

CONTENTS

| | |
|---|-----|
| 1. Introduction: Criminal Law's Three Conduct Requirements | 1 |
| Part I. Basic Acts and the Act Requirement | |
| 2. The Doctrinal Unity of the Act Requirement | 17 |
| 1. Does Criminal Law Have an Act Requirement? | 17 |
| 2. Does Criminal Law Have One, Several, or Many Act Requirements? | 38 |
| 3. The Orthodox View of the Act Requirement and Its Normative Defence | 44 |
| 1. A Preliminary Overview of the Act Requirement | 44 |
| 2. A Normative Defence of the Act Requirement | 46 |
| 4. The Metaphysics of Basic Acts I: The Existence of Actions | 60 |
| 1. Do Purported Descriptions of Action Not Refer? | 61 |
| 2. The Supposedly Shadowy Existence of Events | 65 |
| 3. Human Actions as a Natural Kind of Events | 73 |
| 5. The Metaphysics of Basic Acts II: The Identity of Actions with Bodily Movements | 78 |
| 1. The Identity Thesis: At Least Some Acts (the Basic Ones) Are Identical to Bodily Movements | 78 |
| 2. The Exclusivity Thesis: All Acts Are Identical to Bodily Movements | 109 |

| | |
|---|-----|
| 6. The Metaphysics of Basic Acts III: Volitions as the Essential Source of Actions | 113 |
| 1. Clarifying the Mental-Cause Thesis | 113 |
| 2. The Argument for Volitions | 133 |
| 3. The Arguments against Volitions | 155 |
| | |
| Part II. Complex Action Descriptions and the <i>Actus Reus</i> Requirement | |
| 7. The Doctrinal Basis of the <i>Actus Reus</i> Requirement | 169 |
| 1. The Problem of Borders | 171 |
| 2. Interpretivist Scepticism | 183 |
| 8. Unity in Complex Action Description and in the <i>Actus Reus</i> Requirement | 189 |
| 1. Describing Actions | 192 |
| 2. The Structure of Complex Descriptions of Action | 195 |
| 3. Are All Complex Descriptions of Actions Used in the Criminal Law at least Causally Complex? | 213 |
| 4. Are All Causally Complex Descriptions of Actions Equivalent to Descriptions of Basic Acts Causing Further States of Affairs? | 225 |
| 9. The Normative Basis for the <i>Actus Reus</i> Requirement | 239 |
| 10. The Metaphysics of Complex Actions I: The Dependence of Complex Actions on Basic Acts | 245 |
| 1. Non-willed ('Involuntary') Movements as Complex Actions? | 248 |
| 2. Willings without Bodily Movements as Complex Actions? | 262 |
| 3. Non-willed Non-Bodily Movements as Complex Actions? | 278 |

| | |
|--|-----|
| 11. The Metaphysics of Complex Actions II: The Identity of Complex Actions with Basic Acts | 280 |
| 1. The Metaphysical Issue of Identifying Every Complex Act-Token with Some Basic Act-Token | 280 |
| 2. The Legal Locatability of Actions | 293 |
| | |
| Part III. The Identity Conditions of Actions and the Double Jeopardy Requirement | |
| 12. The Doctrinal and Normative Basis of the Double Jeopardy Requirement | 305 |
| 1. The Double Jeopardy Doctrines and their Rationale | 306 |
| 2. An Introduction to the Doctrinal, Normative, and Metaphysical Scepticisms about Double Jeopardy | 317 |
| - | |
| 13. Legal, Moral, and Metaphysical Notions of the 'Sameness' of Action-Types | 325 |
| 1. Three Approaches to Act-Type Individuation | 325 |
| 2. Adjudicating between the Three Approaches to Serve the Purposes of Double Jeopardy | 350 |
| 14. Legal, Moral, and Metaphysical Notions of the 'Sameness' of Act-Tokens | 356 |
| 1. Agent-Relative and Victim-Relative Individuation of Morally Wrongful Act-Types | 356 |
| 2. The Metaphysics of Act-Token Individuation | 365 |
| 3. Restricting the Metaphysical Enquiry so as to Serve the Purposes of Double Jeopardy | 383 |
| References | 391 |
| Index | 405 |