

Summary

*Ideologia* by Pietro Bottura (1832) is unique attempt in our philosophical and linguistic literature so far, »to apply philosophy to grammar«, i.e. logical linguistics. He conceived his »logical grammar«, as he termed it, at the period when on the one hand thinkers had just started to abandon the theory of language in the spirit of Locke's theory of ideas and tried to introduce the notion of the semantic form, later to be termed structure, i.e. the earliest approach to language as a formal organization of signs; while on the other hand the illuministic model of science and the empirical method of linguistic investigation had become consolidated, and Hamann had just hinted at Humboldt's historical organicism, a concept which separated linguistic theory and the empirical research method. Therefore the evaluation of Bottura's semantic theory appears as the determination of the proper place of this lesser, unknown philosopher from Zadar in the moment of bifurcation of illuministic empiricism — a line which, stretching from Bacon, Galileo and the French illuminists to the modern neo-illuminists, built its basic tenets into modern linguistics — and Humboldt's romanticism which is, in the opinion of some, the forerunner of modern structural linguistics, and in the opinion of others only a factor connecting different lines of development rather than a cluster of new beginnings.

Bottura's relation to Locke's concept of ideas and his acceptance of the formal character of language will be treated in Part One, and the remaining part (to be published in *Prilozi istraživanju hrvatske filozofske baštine*, Zagreb) will treat Bottura's concept of meaning and his explanation of the origin and development of language (theory of language).

Although Locke's third book of the *Essay Concerning Human Understanding* (1690) »On Words« is the first real treatise on language which launched an important initial thesis on the philosophy of language in general — that words are arbitrary sensory signs of our ideas so that we should be able to communicate them to others — it was, primarily as the theory of ideas, a barrier to the adequate interpretation of language. Basic objections were addressed to the privatization of language and the lack of formal interpretation of language. The formal components of language were observed at first in the comparison of ordinary and mathematical languages (Locke in part, Leibnitz at first, Descartes, particularly Hobbes and mostly Condillac) on the one hand, and in the study of metaphor (Vico, Shaftesbury, Blackwell, Herder) on the other. Bottura wrote on ideas too, but his aim was to interpret words as found-figurative signs which have no meanings in themselves, because he had linked their communicative character, probably because of respect of Bacon, Hobbes, Condillac and Stewart, and not knowing of Monboddo, with the location of language in the experience of communication, thus surpassing in advance Humboldt's too narrow thesis of language as the expression of the collective character of the nation. In this sense, Bottura denied the ability of communicating ideas,

and emphasized words as communication signs, thus transmitting to us the message of the illuminists that language is the means of communication not only of the nation but also of culture and civilization, being their product and their formative element. Bottura's formal approach to language starts with the acceptance of Locke's principle of the conventional, but he links it with the use of language, the problem that Berkeley, Burke and Stewart had stumbled upon and which was to be of decisive importance, after the second stage of Wittgenstein, in linguistics and notably in pragmatological semantics. In Bottura's analysis of words in the sentence, the name was given special place, and he thus includes himself in a fairly long history of the interpretation of names from the more distant and the more immediate predecessors such as Locke, Hobbes, Beauzée, Stewart and Smith to the present-day controversies within metalogic, especially semantics. Most similarly to Hobbes, Bottura's formal approach to language takes to the statement that »the whole fabric of human language can be reduced to names and the verb 'be'«. Since just this, in Bottura's opinion, makes the philosophical foundation of grammar, his undertaking can be defined in its essence as the anticipation of the transformational method which differs from the method that Chomsky assigns to Arnauld whom he considers the forerunner of his own transformational method. The parallelism between the linguistic and the logical form which Bottura has made, avoids — in contrast to Chomsky — modern orthodox logic as an adequate rational scheme of linguistic description of natural languages. Although he made use of the notion of class, the key term of the later logical algebra, and although some of his forerunners (Condillac) considered algebraic calculus adequate for the presentation of natural languages, Bottura was nevertheless inclined to seek for the autochthonous linguistic form, as was first attempted by Lord Monboddo (in the work from 1773 to 1792). As with Monboddo, the principle of analogy made it possible for Bottura to present the principal criteria for the determination of linguistic form (composition, derivation and inflexion). As Schlegel is considered to have been of the same opinion but that he had discovered it following Smith and Jones, and as Bottura does not mention any one of them, Monboddo included, it cannot be stated with certainty that he copied them (it is most probable that he did not know them, except Stewart whom he quotes, but in a different context). He differed from them all in his leaning to illustrate his theses with fairly numerous examples, which is typical of modern research, i. e. it can be stated, as Land had stated for Schlegel, that Bottura discovered the three criteria of linguistic form by following carefully all literature available in the Italian language. Analyses can reveal that he did not lag behind Schlegel, especially as regards inflexions in language. It is of especial importance to emphasize that in this connection Bottura employed the term »substituend« which is even at present an important linguistic category in structural linguistics (Bloomfield) and that he referred to the linguistic sign as acoustic picture before Humboldt and De Saussure did.

It can be said that Bottura reached his concept of linguistic form and the formative character of language by affirming the principle of analogy in the

spirit of the phonetic law which was discovered by the Leipzig neo-grammarians school and that in his consideration of the form and matter of language he eliminated the notion of synthetic activism which was the carrier of Humboldt's concept of the transcendental form of language and which the romantic idealists most readily constructed from the first edition of Kant's *Critique*. Continuing in a far higher degree than Humboldt's school the tradition of illuministic empiricism, Bottura was close to the typical characteristics of the research methods of linguistics in its nascent state (Schleicher) thus affirming in advance the implicit theses of the romanticists and eliminating in advance their explicit theses.

With the anticipation of some of the crucial topics of structural linguistics and with his feeling for an unorthodox formalization of linguistic theory, Bottura anticipated the need for the connection of the basic results of 18th century general linguistics and 19th century technical treatment of empirical generalizations, which is the task of linguistics in the present time.