Factoring Disjunction out of Deontic Modal Puzzles: Errata

Melissa Fusco

July 16, 2014

Page numbers refer to the version in the conference proceedings of DEON 2014.

1. Definition 1 (pg. 97) should be amended to make explicit, following Standard Deontic Logic (SDL), that $OPT(w)$ is nonempty for any $\mathcal{M}$ and any $w \in W_{\mathcal{M}}$.

2. Definition 6 on pg. 102 ("P-States in EU Theory and Deontic Logic") fails to distinguish properly between atomic and non-atomic cases. The amended definition is:

   Definition (P-States in EU Theory and Deontic Logic)**.**
   EU Theory.
   (Base Case). If q is an atomic act such that $EU_w(q)$ is maximal in $\mathcal{M}$, then q is an atomic P_w-state. Otherwise it is an (atomic) $\overline{P}_w$-state.
   (Recursive Clause). Any union of P_w-states and $\bar{P}_w$-states is a $\overline{P}_w$-state.

   Classic Deontic Logic.
   (Base Case). If w' is a possible world such that $w' \in OPT(w)$, then $\{w'\}$ is an atomic P_w-state. Otherwise it is an (atomic) $\overline{P}_w$-state.
   (Recursive Clause). Any union of P_w-states and $\overline{P}_w$-states is a P_w-state.

3. The following sentence on pgs. 101-102:

   > My interest, in the rest of this paper, is in isolating an argument for blocking embedded disjunction introduction that doesn't rely on 'Ought' and 'May' being downward entailing—in fact, is compatible with their being *upward*-entailing.

   Should read:

   > My interest, in the rest of this paper, is in isolating an argument for blocking embedded disjunction introduction that doesn't rely on 'May' being downward entailing—in fact, is compatible with the relevant notion of permissibility being *upward*-entailing at the level of propositions, as it is on the classical modal view.