Errata for 'The Normative Stance', published in *The Philosophical Forum* (2021), https://doi.org/10.1111/phil.12282

Marcus Arvan
University of Tampa
marvan@ut.edu

Due to a production error, two block-quotations were originally omitted from the final publication.

These quotations have been corrected in the web-version on the journal's website (https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/full/10.1111/phil.12282), but cannot be corrected in the print/PDF version. Readers of the PDF version should note the following two corrections.

On p. 80, the sentence 'For example, Bedke (2012, p. 111) argues:' is followed by no quotation but instead by a paragraph break. This passage should read:

> For example, Bedke (2012, p. 111) argues:
>
>> [T]o ensure that natural ontology suffices for normative truth, there must be semantically grounded entailments from the natural truths to the normative truths. There are none. So natural ontology does not suffice for normative truth.
>
> I will now argue that from a naturalistic perspective, the normative stance suffices to establish precisely these kinds of entailments: . . .

Similarly, on p. 86, 'As Enoch writes:' is followed by no quotation, but instead by a paragraph break. The passage should read:

> As Enoch writes:
>
>> Because only normative truths can answer normative questions I ask myself in deliberation, nothing less than a normative truth suffices for deliberation ... And because the kinds of normative facts that are indispensable for deliberation are just so different from natural, not-obviously-normative facts and truths, the chances of a naturalistic reduction seem rather grim. (Enoch, 2007, p. 44)