More in the way of a division of labor than usual went into this book. It would not have been written had it not been for the extended discussions of tacit knowledge I had with Rodrigo Ribeiro during my supervision of his PhD. Many of the early problems and tentative attempts at solutions arose as we talked things over and the results have frequently found their way into the book. Later this discussion spread to the weekly seminar of the Centre for the Study of Knowledge, Expertise, and Science, and exactly who contributed what to the earliest formulations would be hard to say. On the other hand, only as the manuscript’s twenty-six drafts unfolded over a couple of years did the nagging logic of the page bring out the vital importance of starting with the explicit and finding a place for relational tacit knowledge, thus driving the argument to coherence while indicating the proper roles and meanings of the elements.

In the course of writing I frequently e-mailed authors and asked them to send this piece or that and they invariably responded with grace and more advice than I had any right to expect. I will make no attempt to list everyone who has helped in this way, because I would be bound to miss some. Nevertheless, I must thank Stephen Gourlay and Edgar Whitley for keeping me in touch with existing studies—each sending me a reading list. Being a terrible scholar myself, I contrived to get them to do some of my work for me, but the end result is my responsibility, as is the fact that there is no attempt in the book to do the kind of review of the literature that would give proper recognition to everyone who deserves it. I thank Terry Threadgold for convincing me, one way or another, that the apparatus of semiotics was not what I needed for the opening chapters and it would be better to start afresh from more elemental components. Rob Evans, Stephen Gourlay, Martin Kusch, Trevor Pinch, Rodrigo Ribeiro, Evan Selinger,
and Edgar Whitley read the manuscript and sent me really useful feedback. And Chicago’s two anonymous readers did a wonderful job, perfectly understanding where the book was coming from, basing their criticisms on where it was trying to go, and doing their best to help it get there. Nevertheless, all mistakes and infelicities that remain are my responsibility. Finally, Christie Henry, my editor, has been brilliant—a full partner in the enterprise. So has Mary Gehl, my copy editor, and, on the basis of my past experience, so too will Stephanie Hlywak be, when it comes to putting the thing out into the wider world. If you are ever lucky enough to get University of Chicago Press interested in a project of yours, bite their arm off.