



PROJECT MUSE®

---

*Baroque, Venice, Theatre, Philosophy* by Will Daddario  
(review)

Spencer Golub

Theatre Journal, Volume 71, Number 4, December 2019, pp. 529-530 (Review)

Published by Johns Hopkins University Press



➔ For additional information about this article

<https://muse.jhu.edu/article/746774>

**BAROQUE, VENICE, THEATRE, PHILOSOPHY.** By Will Daddario. Performance Philosophy series. Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave Macmillan, 2017; pp. 262.

Will Daddario's *Baroque, Venice, Theatre, Philosophy* is a clearly written, closely argued, and carefully drawn study of the Italian baroque in historical (sixteenth and seventeenth centuries), architectural, and metaphorical space and time. The book is alive to and in the paradoxes of history and historiography, corporeality and spirituality, as well as to sights, sites, and cites (many sourced from the original Italian) of civic institutional (state, church, and popular) (re)imagi(n)ing, labyrinthine thinking and planning, and above all close-up and "micro-territorial" viewing (122). The garden thinking of the time is split open in what Daddario calls an act/event of botanical dehiscence (botany and gardening being the structuring order of the genre and the day). The author's case studies illustrate the baroque dialectic and dynamic of self-regarding/self-negating discipline and excess performing their peculiar rough magic. Executions, spiritual conversions, and the "fluctuating ground" (48) of pastoral drama—with its "vertiginous geography of references" (47) and contesting compossibles and impossibles (70)—played off against authorial self-commentary. Comic performances masked political critiques, unbalanced and re-balanced grotesque polices, thought, and emotion. The overall effect was to put lids upon fears of internal and external rebellion, and by so doing set the stage—sometimes inadvertently, sometimes not—to have these same lids blown off.

Daddario draws on a range of theorists to nuance his points, among them Leibniz and Deleuze of course, but also Adorno, Barthes, de Certeau, Derrida, Žižek, and, most deeply, Foucault. But this is a book that stakes its claim(s) less upon theory than history and historiography, and it is there that Daddario is at his most considered and persuasive. His narrative constructs Foucauldian heterotopias and counter-conducts atop theatrical platforms: executions, confessions, conversions, political subversion, upside-down world-making, the orality of political rhetoric in regional dialectal, diarchic, and mystical self-un/making. The overall effect is to create a multifaceted model of discipline and excess that gives ballast to often abstract and generic thinking about what the baroque was and is. The author has turned the spade in the ground to unearth the secret life of speech and methods that history has lulled us into thinking about as default categories of knowledge. At the heart of this is the socioeconomic stratification and colonialist politics of the Republic of Venice represented by the walled-in house garden

(*hortus conclusus*). Paduan actor-playwright Angelo Beolco/"Ruzzante" entered these gardens of privilege to settle scores on behalf of himself, his birthplace (a territory and garden of the republic), and the excluded majority. One of the book's genuine values is to bring Beolco/Ruzzante center stage to claim his rightful place in Italian satire's oral and written history not otherwise consigned to *commedia dell'arte* (whom Beolco influenced) and to Gozzi and Goldoni.

Beolco serves as the primary agent of Daddario's thematic strategy of "imagination that looks down rather than up" (to earth rather than heaven), a coinage originally applied by sociologist John Law to Leibniz's thought structure of gardens-within-gardens, and Leibniz's own attempt to render physically the inner complexity of the soul in the form of the monad. This idea of walling in, of concealing a deeper interiority from even the wealthy homeowner in whose garden Ruzzante performed and who did not necessarily want to engage with the performances as subversive "scenobotanical interventions" (137), doubles down on the sociopolitical territoriality of the day, performing what Daddario consistently calls "the art of taking place" (131). By pursuing a "dissonance of wor[l]ds" (57), the Paduan dialect and neologisms spoken by Ruzzante on these stages encoded a history of cultural and economic oppression and baroque out-of-placeness (*snaturale*), while bearding the Venetian lion in its own den. The third-person/first-person dialectic of actor-playwright Beolco/Ruzzante sets the stage for a consideration of "The Encasement of Self and the Jesuit *Teatro del Mondo*," as Daddario titles one of his chapters. Here, botanical dehiscence "provokes a consideration of a death [of the sinner] that coincides with a (re-)birth [of the penitent]" (160) who is embodied in the person of the "scenic priest"/the good shepherd of pastoral and scriptural drama as the "virtuous actor." A Foucauldian "exomologesis" is performed, in which both the actor and the audience member dramatically recognize their status as penitents. It is this recognition that moves the needle on a baroque scale from its origin in what the Jesuits called their "Spiritual Exercises." Daddario illustrates Jesuit adeptness in both "cultivating the inner garden of the imagination" (38) and at representing the miracle of individual conversion via staged drama. This serves as a kind of counter-weight to the pointed double-tracking of Beolco/Ruzzante's verbal tromp l'oeil in comic performance.

Daddario's study makes a palimpsest of space and spatial thinking in real historical place and time, rendering history itself more dimensionally as an object held in the mind, but rotated until it comes back around to a moment already seen though now offering a new material perspective. Building on the

work of Calabrese and Egginton among scholars, but also Borges and Fuentes among fiction writers, Daddario argues for *baroque* as a verb, which brings a more dynamic agency to an idea that persists by resisting classification while excavating and expanding etymology. In doing this, Daddario's study paraphrases and micro-materializes Derrida's thought that "beginning" or "taking place" (*arkhe*) "instigate[s] a cleavage in the heart of the archive" (206). And with this, history in its performative agency and counter-agency takes a baroque turn.

**SPENCER GOLUB**  
*Brown University*

**PERFORMING PSYCHOLOGIES: IMAGINATION, CREATIVITY AND DRAMAS OF THE MIND.** Edited by Nicola Shaughnessy and Philip Barnard. Performance and Science: Interdisciplinary Dialogues series. London: Bloomsbury Methuen Drama, 2019; pp. 264.

*Performing Psychologies: Imagination, Creativity and Dramas of the Mind* constitutes the latest volume in Methuen Drama's ongoing series Performance and Science: Interdisciplinary Dialogues, which broadly explores the intersections among various forms of performance and scientific disciplines such as neuroscience, cognitive science, and psychology. This volume has uniquely paired its editors from across the disciplines: theatre and performance scholar Nicola Shaughnessy teams with Philip Barnard, a researcher in cognitive and behavioral neuroscience, to curate a collection of essays on the theme of diverse psychologies. With each chapter presenting various case studies in relation to topics such as madness, autism, dementia, trauma, and psychotherapy, this collection excels at presenting a wide range of approaches to reading performance in relation to how the mind makes meaning out of lived experience, focusing on marginalized psychological states in relation to performance, therapy, and applied theatre.

In their jointly written opening chapter, Shaughnessy and Barnard situate their editorial purpose around "understanding the relations between mind, body and environment [which] are endemic to the principles and practices of cognitive and affective approaches to theatre and performance" (3). Rather than relying upon cognitive linguistic theories that have characterized early scholarship within the "cognitive turn," the essays that comprise *Performing Psychologies* instead engage with the "5 E's" of recent cognitive theory: embodiment, embeddedness, enaction, extension, and ecologies. Readers

unfamiliar with these concepts will not find explicit explanation of them in this collection; however, the subsequent chapters implicitly illuminate these concepts by reading specific performances and forms of practice through the lens of cognitive and affective meaning-making. Readers who have found themselves skeptical of the cognitive turn in earlier iterations may find themselves reassured by Shaughnessy and Barnard's approach to bridging the disciplinary gap between the arts and sciences. Eschewing the call to empiricize the arts through scientific frameworks such as falsifiability, the editors argue for the singular potentiality of performance to fill distinct gaps in scientific discourse through its ability to engage first person perspectives, illuminate questions of civil/human rights in scientific practice, and involve neurodiverse communities in research. Defining performance as a "cognitive and affective medium" (12), Shaughnessy and Barnard valorize the unique ability of performance to explore and engage neurodiversity through its holistic and embodied capacities, challenging the hegemony of scientific discourse in hopes of creating a "heterogeneous trans-disciplinary field of collaborative aesthetic and scientific investigations in which new methods are emerging for knowledge creation" (16). In this way, the essays that follow in this volume re-center questions of the intersection of science and the efficacy of performance on the experience of embodied, individual subjects who constitute neurodiverse communities.

While the table of contents structures the volume's essays along four evocative, albeit vague categories ("Contexts," "Interdisciplinary Perspectives," "Practices and Responses," and "Changing Minds"), the chapters that comprise *Performing Psychologies* struck this reader as arranging themselves along a few key psychological states that are excavated from different perspectives. Chapters 2, 7, and 10 each address the concept of madness, speaking to recent discourses in "mad lit"; Shaughnessy's comparative analysis of different productions of *Hamlet* troubles the traditional gendering of Ophelia's madness and evokes theories of cognitive ecologies by rereading her suicidal descent as the product of her maddening environment. Chris Dingwall-Jones's essay similarly interrogates the gendered construction of madness, but does so by examining the mid-1990s plays of Sarah Kane and Sarah Daniels, deftly arguing for their respective destabilization of the sanity/insanity binary through the use of space. Chapters 4 and 10 both tackle the subject of autism, albeit through very different approaches. Speaking across the disciplines, psychologist Ilona Roth presents a nuanced performance analysis of experiments designed to assess qualities of "atypical imagination" in autistic children. She aptly models how psycho-