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Preface

This book has had a long incubation. On the basis of a field task designed by David Wilkins, published here as Chapter 2, successive generations of linguistic fieldworkers at the Max Planck Institute for Psycholinguistics have contributed chapters to this volume. Editorial teams have also changed, as earlier editors moved on to other jobs and projects. The first editorial team consisted of Michael Dunn and Sérgio Meira, Sara Cutfield was then brought in by Nick Enfield both to contribute and to edit the newer chapters, and finally, I myself took over to see the volume through with the help of Edith Sjoerdsma and Ludy Cilissen. I have tried to provide a worthy introduction to what is a unique collection of chapters exploring the semantic and pragmatic typology of this topic, which has played a central role in linguistic and philosophical theory, and is now being picked up as an important issue in the neurosciences.

STEPHEN C. LEVINSON