Introduction

Learning, Using, and Unlearning More than One Language

Annick De Houwer and Lourdes Ortega

Many children are born into families where parents speak different languages to them. Karin was born in Portugal and taken care of at home by her mother, who spoke Portuguese to her. Karin's father spoke Swedish to her from the start, but was usually not home during the day. As a young infant Karin was very happy to have her father come home after work and play with her. When Karin was around four months old, something changed. As usual, Karin would be in her mother's arms when her father came home, and Karin's mother spoke to Karin's father in Swedish. But for a few weeks, Karin did not immediately show her usual joy at her father's homecoming. Instead, she "froze up" and looked at her mother's mouth with a disquieted frown, and refused to cuddle either parent until her attention was led away to something else (Cruz-Ferreira, 2006, p. 62; two other infants described by Cruz-Ferreira showed the same pattern at around the same age).

This early disapproving noticing of language difference lays bare a basic fact related to individual bilingualism, viz., the instant attribution of social value based on the perception of people's use of a particular set of sounds (or gestures, as the case may be). As Chevrot and Ghimenton (Chapter 25, this volume) explain, such social attributions shape and constitute language-related attitudes. The fact that from very early on both bilingually and monolingually raised infants are able to perceive and distinguish accents, regional varieties, and languages (see Serratrice, Chapter 1 this volume, and Chevrot & Ghimenton, Chapter 25, this volume) means that the development of language-related attitudes is an integral part of language development, regardless of the number of language varieties involved. Our very categorization of what constitutes a particular variety or way of speaking is, most likely, intimately tied with the attitudes we have developed from an early age. As De Houwer (Chapter 17, this volume) explains, these attitudes may to a large degree depend on socialization practices, while at the same time examples like

Karin's show that social attributions are driven by internal factors as well. Language attitudes may crystallize into wider-held language ideologies (Fuller, Chapter 6, this volume), which find expression in, for instance, specific language policies (Lo Bianco, Chapter 8, this volume), legal systems (Angermeyer, Chapter 7, this volume), and the world of work and employment (Grin, Chapter 9, this volume) – all of which, in turn, impact individual bilingualism.

This Handbook seeks to offer a developmentally oriented and socially contextualized, realistic perspective on the learning, use, and, as the case may be, unlearning, of more than a single language variety by individual people at different stages of life. The focus is on bilinguals as people and what we know about them, their bilingual issues, and their bilingual lives. As such, it is language users rather than language-as-structure that take central position.

Research findings on individual bilingualism are readily available in North America, Europe, and Australia. We have encouraged our contributors to consider select relevant findings on bilingualism from Latin America, Asia, and/or Africa, as long as these were published in languages that the Handbook readership will likely have access to (that is, English, Spanish, French, and German). Bilingualism is particularly extended and seen as natural in non-Western contexts, whereas much of the research in Western contexts is generated under a societal pressure to conform to monolingual expectations (see further later in this introduction). Therefore, even a brief consideration of more diverse contexts for bilingualism may be particularly informative.

An Inclusive Approach to Bilingualism

Learning, using, and unlearning more than a single language variety are very much interrelated. People may learn a language variety through using it, and people may at least partly unlearn a language variety because they are not using it, that is, they may not fully maintain it (see Keijzer & de Bot, Chapter 14, this volume, and Köpke, Chapter 18, this volume). We use the term learning for any kind of language learning, that is, both instructed and uninstructed, both implicit and explicit. For us, language learning equals language acquisition and language development, and these terms are used interchangeably throughout the Handbook. We use the term language as shorthand for any form of linguistic communication that is socially constructed as habitually belonging to a particular way of speaking, signing, or writing. We do not wish to pretend that this is a full definition of what language is (an impossible endeavor, anyhow), but we wish to stress that we are not only interested in bilinguals learning what are known as standard languages. We also are interested in bilinguals learning signed languages (Tang & Sze, Chapter 24, this volume), and

other language varieties that are not necessarily standardized, such as ethnic varieties, contact varieties (Aalberse & Muysken, Chapter 26, this volume), and regional and social varieties (Chevrot & Ghimenton, Chapter 25, this volume). Some bilingualism researchers and some of the Handbook authors (Fuller, Chapter 6; García & Tupas, Chapter 20) oppose the idea that languages and language varieties can or should be named and enumerated. In this view, the very notion of "language" is a mere ideological invention. We agree that all adult linguistic categories are, ultimately, ideological constructs. However, we see inherent value in studying distinct languages and language varieties in bilingualism because of the fact that already in infancy, prior to any sociopolitical influences, both bilingually and monolingually raised children can perceive, distinguish, and harbor strong attitudes toward different accents, regional varieties, and languages.

The learning of more than a single language variety is where bilingualism begins. Learning a language usually starts with learning to understand some of it. This is where bilingualism starts too: it starts when an individual has learned to understand some of at least two languages. Thus, infants who have started to understand some words in each of two languages but cannot yet speak or sign are bilingual. Their language comprehension abilities (Treffers-Daller, Chapter 15, this volume), however, are still very different from young adults who can understand long stretches of oral or signed discourse in several regional and social varieties, or who can read newspaper articles in one language (e.g., standard Dutch) and understand discourse in another (e.g., West Flemish dialect). For literate young adults, being able to read newspaper articles and understand longer stretches of discourse are age-appropriate, expected language skills. Such skills take time to develop in any language, regardless of how many one knows, and regardless of the modality (spoken, signed, written). This insight, however, should not impinge on individuals' characterization as bilingual or not. Thus we dynamically define a bilingual individual as one who understands at least two languages at age-appropriate levels, regardless of modality (see also De Houwer, to appear). This includes seven-year-olds who can understand Langue des Signes Québécoise (sign language of Québec) and who can read short French sentences with basic vocabulary. This includes educated English-speaking retirees living in the Provence region of France who can understand the local type of French both in informal conversation and in more formal contexts, for instance at city hall. This includes Japanese engineers who are fluent in Japanese and can read English manuals for complicated machinery, but who may be lost if someone speaks to them in English. This includes teens in the south of Morocco who can understand conversations in the local varieties of Berber and Arabic, in Moroccan French, and in standard French as they hear it on television. Thus, our approach to bilingualism includes what many may call multilingualism, that is, the learning and use of more than two

languages or language varieties. We asked our authors to adopt an inclusive approach to bilingualism as involving more than one language or language variety, regardless of the precise number.

Our inclusive approach to bilingualism as starting with dual language comprehension and as referring to the involvement of more than a single language follows classic views in the field (Baetens Beardsmore, 1982; Elwert, 1959; Grosjean, 1982). It implies that the number of individuals who are counted as bilingual is quite high, and that hence the variability among them in terms of demographic background, geographical location, age, and language abilities will be enormous.

A Lifespan Perspective

Indeed, variability is a key concept in bilingualism studies. Also in psycholinguistic processing approaches to bilingualism (Paap, Chapter 22, this volume), this variability is fortunately being taken into account more and more. The variability among bilinguals starts with the youngest of bilinguals: children may hear two languages from birth, usually in the home, or they may start hearing a second language sometime after they have just heard a first, with the first usually heard at home and the second outside the home, for instance, at daycare or preschool (Serratrice, Chapter 1, this volume). This difference in timing and associated circumstances makes for a difference in very young children's early language learning trajectories (De Houwer, 2018a). Many chapters in this Handbook discuss how the timing of first regular exposure to a new language and the circumstances in which that exposure takes place relate to bilingual development (see in particular the chapters by Gonçalves, Chapter 3; Singleton & Pfenninger, Chapter 4; Armon-Lotem & Meir, Chapter 10; Muñoz & Spada, Chapter 12; and Ortega, Chapter 21). As Keijzer and de Bot (Chapter 14) as well as Köpke (Chapter 18) show, exposure also plays a role in the extent to which bilinguals maintain abilities in each of their languages across the lifespan.

Bilingual development and individual language maintenance are likely differentially affected by different conditions and forces at different lifespan stages. This is because individuals are at different points of psychosocial development as a function of their global stage in life (e.g., Caps, 2008). Thus, any relevant phenomenon under study may call for differential research treatment over different lifetime periods. We consequently have striven to build in a lifespan perspective across all topics and chapters in the Handbook to the extent possible. Part I, comprising five chapters, shows this most clearly, as it traces aspects of bilingual development and use across five distinct life stages: (1) the first six years of life, or early childhood (Serratrice, Chapter 1), (2) middle childhood and adolescence, that is, from about age six until around age

18 (Bigelow & Collins, Chapter 2), (3) young adulthood, which we define here as covering the years from around age 18 until toward the late 30s (Gonçalves, Chapter 3), (4) midlife, going somewhere from around age 40 until around age 60 (Singleton & Pfenninger, Chapter 4), and (5) later adulthood, starting at around age 60 (Goral, Chapter 5). Also beyond Part I we have encouraged all Handbook contributors to be as specific as possible about the ages or life stages of any bilingual individuals they discuss, and to include coverage of studies across different life stages where possible and relevant.

The life stage divisions in Part I largely follow general practice in developmental psychology, although in that field finer distinctions are often made. For instance, the authoritative text by Steinberg, Bornstein, Vandell, and Rook (2011) makes a distinction between infancy and early childhood, both of which we subsume under early childhood; it treats middle childhood and adolescence as two separate stages as well, rather than our stage (2), where we combine these. By combining these we are not suggesting there are no differences between infancy and early childhood in the Steinberg et al. sense, or between middle childhood and adolescence. Rather, making these distinctions for a general Handbook such as the present one would lead to a level of detail it cannot accommodate. In future research on bilinguals, however, we would encourage scholars to start carrying out comparative work that fully takes into account different life stages as identified by developmental psychologists. Studies of children may lump together data from four- and eight-year-olds, without acknowledging that at those ages, these relatively small age differences represent developmentally quite different life stages. Likewise, research with people who are beyond middle childhood often combines data on individuals with widely different ages and presents results without taking into account life stage variability and how it may impact bilingualism. As we have found out in working with this Handbook, research especially on bilingual adults often omits precise mention of respondents' ages at time of study, thereby assuming that age or life stage does not matter. And although more and more studies are interested in comparing what are called early and late bilinguals, they tend not to list any information on when exactly study participants started to learn each of their languages. We found this generally cavalier attitude to reporting or taking into account actual ages surprising in light of the fact that, as most pointedly explained in Singleton and Pfenninger's chapter, scholars have been centrally concerned with the factor of age of first exposure to a language. This concern, alas, has apparently not led to a general developmentally oriented view of bilingualism. We hope that this Handbook can contribute to such a more developmentally oriented view in bilingualism research, which recognizes that each life stage represents a different kind of general life experience for most people, and that this may be reflected in bilingual learning, unlearning, and bilingual use.

Broader Contexts and Opportunities for Bilingualism

While different life stages will certainly exert different kinds of effects with regard to individual bilingualism, all bilinguals are directly or more indirectly affected by the global contexts in which their bilingualism develops. These contexts are highlighted in Part II of the Handbook. Fuller (Chapter 6) discusses how language ideologies often lead to linguistic inequality and hegemony, although there are also pluralist ideologies that celebrate bilingualism. Language ideologies are at the basis of specific language policies (Lo Bianco, Chapter 8). Among others, these will affect the ranges and kinds of language choices in education. Language ideologies will also help regulate what language(s) can be used in courtrooms, and will affect what happens to asylum seekers or other bilinguals in legal–lay communication (Angermeyer, Chapter 7). Grin (Chapter 9) explains how economic research can elucidate the complex dynamics of economic (dis)advantages of individual (and sometimes collective) bilingualism, and how policies encouraging linguistic diversity are an economic benefit all around.

It is against the backdrop of particular societal language ideologies and contexts that parents may be raising bilingual children. In her interview study of six upper-middle-class highly educated Thai women in Japan, Nakamura (2016) admirably describes how the largely monoglossic ideology in Japan influenced these mothers' language choice with their children and their own personally held language ideologies. Mothers favored Japanese in talking to their children, and also wanted to practice their own Japanese that way, given their opinion that Japanese was important for both their own and their children's future earning potential. Similar language ideologies and earnings considerations may also have affected changed home language practices of lower-middle-class caregivers in 173 families in the United States. As part of their longitudinal study on language outcomes of young US children in homes where Spanish (possibly in addition to English) was spoken, Mancilla-Martinez and Lesaux (2011) reported that nearly half (47%) of the children's parents (mostly mothers) or guardians spoke only or mainly Spanish at home when children were 4.5 years old. That percentage dropped to 22% when parents were asked again when their children were 11 years old. These drastic changes in parental home language choice may have been influenced by generally negative attitudes held against Spanish in the United States.

The changes in parental home language choice in the 173 families studied by Mancilla-Martinez and Lesaux (2011) may have affected children's language choice as well: at age 4.5, 45% of the children spoke mainly or only Spanish at home, but only 17% of the children still used mainly or only Spanish at home by age 11. Many spoke a lot more English as they grew older. In Nakamura's (2016) study, hardly any of the Thai

mothers' young children spoke much Thai. Instead, they spoke mainly Japanese. These examples make clear that the contexts in which people become bilingual are of prime importance. Some of the main contexts for bilingual learning are described in Part III of the Handbook. These include naturalistic language exposure and input as relevant to young sequential bilingual children (Armon-Lotem & Meir, Chapter 10), bilingual language immersion programs in primary, secondary, and tertiary education (Juan-Garau & Lyster, Chapter 11), foreign language instruction from early childhood to young adulthood (Muñoz & Spada, Chapter 12), and host country language-teaching programs for newly arrived adult migrants (Simpson, Chapter 13). Contexts may be conducive to learning a particular language, or to unlearning it, in the sense that it will be used less and at lower levels of proficiency. In the last chapter in Part III, Keijzer and de Bot (Chapter 14) examine some of the contexts in which such unlearning takes place. They focus both on children and on older adults. Keijzer and de Bot argue that total unlearning (or forgetting) is rare or nonexistent, and explain how previously partly unlearned languages can be relearned.

The diverse learning contexts across the lifespan described in Part III lead to bilinguals being able to use their languages in dynamic ways. Part IV in the Handbook selectively highlights some of these. First there is the issue of how well bilinguals can use each of their languages, and how we should measure those bilingual abilities at different stages in life (Treffers-Daller, Chapter 15). While there are many bilinguals whose abilities in each language are quite uneven, with language X steadily better developed than language Y, other bilinguals are highly proficient in each language they have learned. Furthermore, while many people develop high abilities in three or four languages, others develop high abilities in several more. Biedroń and Birdsong (Chapter 16) discuss the circumstances and conditions relating to this high-functioning bilingualism. Once bilinguals can interact in minimally each of two languages, there is the fundamental issue of what determines which language they will use at any given time (De Houwer, Chapter 17). For instance, even though the Thai mothers in Nakamura's (2016) study did not all speak fluent Japanese, they found it impolite to speak Thai to their young children in the company of Japanese people who did not understand Thai. This resulted in mothers globally not speaking much Thai after migration to Japan, and only speaking more Thai again during rare visits to Thailand. Over a longer period of time, such habitual patterns of language choice may affect bilingual abilities. The ebb and flow of language choice across the lifespan may be such that bilinguals start to show signs of language attrition, that is, their ability in a language appears to diminish. In her discussion of L1 attrition in migrants who after age 12 moved to a place where their L1 was no longer the societal language, Köpke (Chapter 18) explains how the relations between changes in language environments and language proficiency in mature bilinguals are

far from straightforward. Like Goral (Chapter 5) in Part I, Köpke is careful to distinguish nonpathological attrition from declines in language proficiency that are due to pathological conditions such as a stroke or dementia. These are discussed in chapters in Part V.

Connections among Disciplines and Research Areas

As will have become clear from the description so far, individual bilingualism is dynamic and multidimensional. No single discipline can fully capture the complexity and heterogeneity of bilinguals' language (un)learning and use, which affect many different aspects of life. The chapters in Part I through IV are written from several different disciplinary perspectives. For instance, Serratrice and Armon-Lotem and Meir write from a developmental psycholinguistic perspective; Gonçalves and De Houwer from a more sociolinguistic one; Fuller and Angermeyer from a perspective grounded in social anthropology; Juan-Garau, Lyster, Muñoz, and Spada from an applied linguistics perspective; and Grin from the perspective of economics. Our primary aim has been to strike a balance between social and psychological aspects of bilingualism. This is because the social cannot be separated from the individual. The learning, use, and unlearning of languages are socially embedded phenomena that rely on and materialize through the application of and reliance on sociocognitive processes. Straddling the social and psychological, there are also important applications to consider. For instance, the relation between learning opportunities and very young children's early language learning trajectories needs to be taken into account in educational settings and in clinical practice. In policy decisions about provisions for adult later language learning, the role of language ideologies and the symbolic and market values of languages need to be acknowledged.

The inter- and crossdisciplinary focus in the Handbook as a whole is highlighted and complemented in Part V. Here we asked authors to write about what they see as major foci of interest in bilingualism in their respective fields. The chapters in Part V are loosely chronologically ordered according to the life stages they discuss. Hammer and Edmonds (Chapter 19) discuss approaches to language impairment in early childhood and in somewhat older children (but they also discuss clinical aspects of bilingual aphasia). García and Tupas (Chapter 20) turn to early to middle childhood and adolescence. They problematize how many schools treat children's bilingualism and, like Bigelow and Collins in Chapter 2 earlier in the Handbook, advocate the use of pedagogies that respect and celebrate that bilingualism by allowing the use of all languages at school (Gonçalves and Simpson in respectively Chapter 3 and Chapter 13 similarly advocate such translanguaging approaches for adults). In her wider discussion of how second language acquisition research contributes to insights about bilingualism, Ortega (Chapter 21) focuses mostly on young

adults and people in midlife, complementing the earlier chapters by Juan-Garau and Lyster, Muñoz and Spada, and Simpson. As Ortega explains, second language acquisition research is often mired by an implicit deficit approach to bilingualism. Such a deficit approach is, sadly, not limited to academic circles, but is also present in clinical practice and education, as the chapters by Hammer and Edmonds and by García and Tupas both denounce. Until the mid-2010s, Western public media outlets would generally express such deficit views as well. There has been a positive change in this regard, mainly thanks to work on bilingualism in cognitive science coming out of Ellen Bialystok's lab in Canada. This work has claimed several cognitive advantages of bilinguals over monolinguals. These claims, however, have met with deep controversy within cognitive science. In his thorough review in Section 5 focusing on research with mainly young adults, Paap (Chapter 22) lays bare some of the arguments that have been made on either side, and stresses that regardless of the validity of claims of a purported bilingual cognitive advantage, bilingualism is highly valuable. Many of the bilingual processing studies that Paap discusses not only have a behavioral component but also examine neurophysiological evidence. Some of this work is reviewed in Hernandez's Chapter 23, which focuses mainly on adults in midlife and later. Like Hammer and Edmonds, Hernandez discusses bilingual aphasia, but now from a processing perspective.

In the final part of the Handbook, we placed what we called "bilingual connections," that is, chapters that highlight the links between bilingualism and related areas of research. As Tang and Sze (Chapter 24) show in the first chapter in Part VI, research into sign language acquisition and bimodal bilingualism, involving a combination of oral and signed forms of language, has seen a burgeoning of attention and has the potential to shed unique light on traditional questions and preferred answers in the field of bilingualism research as a whole. The use of more than one language code also arises in the case of regional and social varieties that are not necessarily standardized, as individuals may speak both a regional variety and a standard variety broadly seen to belong to the same "language." After a critical discussion of the problematic nature of satisfactorily distinguishing among varieties, Chevrot and Ghimenton (Chapter 25) explore the boundaries between bidialectalism and bilingualism and point to the fundamental role of social perceptions (attitudes) toward particular ways of speaking. Boundaries between different ways of speaking are also central in Aalberse and Muysken's Chapter 26, but now from the perspective of contact linguistics. Bilinguals and bidialectals are the ultimate "locus" for language contact (see also De Houwer, to appear), and this individual language contact may, in the long run, lead to the creation of new ways of speaking that are transmitted from generation to generation.

The final chapter in Part VI, Chapter 27 by Quay and Montanari, reintroduces the distinction between learning, using, and unlearning two versus more than two languages that the rest of the Handbook has

generally ignored, given our inclusive approach to bilingualism as involving more than one language, regardless of the precise number. Quay and Montanari describe a number of settings in the world in which multilingualism rather than "strict" bilingualism is the expected reality. They emphasize several similarities between multilingualism and bilingualism in the strict sense, but point out that due to its larger variability, multilingualism is much more complex and dynamic. Importantly, they argue that there are generally no expectations of multilinguals performing like three or more monolinguals in one, whereas often for bilinguals, there is a societal expectation of linguistically performing like a monolingual in each language.

Bilingual–Monolingual Comparisons

In our editorial work, we have met up with much research into individual bilingualism that we did not know. Both in that work and in research we were aware of previously, there is generally a large interest in comparing aspects of bilinguals' language use and sociocognitive abilities to those of monolinguals. One issue here is that many studies do not provide sufficient background information to evaluate the extent of bilingualism or, indeed, monolingualism, of the study participants (see also Surrain & Luk, 2017). Some participants may have been placed in the monolingual participant group but would count as bilingual under our definition of age-appropriate levels of comprehension in two languages. For example, in many parts of today's world, English as a foreign language is part of compulsory education and access to online media is free. In these contexts, it is difficult to find so-called true monolingual speakers, unless perhaps one samples participants who grew up linguistically insulated from English (but then this would render the age or milieu of such a monolingual baseline noncomparable to the bilinguals under study). Moreover, in many geographies there may be different varieties of what is often considered one language at the nation-state level. Few studies check whether supposedly monolingual participants are perhaps bidialectal.

On a much more fundamental level, however, the question can be asked why bilingual–monolingual comparisons are needed to understand bilingualism. By definition, bilingualism is not monolingualism. Yet monolingualism is usually held up as a gold standard, and there is unfortunately even today a monolingual bias present in many studies of bilinguals. In the field of language attrition, for example, Köpke (Chapter 18, this volume) notes that much research relies on bilingual–monolingual comparisons rather than on longitudinal studies, which she sees as more informative and preferable. In studies of early childhood bilingualism, many bilingual–monolingual comparisons are used to speak of so-called delayed or accelerated development, and it is always the monolinguals who are

held up as the standard. Also here, bilinguals could and should be compared to each other. In second language acquisition studies too, the practice of comparing nonnatives to natives is ubiquitous, and language learners are unfairly compared to an idealized notion of native speakers who are monolingual and who show no traces of other languages (Ortega, 2014). Instead, adults learning an additional language should be viewed as bilinguals in the making, worthy of study in their own right.

At a very deep level, a monolingual bias shows by the lack of identification of the language that study participants are tested in. Many studies often just assume that the term language (or French *langue*, or Dutch *taal*, or German *Sprache*, or Spanish *lengua*, etc.) refers to whatever happens to be the societal language of the setting under study. For instance, in Glennen's (2015) study on the "language abilities" of five- to seven-year-old children from Eastern Europe adopted earlier by families in the United States there is no explicitation of what language children were tested in, although the instruments used were developed for English, and it is described that the adoptees were exposed to English after adoption. Of course, in the case of the internationally adopted children in Glennen (2015), it is a question to what extent children still understood or spoke the language that they had possibly started to acquire prior to adoption (see Keijzer & de Bot, Chapter 14, this volume, for discussion), but this does not relieve studies from the need to at least specify the language they were tested in. The term language abilities all too often refers to just the societal language.

Even if studies identify the language tested, as Ortega argues in Chapter 21 (this volume), they show a monolingual bias if they focus only on one single language of the child or adult bilingual, typically the societal language that they are newly learning. As many chapters in this Handbook demonstrate (Treffers-Daller's Chapter 15 especially), in order to obtain a full picture of a bilingual individual's language functioning, all the languages that this person has learned must be taken into account. This is especially important in clinical settings (Hammer & Edmonds, Chapter 19). Many researchers thus implicitly and unwittingly adhere to what Fuller (Chapter 6) calls a monoglossic ideology.

Finally, rather than seeing bilinguals and monolinguals as fundamentally different, scholars investigating people's language learning and use should fully acknowledge the important insight that classic scholars such as Baetens Beardsmore (1982), Elwert (1959), and Grosjean (1982) expressed decades earlier, namely that the distinction between bilinguals and monolinguals is fuzzy, and that there is a continuum between being more bilingual and more monolingual (see also Serratrice, Chapter 1, this volume).

Closing Words

It has been impossible to cover all the topics and foci relevant to individual bilingualism in a single volume. Yet our selection is meant to cover a broad spectrum, sustaining the lifespan perspective throughout as much as possible. Our particular choices have been guided by a mix of our personal interests and expertise, our assessment of what is generally of interest to scholars working on bilingualism, and our evaluation of whether sufficient research material was available for a particular topic to warrant inclusion in the Handbook. There is, however, sufficient research material to fill several handbooks. Bilingualism research is vibrant and done in many different fields, from migration studies to neurology. We hope this Handbook can inspire scholars from many diverse fields to contribute to this vast and exciting body of work.

Acknowledgment

We are grateful to Wolfgang Wölck for his insights and advice throughout our work on this Handbook.