ISSN 2410-1915 (Print) • Культура і мистецтво у сучасному світі. Вип. 20 • ISSN 2616-423X (Online)

DOI: 10.31866/2410-1915.20.2019.172440
UDC 792.028

PRETENDING FACTOR IN ACTING OF THE THEATER AND FILM ACTORS

Mykhailo Barnych

PhD in Art History, Professor,
ORCID: 0000-0003-2482-5202, mngm@ua.fm,
Kyiv National University of Culture and Arts,
36, Ye. Konovaltsia Str., Kyiv, 01133, Ukraine

The purpose of the article is to argue the factor of pretending in the technique of the theater and cinema actor; based on the analysis of the dual existence of the actor in the role, to prove the need for an approach to the creative act, based on the actor's participation in this act and then taking into account the form and content of human existence in everyday life. The research aims to find out the place and significance of pretending in the art of the theater and cinema actor. The methodology of the research presupposes application of the analytical and logical approach to understanding the actor's play in the creative act. The research uses a comparative analysis of the actor's existence in the role and as an ordinary person during a joke or deception. By comparing the dual existence of the actor in a role with a similar way of existence as an ordinary joker, their similarities and differences are clarified. The scientific novelty of the material presented in the article is to substantiate pretending as an integral part of the actor's activity. It is argued why pretending in a role is a prerequisite for an artistic act creation. It has been justified that there is the need to introduce the lecturers in the course of actors' teaching that explain the actor-beginner what the masterful pretending of bodily and mimic movements and linguistic features that arise during the activities and behavior of the character means, and how emotions arise thanks to pretending. Conclusions. The act of acting in general has more in common with deception than life, although it is designed to reflect it. Therefore, pretending and imitation in a role is a necessary and integral part of acting. Adoption of the way of existence simultaneously in the hypostasis of the deceiver and the character gives the actor more opportunities to observe and explore the features of own psyche, and therefore to manage own psycho-emotional system when acting.

Keywords: pretending; actor; self-deception; deception; experience; hypostasis.

Introduction

It is difficult to agree with those researchers of acting, who take, defend and interpret the imposed and feigned position – to create life in a role, basing on the form and content of human existence in normal life, and completely neglected the participation of the actor in the created life.

There has been no scientist, art critic or an actor so far who at least has tried to approach the analysis of acting from this different position – to create life in a role, primarily basing on the actor's performance in this created life, and therefore – given the form and the content of human existence in ordinary life.

ISSN 2410-1915 (Print) • Культура і мистецтво у сучасному світі. Вип. 20 • ISSN 2616-423X (Online)

In the works by of K. Stanislavskyi and M. Chekhov one important and decisive detail of actor's skill was missed. Both of them accepted the fact of pretending in a role as a self-evident need, and did not give this much importance. But pretending accompanies and complements the process of emotional experience. All the actors are aware of the problem: while acting where to hide from yourself and justify the fact that not everything in a role is really done and how to be with it? Of course, the actors with experience overcome this problem on their own, and partly they fix it, but not everyone – it depends. This is not the way how it should be and this problem should be explained in theater schools. After all, we, the actors, really skillfully falsify all the external characters of the character, from the physical and linguistic features to all the movements within and outside the body. Actually, movements, not actions! Movement is a means of action. And this applies not only to movements associated with physical actions and character traits of the character, but also all the rest, as already mentioned. But the biggest mistake is ignoring the fact that movement pretending is closely intertwined with the feeling that arises during this movement and it is defined by it. Without the first there will be no other. E. Butenko, the author of the imitation theory of actor's transformation in the role, gives a well-reasoned argument about pretending: "It is interesting that M. Chekhov founded another, different from K. Stanislavskyi's method of actor's education. However, K. Stanislavskyi himself did not claim to put the final point in his theories. "Imitation theory" is not yet another "method" or "system" and not another theory of actor's transformation. This is the first attempt to create a theory of stage transformation that is based on the famous provision on the imitative nature of art (Aristotle), reflections on the imitative nature of acting (Denis Diderot), on the discovery and study of general psychology of action, imagination, imitation, acting, etc., on the methods of teaching work of famous stage masters, including their practical experience and theoretical considerations (K. Stanislavskyi, E. Vakhtanhov, M. Chekhov, V. Meiierkhold, S. Mikhoels, B. Brekht, Yezhy Hrotovskyi, etc.)" (Butenko, 2017).

The purpose of the article

The purpose of the article is to argue the factor of pretending in the technique of the theater and cinema actor; based on the analysis of the dual existence of the actor in the role, to prove the need for an approach to the creative act, based on the actor's participation in this act and then taking into account the form and content of human existence in everyday life. The research aims to find out the place and significance of pretending in the art of the theater and cinema actor.

Presentation of the main material

About the *"Stanislavskyi's system"* When carefully looking at the cinema actors acting in close-up, in the place of the dramatic fragmentation of the character, you feel bitter for their failure to arouse the necessary feeling. It

ISSN 2410-1915 (Print) • Культура і мистецтво у сучасному світі. Вип. 20 • ISSN 2616-423X (Online)

happens not because the actors are not talented, but because they are wrongly trained to call and create this feeling. But this can be fixed!

What does it mean to perform the role, using the techniques of the so-called "Stanislavskyi's system", and why this "system" is detrimental to acting talent, if it is understood incorrectly and misused? I've been educated on this "system", I know it, I have worked using it, researched it and therefore I can afford such judgments.

In order to understand what is wrong with the "systems", we'll briefly consider its main principle.

First of all, it should be noted that K. Stanislavskyi questioned the exact definition of what he was doing in order to fit into the role: "If my practical and unscientific technique will help you too, it's good; I do not insist on anything and I do not claim anything" (Stanislavskyi, 1953, pp. 270). But all the actors are aware that according to the "system" they were taught, the actor, forcing themselves to imagine and believe in the circumstances proposed and analyzing acting according to the role, can master this action and, accordingly, emotional experience of the role. Actor's mastery builds and improves basing on this concise and generally formulated concept throughout the entire period of study. The improvement is deepened on the basis of enriching the actor's imagination about the character's image and creative work on it. With only this knowledge and, at first glance, logical beliefs about faith, imagination, attention, action, etc. (because if you observe life, you can really understand it), the actor tries to exist in the process of performing a role, and as a result – the actor succeeds from time to time: the role, in actor's opinion, is no slouch. However, not always and not as often as the actor would like to. Why? The actor didn't work on the image enough and insufficiently believed, imagined and acted, that is, the actor has not mastered the known techniques. And the worst thing is there is not enough talent! That's all, it is a comprehensive answer why it did not work, because you did everything as it was had been taught! If this is hammered into a student's head for all four years, then the student will really believe that there is no other way and that he or she is not talented enough. And with this imposed faith in the "system" the student will lose and bury own talent. Why lose? Because the talent cannot be realized on the wrong method of role performing.

The fault of the "system" in general is that it forces the actor to return in public conditions of acting in that hermetic creativity that was in the imagination. That is, the actor is forced to abstract from the public and those real circumstances that surround and storm him/her from all sides and hinder from creating the role. In particular, it is about the audience and colleagues in the role. Here's a mistake, including K. Stanislavskyi's mistake.

In order to create under public conditions the correct state that an actor created during the hermetic acting in the imagination, to call it repeatedly, it is necessary to use another way of existence, to take another example of life. Not only those K. Stanislavskyi's observations of the usual actions of people in life, but those in which we come closer to the acting profession in the usual life in public. These are the cases when people are joking and deceiving. Yes,

ISSN 2410-1915 (Print) • Культура і мистецтво у сучасному світі. Вип. 20 • ISSN 2616-423X (Online)

these are not noble examples and deeds – to laugh at someone, and moreover, to deceive. But we do this sometimes and we did it in the past. That's where we approach for some instant to the creative state in which the actor must remain, pursuing a noble goal. It is precisely in this state that we are not separated from the one we are deceiving or joking at, nor from the realization of the untruth, we do not force ourselves to believe in what we do and say, but we use our own natural abilities, a gift – another phenomenon inherent in man, which allows us to behave externally so plausibly not to be debunked. And in fact, thanks to this deception, external pretending, we enter into the state in which we experience the true sense of what we are pretending – our thinking is switched on independently in the sense of the deception and we begin to influence people in this state. And they believe us. This "gift of pretending" (the gift of pretending to be another person outwardly) borrowed from a usual deceiver, in fact, is the path that opens another gift – the "gift of experience" (a gift to breathe in a spirit of life into something false) in the role of something specific and special. Diderot considered imitation to be the main thing in the acting profession: "A man is a real man naturally, imitating transforms a man into someone different; the heart that you invent is not like the heart you really have. What is the true talent? In order to study external manifestations of another's soul, to address the feelings of those who listen to us, and to deceive them by imitation, which will exaggerate everything in their imagination and determine their judgments; because otherwise it is impossible to evaluate what is happening inside us. And what is the matter whether the actor feels or does not feel, once we still do not know that. An outstanding actor is the one who has deeply studied and with the greatest perfection reproduces the external signs of the most highly conceived ideal image" (Diderot, 1980, p. 33). The fact that this experience is peculiar, special and not as ordinary was noticed by Plato, then by D. Diderot, K. Stanislavskyo, M. Chekhov, L. Vygotskyi, R. Natadze, P. Yakobson and others. However, actors use pretending when they fit into the role, but unconsciously, without recognizing it. If the actor does not understand and does not recognize *what* he or she imitates in this role, and *what* is created independently, as a result of artificial existence, the nature will strike the actor from the other side – the actor will imitate feelings and pretend. As a result of self-observation and observation, it has been investigated that pretending and imitation in a role is an obligatory and integral part of acting skill. Thanks to pretending something what is really called "faith" is activated in the actor's consciousness and there really appears a sense of action, an emotion is formed. The actor falls into the state that K. Stanislavskyi called "I am": "In our language we call this state on the stage "I am". And what is "I am"? It means: I exist, I live, I feel and think the same way with the role. In other words, "I am" leads to emotions, to feelings, to experience" (Stanislavskyi, 1953, p. 217).

Of course, not all actors act this way. Actors with experience do this way – they pretend and experience at the same time. But this comes with experience! We have to wait for this experience. And not everyone has an opportunity to play an infinite number of roles and work out a personal approach to perform a role! Therefore, it is necessary to recognize and openly tell young actors, what

ISSN 2410-1915 (Print) • Культура і мистецтво у сучасному світі. Вип. 20 • ISSN 2616-423X (Online)

exactly is pretended, imitated in a role, and what is independently formed as a result of this pretending: "The fact of perception of the viewer of so-called "double" acting on the stage can serve as an indicator of how subtly the viewer feels and distinguishes a true transformation from "imitation"; when an actor performs a role of a two-faced insincere man who is insincere in revealing own feelings and tries to show themselves a completely different person. Indeed, here, as a true transformation, that is, with a convincing organics for the viewer, manifests itself in that inner life, the emotion of the person performed by an actor who hides behind the lies of emotions imitated by this man" (Natadze, 1972, p. 118). Is not it obvious that the more the actor gives the character the external characteristic features that the actor is imitating, the sooner the actor enters the role. But if the actor simulates it, then perhaps this is not the solution to the creation of the actor's behavior, facial expressions, breathing, etc. – all external signs and responses? *Actor and deceiver: two worlds – two truths.* The main argument that prompts to turn to the experience of pretending of untruth is the fact that, besides the real experience in the role, the actor also uses pretending. This is known to all actors-practitioners, but the traditional actor's school, for some reason, has stubbornly been keeping it secret. That is, deceit is a part of the actor's art, and therefore, it's food for thought.

When the actor takes over the mode of the deceiver's existence and turns deception into an open public acting, then, firstly, this is no longer a "deceit", because it is disclosed, and secondly – this method surprisingly exactly coincides with the actor's art. Both the deceiver and the actor have the same content of inner life. Both the deceiver and the actor lead a double mode of existence. And this way you can live and control your condition at the same time. The deceiver very clearly fixes all own internal changes up to the heartbeat and tries to control them so that they are not caught when they lie. Such a management, albeit intuitive, but extremely natural, aims at regulating, first of all, the internal state of health during deception. If something can be pretended outwardly, then this state cannot be pretended. It is regulated in a different way. Therefore, the actor must be in the image of the character, and in the mask of the deceiver, to understand and feel how this invisible regulation is taking place.

But an average deceiver is not able to perturb falsehood so much as an actor. Indeed, under this falsehood, not an ordinary deceiver is hidden, but an actor who performs actions from the character. And the most preoccupied position of a deceiver encourages and stimulates these actions to be performed as own. As practice shows, such appropriation occurs. The word "deception" must be understood in quotes also because this actor's "deception" is directed to the actor's own psyche, its change, and not to others. Others – the viewers and the role colleagues – serve only as a kind of "buffer" to commit this deception. In the course of acting, which is simultaneously based on the creative platform and the platform of deception, the actor cares deeply about the fate of the performed character. And these created feelings are different from those in life, not those unattainable, which we, actors, are trying to pullt, looking at life. *About actor's self-deception and deception.* An indisputable factor is that the state of experience of the actor in the role (thinking and feeling in a role)

ISSN 2410-1915 (Print) • Культура і мистецтво у сучасному світі. Вип. 20 • ISSN 2616-423X (Online)

is a state of temporary self-deception. This self-deception cannot be called self-forgetting. No, only the mental part of the actor's consciousness and the psycho-emotional system are subjected to this state. The actor easily leaves from this state when there is a necessity (Hrachev, 2003, pp. 118–119). Such an inherent people's manifestation (phenomenon) can be observed in ordinary life. For example, when we are passionate about watching a movie or a play, reading a book, etc., we are also in a state of temporary self-deception.

The actor's self-deception is to deceive own consciousness publicly, and this is an enormous effort. In the technique of self-deception (if appealing to this word), which was constructed by K. Stanislavskyi, and not only by him, and that is used by the actors, one important moment is omitted – the publicity of self-deception. The efforts of the actors, directed at themselves to get into the state of self-deception (the experience of what is performed), neglecting the viewer, are incorrect – public self-deception is impossible without the "deception" of the public for its own benefit.

The obvious factor of "deceiving" the public is the physical reproduction and creation of all movements of the character. After all, the actor does not reproduce all movements on demand, as in life, but they are performed deliberately and skillfully. The actor pretends to the public that motion is born, arises independently. Such reproductions relate to all external responses of the character, in particular, mimic and speech. Reproduction and creation of movements is a special technique of psychotechnics, such that instantly stimulates the internal response – emotion, experience. First of all, a movement is reproduced and performed and after there appears an appropriate emotional state, thought, experience. That is, the movement is the motivator that launches the mechanism of the actor's experience under the public conditions of creativity.

How to perform and create a movement imperceptibly to the public, how to pronounce a word, how to reproduce and create mimic reactions, assessments, etc., so that the viewer did not differentiate this creative performance from the natural needs of the actor, perceiving them as if just born – these are the psychotechnics techniques, which the actor masters. Only when the viewer cannot differentiate this, the actor's consciousness does not differentiate either. It will accept and perceive these creative movements as real ones, as those that are naturally born as actions. Actually the naturalness of these pretended movements is not that they appear similar to the way they appear in life, but in the ability of the actor to reproduce them naturally or organically, which prompts the consciousness to perceive them as the actor's own actions. This is a technique of deception, which results in the so-called self-deception of the actor (Jacobson, 1936, p. 49).

Is it possible to avoid the word "deception" in the technique of the actor? No. Deception of the public is also a necessary condition because of the fact that the actor during such an active invisible interaction with the audience shifts own perception of the role to that one which M. Chekhov calls "seeing yourself from the side", that is, from the standpoint of the viewer (Chekhov, 1986, p. 266). *Play-actor or hypocrite?* Of course, acting deceit is "white". The

ISSN 2410-1915 (Print) • Культура і мистецтво у сучасному світі. Вип. 20 • ISSN 2616-423X (Online)

actor's untruth heals spiritually and emotionally. As the practice shows, when the actor uses the mask of another person-character and exploits the experience of natural existence in a lie, the actor is able to cross the border of lie as far as possible in order to perpetuate the fiction deeply. However, at the same time the actor never forgets that they are acting. It must be understood that the very ideas we have about life experience of natural existence in deception are not enough for acting and creating a deep state of feeling in a role. The technique of "deception" in applying to a role must first be tried, studied, checked and mastered by the actor in the learning process.

The actor uses deception of another's brain for self-deception, which is referred to as transformation. Actors are delighted when I explain this to them at the first lecture. But when it comes to deceiving the brain of a colleague and, therefore, the viewer, for the sake of a noble purpose, taking advantage of the scientific theory used by the illusionists, and derivative techniques based and tested on this and other theories, here the inner block is switched on. Here you have to manipulate your brain through the brain of others, and it becomes scary. Why? They did not have such experience and such sensations. The experience of black deception – hypocrisy – has always existed, but in this experience you only manipulate the brain of others. And here you do it with your own brain. Therefore, pretending is achievable and easy, and it is not necessary to master it, because it comes from the life experience of hypocrisy – to deceive others, manipulate the brain of others, but not your own. And here it is necessary to be an "idiot" in art. It is necessary to reject the imposed stereotype of the veiled and obscure concept of "subconscious nature" and not to act by chance, but to recognize yourself and become the "magician" who knows for certain that he manipulates the properties of own brain. And to understand that if such a volitional act is impossible to perform over your own brain, then the "trick" will not succeed, the very "subconscious nature" will independently do its "black" deed – to make the actor perform the function of a hypocrite that is available in the actor's profession.

Could the novice actors not be guided by how they would behave and what they would do in the life circumstances corresponding to the role, as it is common practice in theater schools? Who can know how their nature works under similar life circumstances? How to watch, explore, study and fix it? Instead, the deceiver fulfills the task "to be in the proposed circumstances" more precisely as the deceiver just exists in them! The adoption of the way of existence simultaneously in the hypostasis of the deceiver and the character gives the actor an opportunity to observe and explore the features of own psyche. After all, the actor must manage own psycho-emotional system!

Knowledge of one's own psyche is the power that the actor uses while acting.

Isn't it better to study own nature, using deception as acting, putting it at the service of art? May it be worth trying to think and change the vector of actor's technique mastering? Our art, in the end, intersects mostly with deception, rather than with life, although it is intended to reflect life!

ISSN 2410-1915 (Print) • Культура і мистецтво у сучасному світі. Вип. 20 • ISSN 2616-423X (Online)

It must be emphasized that introduction of "deceit" laws into the actor's technique does not destroy the established Stanislavskyi's principle of acting as an art of experience, but only determines another way to achieve this goal – the way to combine pretending and experience as integral parts of acting, creative and public process.

Conclusions

The act of acting in general has more in common with deception than life, although it is designed to reflect it. Therefore, pretending and imitation in a role is a necessary and integral part of acting. It has been researched and observed that the deceiver more precisely fulfills the task of "being in the proposed circumstances" than an ordinary person. Adoption of the way of existence simultaneously in the hypostasis of the deceiver and the character gives the actor more opportunities to observe and explore the features of own psyche, and therefore to manage own psycho-emotional system when acting. Directions for future research will be aimed at revealing the specific features of deception and imitation in theater acting.

Список використаних джерел

1. Бутенко Э. Сценическое перевоплощение. Теория и практика. Москва : Лань, 2017. 372 с.

2. Грачева Л. В. Актерский тренинг: теория и практика. Санкт-Петербург : Речь, 2003. 168 с.

3. Дидро Д. Эстетика и литературная критика. Москва : Художественная литература, 1980. 659 с.

4. Натадзе Р. Г. Воображение как фактор поведения. Тбилиси : Мецниереба, 1972. 184 с.

5. Станіславський К. С. Робота актора над собою. Київ : Мистецтво, 1953. 670 с.

6. Чехов М. Литературное наследие. В 2 т. Москва: Искусство, 1986. 559 с.

7. Якобсон П. М. Психология сценических чувств актера. Москва : Художественная литература, 1936. Т. 2. 214с.

References

Butenko, E. (2017). *Stsenicheskoye perevoploshcheniye. Teoriya i praktika* [Stage reincarnation. Theory and practice]. Moscow: Lan.

Chekhov, M. (1986). *Literaturnoye naslediye* [Literary heritage]. (Vol. 2). Moscow: Iskusstvo.

Diderot, D. (1980). *Estetika i literaturnaya kritika* [Aesthetics and literary criticism]. Moscow: Khudozhestvennaya literature.

Hracheva, L.V. (2003). *Akterskiy trening: teoriya i praktika* [Actor training: Theory and Practice]. St. Petersburg: Rech.

ISSN 2410-1915 (Print) • Культура і мистецтво у сучасному світі. Вип. 20 • ISSN 2616-423X (Online)

Natadze, R.G. (1972). *Voobrazheniye kak faktor povedeniya* [Imagination as a factor of behavior]. Tbilisi: Metsniyereba.
Stanislavskyy, K.S. (1953). *Robota aktora nad soboyu* [Actor's self-improvement]. Kyiv: Mystetstvo.
Yakobson, P.M. (1936). *Psikhologiya stsenicheskikh chuvstv aktera* [Psychology of actor's stage feelings]. Moscow: Khudozhestvennaya literature.

The article was received in editors office: 22.02. 2019

ФАКТОР УДАВАННЯ У ГРІ АКТОРА ТЕАТРУ ТА КІНО

Барнич Михайло Михайлович

Кандидат мистецтвознавства, професор,
ORCID: 0000-0003-2482-5202, mngm@ua.fm,
Київський національний університет культури і мистецтв,
Київ, Україна

Метою статті є з'ясування місця та значення удавання у мистецтві актора театру та кіно. Відповідно до поставленої мети та завдань використано методи аналітичного та логічного підходу до осмислення ігрової участі актора у творчому акті, застосовано порівняльний аналіз існування актора в ролі та звичайної людини під час жарту чи обману. Через зіставлення двобічного існування актора в ролі із аналогічним способом існування звичайного жартівника, з'ясовуються їх подібності та розбіжності.

Акторське мистецтво переважно переплітається з обманом, ніж із життям, хоча й покликане відображати саме його. Тому удавання та імітація в ролі є обов'язковою і невід'ємною частиною акторської майстерності. Досліджено та спостережено, що обманщик точніше виконує завдання «бути в запропонованих обставинах», ніж звичайна людина. Прийняття способу існування одночасно і в іпостасі обманщика, і персонажа надає акторові більші можливості для спостереження та дослідження особливості власної психіки, а відтак керувати в ролі психоемоційною системою. При цьому, введення у акторську техніку закономірностей «обману» не руйнує визначений К. Станіславським принцип акторського мистецтва як мистецтва переживання, а тільки визначає інший шлях для досягнення цієї мети – шлях поєднання удавання і переживання як складових акторського, творчого, публічного процесу.

Висновки. Таким чином, у досліджені доведено необхідність залучення удавання як невід'ємної складової діяльності актора до його майстерності. Аргументовано чому удавання в ролі є необхідною умовою створення мистецького акту. Вмотивовано процес викладання майстерності удавання тілесних та мімічних рухів і мовних ознак, які виникають під час дій та поведінки персонажа, і як завдяки удаванню виникає переживання.

Ключові слова: удавання; актор; самообман; обман; переживання; іпостась.

ISSN 2410-1915 (Print) • Культура і мистецтво у сучасному світі. Вип. 20 • ISSN 2616-423X (Online)

ФАКТОР ПЕРЕВОПЛОЩЕНИЯ В ИГРЕ АКТЕРА ТЕАТРА И КИНО

Барныч Михаил Михайлович

Кандидат искусствоведения, профессор,
ORCID: 0000-0003-2482-5202, mngm@ua.fm,
Киевский национальный университет культуры и искусств,
Киев, Украина

Целью статьи является выяснение места и значения перевоплощения в искусстве актера театра и кино. Согласно поставленной цели и задаче использованы методы аналитического и логического подхода к осмыслению игрового участия актера в творческом акте, применены сравнительный анализ существования актера в роли и обычного человека во время шутки или обмана. Через сопоставление двустороннего существования актера в роли с аналогичным способом существования обычного шутника, выясняются их сходства и различия.

Актерское искусство больше переплетается с обманом, чем с жизнью, хотя и призвано отражать именно его. Поэтому притворство и имитация в роли является обязательным и неотъемлемой частью актерского мастерства. Исследовано и прослеживается, что обманщик точнее выполняет задание «быть в предлагаемых обстоятельствах», чем обычный человек. Принятие способа существования одновременно и в ипостаси обманщика, и персонажа предоставляет актеру большие возможности для наблюдения и исследования особенности собственной психики, а затем управлять в роли психоэмоциональной системой. При этом, введение в актерскую технику закономерностей «обмана» не разрушает определенный К. Станиславским принцип актерского искусства как искусства переживания, а только определяет другой путь для достижения этой цели – путь сочетания притворства и переживания как составляющих актерского, творческого, публичного процесса.

Выводы. Таким образом, в исследовании доказана необходимость привлечения перевоплощения как неотъемлемой составляющей деятельности актера к его мастерству. Аргументировано почему притворство в роли является необходимым условием создания художественного акта. Мотивировано процесс преподавания мастерства притворства телесных и мимических движений и языковых признаков, которые возникают во время действий и поведения персонажа, и как благодаря притворству возникает переживание.

Ключевые слова: перевоплощение; актер; самообман; обман; переживания; ипостась.