This book has been in process for a good many years, during which I have accumulated a variety of debt to a good many people. The study had its beginning in a paper written for a graduate seminar at Indiana University; and I recall, with gratitude, fellow students whose enthusiasm for my early argument enforced my own confidence in it. I am similarly indebted to friends and colleagues along the way for a stimulation that comes with good conversation and encouraging support: I must name, with a particular sense of obligation, Fran and Arnold Shapiro, who were always ready to talk about Hamlet, and Robert M. Estrich and Bernard O’Kelly, whose response to an early product of my argument contributed to its progress. I wish to express special gratitude to those who took time from busy schedules to read the entire book in manuscript and to give me the benefit of their counsel: warm thanks are due to John Harold Wilson and John Gabel; to Rolf Soellner, with added appreciation for his helpful critical notes on the first draft; and to Roy W. Battenhouse, whose generous and open-minded interest in the work of his students can always be counted on and whose provocative teaching and critical advice were a constructive force in the making of this book. Details and conclusions of the germinal study mentioned above were later employed in a chapter of my graduate dissertation, written in 1962 under the direction of the late William Riley.
Parker. Although the latter work dealt with Milton’s use of imagery and the comment on *Hamlet* served only comparative purposes and although Mr. Parker did not see the present study in manuscript, students who had the good fortune to work under his kind and invaluable tutelage must be aware, in the course of any scholarly project they subsequently undertake, of profit from his precepts and example: I record such debt in grateful memory.

The obligation of the *Hamlet* critic to the published work of others defies express acknowledgment. Some of that indebtedness is indicated in my text and notes. However, the latter are necessarily compressed and selective, intended to direct the reader to related lines of inquiry or to findings closely similar or directly contradictory to my own, rather than to provide general bibliography. It goes without saying that if this study of the dumb show helps to effect a resolution of certain long-debated questions (as I hope it does), that result has been implemented by the work of many scholars whose contributions may not be documented in these pages. Finally, I am indebted to the Ohio State University for a grant that freed me from routine academic duties in the winter of 1967; to my typist, Mrs. Roger Johnson, whose competence deserves kudos; and to the staff of the Ohio State University Press for courteous assistance and painstaking care in the editing and proofing of the text.
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