

Leeway vs. Sourcehood Conceptions of Free Will (for the *Routledge Companion to Free Will*)

Kevin Timpe

1 Introduction

One reason that many of the philosophical debates about free will might seem intractable is that different participants in those debates use various terms in ways that not only don't line up, but might even contradict each other. For instance, it is widely accepted to understand libertarianism as “the conjunction of incompatibilism [the thesis that free will is incompatible with the truth of determinism] and the thesis that we have free will” (van Inwagen (1983), 13f; see also Kane (2001), 17; Pereboom (2006), xiv). However, for van Inwagen's later reservations about the use of the term ‘libertarianism’, see van Inwagen (2008), relevant pages). This makes perplexing a number of views that have the name ‘libertarian compatibilism’ (see Vihvelin (2000) and Arvan (2013)) as on the standard use of the terms involved, the name appears to involve a contradiction.

Even the meaning and usage of the term ‘free will’ is itself contested. Manuel Vargas writes that “‘free will’ is a term of both ordinary and technical discourse” (Vargas (2013), 325). However, it is not clear if the ordinary use of the term always tracks the technical use. But in an influential paper on “How to Think about About the Problem of Free Will,” Peter van Inwagen claims that “the phrase ‘free will’ . . . hardly exists except as a philosophical term of art. Its non-philosophical uses are pretty much confined to the phrase ‘of his/her own free will’ which means ‘uncoerced’” (van Inwagen (2008), 320 footnote 1). To many of us, a look at the philosophical and literatures of the past millennium suggest a use that need not be a technical notion, even if it is often used in a technical way.

No matter how this debate about the ‘ordinary use’ of the phrase turns out, recognizing that ‘free will’ gets used in different ways and being careful in such usage is important in order to avoid what Chalmers has called ‘merely verbal disputes’ (Chalmers (2011)).

For this reason, we want to be very clear in how we understand and define free will. There seem to be at least two different fundamental notions of what free will is in the contemporary literature. The first of these, which seems to have garnered the most attention in the last century, works under the assumption that for a person to rightly be said to have free will, she must have the ability

to do otherwise than what she does, in fact, do. Under this view I could be said to have freely chosen to drive to work only if I also could have freely chosen, for example, to bike to work or to skip work altogether. This approach to free will is referred to as a ‘leeway-based approach’ (cite my book) or an ‘alternative-possibilities approach’ (see Sartorio (2016).)

In contrast, a smaller percentage of the extant literature focuses primarily on the issues of ‘source,’ ‘ultimacy,’ and ‘origination’. This second approach doesn’t focus immediately on the presence or absence of alternative possibilities. On this approach, I freely choose to drive to work only if I am the source of my choice and there is nothing outside of me from which the choice is ultimately derived. In what follows, we refer to the first of these conceptions—the conception that free will is primarily a matter of having alternative possibilities—as the ‘leeway-based’ conception. Similarly, we will refer to the second of these conceptions—that free will is primarily a matter of our being the source of our choices in a particular way—as the ‘sourcehood’ conception. (John Fischer and Carolina Sartorio refers to sourcehood views as ‘actual sequence’ views; see Fischer (2006) and Sartorio (2016)).

Both of these notions can be seen in the following passage taken from Robert Kane:

We believe we have free will when we view ourselves as agents capable of influencing the world in various ways. Open alternatives, or alternative possibilities, seem to lie before us. We reason and deliberate among them and choose. We feel (1) it is ‘up to us’ what we choose and how we act; and this means we could have chosen or acted otherwise. As Aristotle noted: when acting is ‘up to us,’ so is not acting. This ‘up-to-us-ness’ also suggests (2) the ultimate control of our actions lies in us and not outside us in factors beyond our control (Kane (2005), 6).

In the next two sections, I look in greater detail at each of these two approaches to the nature of free will, and how they each seek to approach what it means for an action to be ‘up to us’. I also show how the differences between these two conceptions cut across the debate about what Kane refers to as the Compatibility Question: “Is free will compatible with determinism?” (Kane (1996), 13). Along the way, I also briefly point out a number of ways how which of these conceptions is at work shapes how one engages various arguments and other issues regarding free will that are treated in greater detail elsewhere in this volume.

2 Leeway-based Conceptions

As mentioned above, the vast majority of the contemporary free-will literature focuses on the first of these two conceptions. This conception is so prevalent that Joseph Keim Campbell calls it “the classical view” (Campbell (2011), 5) and John Martin Fischer refers to it as the traditional view: “Traditionally

the most influential view about the sort of freedom necessary and sufficient for moral responsibility posits that this sort of freedom involves the availability of genuinely open alternative possibilities at certain key points in one's life" (Fischer (1999), 99). Much of the discussion of free will in the second half of the 20th century clearly evidences a concern with leeway and the ability to do otherwise. Consider the following quotations:

When I am said to have done something of my own free will it is implied that I could have acted otherwise. . . . To say that I could have done otherwise is to say, first, that I should have acted otherwise if I had so chosen; secondly, that my action was voluntary in the sense in which the actions, say, of the kleptomaniac are not; and thirdly, that nobody compelled me to choose as I did: and these three conditions may very well be fulfilled. When they are fulfilled, I may be said to have acted freely. . . . It may be said of the agent that he would have acted otherwise if the causes of his action had been different (Ayer (1997), 110, 117, and 100).

It seems to be generally agreed that the concept of free will should be understood in terms of the *power* or *ability* of agents to act otherwise than they in fact do (van Inwagen (1983), 162).

These examples could be multiplied quite easily.

While many philosophers approach free will presupposing the leeway conception, some go so far as to define free will as one of these two conditions. Peter van Inwagen, for instance, writes that "to be able to have acted otherwise is to have free will" (van Inwagen (1983), 162) thereby identifying free will with the having of alternative possibilities condition. Similarly, Randolph Clarke writes: "I shall say that when an agent acts freely (or with free will), she is able to do other than what she does" (Clarke (2003), 3). I think that the fact that there are two competing concepts of free will gives us good reason to resist this practice. For, as will be discussed at below, it is a contentious issue whether the satisfaction of the alternative-possibilities condition is required for moral responsibility. We could, of course, reserve the use of 'free will' to mean the alternative-possibilities condition, and use some other term or phrase to refer to the kind of control required for moral responsibility. Some in the literature already use the term 'the control condition' in just this way. But I find this way of speaking to be clumsy and awkward. Consider also John Fischer's 'semi-compatibilist' position (more on this view below). On the semi-compatibilist's view, satisfaction of the alternative-possibilities condition—which he often refers to as 'regulative control'—is not required for moral responsibility, but another kind of control—'guidance control'—is required for moral responsibility (?). Fischer writes: "moral responsibility does not require the sort of control that involves genuine metaphysical access to alternative possibilities ('regulative control'). Rather, 'guidance control' is the freedom-relevant condition necessary and sufficient for moral responsibility" (Fischer (2005), 148). The substantial influence of Fischer's view on the contemporary free-will literature gives

us another reason to resist equating free will with the alternative-possibilities condition at the very beginning.

2.1 Leeway-based Compatibilism

As indicated above, we grant that this conception has been the dominant approach for much of the last century, even among compatibilists. In his contribution to this volume, Berofsky differentiates a number of subspecies of leeway compatibilism:

Leeway compatibilism is the weak view that freedom is constituted by the presence of these multiple opportunities for action and determinism would certainly seem to be compatible with freedom in this sense. But the more interesting position is the stronger claim that freedom is constituted by the *power to take advantage* of these opportunities. Since, obviously, the agent has the power to act as he does, the crucial component of freedom is the power to act otherwise, so-called counterfactual power” (XXXX).

The exact role that alternative possibilities play on these sorts of compatibilist views will depend on the details of the view under consideration.

David Lewis’ “Are We Free to Break the Laws” is an influential instance of leeway-based compatibilism. There Lewis is primarily concerned with what he calls ‘soft determinism,’ the view that “sometimes one freely does what one is [causally] predetermined to do; and that in such a case one is able to act otherwise though past history and the laws of nature determine that one will not act otherwise” (Lewis (1981), 113). Though he himself thinks that causal determinism is false, Lewis thinks that soft determinism is possibly true. Insofar as he thinks that there is at least one possible world where determinism is true and agents in that world still have the ability to do otherwise, his view can be seen as a form of leeway compatibilism. Lewis holds that if a determined agent had done otherwise, a miracle would have been involved. (For this reason, his view is referred to as ‘local miracle compatibilism’.) But he distinguishes two different ways this claim can be understood. The weaker of the two claims is that in virtue of being free an agent is able to do something such that, if she were to do it, a law of nature would be broken. The stronger claim, which Lewis rejects, is that the agent is able to break a law of nature.

The ability to do such that a miracle would have been performed is not the only, or even the leading, form of leeway compatibilism. Consider what Peter van Inwagen refers to as ‘conditionalism’ (van Inwagen (1983), 114) and others refer to as the conditional analysis. According to conditionalism, the proposition ‘an agent could have done other than A’ is to be understood along the lines of ‘the agent would have done other than A if some condition C had been fulfilled.’ One way of specifying condition C is with ‘had the agent willed or chosen to do so’. For example, G. E. Moore writes that “[t]here are certainly good reasons for thinking that we very often mean by ‘could’ merely ‘would, if so and so had chosen’. And if so, then we have a sense of the word ‘could’ in

which the fact that we often could have done what we did not do, is perfectly compatible with the principle that everything has a cause” (Moore (1912), 131). And Ayer’s commitment to conditionalism can be seen in the quotation above in the previous section. If the ability to do otherwise is to be understood as Moore, Ayer, and other proponents of conditionalism understand it, then given that the conditional could be true even if the antecedent of that conditional were determined to be false, having the ability to do otherwise would still be compatible with the truth of causal determinism.

However, such subjunctive accounts of the ability to do otherwise are thought by many to be a weakness in this sort of compatibilist position. Though a compatibilist himself, Michael McKenna describes the situation as follows:

Compatibilists were shouldered with the burden of crafting fancy counterfactual theories of agential ability, many of which were regarded as no more than one click away from smoke and mirrors. (And short of alchemy, smoke and mirrors is about the best one can offer.) (McKenna (2005), 163)

Conditionalism’s analysis of the ability to do otherwise will only succeed if the antecedent is fulfillable by the agent.

However, if determinism is true, then whatever is used to fill in the antecedent of the conditional will be false precisely because it is determined to be false:

I could not have decided, willed, chosen or desired otherwise than I in fact did. . . . We will then want to know whether the causes of those inner states were within my control; and so on, ad infinitum. We are, at each step, permitted to say ‘could have been otherwise’ only in a provisional sense . . . but must retract it and replace it with ‘could not have been otherwise’ as soon as we discover, as we must at each step, that whatever would have to have been different could not have been different (Taylor (1963), 44).

It is for this sort of reason that numerous incompatibilists have argued that such accounts are ‘absurd’ and ‘incoherent’. And though compatibilist themselves, the above considerations have led John Martin Fischer to write that conditionalism “has fatal problems” (Fischer (2007), 50); similarly, Joseph Campbell says that it is “prone to clear and decisive counterexamples” (Campbell (2011), 88).

More recently, the leading leeway compatibilist views are dispositional in nature. At the heart of dispositional compatibilist views is the claim that free will is primarily a (or set of) dispositional causal power(s). Having the relevant dispositions is consistent with the truth of determinism since determinism doesn’t rule out dispositional powers. (Even if determinism is true, the glass is still fragile if it is disposed to break when struck.) And these dispositional powers also get us the ability to do otherwise. As Kadri Vihvelin says in her contribution to this volume,

We have the free will we think we have, including the freedom of action we think we have in situations where we make a choice between courses of action that are genuine alternatives for us, by having some bundle of abilities and being in the right kind of surroundings—the surroundings that are test cases for the relevant dispositions... On my view, these commonsense beliefs are true in virtue of the facts about my abilities and my surroundings. I was free to decide otherwise because I had and exercised the ability to decide, on the basis of deliberation, whether to get the coffee or continue typing. (XXXX)

Further discussion of dispositional compatibilist views can be found there.

2.2 Leeway-based Incompatibilism

I will refer to those incompatibilists who endorse a leeway based conception of free will as ‘leeway incompatibilists’. Leeway incompatibilists are thus those incompatibilists who think that having alternative possibilities is at the heart of free will. Given that the incompatibilist thinks that free will requires there to be indeterminism in the world, it should not be surprising that many incompatibilists have focused on the ability to do otherwise. Van Inwagen’s view, mentioned above, is probably the best-known leeway incompatibilist view.

This conception has been central to some of the most influential arguments for incompatibilism (e.g., I think a leeway conception is at the heart of the Consequence Argument), and a leeway based understanding has been reinforced by the importance and influence of those arguments. Another important motivation for leeway-based approaches is the Kantian-inspired ‘ought implies can’ principle. For those who think of free will as necessary for moral responsibility, it might seem that an agent can only be obligated to perform a particular action if she can perform it. If an agent is blameworthy for doing something that she ought not to have done (or is blameworthy for not doing something that she ought to have done), then the ‘ought implies can’ principle requires that she could have refrained from doing it (or could have done what she refrained from doing). Davids Widerker and Copp each have arguments that the need for leeway follows from the ‘ought implies can’ principle (in Widerker/McKenna volume, and those cited in notes 2 and 3 there). Briefly considered, suppose that Emmaline does something blameworthy such that she ought to have refrained from doing it. According to the Kantian dictum, saying that she ought to have refrained entails that she could have refrained. But Emmaline could not have refrained, according to the incompatibilist, unless her refraining was consistent with the conjunction of the past and the laws of nature. But if she did a blameworthy action and, when she did so, it was consistent with the conjunction of the past and the laws of nature that she refrained from performing that very act, then Emmaline has alternative possibilities regarding the action in question. And the point about this action generalizes to all morally responsible actions.

Whereas ‘ought implies can’ might be seen as suggesting a leeway-approach, it has also contributed to the prevalence of the Luck and *Mind* arguments against

leeway-based libertarian views. The basic idea here is that if an event is undetermined, then nothing made it happen. And if nothing made an event happen, then the agent in question couldn't control that event: an action cannot be both a matter of luck and under the agent's control. Similarly the Mind Argument argument argues directly from the leeway that indeterminism provides to the lack of free will. (For a further discussion of these arguments, see Franklin's chapter in this volume on 'the Luck and *Mind* Arguments'; as Franklin there notes, the Luck Argument isn't restricted to libertarian views.)

The mere possibility of something else happening would seem to undermine rather than enhance control, and thus it's hard to see how alternative possibilities could be the heart of free will. As Fischer noted in an early paper on incompatibilist responses to Frankfurt-cases, “[f]or the agent to have control, in the relevant sense, there must be an alternate sequence in which the agent does otherwise as a result of an appropriate sort of chain of events” (Fischer (1982), 31; see also Timpe (2012), chapter 10). Rather than merely having alternative possibilities, many think that in order to be relevant to the agent's free will, the remaining alternative possibilities must be under the control of the agent in some appropriate way. Insofar as it is an incompatibilist theory, whatever it is about the agent in virtue of which she controls what alternative possibility becomes actual will have to be something that is not causally determined by anything outside of her. Most often, the language used at this point is that of the agent being the ‘source’ of the action, or the action ‘originating’ in the agent in some particular way, or the agent ‘initiating’ the choice, or the outcome ‘ultimately’ being up to the agent.

3 Sourcehood Conceptions

In part because of the kinds of considerations raised above regarding both leeway compatibilism and leeway incompatibilism, it is not clear that the having of alternative possibilities, as per leeway-based approaches, is central to the very nature of free will. One reason is that it does not seem that the mere having of alternative possibilities will be sufficient for free will, since to say what ‘could have happened instead’ doesn't address why what happened did happen. A number of philosophers, incompatibilists and compatibilists alike, therefore reject leeway-based approaches and advocate instead for views according to which being the ‘source’ of the action in the relevant way is more fundamental. (I say ‘more fundamental’ because some source-based theorists think that satisfying the sourcehood condition on free will will entail also satisfying some alternative possibilities condition. See, for instance Timpe (2012), chapter 9. There also could be views according to which alternatives and sourcehood are equally fundamental. See Tognazzini (2011) for a relevant discussion, including five different formulations of the fundamental source incompatibilist thesis.) Of course, specifying what is required for ‘being the source in the right way’ is contested.

3.1 Source Incompatibilism

Derk Pereboom nicely captures why some incompatibilists endorse source-based views as follows:

I oppose a type of incompatibilism according to which the availability of alternative possibilities is the most important factor for explaining moral responsibility, and accept instead a variety that ascribes the most significant explanatory role to the way in which the agent actually produces the action. In metaphysical terms, the sort of free will required for moral responsibility does not consist most fundamentally in the availability of alternative possibilities, but rather in the agent's being the causal source of her action in a specific way (Pereboom (2013), 421).

And Michael McKenna writes as follows: "Source incompatibilists hold that determinism does rule out free will. But it does so, not because it rules out alternative possibilities, but instead, because, if true, the sources of an agent's actions do not originate in the agent but are traceable to factors outside her" (McKenna (2003), 201). And McKenna has more recently written, "the core [source] incompatibilist thought is that an agent is the ultimate cause of his action only if he contributes some necessary ingredient to it that cannot be traced back to causally sufficient conditions obtaining independently of him" (McKenna (2010), 437. He, of course, doesn't endorse such a position).

Robert Kane's view is the most worked out source incompatibilist view (see Kane (1996), Kane (2005)), and his view has shaped the views of many other source incompatibilists (see Goetz (2011) and Timpe (2012)). It is plausible that the sourcehood condition is more important for free will than the mere having of alternatives for libertarianism, though I think the relationship between the sourcehood condition and the alternative-possibilities condition is complex. As I've argued elsewhere (Timpe (2012), chapter 9), it may be that satisfying the sourcehood condition, on the assumption of incompatibilism, at any time will entail satisfying some alternative possibilities condition at that or an earlier time (for reasons related to tracing). For if, again on the assumption of incompatibilism, an agent is the source of her action, then it will be an action that is not causally determined. And if it's not causally determined, then there will be two or more alternative possibilities compatible with the state of the universe immediately prior to the agent's origination of her action. (See also Zagzebski (2000) and Zagzebski (2014) for related arguments; for a slightly different take on what makes a view an actual-sequence view, see CS's NEW BOOK, chapter 1.) And proponents of agent-causation, most but not all of whom are incompatibilists, will "understand sourcehood in terms of an agent's literally being the uncaused cause of his or her actions" (Tognazzini (2011), 74.)

3.2 Source Compatibilism

Both of the leading contemporary compatibilist accounts of free will are best understood as source-based views. (These views are dealt with in more detail elsewhere in this volume. See the chapters by Fischer and Jaworska.) Consider Harry Frankfurt's hierarchical compatibilism. On an early version of this view, a person has free will (or what Frankfurt calls 'freedom of the will') if she has second-order volitions in the actual sequence—that is, if she has a desire that certain other of her desires actually move her to action—and if those second-order volitions mesh with her first-order desires. Just as freedom of action is being able to do what one wants to do, freedom of the will is being able to have the kind of will that one wants to have. It is for this reason that Frankfurt's account is often called a 'structural' or 'hierarchical' account, since he understands freedom of the will to be primarily a function of having a certain kind of structural or hierarchical mesh between one's first- and second-order desires and volitions.

A wants the desire to X to be the desire that moves him effectively to act. It is not merely that he wants the desire to X to be among his desires by which, to one degree or another, he is moved or inclined to act. He wants this desire to be effective—that is, to provide the motive in what he actually does (Frankfurt (1988), 15).

On this view, having free will is primarily a function of having that choice's source be located in the agent in a particular way—namely if the first-order volition meshes with the agent's second-order desire for the first-order desire to become a volition. And since having the will one wants to have is independent of whether one could have had a different will, Frankfurt's account isn't based on an alternative-possibilities condition. A natural way of understanding Frankfurt's view at this point is as involving a certain kind of sourcehood condition, which might be put as follows:

a person wills freely only if he wills in a way that is consistent with a second-order desire.

This early way of putting it was criticized by, among others, Gary Watson: "Since second-order desires are themselves simply desires, to add them to the context of a conflict is just to increase the number of contenders; it is not to give a special place to any of those in contention" (Watson (1975), 218). In response to this kind of criticism, Frankfurt later came to add that wholehearted identification was also necessary. Wholehearted identification, for Frankfurt, does not require the complete absence of conflicts among an agent's desires. Rather, Frankfurt understands that an agent can be wholehearted even if his desires conflict so long as he decisively identifies with one of these desires and separates himself from the other. As Frankfurt puts it, "the conflict between the desires is in this way transformed into a conflict between one of them and the person who has identified himself with its rival" (Frankfurt (1988), 172). In earlier work, I described Frankfurt's view as follows:

According to Frankfurt, a person chooses freely only if he chooses in a way that is consistent with a second-order desire that he wholeheartedly identifies with—that is, if the source of that volition is a desire with which the agent unwaveringly aligns himself (Timpe (2012), 125).

Since Frankfurt grounds freedom of the will in the agent’s choice originating in his volitional structure in a particular way, not only is free will internal to the agent’s volitional structure but it more specifically involves the source of the agent’s first-order volitions being located in those second-order desires with which she identifies.

Similarly, John Martin Fischer’s view (developed originally with Mark Ravizza) is also best viewed as a form of source compatibilism. Fischer calls his view ‘semi-compatibilism’; by this he means that the truth of causal determinism is compatible with moral responsibility even if causal determinism ends up being incompatible with a certain kind of freedom. Fischer differentiates between two kinds of control: guidance control and regulative control. Regulative control involves alternative possibilities. And while Fischer thinks that “it’s natural to think that we need alternatives in order to be responsible” (Fischer (2000a), 326), for reasons that have to do with Frankfurt-style examples, he does not think that this is the kind of freedom or control needed for moral responsibility. Instead, what is required here is guidance control, which is best understood as a form of sourcehood.

Fischer’s discussion of guidance control is extensive, but we can focus here on the two central aspects that he thinks are needed for an agent to have guidance control. “Guidance control of one’s behavior has two components: the behavior must issue from one’s own mechanism, and this mechanism must be appropriately responsive to reasons” (Fischer (2002), 307). The responsiveness that Fischer and Ravizza take to be required here requires that the agent act on a mechanism that is moderately reasons responsive.

The second requirement for guidance control is that the agent takes responsibility for the reasons-responsive mechanism that results in his choices; that is, that the mechanism is his own or one for which he has taken responsibility. This feature of Fischer’s view marks an important difference with Frankfurt. Recall that on Frankfurt’s view, all that is needed is the right sort of hierarchical mesh among an agent’s desires, including wholehearted identification. Numerous philosophers have objected to this feature of Frankfurt’s account, since they think it leads to the conclusion that manipulation need not undermine control. Frankfurt himself admits that manipulated agents could still be free: a “manipulator may succeed, through his interventions, in providing a person not merely with particular feelings and thoughts but with a new character. That person is then morally responsible for the choices and the conduct to which this character leads” (Frankfurt (2002), 28). However, Fischer is sensitive to this worry:

I think that manipulation cases are a compatibilist’s dirty little secret. Compatibilists don’t like to admit that this is a problem. . . .

[But] we compatibilists have to deal with this. In my view, honestly, Harry Frankfurt really has not addressed this problem. He has discussed it in different ways and in different places and it doesn't add up to much (Fischer (2000b), 390).

One can think of Fischer's ownership requirement as an attempt to avoid the problems regarding manipulation besetting Frankfurt's account: "the mere existence of a mesh is not sufficient for [the kind of freedom required for] moral responsibility; the history behind the mesh is also relevant" (Fischer and Ravizza (1998), 196).

Rather than primarily focusing on the mesh within an agent's volitional structure, Fischer thinks responsibility must involve the agent's taking responsibility. This involves three related elements:

Taking responsibility involves three elements. First, the agent must see that his choices have certain effects in the world—that is, he must see himself as the source of consequences in the world (in certain circumstances). Second, the individual must see that he is a fair target for the reactive attitudes as a result of how he affects the world. Third, the views specified in the first two conditions—that the individual can affect the external world in certain characteristic ways through his choices, and that he can be fairly praised and/or blamed for so exercising his agency—must be based on his evidence in an appropriate way (Fischer (2006), 224).

Putting these various elements together, we can understand Fischer's view as follows:

According to Fischer, a person chooses freely only if he chooses as he does

1. because of an appropriately reasons-responsive mechanism, and
2. he sees that mechanism as his own in an appropriate way.

We might think of these two aspects as respectively insisting on the agent having the right kind of reasons-responsiveness and the right history behind that reasons-responsiveness. Taken together, these two aspects clearly mark it as a sourcehood approach—or as Fischer often puts it, an "actual-sequence" approach to free will and moral responsibility.

Here, the goal hasn't been to criticize either Frankfurt's or Fischer's view (though see Timpe (2012), chapter 8). Rather, the aim was to show how both of these exceedingly influential contemporary compatibilist accounts are best seen as focusing on sourcehood rather than leeway.

4 Conclusion

In the previous sections, I've explored both leeway and sourcehood conceptions of free will, and how each aims to account for what it means for an action to be

‘up to us’. I’ve also shown how this division is orthogonal to the Compatibility Question.

In closing, it should also be noted that which of these two fundamental conceptions of free will is assumed makes a difference to how one evaluates some of the most influential arguments regarding the relationship between free will and the truth of causal determinism. A number of these connections have already been made, such as the connection between leeway and the Luck and *Mind* arguments. And though I haven’t here made the case, I think that a similar claim could be defended regarding the Consequence Argument (see the chapter by Campbell). Furthermore, the ability to do otherwise that is at the heart of leeway-based approaches has led to the monumentous literature devoted to Frankfurt-style counterexamples to the Principle of Alternative Possibilities. See Carolina Sartorio’s chapter in this volume for more on these examples and the role they play in adjudicating leeway vs. sourcehood views. As she notes there, a key role that these kinds of cases involve is in terms of “motivating an alternative view of freedom, one that is not at all based on the availability of alternative possibilities, but only on the relevant *actual sequences* or actual explanations of behavior” (XXXX). This alternative is, of course, sourcehood. For a treatment of the central role that causation plays in a source-based view, see Sartorio (2016).

So while I think that the Compatibiliy Question is an important question that will rightly continue to attract attention in the contemporary debates about the nature of free will, there are other issues that also deserve continued attention—including, I would say, whether free will is ultimately understood along the lines of leeway or sourcehood.¹

¹I’d like to thank Meghan Griffith, Neal Tognazzini, and Paul Franks for helpful comments on earlier drafts of this chapter.

References

- Arvan, Marcus. 2013. "A New Theory of Free Will." *Philosophical Forum* 44:1–48.
- Ayer, A. J. 1997. "Freedom and Necessity." In Derk Pereboom (ed.), *Free Will*, 110–118. Indianapolis, IN: Hackett.
- Campbell, Joseph Keim. 2011. *Free Will*. Polity.
- Chalmers, David. 2011. "Verbal Disputes." *Philosophical Review* 120:515–566.
- Clarke, Randolph. 2003. *Libertarian Accounts of Free Will*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Fischer, John Martin. 1982. "Responsibility and Control." *The Journal of Philosophy* 79:24–40.
- . 1999. "Recent Work on Moral Responsibility." *Ethics* 110:93–139.
- . 2000a. "Problems with Actual-Sequence Incompatibilism." *Journal of Ethics* 4:323–328.
- . 2000b. "Responsibility, History, and Manipulation." *Journal of Ethics* 4.
- . 2002. "Frankfurt-type Examples and Semi-compatibilism." In Robert Kane (ed.), *The Oxford Handbook of Free Will*, 281–308. New York: Oxford University Press.
- . 2005. "Reply: the Free Will Revolution." *Philosophical Explorations* 8:145–56.
- . 2006. *My Way: Essays on Moral Responsibility*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- . 2007. "Compatibilism." In Derk Pereboom John Martin Fischer, Robert Kane and Manuel Vargas (eds.), *Four Views on Free Will*, 44–84. Blackwell.
- Fischer, John Martin and Ravizza, Mark. 1998. *Responsibility and Control*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Frankfurt, Harry. 1988. *The Importance of What We Care About*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- . 2002. "Reply to John Martin Fischer." In Sarah Buss and Lee Overton (eds.), *Countours of Agency: Essays on Themes from Harry Frankfurt*, 27–32. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Goetz, Steward. 2011. *Freedom, Teleology, and Evil*. London: Continuum.

- Kane, Robert. 1996. *The Significance of Free Will*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- . 2001. “Introduction.” In Robert Kane (ed.), *Free Will*. Malden, MA: Blackwell.
- . 2005. *A Contemporary Introduction to Free Will*. Oxford University Press.
- Lewis, David. 1981. “Are We Free to Break the Laws?” *Theoria* 47:113–121.
- McKenna, Michael. 2003. “Robustness, Control, and the Demand for Morally Significant Alternatives: Frankfurt Examples with Oodles and Oodles of Alternatives.” In David Widerker and Michael McKenna (eds.), *Moral Responsibility and Alternative Possibilities: Essays on the Importance of Alternative Possibilities*, 201–17. Burlington, VT: Ashgate.
- . 2005. “Where Frankfurt and Strawson Meet.” *Midwest Studies in Philosophy* 29:163–80.
- . 2010. “Whose Argumentative Burden, Which Incompatibilist Arguments?—Getting the Dialectic Right.” *Australasian Journal of Philosophy* 83.
- Moore, G. E. 1912. *Ethics*. London: Williams and Norgate.
- Pereboom, Derk. 2006. *Living Without Free Will*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- . 2013. “The Philosophy of Free Will.” In Paul Russell and Oisín Deery (eds.), *The Philosophy of Free Will*, 421–448. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Sartorio, Carolina. 2016. *Causation and Free Will*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Taylor, Richard. 1963. *Metaphysics*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Timpe, Kevin. 2012. *Free Will: Sourcehood and Its Alternatives*. Bloomsbury, 2nd edition.
- Tognazzini, Neal. 2011. “Understanding Source Incompatibilism.” *The Modern Schoolman* 88:73–88.
- van Inwagen, Peter. 1983. *An Essay on Free Will*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- . 2008. “How to Think about the Problem of Free Will.” *Journal of Ethics* 12:327–341.
- Vargas, Manuel. 2013. “Situationism and Moral Responsibility: Free Will in Fragments.” In Julian Kiverstein Andy Clark and Tillmann Vierkant (eds.), *Decomposing the Will*, 325–350. Oxford University Press.

- Vihvelin, Kadri. 2000. "Libertarian Compatibilism." *Philosophical Perspectives* 14 (Action and Freedom):139–166.
- Zagzebski, Linda. 2000. "Does Libertarian Freedom Require Alternate Possibilities." *Philosophical Perspectives* 14:231–248.
- . 2014. "Divine Foreknowledge and the Metaphysics of Time." In Anselm Ramelow (ed.), *God: Reason and Reality*. Munich: Philosophia Verlag.