4.1 Performing theatre theory

Name: _____ Class: _____ Date: _____ **Total: 26 marks**

KEY WORDS theatre theorist • aspect

Performing theatre theory

Objective

Read a theorist five ways, translate one aspect into a performance principle with generative rules, build the solo piece as the theory's experiment, and write the report with video evidence (the solo theatre piece, HL only).

1 Key knowledge and worked examples

Solo-piece toolkit. Task facts: theorist not previously studied; one aspect; a solo of 4–7 minutes maximum; a 2 500-word report plus sources; continuous unedited video; 35% HL. Read the theorist: claim, vocabulary, context, practice, critics – the choice rule is performable principles. Translate: aspect → principle → generative rules → piece events (each event tests the principle; failure visible). Report: theorist and theory; the aspect and why; the translation; the performance with evidence; the evaluation with owned limits. Primary vs secondary sources. Worked: the presence theorist's direct address as encounter.

2 Practice

2.1 State the task's five facts. [2]

2.2 Name the five ways a theorist is read. [2]

2.3 What is the theorist-choice rule? [2]

2.4 Distinguish the aspect from the theory. [2]

2.5 What makes a solo piece the theory's experiment rather than an illustration? [2]

3 Exam-style questions

3.1 *(Reading style.)* A theorist claims theatre's truth lives in the performer's presence, not representation. Draft the five-way read (claim, vocabulary, context, practice, critics). [6]

3.2 *(Translation style.)* From the aspect "direct address as encounter", write the performance principle and three generative rules, and name one piece event each rule produces. [6]

3.3 *(Evaluation style.)* The piece ends with the performer asking the room to choose THEM. Draft the evaluation's evidence move and the owned limit. [4]

Solutions

2.1 A theorist not previously studied; one aspect identified; a solo piece of 4–7 minutes; a 2 500-word report plus sources; a continuous unedited video of the whole piece (35% HL) (2 – 1 for four).

2.2 Claim, vocabulary, context, practice, critics (2 – 1 for four).

2.3 Choose a theorist whose theory yields performable principles: whose vocabulary becomes stage action (1); a theory that cannot be staged cannot be demonstrated (1).

2.4 The theory is the whole systematic claim; the aspect is ONE operational slice selected for its staging yield (2).

2.5 Each event of the piece TESTS the principle and can fail visibly (1); an illustration merely depicts the theory's subject matter and cannot fail, so it demonstrates nothing (1).

3.1 Claim: theatre's truth is in the performer's presence, not in representation (1). Vocabulary: presence, encounter, the empty space – each with its precise meaning (1). Context: answering a commercial theatre of spectacle and psychological realism (1). Practice: exercises stripping the actor to address the audience directly – theory in the body (1). Critics: presence is mystification (the encounter is unrepeatable and unevidenced) (1). The read closes on the aspect's choice: direct address as encounter, chosen for its demonstrable yield (1).

3.2 Principle: the performer always addresses THIS audience, HERE, as themselves (1). Rule 1 – every passage is addressed to an individual spectator by sight at least once: the event of choosing the first spectator and telling the true reason for the choice (2). Rule 2 – no costume; the space shares light so audience and performer see each other: the event of the performer stepping into the audience's light to be seen as themselves (2). Rule 3 – the piece's events happen in the room's real time: the event of waiting in silence until a spectator meets the performer's eye: the encounter happening, not depicted (1). (Accept any principle-consistent rule + event.)

3.3 Evidence move: the video shows the chosen spectators' responses – the turning, the laughter, the held gaze – which is the encounter recorded, exactly the evidence the critics demand (2). Owned limit: presence is not fully evidenced beyond the recording (the recording flattens the encounter it claims to document), which is the theory's own contested ground; the revision would be to let a spectator film back (accept any honest, specific limit tied to the theory's weak point) (2).

Local review guidance: each of the five is the theorist's own, not a gloss; a rule must be checkable – it either held or broke in performance; (R1 3.3) the limit is the theory's weak point owned, not generic modesty. Authored guidance.