CHAPTER IV

**EXPRESSION IN GROCE**

Intuitive or spiritual form of Expression in art and artefacts.
Chapter IV

EXPRESSION IN CROCE

Croce’s Life Sketch:

None before Croce paid due attention to the term “Expression”. An impressive and most comprehensive theory of art as expression in the history of aesthetics was worked out for the first time, in my opinion, by this putative Italian thinker in 1902 when he published his work ‘Estetica come scienza dell’Espressione e linguistica generale’ (Milan Sandron 1902) translated by Douglas Ainslie in English in 1909 under the title “Aesthetics: As science of Expression and general linguistic” (Macmillan & Co. London) with a master piece preface containing a precise acclaimation of Croce and a few compendious notations on his ground personality and epic making work in which Croce had put forward a full-blown theory of “Intuition” as expression, setting aside all those theories of art which relate beauty to physical phenomenon, tacitly or obviously. He appeared as a great aesthetician when he wrote an article as ‘Aesthetic’ for encyclopedia of Britannica and captured the term ‘Aesthetic’ in the English-speaking world for his own concept and system. He was the most popular expressionist in aesthetics whose influences in 20th century can on no account be ignored.

Benedetto Croce was a generous citizen of Italy, an idealist of merits, an eminent aesthetician, an impartial critic, and a candid politician, a prolific and polemical writer of merits and a talented publicist. He was born on Feb 25, 1866 in Pescasseroli, Aquila (in the Abruzzi region of Central Italy bordering on the Adriatic) He belongs to a rich upper middle class family of Pescasseroli in Abruzzi of Italy. Pasquale was his father and Luisa Sipari was his mother. Maria was his sister, but more his biographical knowledge Croce’s autobiography, translated by R.G. Collingwood (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1927) and Cecil J.S. Spigge, Benedetto Croce; Man and thinker (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1952) may be of great value. But my business is not to go in details of his biography except to produce a brief sketch for acquaintance only. His childhood was grievous as he suffered from a fierce earthquake in 1883. His parents were killed and he was injured, and until 1886 he lived with his uncle Silvio Spaneta, brother of Bertrando, the prominent philosopher among his contemporaries of Rome. It was a glorious time for Croce’s life vehicle, occasioned him to attend the university for receiving education. And thus he emerged as a great man of a unique philosophical system, was brought to surface of aesthetics in 1893... and became a historical figure as a great aesthetician and literary scholar who is supposed to be accepting some of French positivists assumptions but after sometime he tried to oppose and reject such assumptions out rightly. That is why Patrick Romanell confidently concludes in his ‘Introduction’, “Like Kant of old, who clipped the wings of reason to make room for faith, so Croce reduces pure mathematics and natural science of their practical or technological or
disinterested value of philosophy. Evidently, this is how Croce subtly takes his final revenge on positivism as the gospel of science."

However, Croce has been a violent reactionary against the positivistic theory of art and Spencer's theory of beauty as well. Croce dismissed these theories by proclaiming that these are "absolutely purile"; it is because he thought that the positivists and the evolutionists in general treated art in crude hedonistic and utilitarian terms, some reducing the beautiful "to a type pleasure", some (like Spencer himself) of play. But by side by side all others, in the opinion of Croce, too have reduced poetry, art and beauty all the back to the "sexual instincts" or "animal prehistory" describing them as "a sort of lust, purified and pacified."

consequently, Croce cited the example of "Paolo Mantegazza who tried to put the beautiful on the anatomy table and make an antopay of it." In the same way Dr. Mario Pilo analyzing beautiful in terms of a "visceral aesthetic sense" could not satisfy the long disputed term of beauty and beautiful. highlighting the antagonistic attitude of Croce, Patrick Romanell write, "Echoes of the early Croce's rebellion against the hedonistic and materialistic 'hodgepodge' in aesthetics, popular during the hay day of positivism, can be heard in the opening of his mature work that is translated here, the Brevario, written in 1912 and published in the following year. He is not limited in criticism to positivists and evolutionists only but going ahead he objects British Hegelian's and says that absolutism, if considered properly in a candourous way, ignores the creative achievements of spirit and ponders upon reality as an eternal, static and perfected whole. It is not a tenable thesis because so many shortcomings can easily be pointed out; Croce dealt with all his book entitled as "What is living and What is Dead in the Philosophy of Hegel". "These thinkers identify the real with historical process interpreted in terms of the Hegelian concepts of evolution, freedom and activity." But he accepts the central thesis of Idealism by assuming the spirit as manifested in human thought and experience, and he weighs it (spirit) with the essence, infallible, the sole reality, the matrix of all that we have in our experiences, i.e. the objective world. But the concept of reality as such is not compromising in Hegel and Croce, interpretations and explanations differ worthwhile. Croce's spirit or self experience is confined to mind instead of touching the idea of transcendence; in Hegel's philosophy to is absolute experience which is full of two contradictory realities, the so called subject and object, or consciousness and unconsciousness, or mind and matter. Croce explains his view: Experience is temporal, and is limited to the living present experience. But the past is real in so far as it unfolds from the present. Historicity is dominant factor in Croce's thought. The role of past or event happened so holds a dignifying position in his view.

He was warmly welcomed and truly admired in the circles of his tours and travels but hardly had he remained out from the city Naple for long. He was not a static rather a dynamic philosopher throughout and had consecrated himself for the cause of humanity, impartiality, historicity and aesthetic sensibility. He was an idealist, an expressionist, an intuitionist and a spiritualist, no doubt, but was never found granting any concession, directly or indirectly, to the existence of God; no clement views had he for transcendence. Although Croce's main fame was in the field of aesthetics based on idealism of spiritual nature in which the whole general system is found postulated on the philosophy of self-experience, or more precisely
tion the philosophy of spirit which is the sole reality but not a transcendent something because Croce explains ‘all’ by self experience. Experience is the spiritual word in the history of spirit. Spirit is taken to be the fulcrum of all that which pervades in mind and matter, here and there, but Croce is not prepared to believe in any such reality which stands beyond self experience; no transcendent reality, no God and no world created by him and hence nothing can vindify the existence over and above spirit or self experience. It is wondrous to have a religious background but not to believe in God.

Croce traversed the deep ocean of knowledge successfully as a great expressionist, adopting always the historical method of study for venture and profundity in the field of art and literature in 20th century, and died on November 20, 1952 at the age of 86. Appreciating Croce P. Romanell writes, “By way of illustration, many of us outside Italy proudly remember Croce as that brave Abruzzian spirit who, endowed with a sharp tongue and a biting pen, dared almost single-handedly to oppose Fascism at its roots defending against all odds, the cause of truth, human dignity, and liberty.”

Douglas Ainslie pays regards to Croce by saying, “but more wonderful than the song of any syren seems to me the theory of Aesthetic as the science of Expression, and that is why I have over come the obstacle that stood between me and the giving to this theory, which in my belief is the truth, to the English speaking world.” There is an abundance of books, papers, Dictionaries and Encyclopedias which proudly treat Croce’s theory of expression as the most comprehensive, not philosophically confined specially to idealistic system only but also diffused over aesthetic hemisphere as the theory of poetry and art in general. “Expression” in all its purports was worked out by Croce in about 1893 by turning down Hegel’s “Beauty is the expression of a content.” But in 1902 in his aesthetic theory he advanced arguments in favour of poetic expression by uttering that it is not the direct expression of emotion of emotion rather it is the expression of intuition that counts all possibilities of beauty in true sense. For this very reason his theory of intuition based on spiritual analysis of experience. As a theorist and as a historiographist Croce puts up a reconciliation of Vico’s historical hypothesis. Sanctis’s literary criticism and Suprental’s Hegelian thought in his philosophy of spirit or in his specific idealism. Vico’s far reaching that poetry and language are identical resulted adequately in Croce’s aesthetic as science of expression with general linguistics. He gallantly opposed Fascism and always fought for the cause of human dignity and individual liberty caused him to be deprived of his friend Gentile (1875-1944) who was sometimes his admirer and intellectual collaborator but turned his mind against Croce. All his works are generally found in Italian, only a few could have English translations. He was no doubt a great historian, a humanist philosopher, critic, and statesman but after all he was a more influential in stature as a person. His background was religious, monarchical and conservative. “The philosophy of spirit in its systematic form produced the effective method of Croce’s work, as in the anthology Filosofia poesi Storia.”

Commentators on Croce’s aesthetic theory of art as science of expression think of him as an explorer of the romantic enlightenment by the work of Coleridge. (Miss Powell) But Croce doubts such assessment in his conversazioni critiche. Nevertheless, Miss A.E. Powell seems to be confident on her opinion that
a study of the English poets, like Coleridge, Shelley and other renowned poets had the same imaginative tendency as was put forward and elaborated a century later by Italian expressionist Benedetto Croce in aesthetic. This view is correct because the romantic influence as coming from renaissance can be observed well in all the onward ages; a great deal of light in this respect has already been thrown in the chapter previously dealt. Hence, Croce might have had a ceaseless impetus in dealing with his theory of art from the romantic enlightenment. The view given in M.H. Abram's book “The mirror and the lamp: Romantic Theory and the Critical Tradition” (New York, 1953): referred by William K. Wimsatt, Jr. and Cleanth, is considerable and is in support to my view put up in the chapter that the romantic tendencies are not new: They are rather a old as the beginning of Renaissance from 10th to 13th century or so. But Croce and others in modern period held the credit of taking romantic tendencies to the apex. However, Croce held the onus on his own account to expose and expound the tacit meaning of art as expression, precisely and most plausibly. “Expression” as a valuable and very useful term in practice and also commonly in lingual affairs had long been ignored. But Croce’s attempt has always been to explore excellently the meaning, the utility and the higher possibilities of expression in art and letters. It is believed that expressionistic theory of art in Crocian aesthetic “is a long way from looking like the preciously burnished perversions of a Baudelaire, the Whistlerian study in grey and black, the velvet-coated flippancies of a Wilde yet the theory is precisely an “aesthetic”, a master theory of art for art’s sake, a profound realization of all that might underline and in part justify the 19th century cry that art must be pure. To explore the purity of art was aimed at by Croce in his epic works: Aesthetics: As Science of Expression and General Linguistic and Brevario de Estetica.”

But recent writers hold the view that Croce’s aesthetic is a synthesis of the expressionistic theory of art which has Germany and Coleridge as its matrix and also had been tested and matured by 19th century vissicitudes. Growing out of an initial preoccupation with the Crocian theory involves historico-social thinking, intrinsic to one sort of 19th century didactic theory, “and it is a partial resolution of the conflict between such theory and the starker versions of art for art’s sake.” Italian antiquities especially of his native Naples-studies and factual knowledge stood futile for Croce. He read Vico’s Scienza Nuova thoroughly and in March, 1893, when “after a whole day of intense thought” he put up an essay “History subsumed under the general concept of art”, he became the center of attraction in the field of lore and learning. Afterwards he rejected the Marxism.

In Feb and May 1900, he read out a paper memoir “Fundamental thesis of an aesthetic as Science of Expression and general Linguistic” before Accademia Pataniana of Naples, which became an epoch-making ‘aesthetic’ published in 1902. Croce’s fame in the field of aesthetics has been recognized almost by all the great thinkers on the globe. His theory of expression, generally based on idealistic system of philosophy indebted to, but not essentially based on Hegelianism, can adequately be said to be responsible for his fame and popularity. Moreover, “His General system he called the philosophy of the spirit, spirit is for him a sole reality, the physical being a construction of the mind, but spirit is not a transcendent something beyond experience...the spirit is the world and the history of spirit is the history of human
experience.  So far as my study of various papers and different books pertaining to Crocian idealism and aesthetic is concerned, no writer of the modern age seems to me to have ever tried to consider the ‘ins’ and ‘outs’ of the nature of spirit as reality. It is, I think, due to the fact that Croce has been in wont of changing and modifying his notions and statements from the very beginning of his thinking and writing. That is why ‘Change’ may be said to be an epithet of Croce’s philosophy. Here and now I just refer to his tacit or opened notion of spirit, also interpreted as self. To examine whether Crocian self is merely particular or it is related to universal, or it is universal and particular both i.e. the infinitude and the finitude both are implied in it or not on account of which he sometimes exposes its nature as particular, sometimes as universal, but in no sense as transcendent, is to go in depth of Crocian view of the self. His spirit is not like the ‘Absolute of Hegel, nor as infinite as God, nor as finite as Berkeley’s self.’ However, it seems something more or something less than what actually is conceived of in totality. As such in making difference between noumena and phenomena, self and not self and universal self and particular self Douglas Ainslie writes obviously, “As aesthetic intuition knows the phenomenon or nature, and the philosophic concept the noumenon or spirit, so the economic activity wills the phenomenon or nature, and the moral activity the noumenon or spirit. The spirit, which wills itself, its true self, the universal, which is in the empirical and finite spirit: is the formula, which perhaps defines the essence of morality with the least impropriety. This wills for the true self in absolute freedom.” Here Croce contradicts his statement of pronouncing spirit as the sole reality, which creates the objects of its experience by itself. But in facing the problem of noumena and phenomena as raised by Kant, he seems to be bound to accept at least the double degree role spirit: as universal it is known through the conceptual knowledge, but as empirical and finite spirit, it is known through the intuitive knowledge. Further more “Intuition gives us the world, the phenomenon; the concept gives us the noumenon, the spirit.”

In this way Croce came out as a prominent figure that contributed near about sixty books, papers and other such literary works to the world during his lifetime in which the Breviaries di Estetica is original one and is basically related to his country. This is an Italian work, translated by Patrick Romanell and published by Regney Gateway Inc South bend, Indiana. Apart from this Patrick Romanell enlisted major philosophical works and collateral books of Croce as follows:

**In Italian:**

2. *Logica come scienza dell concetto pure Baritaterzia*, 1909
3. *Filosophia dell practica: economica etica* Bari: Laterza 1909

**In English:**


**Collateral Reading:**


**Croce’s Aesthetic Genius:**

It is advocated that Alexander Baumgarten, flourished during 1714-1762 in Germany, was the first thinker who coined the term ‘Asethica’ in the sense of a special science. This term appeared in his thesis written in Latin and published in 1735 of which the reprint was obtained by Croce in 1900. But the term coined so by Baumgarten was short of the modern purport and was basically subordinated to logic; logic being superior as a special science while aesthetics was taken to signify only an inferior knowledge having a constituent of beauty. However, Croce thinks of Vico (1668 to 1744) to be the first to discover the term aesthetics in his prominent work ‘New Science-1725’ to which it was Croce who had the opportunity to explore the boundaries in his theory of expression-expression for Croce substitutes beauty.35

Croce lays greater emphasis on historicity. For him history is the original knowledge and is of greater value. He has been changing his views about his theory
of expression, the challenges from the opponents for introducing alterations in his
doctrine of expression exposed and published in previous editions.36

He was also a self critic-honest man who writes "I have in this third
edition made certain alternations of theory especially in chapter X and XI of Part I,
suggested by further reflexion and self criticism."37 He always preferred historical
method of study in aesthetic and also in other fields of knowledge; never admitted
philosophy or rather branches of knowledge to be superior or inferior to history but
convincingly he undertook philosophy as not mere philosophy but as the history of
philosophy which is, according to him, the only genuine knowledge.

He divides knowledge into theoretical and practical. Croce explaining the
sphere of knowledge undertakes Logic, Aesthetics, Ethics and even Economics as
forming the unity of philosophy because philosophy is unity, and his treatment to
these branches means a treatment of the whole of philosophy. He writes,
"Philosophy is unity, and when we treat of Aesthetics or of Logic or of Ethics, we
treat always of the whole of philosophy, although illustrating for didactic purposes
only one side of that inseparable unity."38 Though in the reference given here
Economics has been overlooked but it is given a sound position in the treatment of
idealism and also in the chapter VIII entitled “Analogy Between the Theoretical and
the Practical” of his book “Aesthetic: As science of expression and general
linguistic” on P 55.39

Proliferating his thesis of expression as beauty, as intuition, as
reproduction and lastly as art Croce reveals his profound and lucent genius in his
epoch making work Estetica come Scienza dell’ Espressione inglese generale,
published in 1902, Milan: Sandron which was proudly translated by Douglas Ainslie
published in 1909 as Aesthetic: As Science of expression and General linguistic.
Through this great work and also through his Breviario di Estetica, translated in
English by Patrick Romanell under the title "Guide to Aesthetics" Croce came to
light as a man of great genius. Nevertheless, his ingenuous literary calibre and the
powers of sprouting mind and the original thinking became the matrix of meritorious
ideas. He succeeded well to attract the attention of the world through his near about
sixty such papers and books read out and contributed in certain symposiums and
seminars organised on the western soil which are treated to be of great importance in
the sphere of knowledge.

He adopted not only a historical but also he put down his views by means
of suitable paradigms.40 The illustrations cited by him made his view-points clear
and easier to follow. But it is remarkable that he did not feel hitch to produce
paradoxical statements, creating the troubles for the readers and interpreters.
(Paradoxes will be brought to light in criticism.) This is, in my opinion, a sufficient
life sketch of his profound and excellent knowledge in the field of philosophy for a
good acquaintance with his outlook and sincerity convincingly.
Crocian Idealism

Influences on Croce

Weighing upon the term ‘Expression’ Croce likes to develop his theory of art strictly on the tenets of his metaphysics. He is unique idealist who appears to be a follower of Hegel and also in my opinion, a follower of Berkeley and Kant. In Patrick In Romanell’s opinion the influence of Karl Marx on the formation of the Croce’s mind can also be seen, but in theory he is not Marxist, if I am not wrong to judge him so. Now I hold the responsibility to discuss the matter of influences on Croce’s idealism appropriately, whenever the occasion comes to hand. On this issue the critics in modern philosophy can be divided into two groups-group one treats Croce as a follower of Hegel and group two differing from group one determines his idealism entirely independent. Defending Croce’s non Hegelian position Douglas Ainslie views him “As regards Croce’s general philosophical position, it is important to understand that he is not Hegelian, in the sense of being a close follower of that philosopher.” Not only this, Ainslie is of the opinion that Croce is quite as independent of Hegel as of Kant, as of Vico, as of spinoza but I do not agree with him because there are evidences in sufficient number which prove him, if not Hegelian in strict sense then plausibly prove him to be supporter of Neo Hegelianism.

The Reality

Croce’s idealism is “spiritual” or to say ‘philosophy of spirit’. Since his aesthetic theory is completely based on his metaphysics in which the sole reality is spirit. Therefore Croce may precisely be entitled as a philosopher aesthetician. He admits the fact that his philosophy is of the spirit. In his preface XXIX briefly he sets his aesthetic theory in the framework of a general philosophy of the spirit. Developing his theory of expression he takes start from spirit believing and proclaiming it to be the sole reality. In the springing panorama of the spirit and its most elegant operations as well as its modes of actuation it can precisely be assumed and excellently be ascertained that Crocian idealism is a reconciliation of Vico’s hypothesis of the historical aesthetic, Sanctis’s literary criticism, Sapventa’s Hegelian thought, but also it appears to be having a flavour of Kant’s idealism as criticism and also that of Berkley’s subjective idealism. Kant metaphysically decided to declare the reality ‘unknowable’ and Berkeley declared all abstractions impossible but believed in finite and infinite selves. He recognized the independent existence of the spirit but also developing his idealism could not defend himself from the
opposing reality of matter, though dependent on the subjective knowledge, i.e. all things are ideas in the mind means the existence of the objects is implied in their being known by the knowing mind. On the same pattern but with a slightly different terminology Croce thinks of self experience as the sole reality but negating the possibility of matter, and also not having been clear probably on the nature and form of spirit or self experience he attempted to construct his idealism, more or less, on the same postulates as were put forward by Kant and Berkeley. ‘Spirit’ seemingly viewed as some thing inexplicable or noumenal because Croce never tried to cast light on its genesis and sublimity, what he thinks of spirit is plainly related to his theory of knowledge. However, an interpretation of Croce’s spirit as reality as substratum, as sublime or grand is a need of the study. Let us consider.

**Nature of the Spirit or Self-experience**

Self or spirit is a dynamic and absolute reality; its existence in eternity is non-dual as that of Brahma in Shankar’s Advaita Vedanat. It is an ultimate reality, and all our experiences come from it, and we can rely upon it (the spirit). Self or the Spirit is self-active and self-conscious, does not need the sustenance of any other for its activation. It is assured to believe the spirit of Croce as to have no help from other than itself because nothing exists apart from it, in Croce’s view. It is absolute reality. This character of reality is prima-facie only because Croce is seen committing fallacies while developing his idealism as a basis of his aesthetic theory. It is also a prolific reality, which creates the objects of its own experiences. Hence, all objective phenomena entirely depend on the self, the active reality. Croce lays greater experience on self-experience because he thinks of it as the substratum, which makes a besieging line over all what so ever we have in our experiences. There is chaos or void or non-being beyond the self-experience. Croce, I think, attempts to make aware of it. Concentrating on Croce’s description of the self-experience we just conclude that it is dynamic, ceaseless, mental and above the subject-object duality, (this is the crucial point upon which Croce may be charged of agnosticism). But contradicting his statement that only experience or the spirit as the sole reality is in existence, he seems to be bound up to accept the existence of object as a part of experience, as completely dependent phenomena on the self, the spirit. However, he says that spirit is the matrix of experiences because the spirit creates the things and also develops them as objects which are artistically reproduced in the works of art by the artist of different genius and calibres. Shankar introduces a new concept of Maya to explain the unreality of the world and to prove the existence of supreme reality as Brahma but Croce proposes spirit as self sufficient in explaining all matters of reality and unreality; it is not tenable in my opinion because reality as reality must be one and autonomous, not many as individual-selves. Croce’s concept of spirit is one as a matter of hypothesis, which contains finitude and individuality, and therefore cannot satisfy the human craving for one self.

In another hypothesis, Croce’s concept of reality seems to be Hegel’s Absolute consciousness: Hegel in his idealism weens of conscious mind as the ultimate, dynamic and self developing nature having the powers of generating the
subjective and the object or the mind and the matter ceaselessly. I think the same is
the position also of Croce’s concept of reality. However, his philosophy is related to
self, to the activity of self and also to the relation between the experiential objective
world and the experiencing self. Although Croce rejects outrightly Kant’ agnosticism
and brings all the experiential world with in the limits of self experience but, I think,
his notion of the spirit or to say the self creates a doubt in our minds. To say there is
a self or to say that the self is active and creative is not a logical ground to believe
that self exists as self without other as its subject. Moreover, the description
whatever in respect of its (Spirit) characteristics given by Croce is also not plausible
and adequate. And how can a spirit limited by time and space produce itself and its
objects of experience?

Taking self or the spirit as the sole reality for granted there is a way neat
and clean, straight and simple to interperate the self on the patterns of Hegel’s
universal consciousness. Croce admits that spirit as reality is creative and also
creates the objects of its own experience, i.e. the world. But to my mind it does not
appear tenable because spirit for Croce is windowless and so nothing can enter and
also nothing can pass out of it. If the spirit is matterless then how can it produce
Mind is like a universe without windows. Nothing can pass into it or pass out of it.”46
So Croce’s spirit is windowless. However, Croce does not believe in the objects
beyond the experience. But he thinks of philosophy as a unity, which is related to
self, to its activities and to the experimental objective world as well. Nevertheless,
how is it possible? Is a matter of discovery and criticism, which I will discuss in the
chapter meant for it. However, like Berkley Croce too refutes all kinds of objects
external to the spirit. Berkeley maintains the reality of self and its generated
perceptions but he does not agree with the philosophy that accomplishes the
existence of abstract ideas. However, he recognizes the supreme self along with
individuals. I just think of Croce’s spirit as self-dependent, to be not away from the
so-called supreme self or God, or in Hegel’s view Absolute. Not withstanding that
Croce maintains the extra ordinary assumption of spirit or self in the from of sole
reality, he rather seems to confuse the infinite with the finite because in the analysis
of experience he just names the individual experiences also but does not like to
openly admit the existence of finite and infinite together in the so called spirit either
independent from each other, or finite, depending on the infinite. Thus, on the
monitorial reality of the self as unity is considerable because Berkeley and Kant both
have raised the question of finitude and infinitude in their theories. However, infinite
self is supreme and independent, the finite self is entirely dependent on the first. In
my opinion, Kant and Croce both believe in infinitude, which is thought to be God,
the supreme power, no matter if Croce hesitated to mention anyther in existence
except the spirit, explained in terms of finitude experience.

Distinctive features of Croce’s Idealism

To do justice with Croce is to over shadow him, if logically possible, from
Hegelianism and subjectivism of Berkeley or from Kantian agnosticim but under
certain limitations. It may be said that Hegel's Absolute Idealism is limited to self-conscious Absolute, dynamic in nature and is pan-logesin, but Berkeley's thought is solipism as being absolute conceptualism and that of Kant's Sheer agnosticism, as reality is unknown to him. Accordingly, what we know is limited to appearance only. Croce too holds near about the same position in his spiritual idealism but slightly, different from all these preceding theses. His position can be defended by advancing the argument that spirit in Croce in the first look appears as the same as Hegel's Absolute, Berkeley's supreme self (God) and Kant's God to whom Kant gives an ill position by saying that God is required for moral purpose only, but his statement is neither sound nor logical, and ultimately, that is why, Kant ontologically dismisses all possibilities of knowable reality. Hence, a label of agnosticism has been pasted on his idealism. Croce thinks of God, religion, soul and world as the subjects of study but not these and nor any other else stand beyond the experience in the form of abstract phenomena. Hence, God is subject of study but not believable. Croce's spiritualism is indirectly Absolute, Subjective and Pan activistic in nature. Moreover, I think Croce imports dialectical process from Hegel's dialectic. In his work "what is living and what is dead" Croce proceeds to his dialectic from the criticism of Hegel's theory of dialectics.

**Croce's dialectic:**

Spirit as the only reality has a dialectical along with other two forms of activists-Theoretical and Practical. Croce does not agree with the triadic system laid down by Hegel in which there is Thesis ---- Anti Thesis ---- Synthesis or Being-Not Being ---- Becoming. According to him there is no third phase of dialectic, it is dyadic as Concrete ---- abstract and meaningless, or concrete good ---- abstract good and bad; in the like manner there is concrete beauty (having a tinge of ugliness) abstract beauty and ugliness. So also there is concrete truth ---- abstract truth and mistake. So also there is no synthesis of the two after Hegelian method in Croce. Hegel depicts triangle in his dialectical process, Croce depicts angle.

![Dialectic Diagram](attachment:dialectic_diagram.png)
No doubt there are certain shortcomings in dialectical method of Croce, yet he seems to overshadow himself from Hegelian influences. Gentile (1875-1944) was Croce’s disciple and faithful friend who attempted to remove the mistakes committed by Croce in treatment of his idealism on the same patterns of Aristotle who had taken the job of removing the shortcomings of Plato’s idealism. Gentile stresses on the self-consciousness as well as unity of reality more than that of Croce.

**Theory of Knowledge**

**Historical background:**

In early Greek antiquity the philosophers mainly Socrates, Plato and Aristotle tested the powers of reason and contended that “Conceptual knowledge is the only genuine knowledge” knowledge obtained through all other sources was rejected. In medieval period the reflective man’s mind was subordinated to religious dogma; reason was replaced by faith; church had an ironically dominant position; no individual freedom was granted; Bible was treated to be the only authentic in resolving all problems of the socio-political life; Roman Pope was the governing head whose commands were thought to be undefeatable. An unbreakable remora was just levied on the man’s freethinking. There was no room for logical contemplation, no for free expression of emotions in the field of art and literature. Consequently, a revolutionary movement in the form of Renaissance, Classicism, Neo-Classicism, Reformation and Romanticism emerged and developed against such callous and rigid church pagons for individual tranquility and socio-moral eminence. Probably on this juncture Descartes, Liebnitz, Spinoza and Anslem etc; the rationalists, promulgated reason to be the genuine source of knowledge. “All knowledge is inborn” they said and argued vehemently. Locke, Berkeley and Hume, the empiricists, opposed rationalism and had taken the privilege to put forward their own views. They thought of knowledge as an outcome of the sense experience. Locke raised the problem of primary and secondary qualities and thus he fettered his theory of knowledge by inviting the label of representationalism; a dualistic philosophy was just he yielded. Berkeley was a subjective idealist. He tried to prove and maintain the exigency of the self or spirit as subject in his idealism. Croce too holds the view that spirit is the sole reality; nothing apart from it but differs on the nature and powers of spirit. Berkeley’s theory of knowledge may be put in relevance to that of Croce in a tabular form.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Spirit, the reality (Active)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Particular (Individual Self)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Many</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Converted into Subjective idealism, i.e. Ideas are real, not the abstract matter

Characteristics:

Percepts have more: vividness, coherence, intensity, liveliness, order, steadiness, but not depending on our selves. But in comparison to percepts, the Images are vague and have vividness, coherence, intensity, liveliness, order and steadiness in lesser degree. Notions however, in my opinion, may be interpreted as Croce’s intuition; one of the two sources of knowledge-The Intuition and the Intellect. Intuition has the power of immediate knowledge.

But Croce’s spirit having been the principal reality is not something divine or transcendence. He treats the spirit as a finite self; Spirit is self-created, active and the creator of the objects of its own experiences, i.e. the nature or the experimental world has no existence apart from the experiencing spirit or self. Berkeley’s description is different. He maintains the independent existence of ideas in the mind from the objects, generated and evolved either by the individual soul or by the transcendental spirit. Things are not real, only ideas are real; if things are, they are due to ideas; their existence depend solely on “Esse est percipi”. But Croce’s position seems to me a bit similar and also a bit different from him, which I like to examine henceforth. Croce’s spirit is not apparently transcendent yet he thinks of it as reality, active super active as creative. The spirit creates the objects of its
experience, which are in Berkeley's philosophy the ideas having two forms—the perception and the imaginations but the knowledge of the self and the relations between things or ideas can be obtained through the notions or intuitions. Regarding the super self-Berkeley argues that the perceptions are not dependent on our will; the super creates them. We, the finite beings, create the images. Hence he makes a clear distinction between the things real (Perceptions) and the things imaginary (the images). But he writes, "The table I write on exists, that is, I see and feel it; and if I were out of my study, I should say it existed, meaning there by that if I was in my study, I might perceive it or that some other spirit actually does perceive it. There was an odour, that is, it was smelled; there was a sound; that is, it was heard; a colour or figure, and it was perceived by sight or touch." Agreeably, more or less, Croce on Page 3 of Aesthetic has given the same description: As science of expression and general linguistic. Berkeley's notion on intuition is not aesthetic it has its metaphysical value only.

But in Croce's idealism intuition plays a significant role, as it is epistemological as well as aesthetic. Croce postulates his aesthetic theory on intuition. According to him the spirit creating the objects of its experiences obtains knowledge, either through Intuition or through reflection or conception. But he does not think of self and the relations known through the intuition. He rather says that it is logical knowledge, which is related to knowing the relations between the things. It shows clearly the influence of Berkeley's idealism on that of Croce. In Berkeley's idealism perception is related to the knowledge of things but not to intuition or notion because notions are different from perceptions. Croce's perceptions and intuitions are alike. "By perception is frequently understood perception, for the knowledge of actual reality, the apprehension of something as real." However, perception in Berkeley and Croce are the means of knowing objects. Moreover, there seems another similarity in Berkeley and Croce as Croce writes, "Certainly perception is intuition; the perceptions of the room in which I am writing, of the ink-bottle and paper that are before me, of the pen I am using, of the objects that I touch and make use of as instruments of my person which, if it write, therefore exists; these are intuitions." In this quotation and in that of Berkeley's the term 'perception' clearly indicates the existence of the objects of experience. But Croce does not make difference in percepts and images as he lays down, "But the image that is now passing through my brain of a me writing in another room, in another town, with different paper, pen and ink, is also an intuition. This means that the distinction between reality and non-reality is extraneous, secondly, to the true nature of intuition. Berkeley, howbeit, differentiates image from a percept obviously as already explained.

Although Berkeley's position in his idealism is no seemingly very sound yet he tried to work on monistic patterns taking ahead the mission of empiricism propounded by Locke. Hume, however, crossed all the limits and declared knowledge through perceptions is the only genuine form of knowledge. He refuted the existence of the self, God relations and all those phenomena, which stand beyond our sense experience. To him the existence of the self was nothing more than a bundle of discrete and fleeting ideas. He advanced his thesis on the same patterns in all other matters.
Kant's theory of knowledge is intended to be discussed in comparison with Croce in the succeeding chapter.

**Crocian Epistemology:**

Life has two phases:
(1) Practical and
(2) Theoretical.

Theoretically, knowledge can be obtained through two activities of the Spirit:
(1) Through intuition, the most important in practical life.
(2) Through Logic.

Croce writes, "Knowledge has two forms: it is either intuitive knowledge or logical knowledge, knowledge obtained through the imagination or knowledge obtained through the intellect; knowledge of the individual or knowledge of the universal, of individual things or of the relations between them: it is, in fact, productive either of images or the concepts." 52

**Analysis:**

This description of knowledge in its analysis comes to as follows:

**(1) The Spirit:**

Spirit is the sole reality but is not transcendence as usually thought of; it is rather besieged by experience because nothing exists beyond the experience. Spirit expresses into four forms of activities or moments, divided into two main groups—
(1) Theoretical and (2) Practical.

Theoretical activity is productive of knowledge and consists of Intuitive and logical, the two forms of knowledge and the logical are universal. Hence, according to Croce, intuitive activity or intuition in itself is related to the knowledge of the individual or else to the particulars. Logical activity or logic concerns itself to the knowledge of relations between the things or else to the universals.

**Elaboration:**

**Images and Concepts, Imagination and Intellect**

Intuitive for all knowledge is productive of images; the logical is productive of concepts; is either knowledge obtained by imagination or by intuition.

But intuition in all respects is aesthetic and particular activity of the self or spirit. Through intuition Croce explains his theory of expression in art. He lays greater emphasis on intuition an expression and is not seemingly in favour of recoursing it by the intellect though he paradoxically makes different statements in
respect of its utility and powers subservient to art. It is clear by his following statement “We have frankly identified intuitive or expressive knowledge with the aesthetic or artistic fact, taking works of art as examples of intuitive knowledge and attributing to them the characteristics of intuition, and vice-versa. But our identification is combated by a view held even by many philosophers, who consider art to be an intuition of an altogether special sort. “Let us admit” (they say) “that art is intuition; but intuition is not always: artistic intuition is a distinct species differing from intuition in general by something more.” Croce’s intuition seems in the first look to have the recourse of intellect in its field of art. As Croce writes in this respect that “what can intuitive knowledge be without the light of intellectual knowledge? It is a servant without a master and though a master find a servant useful, the master is a necessity to the, since he enables him to gain his livelihood. Intuition is blind; intellect lends her eyes.” But it is not correct to make Croce a victim of criticism on the basis of not providing excellent eyes to intuition and also not pondering on the intensive role of intellect in knowledge. He, however, contradicts his notion and next in the same reference proclaims that the intuition has eyes of its own and does not require the help of either intellect or of other.

On the same pattern the knowledge in mysticism can also be alluded to intuitive knowledge because in mystic realm true knowledge is related to divine manifestation, it is sublime, it is beautiful but ultimately it is inspired by divine love only. Croce does not believe in divinity.

Concerning the logical knowledge Croce admits that in our ordinary lives only the intuitive knowledge unfolds its umbrella to over shadow us from philosophical complications, but there is another aspect of life in which “Logical knowledge has appropriated the lion’s share” and discussing this combating system of knowledge between intuition and intellect in the field of theory and philosophy, Croce commits paradoxes as he determines the major role of intuition without partaking the role of intellect on the one hand and on the other hand he comes down to make intellect as partaker of intuitive knowledge. It is creative of confusion, not clear. He writes, “Now, the first point to be firmly fixed in the mind is that intuitive knowledge has no need of a master, nor to lean upon any one; she does not need to borrow the eyes of others, for she has excellent eyes of her own.” Croce admits that there may be certain concepts mingled with intuitions but such mixture he roots out from the purity of intuition. According to him any combination of concepts with intuitions certainly loses the independence and autonomy of the concepts.

Four Fold Crocian spiritual dynamism-

Four activities of the Spirit: -

Out of the four moments or activities of the spirit placed in an order, the first two have been considered as productive of the two forms of knowledge, but the onward journey in the ocean surrounded by such moments certainly requires a great deal of light on all the four in entirety; it is necessary for lucidity of the matter and
for a better comprehension; any repetition in this course ought to be treated as
exhilarious to abstruse situation aroused by Croce.

Croce forms two categories of the moments: (1) Theoretical and (2) Practical, the first comprises of (a) Intuitive and (b) Logical; the second category contains (c) economics and (d) Ethical activities. Theoretical is productive of knowledge and practical is productive of action.

Intuition form of the moment is aesthetic or expressive or representational or perceptual or imaginative. As such, it is productive of images, and is particular. It is the basis of the first, the logical as it is the only independent and self-luminous. The logical activity is intellectual or philosophical or scientific or of relations between the things of experience; it is productive of concepts and after all universal depending upon the first, the intuitive, the aesthetic, and the particular.

Economic form of activity is related to the particular needs, interests and usefulness of man. It is good in individualistic sense and also in elucidation. The Ethical form concerns the violation of the rationally and universally conceived end-willing true self or spirit (Ethical activity-Absolute freedom); it is good in general, as such the economic moment is particular, the ethical is universal.

Forming the hierarchy Croce puts up each particular dependent on the universal, i.e. just as the logical activity depends on the intuitive, so the ethical activity on the economic and on the same paragon the practical on the theoretical in which the intuitive form has got crucial position. Croce develops his aesthetic through intuitive activity taking it to the hilltop of the spiritual expression.

All these four forms of activities in ultimate analysis are viewed as qualitatively and a priorily different from each other but I think 'it is not' 'as it is' because there is a marked co-relationship among all the four-the practical needs the help of the theoretical; the ethical looks at the economic activity for help; the logical requires the support of the intuitive moment; but in no matters the intuitive needs a master; it is self expressive, has the eyes of its own. This type of related or correlated state among the activities Croce discusses widely in two of the chapter (VI & VII)of his work entitled as “The Theoretic Activity And the Practical Activity” and “Analogy Between the Theoretic and the Practical.”

The elicit and the conjural web of Crocian thought on philosophy and aesthetics is to go a bit more in details of the theoretical and practical hemispheres. Hence, as stated previously that all the activities in the spiritual kingdom of Croce are co-related and belong either to revealing the knowledge or to disclosing the mystery of action, therefore in Theoretical there is knowing and in practical there is willing. Further, Theoretical form enables us to understand things, but through practical form we change the things and create the world of experience, it is an appropriation of the universe. But practical depends on the theoretical because there is a relation of double degree: “A knowing independent of the will is thinkable, at least in a certain sense, will is not; true will has eyes.” Further man begins action from intuition and conception and if the track is not clear, obstruction is there of any kind then action either is not in start or stops at once because the theoretical moment is important and occupies the consciousness for a longer time. However cognitive

---

FN Croce himself in Brevario de Estetica on P 134 has contradicted intuition as productive of images. He states reversely, as “Intuition is the production of images”.
activity always precedes the actions. Croce making the point clear writes, "We do not desire things because we know them to be good or useful; but we know them to be good and useful, because we desire them. Here the word because is remarkable, it stands first for 'cause' and second for 'therefore'. However, cognition is prior to action and there is a remarkable distinction between the practical and the theoretical knowledge, yet there appears an illusion between the spheres of practical action and theoretical knowledge, and the practical action and practical knowledge. Croce does not recognize the role of practical knowledge in the field of art. For him only the intuitive knowledge suffices the artist to reproduce the images or to express the impressions through the art-makings. Physical representation is not conciliatory to him. Expression as Expression or intuition as expression but merely mental is the form of a good art.

Crociian Idealism may thus be represented precisely as follows:

(Its four fold expression, the so called Spirit (The sole reality but not transcendental)

Activities by Croce)

Theoretical
(Productive of Knowledge)

Practical
(Productive of volition or action)

(PRACTICAL depends on THEORETICAL)
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Or

Imagineative
Or
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Universal

Conceptual
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Or

Logical
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Universal

Ethical

Or

Or

of general interests)

of individual interests)

Findings: -

(1) Intuitive activity is the principal one; it is related to experiences of every day life and is independent of intellect.

(2) Intuitive knowledge is the absolutely queen knowledge.

(3) Intuition is expression; it is beauty; it is art, it is perception, it is imagination; it is aesthetic, it is assimilating to intellect.
Croce's Theory of Expression:

Croce’s main thesis is called expressionism. It is his theory of art in which he intended to explore the real meaning of art. He is more interested in determining the nature of art than the form and nature of beauty. That is why stressing the word expression in his theory of art as expression Croce had the privilege to ascertain and evaluate the essential meaning of expression in deeper and also in broader sense of the term. As already noted down Croce postulated his theory of expression on the robust grounds of his spiritual idealism in which the intuitive activity of the spirit is the foremost, absolute, autonomous, perfect, free from conceptual interference and also it is related to the ordinary experiences of life as he says, “But this ample acknowledgement granted to intuitive knowledge in ordinary life, does not correspond to an equal and adequate acknowledgement in the field of theory and of philosophy.” 66 This statement is in reference to intuitive knowledge of the theoretical domain. Intuitive activity or knowledge is not blind; it is expressive in itself and is basis of all logical activity on the one hand and also the basis of economical and ethical activities on other, which creates action in life. It is worthy to note that showing the value and importance of intuition in practical life, Croce seems to suggest that the intuitive knowledge may be considered to be a maid servant of the logical knowledge because it needs the recourse of intellect without which it is helpless in exercising its efficiency and powers, i.e. “what can intuitive knowledge be without the light of intellectual knowledge…. Intuition is blind, intellect lends her eyes.” 67 But in the next passage he ascertains the intuitive knowledge as absolutely independent. Showing the identity of the intuitive knowledge and the expressive knowledge Croce writes, “…intuitive knowledge is expressive knowledge, independent and autonomous in respect to intellectual function; indifferent to later empirical discriminations, to reality and the unreality…. To intuite is to express, and nothing else (nothing more, but nothing less) than to express. 68 Croce puts up a hierarchy of degrees in the four forms of activities or moments of the spirit. 69 But I say that these activities are the four fold expressions of the spirit in which intuition tops the galaxy and ethics rests on the bottom, the remaining intermediary two moments or degrees or expressions are logic and economics. But in every case universal ethical moment depends on the particular economical moment; logic as universal on intuition, the particular, and so both practical activities on the theoretical form of spiritual activity. Croce does not differentiate between intuition and expression. According to him intuitive knowledge is self expressive and need not “a master, nor to lean upon any one; she does not need to borrow the eyes of others, for she has excellent eyes of her own.”70 But intellect needs intuitive help because “The impression of a moonlight scene by a painter; the outline of a country drawn by a cartographer; a musical motive, tender or energetic; the words of a sighing lyric, or those with which we ask, command and lament in ordinary life, may well all be intuitive facts without a shadow of intellectual relation.”71 It results the meaning in my view, that knowledge of logical relations between the objects created by the self comes to light when it is assisted by the intuitive expression.
Intuition or Expression and Representation:

Croce exposes the meaning of expression not only in the form of intuition but also he thinks that intuition in true sense of meaning is true representation, and it is also a true expression which is different from mechanically passive natural fact because it is an spiritual fact which objectifies itself as the phenomenal world, but the mechanically passive natural facts have no such capacity. Clarifying this crucial point Croce says, "That which does not objectify itself in expression is not intuition or representation, but sensation and mere natural fact". Croce expels out the role of sensation and natural facts from his aesthetic, which is elegantly an spiritual dynamism, so far as I think. But elaborating his concept of expression for its own sake he says that intuition from expression cannot be distinguished because the one appears with the other at the same moment. Intuition and expression are not the two isolated facts, but one. Moreover, intuitive activity possesses intuition to the extent that it expresses them. However, it is paradoxical but this kind of statement is restricted to verbal expression only. "But there exist also non-verbal expression, such as those of line, colour and sound, and to all of these must be extended our affirmatives which embraces therefore every sort of manifestation of the man, as orator, musician, painter or anything else".

No room for feelings and emotions:

Intuition is the core of Croce's idealism as well as his aesthetic theory. Intuition is expression and vice-versa; it is this that takes Croce to the toppers of the rare galaxy of expressionists. However, it will not be an expedient account of which I like to make clear: That Croce tries to explain all reality, all humanity, all practico-moral, all theoro-spiritual and all socio-philosophical life and nature by one single principle—the so called intuition as expression, and I think he has been successful in his attempt to a larger extent. But he could not defend himself from the criticism in which he is thought to be a victim of accent as he lays greater emphasis on the value and importance of intuition or expression than actually required. Moreover, he ignores the important role of feelings, emotions and experiences of life in assigning the lion's share to expression in the field of art and artwork. But it lends to turn the art into a jejune because there is always an expression of feelings and emotions in the art. Art as art must speak to man what is expressed by the artist through it. Living art blows the living expression of feelings in the audience.

Dr. Freud too has the same position. He had also attempted to explain the total human life through one single principle, the so-called 'Id' or 'Libido', and thus became a victim of the same fallacy of accent.

Expression as Expression, not definition:

Croce willy-nilly admits that in man's ordinary life there are certain those terms which are used without knowing the definition or the actual meaning or
meanings, or such terms are difficult to define. This is the reason, in my view, on account of which Croce failed to define either expression or intuition except to produce before the readers the meaning or meanings of these two synonymous terms as thought by him setting aside every possibility that might compel him to include feelings and emotions in his theory. However, certain of its meanings have been in vogue for long but none had ever tried to pay attention to deal with the importance and value of expression in the field of art and letters before this prominent thinker Croce who can be said to be the pioneer in this respect. He gives us so many meanings of expression but all meanings he converts into one, the intuition which is aesthetic and theoretical and productive of imaginations, but real, not real, not unreal because he differentiates between these two forms, although in explaining the meaning of expression as intuition he does not candidly discriminate between real and unreal. To him all expressions are intuitive and are indifferent to real and unreal.

Bergson, an evolutionist, had also introduced the word intuition in his theory but his view is different from that of Croce. Patrick Romanell contends, "In contrast to Bergsonian intuition, Crocian intuition is restricted to the realm of art. Where the distinction between reality and appearance, true and false is the ordinary sense, possible truth and actual truth, is irrelevant. In short, the doctrine of aesthetic intuitionism, which characterizes part one of Crocian system puts intuition in the first moment of the spirit and keeps in there in its "pure' form as "artistic imaginary". It has been my sacred duty to define the term expression and I have done it to my best in chapter II. Croce, I can't say, in what whim and caprice forgot the exploration of the esoteric meaning of expression, which is related intrinsically to man's inner self. The inner of man is full of vexing desires, impulses, motivations, feelings, emotions, interests, attitudes and liking and dislikings. And as such in expression, particularly in the field of art, man as an artist attempts to express himself through his artwork. But it is astonishing that Croce talks of art for the sake of art or "art as art"; but he does not give room to the expression of ideas and emotions by the artist in her or his work of art. What he means by expression is either intuition or art or some other terms commonly prevalent in art and letters granting them an equal status in theory of expression.

**Expression as an active process:**

Intuition as expression is expressive in it and is a system of aesthetic as a science of expression and general linguistic. Croce thinks that expression is always of impressions, which lie latent in human mind and are the objects of experience, created by the self. But Croce goes on making difference between a good form of art and a bad by proclaiming plausibly that a successful expression is a good form of art while an unsuccessful or impeded expression is either a pseudo art or an ugly phase of art.
Indivisibility of Art and unity of expression:

But taking ‘art to be a corollary of the unity as unity, art is indivisible. Croce, hence forth truthfully declares that in reference to such corollary the conception of expression as activity retains the indivisibility of the work of art because, according to Croce, expression is a synthesis or the unity of the various or multiple in the one, and “Every expression is a single expression in a form of such an activity which is a fusion of the impressions in an organic whole.” And thus any division in a work of art into parts is not admissible to Croce. As such expression into a single complete expression should occur from that work of art for justification of the criteria laid down by Croce. Every work of art is liberal and pure and is related intrinsically to its character as activity. “Activity is the deliverer, just because it drives away passivity.” That is to say the inanimatic is to be made animate by the artist. The picture depicted must speak to the perceiver. It is however clear that expression as intuition is a process of activity and if it exist in any work of art, it is art, otherwise passively will result into art improper or into that, the so called pseudo art. Collingwood precisely thinks of an art, as arousing the emotions is art improper while a successful expression is a form of art proper. Collingwood says “... the difference between good art and bad art is like the relation between two living men, one good and the other bad.” Making difference between art proper and improper Collingwood-clearly says that art proper is the expression of emotion while craft (Art improper) simply arouses the emotion.” Again, “A bad work of art is an activity in which the agent tries to express a given emotion, but fails. This is the difference between bad art and art falsely so called....

“Expression” or “Intuition”-various meanings and usages in Croce’s aesthetics:

Critics are of the opinion that Croce’s aesthetic lacks unity in elaboration of his ideas put up in the form of expression or intuition. According to them Croce seems to have three or four aesthetics in his theory of art. But P. Romanell defending Croce says that like other philosophers Croce’s aesthetic has been in the process of continuity as regards its development. “A careful and dispassionate examination of Croce’s work in aesthetics will reveal concretely that, from a strict philosophical standpoint, the development of his aesthetic thought from, say, 1893 until his death in 1952 exhibits a remarkable continuity representing as it does in the main, logically speaking, simply a series of variations on the same theme, rather than substantial changes in doctrine, notwithstanding appearances to that effect. Moreover, these variation do not constitute strictly speaking, “distinct phases in Croce’s thinking” On the problems of aesthetics, on the contrary, they constitute different emphasis he gives to his favourite subject in response to changing circumstances, including, of course, the challenges in his many critics, friendly and otherwise.”

The fragments of Croce’s aesthetic theory though overshadowed by Patrick Romanell assuming as making a continuous development, in my view paves the way to think of him as having a thesis of art, not static but dynamically marching
forward which is not easy to understand. It is because he uses the term expression in the artistic sense but extends it in other such terms that have different usages also.

Croce uses the term expression as a synonymous not only to intuition but also to:
(1) Art
(2) Vision and Perception
(3) Imagination or Images
(4) Contemplation
(5) Fancy
(6) Invention
(7) Representation
(8) Lyric
(9) Form and so on.

It is, here, needed expediently to discuss the meaning and usages of the term expression with a view to expose and apprehend the essence of art in the form of expression. Now I propose to tackle the notion of art and expression appropriately in the proceeding chapter meant for comparison between Croce and Freud.

**Perception and Expression:**

Art is intuition and it is also vision but what is the place of perception? Croce makes no difference in all those three terms as produced by him. Regarding perception he says that intuition and perception are not the two different phenomena rather both are one. He writes, "By intuition is frequently understood perception, or the knowledge of actual reality, the apprehension of something as real." Again he writes, "certainly perception is intuition: the perceptions of the room in which I am writing.... The means that the distinction between reality and non-reality is extraneous, secondary, to the true nature of intuitions. If we imagine a human mind having intuitions for the first time, it would seem that it could have intuitions of actual reality only, that is to say, that it could have perception of nothing but the real."83 This very notion that intuition and perception have the same meaning in art reveals the fact that an ordinary perception is different and an artistic is different. Croce concerns to artistic meaning of perception, it is due to the fact that artistic genius and an ordinary are different from each other we apprehend the meaning of art as intuition or expression, if we have such a genius, the artistic. Thilly is right to assess the Crocian theory of intuition as sense perception which in Kant’s sense is “aesthetic”84 He explains all Crocian drama of aesthetics into two forms of present experience: Theoretical which includes all knowing by intuition and by intellectual both are theoretical activities. Practical form or aspect embraces willingly or the activities of the mind resulting from the exercise of will which has economic and ethics, the forms of content (I will discuss later on) have been arisen. As such theoretical activity provides mind with both the material (content) and form of knowledge. Intuition is that process of mind, which creates, in real sense, all the material of our knowledge or experience as against the Kantian theory of knowledge,
in which sensation as the raw material comes from the sensory instruments and intuition with its two forms of time and space works upon it (sense) and then handover to the intellect for complete formation. Croce does not make difference between form and content. He thinks that the formless matter is inconceivable.

Aesthetics is a branch of philosophy or the theory of perception or the theory of beauty. Thilly does not make distinction between ordinary perception and artistic perception, but I do not agree with him on this account because Croce himself differentiates between lay and learned, ordinary and artistic and common and genius, artistic and non-artistic by virtue of being a man every is himself a philosopher, but to some extent because a philosopher in reality has his vision and knowledge richest while in the case of a lay man it is narrow, shallow and limited. However, casting light on Croce’s theory of expression or intuition in the real sense of perception Thilly writes, “A theory of perception, if adequate, is at the same time an account of the activity of the creative artist or poet: ordinary perception has an aesthetic quality, and aesthetic creation and appreciation are refinements of perceptual experience. Sense perception is not a process in which the mind is passively aware of an external objects; it is a cognitive process in which the data of thought are created by intuition. The difference between perception and artistic creation is not a difference of kind but of degree: they are both manifestation of the same expressive function of the mind. The aesthetic intuition of sense perception requires expression in the medium of images; and this is the primary function of the creative artist. This artist’s images, which are expressive of his perceptual intuitions, are not separate from the original intuition, but are rather a return to that intuition. In this way art frees the mind from the limitations of the reflective level of thought by reinstating the immediacy of perception.” With this clarification it is probably true to say that Croce’s intuitive faculty of spiritual activity is self-expressive as well as perceptual in nature. But Croce does not recognize perception as artistic. Discussing, however the meaning of perception he writes that intuition is perception of the real and of the simple image of the possible. We simply objectify our impressions, whatever they be, in our intuitive expression instead of opposing to empirical things to external reality. This objectifying efficiency must prevail throughout in all the artistic perception but in an ordinary perception it is lacking. Anyhow Crocian aesthetic is related to theoretical activity of intuition as expression but pure concepts of logic also possess the characteristics of universality, expressiveness and concreteness. Croce, enumerating logic, assigns quality, evolution, shape and beauty in general which have their value because of the creative spirit of intuition.

**Expression includes both Form and Content:**

In this prospective Croce contends, “Does the aesthetic fact consists of content alone or of form alone, or of both together? This question is related to various meanings of expression, which requires proper consideration. But when these words are taken as signifying what is already defined, matter is understood as emotionally but not aesthetically elaborated; or impressions, and form as the two forms of one intellectual activity or the two aspects of one expression, then our view
cannot be in doubt...this is that makes the aesthetic fact to consist of the content alone (that is, the simple impressions) and the thesis which makes it to consist of a junction between form and content, or to say, impressions and expressions. In the aesthetic fact, expressive activity is not added to the fact of the impressions, but these latter are formed and elaborated by it. The impressions reappear as they were in expression, like water put into a filter, which reappears the same and yet different on the other side. The aesthetic fact therefore, is form, and nothing but form. Now what is the place of impression and sensation or the contents in Croce's expression? It is true answer that Croce obviously distinguishes impressions and sensation from pure intuition. He says, "What is generally experience, but these intuitions are always of sensations and impressions." He adds further in a separate line, "Art is expression of impressions, not expression of expression." This statement mentioned so suffices to say that the unity of content and form is called expression but the nature of unity differs in kind and also in quality, particularly in art. Moreover, content and form together have their existence not as content alone, not as form alone, and not as content and form both, but concrete form and nothing more than form in art. Croce certainly, I understand, likes to follow Aristotelian method of philosophization here. Since, Plato in his theory of ideas could not reconcile the abstraction of matter with the form of ideas. Therefore, Aristotle produced a nice solution and said that content and form are the two sides of a coin. In the same way Croce thinks of abstraction inconceivable without form in art. However, he had in his mind the distinction of content and form. Impressions and sensations have been provided the position of abstraction while expression or intuition treated as the other side of the coin which is from in real sense. Otherwise what can be the philosophy of impressions as expressed and impressions obtain form in expression they cannot be said to be intuition or expression because according to Croce there is always an expression of impression, but not the expression of expression. In art Kant, however, obviously differentiates between content and form in all matters.

Criticising the theory of aesthetic senses Croce holds the view that it is due to failure to establish the character of expression as distinct from matter, to which the theory of aesthetic senses has arisen. But aesthetic sense of visual ands auditive and other groups of impressions are interdirectly connected into the aesthetic fact. "Aesthetic expression is synthesis in which it is impossible to distinguish direct and indirect. All impressions are placed by it on a level in so far as they are aesthetisized." Further, Croce emphasizes the unity of a thing for bringing it to aesthetic expression is necessary. Impressions are conditioned solely by the operating stimuli because, if a man who has never had the impression of the sea, will not be able to express it, but it does not justify the dependence of the expressive function on the stimulus. However, "expression presupposes impression, and particular expressions. For the rest, every impression excludes other impressions during the moment in which it dominates; and so does every expression." Interpreting Croce's notion of form and content Patrick Romanell writes that following Hegel's footsteps Croce is definitely thinks of the Aesthetics as having the two polar terms of the synthesis-form and content are not interpreted as opposites but as distincts, in as much as the emotional content of work of art has an abstract status only when viewed aesthetically, but certainly not when viewed
emotionally. In his view every genuine work of art is actually a concrete of both form and content is abstract. As such Croce, according to Patrick Romanell, learns from "De Sanctis that the essence of art lies in its form by which is meant not something abstracted from "content", but the transformation of any emotional state or content what so ever into an object of contemplation or artistic vision. Further, discussion on the content of art as feeling or as state of mind has been set aside by Croce. He does not treat feelings as thought, but deems them to be form as intuitive as artistic. The Romanell's thought itself appears to be a corollary of Croce's elegance of strategy to concede to indirectly the distinguishing features in the form and the content, but directly there is only form in his mind; it is due to inconceivability of the formless matter.

Croce's aesthetic does not include feelings, emotions, sensations, impulses and all other terms and tendencies which fall short of the spirit and are not assimilation to human mind or to human nature in broader sense. Because I think he treats them all as mere abstractions of matter. But since Croce views the form and content as the same, therefore, it is not likely vindicative to think that both form and content are at par. There is however, a distinction of atleast degrees in them, if not in full stature. Croce puts sensation, the formless matter on the lower limit but he says that such a formless status of sensation or of other such things can never be apprehended by the spirit. "Matter, in its abstraction, is mechanism, passivity, it is what the spirit of man suffers, but does not produce. Without it no human knowledge or activity is possible; but mere matter produces animalistic phenomenon; whatever brutal or impulsive in man, not the spiritual dominion 'which is humanity'. It means that matter's role, as content and intuition's role as form are the essential needs for our knowledge. Moreover, Croce says, "Matter, clothed and conquered by form, produces concrete form. It is matter, the content, which differentiates one of our intuitions from another: the form is constant: it is spiritual activity, while matter is changeable. Without matter spiritual activity would not forsake its abstractness to become concrete and real activity this or that spiritual content, this or that definite intuition." However, it is abstruse to think of Croce's thesis on form and matter because once he admits the distinction between content and form and twice he negates.

The real position to my belief is that the impressions, feelings, sensations, emotions, impulses and such other states of mind are aroused by self experience or by spiritual experience, as Croce thinks of. But formless contents to which the artist provides form by expressing them in her art work is considerable. Actually, art is the expression of emotions, if the artist succeeds to bring such abstraction to the surface of art, or succeed to express properly then she will be a good artist and her work of art in which all abstraction gets form, will be a genuine work of art. But in every situation the distinction between form and content ought to be kept in mind.

**Intuition and Images:**

Intuitive knowledge is productive of images, says Croce. Recognizing the theoretical character of art in his own doctrine of expression Croce considers
another most important problem—the problem of image. Art is expression, no doubt but the role of imaginary writes, "The doctrine of art as intuition, fancy or form, now gives rise to a further problem (I have not said as yet a “final” problem), which is no longer one of opposition and distinction with respect to physics, hedonistics, ethics and logic, but is internal to the field itself of images. To doubt whether an image is sufficient to define the character of art really involves the question of how to differentiate a genuine from a spurious image, there by enriching the concept of image and of art." 99 Croce makes difference between a real image (genuine) and a spurious. Genuine image is that which has the capacity or power to produce intuition 100 but it is also true to think of intuition not as a product of an incoherently accumulated form of images obtained by recognizing up ancient images 111 rather as self sufficient existence and in application. Here he directs attention to the fact that there is a clear distinction between intuition and fantasy in the realm of expression. However, according to Croce genuine images are the ground of all intuitive activity, the so-called aesthetic. Spurious images are kept out of way. But Croce himself is not definite about the distinction pertaining to real and unreal images. But for Croce expression is not such that consists in over looking the distinction between the real images and the unreal images. If reality of expression consists in over looking the distinction between real and the unreal then it is spurious, and no images shall likely stand useful for an artist. But for Croce, according to my calculation, there is only one image, related to organic whole or to man’s totality of life, instead of being a jumble of fragmentary states of mind. Croce writes, “To collect, select, divide and combine images presupposes within the spirit the production and the possession of the single images themselves. Fancy is a producer, whereas imagination is a parasite, fit for incidental occasions but incapable of begetting organization and life.” 102 Croce’s view in respect of the nature of the creation and nature of pure images is important and considerable from an aesthetic viewpoint. Pure images are different from imagination and are not divisible or combinable with any of the states of mind in which there are impulses, feelings, emotions and impressions and even imaginations. These states of mind remain incoherent, fragrant and seek and require the collection, selection, division and combination within the spirit, but it is the work of an immediate, not of a genuine artist to combine them.

Images come and go in our minds but those images, which are haphazard and divert, are not artistic. 103 The artistic image is always coherent, profound and productive of pure intuitions. “Intuition-as-image” or a system of image is an artistic fact because no “image-in-isolation” can exist. Moreover, artistic images are always intuitive and so also an artistic intuition always a lyric intuition, (Croce uses the word lyrics as a synonymous to intuition) and thus Croce assigns a dignifying status to pure images as different from imagination. Definitely in Croce’s view the images are productive of pure intuitions in the realm of art. To him art is intuition but intuition is not always art because artistic intuition is quite different in form and nature than the intuition, which is related, to the expression and to pure images. 104
Croce’s concept of Beauty

Expression is beauty and beauty is Expression

Associating himself to the cause of the term ‘Expression’, and also the proving himself to be an expressionist in the strict sense of the term, Croce is not prepared to cross the wide spread kingdom of expressionism. His doctrine of expression, indubiously, is a doctrine of art; he concerns more to art than beauty. But ‘Beauty’ is a key problem in aesthetics. Much energy has been devoted to find out a general consensus for a genuine solution in respect of beauty and ugliness but all in vain. Consequently, a number of definitions and explanations have been brought to light from time to time but none, probably, succeeded to have a general recognition. The problem sprouted complicated day by day. Croce is one who puts the problem of beauty on the ordeal and attempt to examine most of the theories and thoughts in this course. It will be irrelevant to discuss all such theories here because to usher Crocian view on beauty and ugliness is the expedient and needed phenomenon as well.

Croce commences his journey in pursuit of beauty from ‘Expression’ and also ends it on ‘Expression’ i.e. his journey as such is ‘Expression’ to ‘Expression’, no prolific tendency can be seen apparently, despite the fact that he has been a prolific writer. According to him beauty is both permissible and advisable to define as successful expression or rather, as expression and nothing more, because expression when it is not successful is not expression. Likewise, the solution of the problem of ugliness in Croce’s doctrine adheres to the same pedigism. He writes, “Consequently, the ugly is unsuccessful expression. The paradox is true, for works of art that are failures, that the beautiful presents itself as unity, the ugly as multiplicity.”

In characterization beauty and ugliness Croce narrates to such pairs that are of confronting nature-pair one, successful expression and unsuccessful expression, pair two, unity and multiplicity. The first of each belongs to beauty and the second to ugliness. These distinctions are precisely with in the expression. That is why it is said that the paradox is true in the above quoted lines, which it has been made clear that success and unity is the criteria of beauty, and unsuccess and multiplicity of the expression is the criteria of ugliness.

Criteria of Beauty-Subjective

Openly there is no such criterion as subjective or objective in Croce’s theory of expression. Tacitly or willy-nilly he is bound to appropriate the successful expression and unity for criteria of beauty and contrary to it, the criteria of ugliness, which falls in subjective criteria of beauty and ugliness. For this very reason a good artist is one whose expressions are successful; her art work is a good art, but one who fails to express successfully is not a good artist; her work is pseudo and nothing more. Symmetry as a criterion of beauty has not being accepted by Croce because he does not go beyond the limits of expression and does not extend approbation to
physical phenomena. What remains, there is simply the mental or spiritual expression. But Croce does not accept the role of feelings and emotions in his doctrine of expression; it is deplorable. Now the question is if the expression does not evolve feelings and emotions then what it is an expression? It is puzzling. Again, he does not cross the boundary of expression. It is in my view, a universally admitted fact that the expression in art-poetry, music, painting and sculpture-is intrinsically related to feelings and emotions. Without them expression is bare and empty. However, in defence of Croce it may be assumed that the phenomenon expressing is beauty and the phenomenon expressed is beautiful. In reference we just cite the example of Cicero who utters adequately, "...beauty is the Divine, the Idea, shining through; and matter is beautiful, not in itself, but only when it is illuminated by the idea."

Illumination is certainly manifestation or expression of divinity. But for Croce this theory of beauty is not plausible because he is not ready to include any element, which may have vim of expression. But I argue against Croce by putting down his own version in which he says that there is expression of impressions but not expression of expression. The idea of impression in my view remains in the bottom of the expressing phenomenon but not in the form of abstraction. According to Croce reality in purity has two poles one is positive and the other negative; pure expression or pure intuition is free from distinction of real and unreal. But all this is in relation to successiveness and unsuccessfulness of expression. It is successful, it is beauty, if not then it is ugly. The same is the position of art-successful expression is good art, otherwise pseudo. Success and unsuccess, in all respects of art and beauty, are creative of either pleasure or pain in my opinion. But Croce does not grant approbation to pleasure and pain as he is anti-hedonism.

No degrees in beauty:

Since, expression is intuition and vice-versa, and intuition or expression has no degrees therefore beauty does not possess degrees. For Croce "Unsuccessful works may have merit in various degrees, even the greatest. The beautiful does not possess degrees, for is no conceiving a more beautiful, that is, an expressive that is more expressive, an adequate that is more than adequate. Ugliness, on the other hand, does possess degree, from the rather ugly (or almost beautiful) to the extremely ugly. But if the ugly were complete, i.e. without any element of beauty, it would for that reason cease to be ugly because it would be without contradiction; contradiction as such makes ugly and beauty possible. The disvalue would become non-value; activity would give place to passivity, with which it is not at war, save when activity is really present to oppose. These compounded lines on beauty and ugly are expressive of Croce's paradoxical viewpoints. As such his reality, i.e. spirit is full of contradiction as that of Hegel's absolute. Croce does not recognize beauty without ugliness, and ugliness without beauty; there is no absolute or complete beautiful or ugly.

Paradoxes in Croce's aesthetics--
The paradox that when all is perfect, nothing is perfect or to say when all is beautiful, nothing is beautiful may be interpreted in terms of the doctrine of relativity because for Croce neither beauty nor ugliness is conceivable in isolation but in relativity they are thinkable. It can be equivoulsed in reverence to Augustine who says that ugly brings beauty to prominence; hence, a perfect form of beauty or ugly in isolation (empirically) is neither beauty nor ugly rather ceases to be either beauty or ugly. I once again like to make the Relativity operative in which nothing is absolute and independent; every phenomenon is relative and all things are interdependent.

Croce's notion, "Where all is real, nothing is real." and "To show how the content of history comes to be distinguished from that in the narrow sense, we must recall what has already been observed as to the ideal character of the intuition or first perception, in which all is real and therefore nothing is real", makes the problem more complicated. The ideal character of intuition or the first perception is paradoxical. Logically, anything is either real or unreal, but not as, if all is real then nothing is real. I am right to some extent to interpret Croce's paradox in terms if relativity because what other explanation can be, will also be put up in due course. Moreover, it can also be argued at this juncture that when intuition is a simple activity and basis of logical activity (these are the two forms of theoretical activity of the spirit) and knowledge is reality based upon distinguishing real from unreal or real images from unreal images and "since this distinction does not at the first moment exist, these intuitions would in truth not be intuitions either of the real or of the unreal, not perceptions, but pure intuitions." Further, "Intuition is the undifferentiated unity of the perception of the real and of the simple image of the possible." The word "Possible" is indicative of that phenomenon which gets expression; that phenomenon is neither less nor more than impressions because impressions are expressed, not the expression.

No doubt, there are various kinds of intuitions or in strictly broader sense there are quite a sufficient number of expressions but not all have artistic beauty: only successful expression comprises of artistic beauty. But according to Croce intuition indistinctive of real and unreal is pure intuition and involves a paradoxical tendency. Accordingly where all is real, nothing is real. This tendency remains implied in the character of pure intuition. But distinction between real and unreal or between real image and unreal image comes to light only when intuition as pure intuition or perception as the first perception passes on the second stage where spirit forms the concepts of external and internal, of subject and object. Meaning there by the interference of intellect in the tacit duality of the intuition destroys its purity, virginity, simplicity and placidity, and thus the equilibrium is disturbed, the complexity in thought takes shelter.

In the case of the problem of beauty and ugliness the same paradoxical nature of intuition or expression attracts the attention towards success and unsuccess of the expression itself. Successful expression is the character of beauty or beauty itself and the unsuccessful expression is denotive of ugly but both are expressions: Beautiful is unifying whole, ugly is diversifying part. It is not inadequate or inexpedient to quote Croce who determines the meaning of art in great enthusiasm.
by means of the dictum "art is expression but all expressions are not art."
(Expression is not distinct from intuition.)

In Croce's view artistic expression is beautiful because it is successful. An unsuccessful expression is not artistic and therefore it is ugly. Beauty and ugly or artistic and non-artistic expressions are correlative; none is conceivable without the other. All other notions are also on the same platform for example, regarding error and truth Croce writes, "The strict relationship of error and truth originates from the fact that a pure or absolute error is inconceivable and, for this reason does not exist. Error speaks with a double voice, one of which affirms the false, while the other belies it, thereby constituting that clash of yes and no which is called contradiction. Consequently when we go from a general consideration to a detailed and specific examination of a theory which has been condemned as erroneous, we find in the theory itself the cure for its falsity, that is to say, the true theory which sprouts from the soil of error." 114

**Beautiful used as value**

Croce undertakes to discuss the problem of beauty from another viewpoint. The concept of value he considers and evaluates for determining the nature of beautiful. The value of expression as beautiful may be related not to aesthetic only but to logic, ethics and economics also.

Croce nevertheless, is vigorously conscious of the treatment of ‘beautiful’ as value in the practical human life. There is a long galaxy of values in different varities. There are aesthetic, logical, economic and ethical values but all these and also others opt different denotations: beauty for aesthetic, ‘true’ for logic, ‘useful’ for economic and ‘good’ for ethics, the antonyms of which are ‘ugly’, ‘false’, ‘useless’ and ‘bad’ respectively. ‘Beautiful’ as value mat be used vicissitudinally, not merely for aesthetic but also for other values e.g. ‘beautiful truth’, ‘beautiful use’ ‘beautiful action’ ‘beautiful work’ and so on. Croce tends to make the use of the adjective beautiful as value free from any illusion or confusion. Thus he writes, “Beautiful, for instance, is said not only of a successful expression, but also of a scientific truth, of an action successfully achieved, and of a moral action: thus we talk of an intellectual beauty, of a beautiful action, of a moral beauty.” 115 In the continuity of the applicability of value or values we just utter, ‘beauty of truth’, ‘beauty of good’; ‘beauty of action’, ‘beauty of work or job’ or we say a beautiful speech or a beautiful action or a beautiful work or job and so on. For Croce these denotations in relation to value are indicative to free development of spiritual activity, of action, of scientific research and of artistic production etc. Provided they are successful expressions and if not they are ugly and false when the activity is embarrassed, the products such as will be a failure. 116 Here it is once again remarkable that success in practical life, in my opinion is always productive of happiness, failure is productive of pains. Consequently, Croce’s beauty is no more than a successful expression because that expression which is not successful is not expression.
To the answer what expresses and what is expressed in the form of expression, it may precisely be stated that an appropriate solution to the existing problem comprises of “expression presupposes impression, and particular expressions, particular impressions. For the rest, every impression excludes other impressions during the moment in which it dominates; and so does every expression.” But in reference to the indivisible character of the work of art Croce creates certain baffling points. He writes, “Every expression is a single-expression. Activity is a fusion of the impressions in an organic whole. A desire to express this has always prompted the affirmation that the work of art should have unity, or what amounts to the something Unity in variety. Expression is a synthesis of the various, or multiple in the one.” Croce seems to emphasise the unifying character of art and allocates the position of impressions as the basis of expressions in all forms of art. Diversity of impressions finds unity in expression. Hence, the artistic activity binds up the multiplicity of impressions into one single expression, making the expression an organic whole i.e. unity in diversity. There is no expression of expression because expression is always of impressions. Beauty of expression lies in successful expression and nothing more than this, so far as my opinion is concerned. Thus we can say that a successful expression is beautiful and contrary to it ugly. Moreover, beauty without ugly, reality without unreality, form without abstraction and so on are inconceivable because where all is nothing is real (Croce) or to say where all is beautiful, nothing is beautiful and vice-versa. It is, I think, the best plausible interpretation of Crocian paradox by thinking of beauty and ugly, reality and unreality and so on as having a suitable espousal with each other. However, relativity remains at work in which nothing is absolute, every thing is interdependent.

**Non-Logical character of Art-tautological explanation:**

In Croce’s aesthetic intuition or expression has miraculous position, as already discussed. His doctrine of expression is particularly related to art. For Croce art is intuition, it is also vision. Image, imagination, fancy, representation etc are treated as synonymous and reappear in the discussion on art. There is no logical character of art. Croce has not accepted conceptualism in this respect. The role of images has been highlighted. Croce emphatically discusses images as the genuine part of a genuine work of art because in reality intuition itself is production of an image contradicting his previous statement in which he said that intuitive knowledge is the basis of all other forms and is productive of images. Images are either genuine or spurious but difficult to differentiate between the two. But only genuine image enriches the art but art as conceptual is dead. “As soon as reflection or judgement develops out of that state of ideality, art vanishes and dies. It dies in the artist, who changes from artist and becomes his own critic; it dies in the spectator or listener, who from rapt contemplator of art changes into a thoughtful observer of life.” Art as art, genuine work of art in strict sense is intuition or expression, the successful expression only. In art intuition excludes “art as production of classes, types, species and genera....” Art as such is a unity; it is a unity in expression or intuition.
Crocian concept of art is as mental or spiritual as the concept of expression. For Croce every expression is mental or spiritual but not physical in any respect. However, work of art is as a reproduction of the genuine images of the artist. (Colours, sounds, stones, streaks and so on are the forms of a body or the physical facts and are not expressive of reality. Art is the supremely real.”

Art is not a utilitarian act because all such theories are directly or indirectly hedonistic in which the aim assigned to the act remains to produce a state of pleasure and relieve the mind from melancholic state. But “Art considered in terms of its own nature has nothing to do with the useful, or with pleasure and pain, as such.” However, Croce has, also negated art as a special form of pleasure instead of general one. It is because pleasure as pleasure is not in itself artistic. Suppose there is a picture produced by an artist, it may be a beautiful but may also cause some painful memory at the same time. Moreover, a picture is beautiful but the figure represented may be abominable to our soul.

The Greeko-Roman world occurred in art in 18th century and also got sprouting tendencies in second half of 19th century. As such the beginners in art in this century are much impressed with the fact that art arouses pleasure, Croce rejects it.

Art considered in terms of morality has also not been accepted by Croce because according to him art does not come into being from an act of will. Good will no doubt, makes a man honest but does not constitute the artist; it is a clash between a theoretical act (art) and practical act (ethics) but Croce refutes moral obligation in art on the one hand gives his consent on the by uttering, “For if art is beyond morals, the artist is not, since he is neither beyond nor this side of it, but under its dominion. Insofar as he is a man, the artist cannot shirk the duties of man and should consider art itself—which is not and never will be morals—as a mission, to be practiced like a priesthood”; it is miraculous.

For Croce, art is neither feeling or Psychic matter. Feelings have kept banished from mental expression on the same pattern as Kant did for feelings in his intellectual ethics. Croce thinks of feelings as related to the chose states of mind, which are either pleasant or unpleasant. But art has to do nothing with pleasures or pain. On this point once again Croce creates confusion, as he is not definite in his decision. He writes, “As pleasure is common to aesthetic activity, no denial of it is intended at all in denying categorically the identification of art with the pleasurable, and in distinguishing it from the pleasurable by defining it as intuition.”

Regarding beauty and ugly Croce’s view is not different from what he reveals in his ‘Aesthetic: As Science of Expression and General linguistic” and in his second book ‘Brevario de estatica’. Accordingly “a proper expression if proper, is also beautiful-beauty being nothing but the determination of the image, and, hence of the expression...if it contains inexpressive, superfluous, extrinsic elements, it is not beautiful but ugly, that is to say, it is not expressive or not as yet so.” Moreover, beauty and expression are not two but a single concept for Croce.

Croce tells us variety of beauties in his ‘Brevario de estatica’. According to him there are different forms of beauty such as physical beauty, which appears in nature and is called natural beauty or beauty of nature. But it is not artistic. Beauty of nature apparently is transformation of intuitions into physical things but all these things are useless. It is man who makes the useful to useless things. Croce writes,
“We leave to the rhetoricians and the exuberant to affirm that a beautiful tree, a grand river, a majestic mountain, or even a beautiful horse or a beautiful human figure are superior to the chisel strokes of Michelangelo or the verses of Dante. As for us, we declare, with greater appropriateness, that “nature” is stupid compared to art, and that she is “dump”, if man does not make her speak.”

Croce makes distinction between expression proper and beauty of expression. Expression proper is simple and beauty of expression is ornate, or is the first is simple and the second, in my opinion, is artificial because Croce also differentiates between artificial beauty and pure beauty. Pure beauty is proper expression while artificial is an improper form. But simple expression has been treated as related to thought and philosophy, ornate expression to fancy and poetry. Yet in all respects it is expression in art that does not require any of the physical phenomena. Because Art is mental expression and the world is an abstract construction; both are the works of human intellect. Intuition constitutes art and its corollaries provided it is complete but the intellect constructs and extends its creations afterwards. In art proper there is reproduction of artist’s images. And, hence, the artist in the form of reproduction serves practical activity. Lastly, aesthetic experience-proper or ornate-constitutes the domain of art in all respects. There is no art without expression but all expressions are not art. The concepts of beauty and ugliness have their complete merger in expression without qualification.

**Expression and Language:**

Croce himself writes that he has entitled his work on aesthetics and named it as a science of expression and general linguistic. He intended articulately to show the relation of expression with language. But he dealt with it in his conclusion, extended to 13 pages. He concluded that language and expression are not two distinct phenomena rather are one. He writes, “Aesthetic and Linguistic, conceived as true sciences, are not two distinct things, but one thing only. Not that there is a special linguistic; but the much sought for science of language, general linguistic, in so far as what it contains is reducible to philosophy, in nothing but Aesthetic: who ever studies general linguistic, that is to say, philosophical linguistic, studies aesthetic problems, and vice-versa. Philosophy of language and Philosophy of art are the same thing.” Continuing discussion on the relationship between language and expression, it is said that the language had its spiritual origin. Logical analysis of language in preposition or grammatical explanation in verbs, nouns and others is not proper because language as expression is an indivisible whole but grammar involves error-making analysis in language, which is not excellent. Moreover, languages in general do not have existence outside the art. At this juncture Croce points out certain errors committed by the linguistics. Language being creative is not vocabulary, a collection of abstractions, or cemetery of corpses more or less will embalmed. Language is entirely creative and self expressive.

Again, language is productive something, continuously changing and passing away even its preservation in writing is incomplete. Humboldt thinks of language as a kind of mumification because it is not a work but an activity that
flows out automatically from the breast and appears in utterances. Croce attributes humanity to language because he thinks that it comes from generation to generation. Further, winning the scientific elaboration of linguistic phenomena in so far as it is philosophy, he opines that such an elaboration "must merge itself in aesthetic; and this indeed thus without leaving a residue." 

Croce was an impartial critic his time who shifted out certain errors committed by the thinkers, predecessors and contemporaries according to him if it thought that language is the name of mere sounds and echoes then it is wrong for as emission of sound expressing nothing is not language but it is sound articulated, circumscribed and organized for the purposes of expression. Through this statement Croce proves the identity of linguistic and aesthetic.

**Emotization:**

In summarizing this chapter the following points are remarkable: -

1. Croce's aesthetics is based on intuition as expression. The words like symbol, image, expression, representation, imagination, art, beauty and so on and so like as used by Croce other than expression have no different meaning from the art and expression.

2. Croce's aesthetics entirely depends on his idealism, which in my view is better to the four fold spiritual as dynamism. As spirit is the sole reality and manifests itself into four moments or activities and intuitive is aesthetic and is the ground of all other activities; intuition is such a principle through which total aesthetic kingdom has been attempted to be explained.

3. Croce's interest has been in articulating the meaning of art than beauty. What he considers of beauty is not over and above the successful expression or the expression of aesthetic activity.

4. All spiritual activities after all merge in aesthetic activity, the intuitive or self-expressive.

5. He concludes his Aesthetic: As the Science of expression and general linguistic by showing the inseparable identity between language and expression.

6. In his book second of the same work he has criticized all his predecessors who took beauty and art in the form of pleasure or usefulness or for the purposes other than "art as art" which is for contemplation, and even not for recreation. I think realization of artistic expression means contemplation. It is just to say, "Croce maintained that all works of art are intuitions and that all intuitions are works of art" is to determine art or works of art and intuitions identical but it is the effects of what an artist intuitively expresses.

7. It is deplorable not to place the 'ins' and 'outs' of aesthetics in the human feelings and emotions.

8. No considerable mention of sublime in Croce's theory but Croce must have to allude it clearly even if it was no more than intuitive expression.

9. His statements are paradoxical, no excuse except to interpret them in the light of theories of causation, particularly relativity and co-relative theories.
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