Erratum to: Mechanisms and constitutive relevance

Mark B. Couch

Published online: 21 February 2012
© Springer Science+Business Media B.V. 2012

Erratum to: Synthese (2011) 183:375–388
DOI 10.1007/s11229-011-9882-z

Incorrect text in footnote 5: the mistakes are underlined

Notice the Craver describes constitutive relevance as “a relationship between a component in the mechanism and the behavior of a mechanism and the behavior of a mechanism as a whole” (2007, p. 146, n 26). Understood this way, it is __ relationship between a component and the mechanism’s behavior. But when it comes to the account he explains how to ascertain if a component is relevant to the mechanism’s behavior (not the relation), which is something different.

The correct text as it should read

Notice that Craver describes constitutive relevance as “a relationship between a component in the mechanism and the behavior of a mechanism as a whole” (2007, p. 146, n26). Understood this way, it is a relationship between a component and the mechanism’s behavior. But when it comes to the account he explains how to ascertain if a component is relevant to the mechanism’s behavior (not the relation), which is something different.

The online version of the original article can be found under doi:[10.1007/s11229-011-9882-z](https://doi.org/10.1007/s11229-011-9882-z).

M. B. Couch (✉)
Department of Philosophy, Seton Hall University, 400 South Orange Ave., South Orange,
NJ 07079, USA
e-mail: mark.couch@shu.edu