Errata

Introduction:
p 11, second paragraph, line 1: “…clarifying the framework…” is corrected to “…clarifying the kind of state…”
p 13, first paragraph, line 3: “…individual moral development sees…” is corrected to “…individual moral development in psychological terms sees…”
p 13, third paragraph, line 5: “…and what they value” is corrected to “…and what they value (and thereby enacting their personal autonomy)”
p 26, first paragraph, line 8: “…to fill up the lacuna, or the hole in the doughnut, so to speak” is corrected to “…to fill up the lacuna (according to Goodin’s negative characterization), or the hole in the doughnut (Dworkin’s characterization),”
p 34, first paragraph, line 10: “…the normative contexts of judgment…” corrected to “…the normative contexts of judgment…”
p 34, second paragraph, line 9: “…constitutional regime…” is corrected to “…state regime…”
p 34, second paragraph, line 12: “…the normative contexts of judgment calling for equal treatment and judgment calling for individualisation” is corrected to “…the normative context of judgment calling for equal treatment and the normative context of judgment calling for individualisation”
p 35, second paragraph, line 5: “…the normative contexts…” is corrected to “…the normative contexts of judgment”
p 51, second paragraph, line 4: “The practice also sustains…” is corrected to “The practice sustains…”
p 55, second paragraph, line 21: “…a need is for”, is corrected to “…exists a need for”
p 66, first paragraph, line 15: “…on the clinical level” is corrected to “…on the clinical level to ensure legitimacy in clinical judgment”
p 70, first paragraph, line 2: The numbering of the questions 1) -3) is removed.
p 73, first paragraph, line 3: “…theoretical horizontal reflection would be a fixed point for a systematic reflection”, is corrected to “…it is in how theoretical horizontal reflection is carried out we should look for fixed point (s) for systematic reflection”
p 73, first paragraph, line 5: “…possibility that premises…” is corrected to “…possibility that normative premises…”
p 73, second paragraph, line 1: “…systematic reflection requires…” is corrected to “…systematic reflection (for a general method) would require…”
p 73, second paragraph, line 5: “…should be…” is corrected to “…should be…”
p 74, second paragraph, line 20: “…Rawls and Daniels (Rawls 1971; Rawls 1993; Daniels 1996; Daniels 2003)” is corrected to “…Rawls and Daniels (Rawls 1971; Rawls 1993; Daniels 1996; Daniels 2003) and also Beauchamp and Childress (Beauchamp and Childress, 2001)”
p 76, first paragraph, line 7: “So here we have a fixed point for a method” is corrected to “So here we have a formal requirement on theoretical reflections representing a fixed point for a method”
p 76, first paragraph, line 8: “1) An epistemological…” is corrected to “(1) An epistemological…”
p 76, third paragraph, line 6: “1) includes the objective…, and 2) allows us to consider…” is corrected to “i) includes the objective…, and ii) allows us to consider…”
p 77, first paragraph, line 2: “Such constraints will… normative conditions for theoretical bioethics, … be considered a general method for theoretical bioethics” is corrected to “Such constraints will, together with 1), … general formal requirements for theoretical bioethics, …
be considered a *general method* for theoretical bioethics as these requirements represent fixed points for systematic reflection”

p 78, second paragraph, line 3:”...justification of those...” is corrected to “...justification of these policies...”

p 79, third paragraph, line 2:“...valid conclusions” is corrected to “...valid conclusions (i.e. (1) above)”

p 80, the box: The separate points have been numerated “(1), (2), (3)...”

p 84, first paragraph, line 13:“...introduction the articles” is corrected to “...introduction and the articles”

p 86, first paragraph, line 3:“Thirdly, when inviting...” is corrected to “Thirdly, inviting...”

p 86, first paragraph, line 8:“...theoretical bioethical works”, is corrected to “...the theoretical bioethical works”

p 91, second paragraph, line 1:“The framework presented here...” is corrected to “The framework for clinical judgment presented in this thesis...”

p 92, second paragraph, line 1:“My argument for suggested...” is corrected to “My argument for the suggested...”

p 92, third paragraph, line 4:“...that eventually applies...” is corrected to “...that eventually applies...”

p 95, first paragraph, line 6:“...or incompetent persons” is corrected to “...or obviously incompetent persons”

p 96, second paragraph, line 1:“...are vertical reflections” is corrected to “...are what I have referred to as vertical reflections”

Article I

Section 3.2, fourth paragraph, line 6: “... (ie, to get hold of her house),...” is corrected to“... (for example, to get hold of her house),...”

Section 5.2, first paragraph, line 12: “…c) automatically connects to a) and d) based on...” is corrected to “…c) automatically connects to a) and then d) based on...”

Article IV

p 3, first paragraph, line 10: “…possible capture...” is corrected to “...possible to capture...”,

p 4, second paragraph, line 10:“...in order to perform in a manner worthy of trust,...” is corrected to “...in order to perform in a trustworthy manner,...”

p 7, second paragraph, line 20:“...single the interpreter...” is corrected to “...single interpreter...”

p 8, second paragraph, line 14:“...the distinction responsibility...” is corrected to “...the distinction between responsibility...”

p 11, second paragraph, line 8:“...the second requirement...” is corrected to”...the first requirement...”

p 12, first paragraph, line 8:“The first requirement...” is corrected to ”The second requirement...”

p 15, first paragraph, line 6:“... the seventh requirement...” is corrected to “... the sixth requirement...”