

Erratum to: Dispositions and interferences

Gabriele Contessa

Published online: 28 November 2014
© Springer Science+Business Media Dordrecht 2014

Erratum to: *Philos Stud* (2013) 165:401–419 DOI 10.1007/s11098-012-9957-9

Throughout the paper, all occurrences of ‘not- $(I_1$ and ... and $I_k(x)$ and ... and $I_n)$ ’, ‘not- $(I_1$ and ... and $I_{(j-1)}$ and $I_{(j+1)}$ and ... and $I_n)$ ’, ‘not- $(I_1$ and ... and $I_n)$ ’, and ‘not- $(K(x)$ and I_1 and ... and $I_n)$ ’ should be replaced by, respectively, ‘not- $(I_1$ or ... or $I_k(x)$ or ... or $I_n)$ ’, ‘not- $(I_1$ or ... or $I_{(j-1)}$ or $I_{(j+1)}$ or ... or $I_n)$ ’, ‘not- $(I_1$ or ... or $I_n)$ ’, and ‘not- $(K(x)$ or I_1 or ... or $I_n)$ ’.

In particular, the definitions of (DI) and (CI) on pp. 407–408 should read, respectively:

(DI): x (destructively) interferes with o ’s being intrinsically disposed to M when S iff:

- (1) I_1 and ... and $I_k(x)$ and ... and I_n (where ‘ x ’ occurs free at least once in ‘ I_1 and ... and $I_k(x)$ and ... and $I_n)$ ’,
- (2) it is nomically possible that not- $(I_1$ or ... or $I_k(x)$ or ... or $I_n)$,
- (3) it is not the case that, if it were the case that S , then o would M ,
- (4) for each I_j ($1 \leq j \leq n$), even if it were the case that not- $(I_1$ or ... or $I_{(j-1)}$ or $I_{(j+1)}$ or ... or $I_n)$, it would still not be the case that, if it were the case that S , then o would M ,

The online version of the original article can be found under doi:[10.1007/s11098-012-9957-9](https://doi.org/10.1007/s11098-012-9957-9).

G. Contessa (✉)
Philosophy Department, Carleton University, PA 3A46,
1125 Colonel By Drive, Ottawa, ON, Canada
e-mail: gabriele_contessa@carleton.ca

- (5) if it were the case that not- $(I_1$ or ... or $I_k(x)$ or ... or $I_n)$, then:
- (5.1) it would be the case that, if it were the case that S , then o would M , and
- (5.2) it would not be the case that, if it were the case that not- S , then o would M ,
- (6) it is not the case that, if it were the case that not- $(I_1$ or ... or $I_k(x)$ or ... or $I_n)$, then some (proper or improper) part of o , o^* , would acquire some (sparse, natural) intrinsic property,
- (CI) x (constructively) interferes with o 's not being intrinsically disposed to M when S iff:
- (1) I_1 and ... and $I_k(x)$ and ... and I_n ,
- (2) it is nomically possible that not- $(I_1$ or ... or $I_k(x)$ or ... or $I_n)$,
- (3) if it were the case that S , o would M ,
- (4) for each I_j ($1 \leq j \leq n$), even if it were the case that not- $(I_1$ or ... or $I_{j-1})$ or $I_{j+1})$ or ... or $I_n)$, it would still be the case that, if it were the case that S , then o would M ,
- (5) if it were the case that not- $(I_1$ or ... or $I_k(x)$ or ... or $I_n)$, then it would not be the case that, if it were the case that S , then o would M , and
- (6) it is not the case that, if it were the case that not- $(I_1$ or ... or $I_k(x)$ or ... or $I_n)$, then some (proper or improper) part of o , o^* , would lose some intrinsic property,

The numbered lists on p. 411 and p. 412 should read, respectively:

- i. o is intrinsically disposed to M when S .
- ii. not- J ,
- iii. if it were that not- $(I_1$ or ... or $I_n)$, it would be that J .
- iv. if it were that $(J$ and not- $(I_1$ or ... or $I_n))$, it would not be the case that, if it were that S , o would M .

and:

- v. There is no x such that:
 - v.a. $K(x)$,
 - v.b. it is nomically possible that not- $K(x)$,
 - v.c. if it were that not- $(K(x)$ or I_1 or ... or $I_n)$, it would not be the case that J .

Finally, the first sentence of the last paragraph on p. 412 should read:

'As far as I can see, there are no clear counterexamples to intIFCA that satisfy conditions (i)–(v), for the only cases in which (i)–(v) would be obviously jointly satisfied are cases in which it is not (logically, metaphysically, or nomically) possible that not- $(I_1$ or I_2 or ... or I_n or $J)$, so that, if it were the case that not- $(I_1$ or I_2 or ... or $I_n)$, it would have to be the case that J .'

I would like to thank Michael Kremer for bringing this issue with the published version of the paper to my attention.