3.4	Methodological Normativity.....	22
4	How Much Pluralism Do We Need?	24
4.1	Two Senses of Non-universality	24
4.2	Balancing Specificity Against Generality	25
4.3	The Pluralist’s Response	26
5	Philosophy of Science: Descriptive and Normative at Once?.....	28
5.1	Epistemic Norms in Science	30
5.2	Dimensions of Normativity.....	31
5.3	The Normative Part of Descriptive-Normative Projects	34
5.4	A Dilemma.....	35
5.5	How Normative My Account Is	37
6	The Relevance of Philosophy to Science	39
7	Interim Conclusion.....	40

3	Drawing Lessons from the Previous Debate	43
1	First Lesson: Understanding Reduction Before Disputing About Reductionism	44
2	Second Lesson: It Is Epistemology that Matters Most	49
2.1	Ontological and Epistemic Reduction	50
2.2	Relations Between Ontological and Epistemic Issues	59
2.3	Why Epistemic Issues Matter Most	64
3	Third Lesson: Tell Apart Different Types of Reduction.....	66
3.1	Theory Reduction.....	67
3.2	Methodological Reduction.....	71
3.3	Explanatory Reduction.....	81
3.4	Successional vs. Interlevel Reduction.....	81
4	Fourth Lesson: It Is Time to Move beyond Nagelian Reduction	84
4.1	Clarifying the Object of Criticism	84
4.2	Why Not Abandon the Syntactic View of Theories?	86
4.3	The Inadequacy of Nagel's Model to Biology	87
5	Interim Conclusion.....	92
4	Two Perspectives on Explanatory Reduction	95
1	First Perspective: Reduction as a Relation between Two Explanations.....	98
1.1	Darwinian Reductionism	99
1.2	Rosenberg's Notion of Explanatory Reduction	105
1.3	Shortcomings of Rosenberg's Perspective	107
2	Second Perspective: Individual Reductive Explanations	110
2.1	First Insights.....	111
2.2	Sarkar's Analysis of Reduction in Genetics.....	113
2.3	Hüttemann's and Love's Three Aspects of Reductive Explanation.....	121
3	Interim Conclusion.....	132
5	A Closer Look at Biological Explanations	135
1	Accounts of Explanation.....	138
1.1	Covering-Law (CL) Model	139
1.2	Causal-Mechanical (CM) Model	140
2	What Makes a Conception of Explanation Ontic?.....	145
3	Explanation and Explanatory Reduction	150
3.1	Different Questions	150
3.2	Some Matters of Terminology	152
4	Explanation and Disputes About Reductionism	154
4.1	Which Questions About Explanation Are Relevant to Reductionism?	154
4.2	Why the Reductionism Dispute Amounts to a Dispute About Explanation	159

4.3	Pragmatic Dimensions of Explanation.....	161
4.4	Is There a “Right” Level of Explanation?.....	167
5	Interim Conclusion.....	170
6	The Ontic Account of Explanatory Reduction	173
1	Preliminaries	175
1.1	My Account of Biological Parthood	175
1.2	Levels as Determined by Part-Whole Relations and Kinds	181
1.3	The Methodology of My Account.....	186
2	Lower-Level Character	188
2.1	Starting with Molecular Biology	189
2.2	Unidirectional Flow of Explanation.....	192
2.3	Exclusion of Higher-Level Factors	194
2.4	Subtypes of Lower-Level Explanation.....	200
3	Focusing on Internal Factors.....	210
3.1	The Internal Character of Reductive Explanations	211
3.2	Distinguishing the Internal from the Lower-Level Character	215
3.3	Simplifying the Environment.....	217
4	Parts in Isolation	221
4.1	Isolating Parts from Their Original Context	223
4.2	Treating Biological Systems as Nearly Decomposable	229
5	Part-Whole, Mechanistic, and Reductive Explanation	236
5.1	Part-Whole Explanation.....	237
5.2	Mechanistic Explanation.....	238
6	The Ontic Character of My Account.....	242
7	Interim Conclusion.....	244
7	Conclusion	247
	References.....	259
	Index.....	273