Introduction: Imagining audiences

Katharine A. Craik and Tanya Pollard

IMAGINING LITERATURE'S EFFECTS

How did early modern writers imagine the effects of plays and poems on minds, bodies, and souls? In what ways does the history of theatrical or literary experience overlap with the history of humors, passions, and emotions? Throughout early modern texts, writers depict playgoers and readers responding to imaginative literature both affectively and physiologically. In tragedies, audiences at plays-within-the-play are devastated, brought to tears, startled, and killed; in comedies, they are moved to laughter, driven to lust, and agitated into redirecting the plot. Letters and poems within plays of all genres, meanwhile, lead readers to react with anger, grief, or pleasure. Poems, similarly, meditate on the transformative effects of reading, watching, and hearing. Satires and epigrams describe pricking readers into states of aggrieved indignation, or galling, lancing, or purging their targets. Love poems envision pressing readers into states of longing or embarrassment, epithalamia are described as festive restoratives, and elegies aim to nourish and console the bereaved. Poems and plays alike were imagined to affect those who encountered them in ways that could be threatening, inflammatory, dangerous, or soothing, comforting and therapeutic.

Despite the prominence of scenes of reading and watching imaginative literature in early modern texts, and authors' insistent attention to the consequences of such encounters, critics have had surprisingly little to say about the period's investment in imagining literature's impact on feeling. The absence of this discussion is striking given how urgently the topic impinges on current critical conversations. For some time now, histories of the body and sexuality have been at the fore of early modern studies. Influential scholarship by Gail Kern Paster, Jonathan Sawday, David Hillman and Carla Mazzio, Jonathan Gil Harris, and Michael Schoenfeldt established the pervasiveness of the period's anatomical and

humoral assumptions, and their significance for our understanding of literary representations of bodies and selves.[1] More recently critical attention has turned to early modern conceptions of emotion and its relationship to the body. Important books by Paster, Mary Floyd-Wilson, Katherine Rowe, Bruce Smith, and Matthew Steggle have delineated the distinctive contours of emotional experience in a pre-Cartesian moment in which bodies and minds were understood to be intimately intertwined.[2] Floyd-Wilson and Garrett Sullivan, like Paster, have called attention to the permeability not only between minds and bodies, but between selves and their surrounding environments at a moment when the boundary between external and internal was indistinct.[3] Relatedly, a number of critics have directed our attention to the period's conceptions of the senses and their functions: the contributors in Elizabeth Harvey's *Sensible Flesh* have examined early modern theories of touch, and those in Lowell Gallagher and Shankar Raman's *Knowing Shakespeare* have explored the role of the senses in shaping cognition.[4]

Beyond this surge of attention within the early modern period, the interface between bodies and emotions has come to occupy a crucial position in a wide range of conversations. In particular, the ambiguous and powerful concept of affect has attracted attention from scholars across a wide range of disciplines, including social and biological sciences as well as humanities.[5] Theresa Brennan has distinguished affect from emotion by defining it as "the physiological shift accompanying a

[1] See Gail Kern Paster, *The Body Embarrassed: Drama and the Disciplines of Shame in Early Modern England* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1993); Jonathan Sawday, *The Body Emblazoned* (London and New York: Routledge, 1995); David Hillman and Carla Mazzio, eds., *The Body in Parts* (London: Routledge, 1997); Jonathan Gil Harris, *Foreign Bodies and the Body Politic: Discourses of Social Pathology in Early Modern England* (Cambridge University Press, 1998); and Michael Schoenfeldt, *Bodies and Selves in Early Modern England: Physiology and Inwardness in Spenser, Shakespeare, Herbert, and Milton* (Cambridge University Press, 1999).

[2] See Gail Kern Paster, *Humoring the Body: Emotions and the Shakespearean Stage* (University of Chicago Press, 2004); Paster, Katherine Rowe, and Mary Floyd-Wilson, eds., *Reading the Early Modern Passions: Essays in the Cultural History of Emotion* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2004); Bruce Smith, *The Acoustic World of Early Modern England: Attending to the O-Factor* (University of Chicago Press, 1999); and Matthew Steggle, *Laughing and Weeping in Early Modern Theatres* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2007).

[3] See Garrett Sullivan and Mary Floyd-Wilson, eds., *Inhabiting the Body, Inhabiting the World* (Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2007), and Paster, *Humoring the Body*.

[4] Elizabeth Harvey, ed., *Sensible Flesh: On Touch in Early Modern Culture* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2003), and Lowell Gallagher and Shankar Raman, eds., *Knowing Shakespeare: Senses, Embodiment and Cognition* (Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2010).

[5] See Brian Massumi, *Parables for the Virtual: Movement, Affect, Sensation* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2002); Eve Sedgwick, *Touching Feeling: Affect, Pedagogy, Performativity* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2003); Teresa Brennan, *The Transmission of Affect* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2004); Patricia Clough, *The Affective Turn: Theorizing the*

judgment," and claiming that "all affects, including even 'flat affects,' are material, physiological things."[6] In recent years cultural linguists have similarly explored the relationship between biology and emotional responses, raising provocative questions about ethnically specific and linguistically determined factors in emotional experience.[7] Scientists, meanwhile, are pursuing links between brain circuits and the expression of emotion, seeking to measure emotional impulse and to explore the innate or acquired nature of emotional landscapes. Scientists now widely acknowledge that knowledge garnered by the emotions contributes in important ways to processes of reasoning, particularly the rapid form of judgment we call intuition. Their work has challenged the mind/body dualism long central to western medicine, so that emotion is increasingly understood as rooted in the body rather than as "an elusive mental quality."[8]

The attention to embodiment in current conversations about affect makes the early modern period, with its assumptions about the intrinsically material and physiological nature of emotion, an especially rich site for exploring the nature of affect. *Shakespearean Sensations* is informed by recent interdisciplinary conversations about emotion, but adds historical, social, rhetorical, and especially literary perspectives to these conversations. Late sixteenth- and early seventeenth-century writers not only identified emotional experience firmly with the body, but also privileged the sensations aroused by imaginative literature. In the texts explored in this volume, men and women respond to plays and poems not only with their minds and souls but also with their hearts, hands, viscera, hair, and skin. Such responses suggest an important prehistory for current psychobiological investigations; they also uncover the ways that authors aspired to affect the inner equilibrium of readers and audience members, and the cultural consequences of such aspirations.

Social (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2007); and Melissa Gregg and Gregory Seigworth, eds., *The Affect Theory Reader* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2010).

[6] Brennan, *Transmission of Affect*, 5 and 6. Massumi writes: "Call the coupling of a unit of quasi corporeality with a unit of passion an *affect*: an ability to affect and a susceptibility to be affected. An *emotion* or *feeling* is a recognized affect, an identified intensity as reinjected into stimulus-response paths … Emotion is a contamination of empirical space by affect, which belongs to the body without an image" (*Parables for the Virtual*, 61).

[7] See, for example, Anna Wierzbicka, *Emotions Across Language and Culture: Diversity and Universals* (Cambridge University Press, 1999), esp. 11 and 28.

[8] Antonio Damasio's *Descartes' Error: Emotion, Reason and the Human Brain* (London: Vintage Books, 1994) investigates "the neural underpinnings of reason" (xxi); the quotation appears on xxiv. Daniel Gross provides a cogent discussion of the limitations of Damasio's approach in *The Secret History of Emotion: From Aristotle's Rhetoric to Modern Brain Science* (University of Chicago Press, 2006), 28–39.

Exploring early modern ideas about literature's effects on mind and body involves close consideration of the period's theories about literary forms and functions. In fact, these topics have also experienced a surge of critical interest. Recent work on rhetoric and early modern literature has been enlivened by historically attentive studies of how style and genre inform meaning.[9] Early modern audiences approached literary genres with the expectation that they would move, stir, or enrapture them in particular ways. Theories of genre therefore overlap with theories of affect, since both inform our understanding of reader and audience response.[10] The essays in this volume consider tragedy, comedy, epigram, and narrative poetry, and define their formal properties less through thematic content than by way of the emotional and physical states they describe, enact, and claim to induce. The work of our contributors therefore combines sensitivity to literary and theatrical form with insights drawn from early modern philosophical and medical thought in order to deepen our understanding of the period's conception of literature's relation to sensation.

The combination of this renewed critical interest in form with the recent "affective turn" in so many disciplines makes it surprising that contemporary scholarship has by and large shied away from the interface between literary texts and their physical and emotional consequences, especially in the context of early modern writers' intense interest in literature's impact on audiences.[11] Literary studies of the emotions and the body have focused primarily on their textual representations, rather than taking seriously the complex and intimate reciprocity between books, bodies, and selves. Now, as in the early modern period, people seek out plays, poems, and other literary forms in large part for the intensity of feeling that they produce: the involuntary flush, pang, or shiver.[12] Our longstanding habit

[9] See, for instance, Mark David Rasmussen, ed., *Renaissance Literature and Its Formal Engagements* (New York and Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2002); Stephen Cohen, ed., *Shakespeare and Historical Formalism* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2007); and Susan J. Wolfson and Marshall Brown, eds., *Reading for Form* (special issue of *Modern Language Quarterly*, 2000).

[10] Heather Dubrow has described genre as "a code of behavior established between the author and reader." Dubrow, *Genre* (London: Methuen, 1982), 2. See also Stanley E. Fish, "Literature in the Reader: Affective Stylistics," in *Self-Consuming Artifacts: The Experience of Seventeenth-century Literature* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1972), 389.

[11] On the idea that current criticism is experiencing an "affective turn," see Patricia Clough, *The Affective Turn: Theorizing the Social* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2007). Recent work directly addressing the relationship between early modern affect and literary texts includes Katharine A. Craik, *Reading Sensations in Early Modern England* (Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2007); Tanya Pollard, *Drugs and Theater in Early Modern England* (Oxford University Press, 2005); and Steggle, *Laughing and Weeping*.

[12] Frank Kermode examines the "shudder," which T. S. Eliot identified as the body's automatic response to true poetry, as illuminating what he describes as Eliot's "physiology of poetry"; see Kermode, "Eliot and the Shudder," *London Review of Books*, 13 May 2010, 13–16.

of separating bodily responses from intellectual reasoning has deterred critics from exploring their interdependence. Although early modern literary theorists often described the body as frail, it nevertheless emerged as a powerful site for forming and articulating aesthetic response. Neglecting literary sensations therefore cuts us off from the heart of early modern conceptions of literature and its purpose. It also blinds us to the historical specificities of the period's vocabulary for describing consumers' experience of literature, and the ways in which these descriptions challenge our own assumptions about what literature is and does.

THE PHYSIOLOGY OF AFFECT

Who were the imagined audiences of Shakespeare and his contemporaries, and how did they understand their emotional and physical responses to be constituted? The period's understanding of minds and bodies was substantially shaped by medical models inherited from the Greek physician Galen and the Hippocratic corpus, in which the mind and body were understood as inseparable components of the self.[13] Humors, the four defining fluids that coursed through the body, were simultaneously literal substances and affective dispositions. They were also both innate and subject to change: although a person could be inclined towards being sanguine, choleric, melancholic, or phlegmatic, various factors could alter that balance, either temporarily or permanently. The six non-naturals that could interfere with one's humoral balance were air, food and drink, exercise and rest, sleep and wakefulness, retention and evacuation of wastes, and perturbations of the mind, or emotions.

These perturbations, or passions, were understood to derive from the stirrings of the sensitive or sensory soul, where impressions from the outside world were received, and processed by the five outward senses. Following Aquinas, early modern thinkers identified the sensitive soul's faculties of inward apprehension as the *sensus communis* or common sense, the imagination, and the memory.[14] Of these faculties, the imagination was most closely allied to sensory appetite and least responsive to the tempering effects of the soul's most exalted aspect: reason, or intellect.[15] The

[13] For an overview of the period's medical thought, see Nancy Siraisi, *Medieval and Early Renaissance Medicine: An Introduction to Knowledge and Practice* (University of Chicago Press, 1990).

[14] Ruth Harvey discusses *imaginatio* and the *sensus communis* in *The Inward Wits: Psychological Theory in the Middle Ages and the Renaissance* (London: Warburg Institute, 1975), 43–44.

[15] Katharine Park and Eckhard Kessler, "The Concept of Psychology," in *The Cambridge History of Renaissance Philosophy*, ed. Charles B. Schmitt *et al.* (Cambridge University Press, 1988), 455–63.

imagination was also the faculty most intimately linked with the body, as Margaret Healy's essay in this volume details. The physician Thomas Fienus explained the power of the imagination to bring about physiological change:

> The imagination is fitted by nature to move the appetite and excite the emotions, as is obvious, since by thinking happy things we rejoice, by thinking of sad things we fear and are sad, and all emotions follow previous thought. But the emotions are greatly alterative with respect to the body. Therefore, through them the imagination is able to transform the body.[16]

Fienus's account offers important insights into the period's assumptions about literature's transformative power. Books and plays ignited the imagination of those who wrote, read, and saw them, and exerted a direct impact on the body by virtue of the imagination's ability to stimulate emotion.

In its role as conduit between external stimuli and internal responses, the imagination reveals a complex relationship between inner and outer realms. Significant changes in early modern medical thought and practice were placing this relationship under increasingly close scrutiny. The flourishing new science of anatomy and dissection, driven especially by Andreas Vesalius's 1543 *De Humani Corporis Fabrica*, challenged traditional assumptions about the body's interior, and heightened interest in exploring its inner workings.[17] The influential writings of the Swiss physician Paracelsus also complicated the Galenic model by redefining disease as an external agent rather than a matter of internal balance.[18] Paracelsus's interest in exogenous threats helped explain the spread of infectious and airborne disease, and involved early modern thinkers in a broader refinement of their understanding of homeostasis. Men and women were never left unchanged by their experiences in the world they inhabited.

The impact of both ancient and modern ideas about internal regulation is especially striking in the work of physician and moral theorist Thomas Wright. Wright explained that the passions could be altered by internal forces, such as the imagination, and by encounters in the world. As he remarked in his 1601 treatise *The Passions of the Minde in Generall*, "By [the] alteration which passions work in the wit and the will, we may understand the admirable metamorphosis and change of

[16] Thomas Fienus, *De Viribus Imaginationis* (Louvain, 1608), trans. in L. J. Rather, "Thomas Fienus' (1567–1631) Dialectical Investigation of the Imagination as Cause and Cure of Bodily Disease," *Bulletin of the History of Medicine* 4 (1967), 349–67; 356.
[17] On some of the consequences of these discoveries, see especially Sawday, *The Body Emblazoned*.
[18] See Harris, *Foreign Bodies*.

a man from himself, when his affects are pacified, and when they are troubled."[19] Wright understands the faculty of apprehension, driven by the passions, as one of perpetual change and adjustment in response to encounters with people, places, and things.[20] The passions of early modern subjects were constantly and actively engaged, whether pacified or troubled, and passionate feeling was a continual, dynamic activity rather than an occasionally arising state. The unsettling unpredictability of this reactive, improvisational process led physicians such as Wright to emphasize the importance of exercising scrupulous vigilance over the emotions. The essays in this volume explore one particular kind of encounter out of the many considered by Wright and his contemporaries: those occasioned by imaginative literature. Books and plays were among the external agents capable of profoundly altering humoral balance, implicating readers and theatergoers in complex processes of transaction or exchange.

The volatility of the early modern embodied self is still evident in the material vocabulary we use to describe emotional experience. We are now speaking metaphorically when we call someone hot-headed or cold-blooded, and recent work on the language of emotion has explored the cultural consequences of such figurative expressions. Zoltán Kövecses, among others, has surveyed "metaphoric aspects of emotion concepts in English," concentrating on how these have developed over the last ten years or so and arguing that an appreciation of figurative language (both metaphoric and metonymic) is essential for a full and nuanced understanding of emotional experience.[21] Anger can boil; sorrow can weigh us down; fear and embarrassment can inflame. Language of containment, such as being *filled* with sorrow, fear, or pride; or *overflowing* with love or happiness, suggests that emotion is bounded by the sealed unit of the body. The insistent materiality characteristic of early modern affect, however, complicates the metaphorical nature of this vocabulary. Understanding the period's psychophysiology requires recognizing that the boundaries between metaphorical and literal language were radically unstable. As Gail Kern Paster has shown, the humoral body was implicated in a network of sympathies with the wider world where the cosmic macrocosm

[19] Wright, *The Passions of the Minde in Generall*, sig. E6r.
[20] Damasio identifies a similar dynamism in what he calls our emotional "background state"; see *Descartes' Error*, 143–44.
[21] Zoltán Kövecses, *Metaphor and Emotion: Language, Culture and Body in Human Feeling* (Cambridge University Press, 2000), 20 *et passim*; see also Paster, *Humoring the Body*, 6; and Paster, Rowe, and Floyd-Wilson, eds., *Reading the Early Modern Passions*, 16–18.

was understood to be as sensible – and as vulnerable to change – as the subjects who lived in it.[22]

At their most straightforward, sensations are feelings (in body or consciousness) caused by the operations of the senses as they perceive objects in the world. Many of the sensations discussed in the following essays are accordingly states of consciousness, or changes in the body, caused by multi-sensorial encounters with plays and poems. Reading and playgoing were not only visual and auditory experiences, as we might expect, but also tactile, gustatory, and even sometimes olfactory. The five senses were not thought equally useful or valuable, however, and the ways of knowing that they facilitated were imbricated in patterns of spiritual, emotional, and ethical conduct.[23] Sense perception was understood in turn to alter the passions, or affections; and, through them, the cognitive processes of reason, memory, and the will. The sensations aroused by plays and poems therefore emerge most clearly when they leave impressions on the interior landscapes of those who experienced them. Described at different moments as abrasive or fortificatory, sensations felt in the passionate soul suggest the powerful effects of both the written and the spoken word. A particular aim of this volume, indeed, is to consider together the sensations aroused by reading and playgoing. Plays and poetry are often regarded separately in present criticism but, as we will see, early modern writers who discussed how it felt to experience them shared a conceptual and discursive vocabulary.

STAGING SENSATIONS

The susceptibility of bodies and emotions to external perturbations was a central controversy in early modern discussions about the theater. With their visibility and economic power, the new commercial playhouses in early modern England brought the theater to the forefront of debates about literature's effects on audiences.[24] The medium's dependence on

[22] See Paster, *Humoring the Body*.

[23] See Gallagher and Raman, *Knowing Shakespeare*, 8–10.

[24] Scholarship on early modern theater audiences is indebted to the work of Alfred Harbage, Ann Jennalie Cook, and Andrew Gurr; see Harbage, *Shakespeare's Audiences* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1941); Cook, *The Privileged Playgoers of Shakespeare's London: 1576–1642* (Princeton University Press, 1981); and Gurr, *Playgoing in Shakespeare's London*, 3rd edn. (Cambridge University Press, 2004). More recent studies of the period's playgoers include Cook, "Audiences," in *A New History of Early English Drama*, ed. John D. Cox and David Scott Kastan (New York: Columbia University Press, 1997), 305–20; Jeremy Lopez, *Theatrical Convention and Audience Response in Early Modern Drama* (Cambridge University Press, 2003); Charles Whitney, *Early Responses to Renaissance Drama* (Cambridge University Press, 2006); Matthew

actual bodies, both onstage and in the audience, highlighted the intimate physicality of its relationship with consumers. Plays were widely seen as attracting audiences especially through their ability to seduce, entice, tickle, anger, frighten, please, and soothe. As sixteenth-century writers began probing more deeply into the nature of plays and their consequences, concerns about these sensations escalated, and engaged a wide range of responses.

Perhaps surprisingly, a powerful catalyst for debates about the theater's emotional and physiological effects on audiences came from the Hellenistic revival of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries. The influx of Greek manuscripts and scholars from the East after the 1453 sack of Constantinople led to both a sharp interest in the Greek dramatic tradition and a renewed study of Galen and Greek medicine, often by the same humanist scholars. Thomas Linacre (1460–1524), founder of England's Royal College of Physicians, joined other humanist scholars in studying Greek language and literature in Italy in the 1480s and 1490s, and went on to translate Greek medical texts and promote the study of Galen, Aristotle, and the Hippocratic tradition. At the same moment, and within the same humanist circles, the Aldine Press in Venice began producing the first printed editions of Greek texts, which sparked significant changes in literary thought.[25] As Daniel Javitch has demonstrated, the newly visible Greek plays prompted a surge of interest in genre theory, which in turn intensified interest in the newly published and translated text of Aristotle's *Poetics*.[26] Aristotle's influence directed Renaissance writers to identify audiences' emotional responses as the proper focus for literary theory, just as newly unearthed medical texts encouraged scholars to explore more fully the implications of Greek theories about the mind's embeddedness in the body.[27]

Steggle, *Laughing and Weeping in Early Modern Theatres;* Jennifer Low and Nova Myhill, eds., *Imagining the Audience in Early Modern Drama, 1558–1642* (Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2011); and Tanya Pollard, "Audience Reception," in *The Oxford Handbook to Shakespeare*, ed. Arthur Kinney (Oxford University Press, 2012), 452–67.

[25] On the early printing of Greek plays, see especially Rudolf Hirsch, "The Printing Tradition of Aeschylus, Euripides, Sophocles and Aristophanes," *Gutenberg Jahrbuch*, (1964), 138–46. On the impact of Greek texts and theory on the period, see Pollard, "Audience reception," and Pollard, "Tragedy and Revenge," in *The Cambridge Companion to English Renaissance Tragedy*, ed. Emma Smith and Garrett Sullivan (Cambridge University Press, 2010), 58–72.

[26] See Daniel Javitch, "The Emergence of Poetic Genre Theory in the Sixteenth Century," *Modern Language Quarterly* 59.2 (1998), 139–69.

[27] On the new Renaissance emphasis on audience following the printing of Aristotle's *Poetics*, see Nicholas Cronk, "Aristotle, Horace, and Longinus: the Conception of Reader Response," *The Cambridge History of Literary Criticism*, vol. 3: *The Renaissance*, ed. Glyn Norton (Cambridge

Continental literary critics seized upon the affective and physiological assumptions implicit in Aristotle's account of the effects that tragedy should have on audiences. In particular, they responded to his famous claim that through arousing pity and fear, tragedy should bring about the catharsis – a technical medical term referring to purgation, purification, or cleansing – of such emotions.[28] At the same time, they were also keenly interested in Aristotle's juxtaposition of the discomfort typically linked to purgation, pity, and fear, with a very different sensation: pleasure. Arguing that tragedy generated its own distinctive form of pleasure, Aristotle had written that "the poet must by 'representation' (*mimesis*) produce the pleasure (*hedone*) which comes from feeling pity and fear."[29] Aristotle's compressed evocation of a complex web of emotions, as well as his allusion to a formal medical procedure, established the groundwork for a wide range of interpretative responses. For some, catharsis suggested a hostile process. "A physician," wrote Antonio Minturno in his 1564 *L'Arte Poetica*, "will not have greater capacity to expel with poisonous medicine the fiery poison of an illness which afflicts the body, than the tragic poet will to purge the mind of mighty perturbations with the force of the passions charmingly expressed in verses."[30] Others contrasted these violent associations with an emphasis on the voluptuous appeal of surrendering to the emotions: Lodovico Castelvetro wrote that literary purgation could be "with the utmost propriety called *hedone*, that is, pleasure or delight."[31] Yet through their varying interpretations, literary commentators consistently credited plays with the ability to bring about emotional and physical transformation, typically linked with the possibility of therapeutic cure.

Although Aristotle confined his use of the term *catharsis* to tragedy, Renaissance commentators incorporated the idea into their conceptions

University Press, 1999), 199–204; also Timothy J. Reiss, "Renaissance Theatre and the Theory of Tragedy," in the same volume, esp. 242.

[28] Aristotle, *Poetics*, 49b20. In identifying theater with purgation, as the term was most frequently translated, Aristotle drew on his own study of the Hippocratic medical tradition; the term must have resonated with early modern authors especially because the same medical legacy was so central in shaping their own understanding of mind–body relations. On the period's overwhelming interest in "the notion of tragedy as a genre defined by its therapeutic effect on the audience," see Stephen Orgel, "Shakespeare and the Kinds of Drama," *Critical Inquiry* 6:1 (1979), 107–23, 117.

[29] *Poetics*, 53b10. In the same section, Aristotle writes suggestively that "One should not seek from tragedy all kinds of pleasure but that which is peculiar to tragedy."

[30] Antonio Minturno, *L'Arte Poetica*, 1564, trans. Allan H. Gilbert, in *Literary Criticism: Plato to Dryden*, ed. Allan H. Gilbert (New York: American Book Company, 1940), 274–303, 290.

[31] Lodovico Castelvetro, *The Poetics of Aristotle, Translated and Annotated* (1571), trans. Gilbert, in *Literary Criticism*, 305–57, 350. Castelvetro also suggested that the pleasure of purgation "ought properly to be called utility, since it is health of mind acquired through very bitter medicine" (350).