The Impact of Plato's and Aristotle's Mimesis Concept on the Cinema

Vahid Hayati

Abstract--- Among the important theories in the philosophy of art, Mimesis and imitation can be considered as one of the most important approaches along with theories such as expressionism, institutional theory and other theories, whose description and explanation are the basis of many philosophical discussions of art. Plato and Aristotle have a special place among the philosophers who have dealt with Mimesis. Although the term has evolved over the centuries, the concept of mimesis has sometimes been marginalized by the importance of the creative imagination in the Romanticism approach, but it has always maintained its place among the art theories. This study examines the concept of mimesis in Plato's and Aristotle's speech and, while explaining this concept in the field of art from the perspective of these two philosophers, and analyzes the impact and placement of this concept on cinema through Realism using descriptive and analytical method. As a result, Mimesis's semantic in the history of art evolution and the traces of this concept in cinema are outlined in this research under the theory of realism and formalism in cinema.

I. INTRODUCTION

Although the philosophies of art deal with the imitation and mimesis concepts in art, many scholars in the field have devised related concepts, some of which differ markedly based on different thinking and worldviews. However, Plato's and Aristotle's points of view are referred to in presenting a topic that can clarify the place of ideas in the formation of art; in other words, the position of mimesis and imitation in art. In between are philosophical thoughts and ideas. The views of others such as Kant, Nietzsche, Croucher, and many other thinkers have not been addressed, as each can be a gateway to widespread debate and research, which is beyond the scope of this research. But, for example, we refer to the views of two philosophers (Plato and Aristotle) to address the differences between the semantics of the word "mimesis" in the opinion of these two and to examine its traces in the theorizing of cinema.

Plato's and Aristotle's works on the theoretical foundations of art are of crucial importance. However, this importance is unlikely to appear at first glance. But why is their work so important in the theoretical foundations of philosophy and art? It can be said that the main reason is simply that they belong to Plato and Aristotle, and from about the 13th until the beginning of the current century, European scholars have scrutinized these works by referring to the original Greek texts and their Latin translations, and have evaluated or criticized as the reference. This applies, of course, not only to art but also to all other concepts that influence the theoretical foundations of art, such as concepts and theories about nature, knowledge, the role of reason, reality and potential human abilities. Whether we are aware of it or not, Plato's and Aristotle's ideas have somehow enriched our thinking to date, that's why we refer to such views and benefit from them (House, 2005: 13).

Vahid Hayati, PhD. Candidate in Philosophy of Art, Department of The Wisdom of Religious Arts, Institute of Higher Education of Islamic Art and Thought, Qom, Iran. Email: Hayati.vh@gmail.com

Mimesis's conception of art is intertwined with various concepts. In some ancient Greek texts, it has been translated into imitations, and in others they are meant to be performed, especially in rituals, to imitate behavior to entertain others and play a role. Therefore, some of their discourses on Mimesis at first seem different and sometimes contradictory, when studying the translation of the works of Aristotle and Plato. Since they think of things that we know very differently, or they conclude from something else that is not true to the present reader. However, it should be borne in mind that the reason for disagreement with Plato and Aristotle may also be due to the translation of those terms, i.e. the expressions in which the terms imitation and representation, and the attributes and verbs associated with them are used.

The same philosophical approach to cinema leads to different interpretations, which can be said to be the following imitation of the reality and the realism of many theories. From the original realism of the invention of the camcorder (invented by Lumière brothers) to the realism formed in Italy under the name of neorealism, and even the realism of France and England, which each formed a movement behind their concept; There are many landscapes, being included in the mentioned category.

This study seeks to analyze the philosophical art theory in cinematic theory from the view of mimesis to provide an understanding of the evolving relationships underlying philosophical thought and its influence on the contemporary visual arts, including cinema. Thus, the evolution of early thought behind the mimesis and its presence in cinema is partly explained.

II. MIMESIS

Art has been interpreted in various terms in ancient Greece; techne, poiesis, and mimesis are among the many topics that have led to many discussions. Meaning, interpretation, and how they apply to the instances have been the most important issues of these terms. The word mimesis has gone through many ups and downs in the history of philosophy and art, so it is not the only one with a specific meaning. Rather, it can be said that in the times' various concepts have been developed for that. Linguists and philosophers each have several meanings in their field of thought: "The root of mimesis] is derived from "mimos", and words like mimeisthai, mimesis, mimotes, mimetikos are all derived from the same root. Mimos and mimotes refer to someone who imitates. Mimema refers to the outcome of the act of imitation, and mimesis of the act itself and its process. Mimetikos is a subject that can be imitated and tried. "(Zimmaran, 2009: 48 and 49)

In a part of the History of Aesthetics, Tartarkewicz believes that the word mimesis was a term used both to imitate reality and as a description of ritual activities: "The term mimesis was used to describe the religious activities of clergy associated with music, but not for the visual arts." (Tatararkovic, 2013: 238)

The transfer of the concept of Mimesis to the realm of philosophy began in ancient Greece and changed its meaning in the use of the word in new domains. Socrates, Plato, and Aristotle used the term in art. Plato moved this word to the field of painting and carving and applied it in Book X of the "Republic". Aristotle, while accepting artists' imitation of reality as it is, also considered it in the better or worse presentation of things. He extended the process of imitation to other realms beyond the reality of things. This variety of approaches in the word Mimesis is also found in other works of Greek philosophers: "According to the Pythagorean belief, mimesis is the expression of the inner personality. The main focus of the mimesis was music. According to Democritus, Mimesis meant to obtain a model of the works of nature that can be applied to all arts, not just to art but to imitation." (Tatararkovic, 2013: 286)

The "Mimesis" has been existing as a term in philosophical discourse since before Plato. After Plato, imitation of nature as an idea was revised by Aristotle. Until the mid-eighteenth century, Mimesis was regarded as a criterion for compatibility of artistic work with the authentic reality of life until it was finally challenged by the English classicism in the eighteenth century, without denying its role in general.

As in the middle of the nineteenth century, the realism in France and Germany came to be seen as a general program which, in the words of the likes of Durante and Corbé, sought to reject realism in its idealism. However, like any philosophical concept, Mimesis has had its theoretical definition and explanation. The word can also be found in Persian in the literal sense of words such as imitation and trial. The word represents an imitation, which is the English word for representation and imitation, which is also used in the Persian translation of Mimesis. "Trials in the word means to tell together, to quote a person's promise or action, to speak, to say, to quote, to be like someone or something" (Dehkhoda, 1373: 12). Art is used to imitating. (Mirsadeghi, 1377: 237) Therefore, the word mimosas have expanded to include more semantic roots in the process of evolving epochs and consequently having the same semantic roots and have been able to continue in the maze of concepts. Even in contemporary times, it has a special place among philosophers of art and philosophy.

Mimesis and Plato

However, some Plato scholars consider it to be a kind of art and have put the concept of poets' rejection of utopia into context and have invoked the tenth treatise of his republic to prove it. But the fair approach is that his thoughts on his work do not altogether endorse such an atrocity. In quoting Socrates in Plato's Republic, Plato speaks of rules that do not accept imitation poetry in Medina. But his approach to the remainder of his discussions in the tenth section of the Republic's treatise suggests a distinction between the types of poetry. In this treatise, he mentions something called a three-seater bed, which is the natural bed that the saunas make, the bed that the craftsman makes, and finally the bed that the creator brings into his picture. But the word mimesis is used only to describe the act of the poet and the artist. A face whose product is three times the truth. (E 597 & Gat, 2014: 4) This way of looking at the work of poetry and imitation art brings with it a kind of vulgar and obscene valuation that attributes a low degree of creation to the craftsman. But "Mimesis does not always mean negative to Plato, but is sometimes means praised and sometimes denounced" (Binayi Motlaq, 1390: 28).

Such an approach can be found in the republican treatise: "In the transcript of the republican guards have been forbidden to imitate and sometimes allowed to imitate. The guards must not imitate, or if they imitate, they must be one of those things that have been appropriate to them since childhood." (Ibid.: 28) It is Plato's distinction between types of imitation. Plato at the end of the Sophist treatise separates art from humanity and the imitation used in it from Sani's production and art. Therefore, the simulation and imitation applied to human labor, both in speech and in imagination, transmits both right and wrong. So, it can be said that imitation and knowledge matter here. In fact, by drawing the imitation in the Sufi context, Plato views the Sufi as saying and imitating the negative and other types of imitation as positive. Plato at the end of the Sophist treatise considers Mimesis to be of two kinds: one with knowledge and the other with ignorance and ignorance (Binayi Motlaq, 2013: 37)

Given what is in Plato's philosophical vision of art and imitation, the work of the poet and painter is not merely the recreation and extraversion of things, but the artist in the process of production must consider the truth of things.

Such an approach depicts the work of art as an imitation of something else. Thus, Plato's mirror-like look at objects, which is the imitation of reality as it is, does not hold a place in Plato's view. For Plato, the subject of art cannot be merely the re-creation of reality (Binayi Motlaq, 2013: 40). This approach suggests that art within the Platonic framework is not limited to tangible examples. What puts art at a significant level is the transcendence of the ritual and the way we look at things. The artist reveals the reality through artistic representation and imitation of something beyond the objects and looking at it from another perspective. Therefore, Plato does not consider a poet to be a poet in terms of weight and rhyme. It will be. " (Ibid: 41)

In sum, Plato, although skeptical of imitation in art, is at the same time trying to make a distinction between what he likes or dislikes. In the tenth book of the Republic, it is said that "the painter paints the bed, not as the bed is, but as the bed

looks. It is here that Plato puts painters in the image of imitators and classifies them as false industrialists, who do not have original craftsmanship, such as physicians, but have false traditions or fatalities, such as goats, which provide us with health. (Beardsley, 1997: 10)

In the meantime, the word Mimesis, used in various ways in Plato's various treatises, also expresses an outline of Plato's word in art. In his view, the artist's human being in the process of imitation must provide a complete representation of the truth of the objects and any defects in the process will result in distortion. The desire to elaborate on the imitation of art can also be seen in the attitude of contemporary Plato's society, which led to Plato's attempt to criticize, rather than endorse, Plato. Their folk legends praised the painter Zeuxis for painting the clusters of grapes so real that the birds invaded them. "It is said to be signs that it may indicate a decline in the status of art in his contemporary era. The thought that was more about separating art from the truth and trying to create an illusion of thought led philosophers like Plato to shine a light on understanding the story. "He [Plato] has repeatedly stated that he opposes false poetry, poems that give a false impression of very important things such as the nature of the good and the sensible. The error found in most of the current stories is the false representation of the gods and heroes. These stories are completely untrue. The poets make vain mistakes; their explanation of the afterlife is false, much of what they say is a vicious lie, not only because they are lies, but because they are very important. (Haus 2005: 21)

According to Plato in his early and middle dialogues, during the period when he wrote the Treatise of the Republic, the world we normally experience is an illusion or a set of mere representations, such as mirrors or shadows on the wall. The real world is a parable, and the knowledge we derive from our senses in the ordinary world is not knowledge at all, but mere manifestation: true knowledge is acquired through the world of example through reason and understanding. According to Plato, the parable is separate from this universe, in the primordial world, literal and transcendental, and it is only in the real world that there are proper attributes of knowledge, which philosophers also seek to interpret and to attain. Plato describes human conditions as inmates of a cave, who, because of their imprisonment, are only able to gaze in one direction, with fire behind them and a wall in front of them. Unfortunately, they conceive of these shadows as reality, and have no image of the reality behind them and their nature and nature, in Plato's view, in that we hold ourselves captive within our own body, emotions, and emotions. We have a cave, and only when we turn away from these things and use our rational insights are we able to escape and escape the cave, and in the light of the sun and fire we come to see real things like the first, and for the first time, we come to true knowledge. He says: "The representation of the artist ... is very far from the truth (the artist merely creates shadows that are three times the reality, ... so it can be assumed that not all poets from Homer onwards had any (epistemic) understanding of reality. They only deal with superficial representations of subjects, one of which is human virtues" (Haus, 2005: 27).

Plato goes on to discuss imitation art, sees it as an example in painting, and somehow treats it with contempt because it compares it with holding a mirror to reality that could be the work of anyone, who himself It reads as follows: "Every human being of the brain can also obtain a mirror." (House, 2005: 30) He admits that: "The painter must be skilled not to be a brain, of course. That his skill requires knowledge. His painting is knowledge of phenomena, for the artist merely attempts to represent the images. " (Ibid.: 30) When exploring Plato's assumption that the painter does not attempt to conceal the apparent phenomena, the theory of the good is self-evident. It makes it clear that the painter's goal should not be to imitate the objects of this world, but to imitate and convey "true beauty". It is to imitate a beautiful example that is devoid of its incomplete transcripts in this world. In other words, Plato can be argued to argue that the artist's purpose in representing things is not merely to depict the exalted model of progress, but to imitate the true nature and essence of things instead of understanding and exemplifying multiple examples. It is an ideal or parable, or a rational abstraction of the details that make up the true representation. This imitation may require depth and sophistication, but if the painting is

merely a depiction of what is in front of the actual one in front of the person, though this in principle requires technical skill, it does not require any sophistication.

Mimesis and Aristotle

Art, or in a beautiful sense, falls within Aristotle's intellectual system and the framework of the classification of the sciences into the domain of poiesis, which has a synthetic and aesthetic aspect. Thane and mimesis are words used in Aristotle's discussion of art in Batticals. Artifacts and imitation are features of the art category that are used against nature. Artistic phenomena are also imitation and craftsmanship that flow from their creator. For this reason, "its actual cause is searchable in the creator's existence, not in the soul itself. In a sense, the product of art is voluntary, but the product of nature is indispensable." (Zimmaran, 24: 1388) Such an approach proposed by Aristotle in the discussion of art is contemplated regarding man and his place of creativity in imitation and imitation. It can also be considered as the ground for a subjectivist approach to art in later centuries.

However, Aristotle did not specifically define the word mimesis and imitation, but what he says in his treatises implies that his imitation was not merely a duplication of objects. "Aristotle wrote, it may not be possible for the people painted by Zeuxis; he decorated them, but he was right in doing so because the ideal type must have superiority over reality" (Tatarkovich, 2013: 284) Thus art can represent and represent things above or below what they are. While he does not imitate mere copying of objects as they are, he places poetry deeper and more philosophically, and has a more valuable place in history, because history merely represents personal and personal affairs while poetry It illustrates general things. "History sought for individual experiences, but poetry was concerned with general experience." (Bhatika, 1451. 36) Such an attitude would lead to an understanding of Aristotle's ruling spirit in which, in addition to imitation and representation, confrontation and It's about looking at things freely. "His [Aristotle's] understanding of the meaning of imitation, unlike what modern thinkers perceived in this sense, had two aspects: on the one hand Mimesis was a representation of reality, and on the other, it meant freely expressing it." 1392: 287) Aristotle also understood the meaning of imitation in addition to the realm of music - meaning previously imbued with Aristotle - as well as imitation in poetry, epic, and tragedy. In tragedy, the main purpose of mimesis is to imitate the representation of a speech or behavior. This is the ability and skill used to represent literary subjects. The same approach has been considered by Aristotle in other artistic fields such as sculpture, poetry, and poetry. Aristotle underlined Mimesis's argument that the representation of reality was beyond what it was and was, so it did not rule out the possibility of making the subject more beautiful or uglier in the representation. "We rely not only on Mimesis to reconstruct and replicate existing phenomena, but also to change them," he says in his essay. That is, to refine them or to personalize the overall approach and make them beautiful in general." (Zimmaran, 2009: 53).

The term Mimesis in Aristotelian thought extended to other areas of meaning as part of it, so that Aristotle considered an imitation of art in phenomena that were essential to the subject matter. "The poet has a duty not to Talk about what happened, but what might happen." (Zimmaran, 2009: 55) It should be added that the artist in his works is also capable of designing impossible objects, provided that Be it goals and make the imitation necessary. "Aristotle applied the concept of imitation mainly to a tragedy filled with mythological heroes and occurring somewhere between the human world and the divine world." (Tatararkovic, 1392: 285) About imitating such a world where reality is at least It turns out that one cannot question the representation of reality.

Aristotle, who did not provide a precise definition of Mimesis, has used the term extensively in his work and for his opinion. In all these terms, what can be said is that Aristotle on Mimesis has taken an approach beyond the reflection of reality, but has a particular view of expressing the inner human qualities rather than the external properties of objects. "To Aristotle, poetical inspiration is tied to one's natural talent" (Beheshti, 2010: 4). Thus, the artist who depicts Aristotle can

create a much more beautiful work than the artist following Plato, since other processes of production and imitation abroad the artist is not a human being. Whereas in Plato's true imitation was meant by inspiration, while in Aristotle's views there is no trace of inspiration and connection with exemplary facts.

In Plato's view, the reality is inherent in the parable, and the real world is the parable. However, he does believe in tangible facts. In Aristotle's view, therefore, that all objects are made up of matter and matter, "the object is real and its face is what it was. In that case, there is a kind of durability, which, despite the instability of matter in an object, lasts for the same kind of durability. " However, in Plato's philosophy, the degree of the objects in existence is far lower than that of the parable, whereas in Aristotle's theory they are the objects of their inhabitants.

Plato and Aristotle share the view that poetry is like imitation or representation in visual arts, and this famous discourse is remembered by Aristotle, though it has no objectivity in Aristotle's works famously mentions it: "Art imitates nature." (Hauss, 1384: 38) Hauss says in his book: This speech is not in the context of the book itself, and the fact that it is often used as an abstract from Aristotle's view of our relationship between art and the outside world. And it will. So, it is a mistake to suppose that it is, in its literal sense, a discussion of how tragic poetry imitates nature. Aristotle, in full adherence to Plato, regarded poetry and other arts (painting, sculpture, music, and dance) as imitating and discussing what poetry imitates without reference to nature. (Same: 39)

However, Aristotle considered the art of this world to be the essence of art. Unlike Plato, who provided an intuitive and inspirational basis for the creation of at least some forms of art, Aristotle did not believe in any immaterial source as the basis for artistic creation. Aristotle, according to his philosophy, analyzed art and artistic creation based on this whole world, under natural and material rules. Aristotle has divided science into theory, practice, and production. The immediate goal of each of these sciences is cognition, but their ultimate goal is to know, behave, and make useful or beautiful objects, respectively. Aristotle, like Plato, considered trials and imitations in the art world as though it were imitation from the perspective of the human senses and regarded it as an ideal and imitation of things as they are.

Reality and cinema

The real issue that comes up with the film and its nature, which has come to the attention of cinema theorists and theorists, is that cinema has its unique concepts and elements. Thus, they try to define and describe the unique quality of cinema based on the characteristics and capacities of the media or based on the audience's experiences. That is why we find that many theories have been developed and accepted in this regard. Rudolph Arnheim, for example, talks about the limitations of the images from the outside world and seeks to prove his point about the odd possibilities of cinema. According to Sergei Eisenstein, "facade and assembly" are the basic elements of cinema and defines film based on them. Andre Bazin speaks of fragments of reality depicted. Ff. Perkins considers the possibilities of cinema media and believes that these possibilities go far beyond the aspects that result from realistic recording and illusory creation during the dominant cinematic narrative. Ziegfried Krakauer speaks of the fundamental and technical characteristics of the cinema media, or Christine Metz of the cinematic and linguistic features of the cinematic elements as follows: audiovisual, animated, multiple, and so on. In general, it has been the subject of various kinds of debate around it.

Experts and theorists in the field have argued that the film offers much more than just moving pictures to defend the film against allegations that the film is a downfall of reality. Even among film proponents, there is no consensus on accepting it as a reality-related art. The question has always been whether the film should be an intuitive medium, or should it have all the tools that might make it more realistic; and use sound, color, and three-dimensional effects? Where is the art in this mechanical production and the combination of sounds and images, and what is the nature of artistic participation in the creation of a film? Some believe that there is only one supervisory and controlling force: the director or the artist who stands for the combination of reality by selecting and organizing the film strips. While acknowledging that

actors, techies, and writers are also contributing to the making of the film, some scholars believe that the film should be considered a literary piece created or written by the director alone; The character recognizes the artistic style of the director, just as some literary critics concentrate on the character of the artist or proponents of the author's view in cinema. The difference in viewpoints is abundant in the film, even where theorists agree that the director plays a key role in the creation of the film, with disagreements over the means of organizing the elements of reality. This raises the fundamental question of whether the director allows the camera to record external events with minimal interference, or does the artistic process necessitate a reorganization of that basic reality by adjusting the scene according to the graphic design, by changing the camera's viewing angle and side by side. Is the placement of edited films in a way that encompasses features beyond ordinary understanding of reality? However, these issues regarding the film's position concerning the reality and nature of the creative process of art have always been a subject of concern among scholars in this field.

It is a deep-rooted struggle in the history of cinema to see how reality unfolds in the film. After World War I, film theories found their proper place in philosophical discussions, two major currents in film theories emerged that had begun from the very beginning of cinema: realist theory and expressionist theory. In the history of cinematic contemplation among the theorists of cinema, issues such as whether a film examines reality or whether it looks beyond reality or points to a self-made reality are familiar. A debate that inevitably extends to areas beyond cinema and seeks its roots in philosophy.

The roots of both theories of realism and formalism are easily recognizable in the history of thought. In essence, this fundamental difference is the result of two different views of the man on the world that in the history of thought, these two views are recognizable in Plato's and Aristotle's theories. Plato believed that the real world itself derives its epistemic validity from the real world, real and real beyond the physical and physical world. To be recognized, one must return to the world of the like. Aristotle, on the other hand, holds that the universe and the parable that Plato refers to as the real truth are not situated apart from the same physical or detailed world. Plato considered the representation of reality in the art to be less valuable than reality itself, and original art was in his view an artist whose source of inspiration and source was the work of the universe, or parable. Aristotle, like Plato, imitates art, and at the same time considers the value of art as imitative. The importance of education in Aristotle's view makes this aspect valuable. Because man imitates what he teaches. The child learns how to live by imitating the behavior and actions of others in his or her developmental stages and imitating the foundation of human education. Aristotle believes that the audience not only after watching the drama captured by the illusions of the world not being imitated but that their emotions are elevated to a higher level. According to him, we are always able to distinguish between the real thing and its image and are aware that what we see as imitation is fictitious. But this awareness drains our inner emotions and makes us less likely to commit the tragedy's mistakes.

There have been two different views in cinema theorizing from the beginning. A look that focused on representing the world and trying to represent the outside without interference, and a look that used cinema as a tool to cross the real world and draw a world beyond. The early works of the Lumière brothers, such as "Train Arrival at the Station" and "Workers Exiting the Factory" were merely a representation of the world, and they sought to record it without interference. In front of them was another early filmmaker, Georges Maylis, who came into the filmmaking world through his experiences in the fantasy world, and from the beginning, he sought to realize the human dreams and aspirations in the cinema and the capacities of the cinema. Discovered dreams to fulfill. In the history of cinema and based on these two types of views, two forms of cinema have emerged in terms of reality. The two theories of film, formalism, and realism, were the basis of cinematic theorizing and, of course, the basis of the creation of new genres and genres of cinema.

The likes of Andre Bazen and Krakai were the most important theorists in the realism theory. Proponents of this view, drawing on the role of photography as the main essence of cinema, depicted the cinema's approach to reflecting reality. In

Bazen's view of this form of photography and cinema, he places cinema as a natural mirror to the real world or the reality of the world. Realism theory considers the basis of cinema to be its historical growth, that is, the creation of photography and realistic theorists see art as a moving and evolving movement, and thus, even after recognizing streaks of cinema demand. And the concept of moving images in pre-cinematic artwork was also present. For example, the famous French filmmaker Jean-Luc Godard, a close associate of Bazin in the Cayé de Cinema magazine, recognizes the 18th-century illustrations of the movement's depiction of Grotsk's paintings. Therefore, they believe that cinema should not depart from its origins, which is realistic painting and photography. According to Godard, cinema is an art in which structure and natural content take precedence over any form and form, and this is precisely the reformist theory that cinema is the crystallization of the mental form.

The formalist theory was founded by thinkers who were influenced by Kant's epistemological theories. Formal theorists saw the basic basis of cognition and knowledge as the mental shackles that exist in the a priori mind, and the adaptation of these shocks to sensory experiences as the basic condition for the realization of knowledge and cognition. The formalist theory builds on the principles and basis of its narrative concerning the cognition it derives from the functioning of the human mind. Formal theorists sought to visualize the inner workings of the mind, the imagination, and the possibility of dominating time and place in the cinema and saw forms as a substitute for the mechanical re-creation of reality. The most important theorists in this field are Münsterberg, Eisenstein, Arnhem, and Balbalage. Although the views of these thinkers are not the same in all aspects of cinema, all these theorists generally saw cinema theorists as more than mere representations of reality.

The important thing to keep in mind about both realist and form-oriented theories is that in both cinemas, whether realist or forms, one cannot find a serious contrast to one another. For example, no realism film is devoid of subjectivity, and no formality film lacks some realism. These contrasts are subjective and cognitive contradictions, rather than real and objective ones, and have taken a different path through worldview and the way we view things. Although these two theories were the mainstream of early thought about cinema, cinema and thought continued to pursue different perspectives, including visual language, verbal systems, psychoanalysis and semiotics, and film theories. Has entered a new realm.

Mimesis and Cinema; The Relationship of Cinema and Imitation of Reality

As we have discussed in the previous discussion of Mimesis in the views of Plato and Aristotle, it should be noted that imitation and criticism in art, especially in the art of cinema, is also found as an arena for the emergence of ideas. In this section, with a historical examination of the presence of intellectual currents in the art of cinema, we will try to find the characteristics and characteristics of these intellectual currents in cinema to deal with the crystallization of such an idea in the art of cinema. Investigate.

The film, as a whole, is made up of distinct components. This phenomenon arises from the integration of older photographic tools and tools such as imagination lanterns. Besides, elements such as audio and editing that are not photographic have also played a significant role in the growth of this industry. However, man longed for a device that could record the most pivotal events around him, though they were formally able in 1895 to bear the fruit of the Lomair brothers' efforts to launch a mass movement and later a cinema. The concept of realism and imitation of reality also became important in the nineteenth century when it came to a movement in visual and narrative arts whose aim was to accurately perceive and represent the contemporary world. In other words, the French critics coined the word realism in a new sense that was at odds with the attitude of romantic and classical models in fiction and painting. The emergence of cinema coincided with this historic period of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. The emergence of cinema, of course, coincided with a crisis of realism as well, with realistic novels encountering naturalistic novels and theatrics

aimed at presenting a model of human representation in the biological sciences and superficial naturalism. This trend of the emergence of cinema is also seen as coinciding with artistic modernism, which created a kind of duality in cinema between realism and modernism. On the relation of film to modernism, Robert Stam says in his Introduction to Film Theory: "Artistic modernism is an art movement that emerged both in Europe and abroad in the late nineteenth century, during the first decades of the twentieth century. After World War II, it became institutionalized as "high modernism". In this tendency the interest in non-representational art was tangible, an art characterized by abstraction, a fragmentation of vestigial.". In the cinema of that era, the duality of realism and modernism can be exaggerated.

In real life, our vision controls our attention. But in the cinema, this is the opposite; it is the insight that controls attention. In other words, in everyday life, we see what we pay attention to, but in the cinema, we pay attention to what we see. What we see in cinema is really what the director shows us at his/her discretion, actually in different ways, such as image segmentation, camera movement, scene-making, lighting, motion-animation, visual combinations, filmmakers. With his art, he can determine what the viewer wants to see. In the outside world, human attention is drawn to the details, ignoring other points. In cinema, a close-up view has the same function, meaning a large component is enlarged and other components are removed from the frame. Remembrance calls past images to present-day events. Cinema does the same with continuous cuts to the past and the inclusion of past images among present-day events. The imagination foreshadows the future, or dreams and dreams prevail over reality, but cinema does so in a richer way. Our interests move our minds here and there. As we can think of events in different places at the same time, cinema is also able to represent all the contents of the mind in complex scenes. In cinema one can combine the events of three or four or five points of the world in the form of a complex action. This suggests that what we see in film and cinema is not the objective and tangible reality, but the product of objectivity and subjectivity that links images. Examining the processes of attention and focus, memory, imagination, impression, interest, and emotion mentioned above, reveals important insights into the nature of cinema.

On the other hand, film and cinema viewers do not perceive the events within the film as genuine events in general, though it may have a profound emotional effect on the viewer. "By watching the film, the viewer feels strongly what they see on screen, a feeling that no other visual artist can create. However, viewers of the film do not exhibit the same reaction to the events of daily life." (Stevenson / Debris, 2004: 232) In real life, an unexpected event may trigger a person's reaction. Be. In cinema, the audience's reaction and reaction are usually limited to expressing emotions.

The world of cinema is ultimately close to the manifestation of life and what exists in the outside world, but this world of cinema does not always encompass all reality; Assuming that the objective world is divided into two visible and non-visible areas and that the camera focuses on something and focuses on the field, the question arises as to what the camera sees and what it does not mean. The structure of the world outside the camera view is as important to the viewer as it is to the camera, if not more so, and can be seen in many cinematic works, including the horror genre. In other words, one must accept the fact that the world of cinema is always a part of another world, and this is one of the main properties of cinema over other arts. It must be acknowledged, of course, that there is a difference between the visible world in life and the cinema. "The real visible world of life is not discrete," says Yuri Lutman. While our hearing divides the audible word into words, our eyes see the world as a "whole". The world of cinema is the world we see, except that the world of cinema is also divided: a world divided into components or pieces that each have a certain degree of autonomy for themselves." (Lutman, 1996: 48) That is, the multiple combinations that are not possible in the real world become possible for us, and the world around us becomes a visual art world in cinema.

The film is more capable than any other art and can provide us with material reality, though we owe part of that ability to realism from photography and vice versa. The fact that cinema gives a relatively complete picture of the real world has made this art a complete and comprehensive art and even made people imagine, artistic perfection is that we get closer to

the material reality. While cinema differs greatly from material reality, and of course its artistic power lies in that difference. This can be illustrated by Ralph Stevenson's argument in the art of cinema: "Fans of complete cinema consider this art incomplete because they cannot reach the full reality. In their view, the complete cinema must achieve all reality. But if this dream comes true, the cinema itself will come true, and it will no longer go out of the way of art. "(Stevenson / Debri, 2004: 33) The point here is important and more to be noted is that film is more than Every other art gives the audience the feeling of being real. There are several reasons for this:

A. The power of cinema is in recreating the movement. The movement itself, without the aid of any other factor, has a special attraction and gratitude that draws the human mind to its incontinence. "In the cinema, graphic combinations come alive when they move, and so on. It reduces the viewer's critical resistance, causing him to impose his image more powerfully and to give the viewer a stronger sense of reality." 236) The image of the film is far more objective than other forms of artistic recreation, and thus gives it a certain degree of scientific certainty.

B. Another effect that the film gives the viewer of being real is the feeling that gives the viewer a presence. For example, we accept and believe a war documentary film with shaky image, illuminated lighting, etc., and we believe it to be far more than the film made in the studio, though it may better imitate reality. However, our belief makes that documentary more realistic to us.

C. Another feature that makes cinema so real is that the film is made of material and sculptural images. The film is on a completely different level from the novel and the play, which consists of abstract or written words. However, as scholars such as Alexander Astruk interpreted with camera-pen theory, the film is also a type of writing, but it is more about writing with imagery. It is perhaps best to say that film can even express abstract ideas in a spiritual sense, provided that these ideas are adapted to the nature of cinema and are structured and structured in terms of visual language.

D. Another characteristic of the cinema's real sense of giving to the viewing conditions is that the viewer returns to the cinema, which sits in the darkness of the cinema in front of a wide, luminous screen that will somehow make the viewer feel at the heart of the film during the screening. Ralph Stevenson quoted Marcel Lapier as saying: "The darkness of the theater prevents the viewer from comparing the actual size and size of the objects on the screen. On a screen that surrounds darkness, a human being can be up to three meters in length without being out of order because the viewer's attention is devoted exclusively to the cinema's rectangle and the size of objects on the screen and the size of objects outside the boundary. There is no fit for the clear screen. "(Stevenson, Debre, 2004: 143)

As such, there is an important issue in cinema as well as the idea of reality. The event that unfolds in the cinema, though imagined, is watched by the audience and participates in a sense. Thus, while the viewer is aware of the unreal nature of the event, he reacts emotionally to the reality. The viewer's emotional belief in the thematic authenticity shown on-screen captures the cinema in one of its most important issues in the notion of reality. The point is that if the viewer does not forget that he has the cinema behind him, or is constantly thinking about the actors' roles and purpose, then it is natural to not be influenced by affective scenes, for example, or emotions. Do not experience the other associated with real-life situations. On the other hand, if the viewer does not separate the scene from real life and forget that the artifact is in front of him, then he will no longer understand the artistic feel of the work. In other words, the work of art will present a dual sensory experience to the audience and in some way create an apparent contradiction. This is exactly what the viewer is facing.

This question of the audience's credibility and the question of the nature of the illusion faced by the film is, in fact, one of the theoretical and practical issues of representation in cinema that is of great importance in the performing arts and film. Raman Selden knows the history of this debate from Aristotle's time: "When Aristotle put the play in the field of imitation arts, commentators on the Renaissance came to the conclusion that the viewer, when he believed, onstage, was

really, But the illusion itself is another question: are all the arrangements that a film provides, whether it is movement, sound, imitation of acting, and ... really in the direction of being realized? " (Selden, 1377: 29). Is the spectator deceived and deceived? It should be acknowledged that even the most delusional work of art cannot be deceived, because the audience or viewer is always aware of the artistic product or film. Famous English critic Samuel Johnson, even dismissing the notion of spectator seduction, even saw it as a pleasure for art like Aristotle: "The truth is that audiences are always alert and know from the first to the last that the scene is just a scene, that the actors are just actors. ... The tragedy's pleasure comes from our awareness of its story, if we considered the killings and tragedies to be real, they would not be pleasant. (Selden, 1998: 30) But in the discussion of the nature of illusion, Coleridge, contrary to Johnson, believe in the voluntary suspension of infidelity: "It is not a real scene ... to affirm the mind to be such a jungle, but to ignore the affirmation of the mind." (That is: 30) So the viewer is not trying to show that the real things are real. He admits to suspending his disbelief for some time, such as in film and cinema. Of course, there is also the issue that the film itself or the show itself must adhere to believability and illusion, but their non-observance violates the principle of attracting audiences or, in a better sense, creating the illusion of reality, leading to a distance between the viewer and the viewer. Will. Susan Langer puts this voluntary suspension of infidelity in this way: "The artistic illusion is not to be believed, as many philosophers and psychologists believe, but rather to be liberated from belief ... to know what is in it. It's ours, it has no practical significance in the world, that's what makes us pay attention to its presence." (Ibid: 30) Ms. Langer's kind of look will change the way she views film and art, though. It drives the look and approach to film to the voluntary suspension of disbelief and, in essence, exposes the content and debate of the validity of reality.

III. CONCLUSION

To find the source of many challenging concepts, we turn to the views of Greek philosophers. This genealogy sheds light on many of the ignorant and sometimes ignorant. But Plato and Aristotle could not conceive of a phenomenon called cinema. Although much has been written about art and display and imitation. Whether or not we accept these philosophers' thinking about art, one cannot ignore that their view of art and the arts are also one of the most important in the field of performing arts.

The same ideas in the history of art made it possible, at least until the early part of the 20th century, to develop a closer appreciation of the work of art. This trend, which reinforced the imitative aspect of cinema art, was further enhanced by the increasing progress of cinema in the field of sound and color. On the other hand, the formative thought also developed because of its intellectual base against the other view and was able to devote itself to this arena.

Mimsey is an imitation of important theories in philosophy and art that have historically woven human thinking at different junctures. Its semantic development is also reflected in modern art schools today. This process has also penetrated the field of cinema and has been incorporated into cinematic theories. With all this detail, what comes to mind when analyzing this issue are:

1. The Different Views of the Philosophers From the philosophical apparatus and the worldview, each has been able to present concepts under the terms mimsey, imitation, and judgment, and so has the theorem of cinema theorists. These concepts, while having some common roots, are sometimes considered distinct. It should be noted, however, that the meaning of the term has evolved throughout its evolution in the arts from the individual perspectives of philosophers, worldviews, and social transformations, which further reinforces thought and art.

2. The artist still adheres to the principle of imitation and trial, even in the cinema. This process is visible in both realistic and formative theory. However, this imitation is in his conscious or unconscious. Practically, the differences are

in the question of imitation and in the nature and level of contact between the meanings of the word imitation and in reality, which has led to the distinction between theories.

3. If Plato's and Aristotle's views on art and imitation of the style were to be compared, then the two artistic methods of realism and formality could, to a certain extent, draw the attention of these two philosophers. What can be said from these philosophers' speeches in the field of mimicry and imitation and trial is that the views of these two philosophers with convergent and realistic theories sometimes create convergence and chauvinism. Because Plato can be considered by Plato for the abstraction of minor things and the objects around them and moving to a space disjointed by them in the form of formalism. This philosopher fits more into the artistic form of formalism with his approach to the process of imitating and representing the truth of things, as well as his ethical approach to the object of imitating objects which he considers to lower the spectator's level of thought. At the same time, the cinematic arrangements in the film will also come from Plato's thought, so that the audience will not be detached from the truth of the story to deliberately separate the audience's relationship with the film, and, while observing the distance from the notion of reality to the realization of reality. Be. The origin of the breakthrough in Brecht's theater work is an experience that has continued in cinema with the work of people such as Jean-Luc Godard. These cinematic arrangements can provide such a function that has already been experienced to achieve this philosopher's view.

Formalism in the film is also of interest to Aristotle's view of imitation, which does not merely represent and imitate mere objects. Aristotle, while seeking to imitate the path of reality from within, will thus value art, and may require the artist's mind to be present in the work of art, which would be a formal formality for this purpose. But on the other hand, Aristotle's words, which believe that there is a repetition and taciturn in Mimesis, will be contested. For in Aristotle's view under mimicry and imitation creation no trace of invention and creativity can be imagined. Such discourse from Aristotle will tend to realism at a level distinct from formality, and perhaps the word double reality is appropriate to Aristotle's discourse on filmmaking that embodies double reality as well as abstraction and mere formality. On the other hand, since Aristotle's view of imitation art in the field of education is an important tool in educating the citizens of Medina, there is a desire for realism in it, but toward the double reality that transcends ritual.

REFERENCES

[1] Stam, Robert, Introduction to Film Theory, translated by Ehsan Noroozi, Tehran, Soureh Mehr Press, 2004.
[2] Stevenson, Ralph / Debre, JR, The Art of Cinema, Translated by Parviz Dawaie, Tehran, Amirkabir Press, 2004.
[3] Beardsley, Monrose / Hospers, John, History and Aesthetic Issues, translated by Mohammad Saeed Hanaei Kashani, Tehran, Hermes Press, 1997.
[4] Beheshti, Seyed Mohammad Reza, Historical Encyclopedia of the Concepts of Philosophy, Volume I: The Philosophy of Art, Reiter, Joachim et. al, 2010
[5] Binayi Motlaq, Said, Art in Plato's View, Farhangestan- Honar Press, Tehran, 2011
[6] Tatarkevich, Wadyshev, The History of Aesthetics, Volume I, Elm Publishing, 2013.
[7] Dehkhoda, Ali Akbar, Dictionary, First Edition, Volume 12, University of Tehran Publishing, Tehran, 1994.
[8] Selden, Raman, Representation and Realism in Communication, Cinema and Literary Theory, Translated by Mansour Ebrahimi, Farabi Quarterly, Seventh Volume, No. 4, 1998.
[9] Zaimran, Mohammad, Aristotle's Philosophy of Art, Farhangestan- Honar Press, Tehran, 2009.
[10] Carroll, Noel, An Introduction to the Philosophy of Art, Translated by Saleh Tabatabaei, Farhangestan- Honar Press, Tehran, 2008.
[11] Gatt, Brace, Auer Lopez, Dominic Mac, Encyclopedia of Aesthetics, Department of Translators, Farhangestan- Honar Press, Tehran, 2014.
[12] Lutman, Yuri, The Semiotics and Aesthetics of Cinema, translated by Massoud Owhadi, Tehran, Soroush Press, 1996.
[13] Mirsadeghi, Jamal, Dictionary of the Art of Writing, Volume I, Mahnaz Book Publishing, Tehran, 1998.
[14] Wall, Jean, Discussion in metaphysics, translated by Dr. Yahya Mahdavi, Kharazmi Publications, Tehran, 2001.

[15] House, Rosalyn Hearst, The Philosophy of Art and Beauty, Translated by Amir Nasri, Farhangestan- Honar Press, Tehran, 2005.