



University of Tehran press

The illogical structures of the Italian language according to Wittgenstein's thought in Tractatus



Iman Mansub Basiri* 0000-0002-1687-1324

Department of Romance Languages and Literatures, University of Tehran, Tehran, Iran
Email: i.m.basiri@ut.ac.ir



Giuseppe Labisi** 0000-0003-0662-2014

Department of History and Sociology, University of Konstanz, Konstanz, Germany
Email: giuseppe.labisi.87@gmail.com



Mohammad Almasi*** 0009-0004-6277-6645

Department of Romance Languages and Literatures, University of Tehran, Tehran, Iran
Email: mohammadalmasi036@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

Ludwig Wittgenstein (1889-1951) considers the objective of his Tractatus Logico-Philosophicus determining the boundaries of thought. "We should therefore have to be able to think what cannot be thought." He defines the relationship between the universe, language and thought as a form of isomorphism due to the fact that they all have the same logical form. The author of Tractatus, introducing the Picture Theory of Language, categorizes the propositions of language into true, false and senseless (illogical). He explains the relationship between reality and picture in this way: "In order to be a picture a fact must have something in common with what it pictures." Some of the main characteristics of the book are the extreme conciseness in mentioning the philosophical resources and the lack of examples. He doesn't give examples for elementary propositions and this style of writing arouses the readers' curiosity to find examples for the concepts of the early Wittgenstein's philosophy. In this article, with the comparative study of the thought of the author of Tractatus and the grammatical structures of the Italian language, we try to distinguish between the structures with truth-value and the illogical structures of the Italian language. Wittgenstein scarcely uses the Symbolic Logic. This matter evokes our minds to grasp the relationship between the grammatical structure of ordinary languages and logic, from his point of view. By studying the small structures, we try to pave the way for understanding the relationship between the Italian language and the Picture Theory of Language.

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:
Received: 03 April 2024
Received in revised form
29 May 2024
Accepted: 29 May 2024
Available online:
Spring 2024

Keywords:

logic, Italian language, Wittgenstein, Picture Theory of Language, Tractatus, Logico-Philosophicus.

Mansub Basiri, I., Labisi, G., & Almasi, M. (2024). The illogical structures of the Italian language according to Wittgenstein's thought in Tractatus. *Journal of Foreign Language Research*, 14 (1), 169-180. <http://doi.org/10.22059/jflr.2024.374042.1115>.



© The Author(s).

Publisher: The University of Tehran Press.

DOI: <http://doi.org/10.22059/jflr.2024.374042.1115>.

* Iman Mansub Basiri is an assistant professor in the Department of Romance Languages and Literatures at University of Tehran, Tehran, Iran. He is a multidisciplinary scholar and has published studies in the field of Romance philology, historical linguistics, philosophy and comparative literature, has taught at Italian universities and at the University of Tehran.

** Giuseppe Labisi is a post-doctoral fellow at the University of Konstanz. He earned his joint PhD in Islamic Archaeology from the University of Rome 'La Sapienza' and the University of Paris 1 'Panthéon-Sorbonne' in 2017.

*** Mohammad Almasi, graduate summa cum laude of the Italian Language program at the University of Tehran, Tehran, Iran.

Introduction

The style of writing and the concepts of *Tractatus Logico-Philosophicus* raises many questions in the mind of the reader. The extreme conciseness, chosen for transparency and clarity, paradoxically leads to a lot of ambiguity. Wittgenstein, using short and simple propositions, explains his unique writing style in this manner: "How far my efforts agree with those of other philosophers I will not decide. Indeed what I have here written makes no claim to novelty in points of detail; and therefore I give no sources, because it is indifferent to me whether what I have thought has already been thought before me by another." (Wittgenstein 1922) The ending of the *Tractatus* coincides with the negation of the principles introduced in this short yet informative philosophical masterpiece and this matter increases the incomprehension of the text. The great importance of this work in the field of philosophy of language leads us to try to understand this lasting work of philosophy of the previous century by the comparative study of the grammatical structures of Italian language and the thought of early Wittgenstein. Regarding this matter, the author of the *Tractatus* invites us to investigate furthermore: "Here I am conscious that I have fallen far short of the possible. Simply because my powers are insufficient to cope with the task. May others come and do it better." (Wittgenstein 1922) This paper can be defined as a part of a research process for the accurate understanding of the relationship between the philosophy of language and natural languages. A relationship that has been

examined by the philosophers of language to different extents. As an example, Russell's critique of Frege's Definite descriptions can be mentioned. The proposition "The present King of France is bald" according to Frege is neither true nor false. In other words, for Frege this sentence doesn't have Truth value and is impossible to be logically verified since for him definite descriptions that are the subject of the proposition are false if they are not included in the concept of the predicate and are true if they are included in the concept of the predicate. When the subject of the proposition does not have denotation (like the current King of France) to fall under the concept of predicate, it does not have Truth value either. For Russell on the other hand, this proposition has a Truth value, but the defect of the grammatical structure of natural language deceives us and persuades us to think that it is logically impossible to verify. He rewrites the logical reformulation of the aforementioned phrase in this manner: "Someone is currently reigning over France, and he is also bald, if someone is currently reigning over France, he is the only person who reigns over France." (Casalegno 2011) Unlike his mentor, the early Wittgenstein has done his best to avoid dealing with the details of the relationship between natural languages and logic. Moreover, such a comparative study helps us significantly in understanding the capacities, limitations and subtleties of the Italian language. Therefore, a comparative study of Italian grammar and philosophy of language of early Wittgenstein opens a new door to understanding both phenomena. In the world of Eastern and Western thought, the uniformity and the

similarity of logic and grammar has been the subject of a large number of great profundities since ancient times. Since the last century the school of philosophy of language criticizes this similarity and examines the differences in grammatical and logical structure. Many examples of this issue can be found in the works of thinkers preceding Wittgenstein, e.g. Frege and Russell. Thinkers who have at times created logical symbolic languages emphasizing on this exact difference. Wittgenstein's approach is different: the Austrian thinker avoids speaking of the details of logical language by referring to this contradictory statement in a letter of 1919 "the half is greater than the whole" (Wittgenstein 1969) and pointing out to the importance of what he did not address. As it often inevitably occurs in profound studies of the structures of the Italian grammar, we'll take a brief look at one aspect of the transformation of the spoken language from Latin into Italian to redefine one of the illogical structures of Italian in its Latin logical origin. This article begins with the examination of the smaller structures rather than the elementary propositions because from the point of view of the philosopher himself, any compound object can be broken down into simpler objects up to the point the compound objects are fully explained. Moreover, according to him, the objects are equal to the nature of the world and therefore they cannot be compound from a logical perspective. (Wittgenstein 1922)

Literature review

According to Corbett (1991), grammatical gender, as one of the phenomena of language, is the most confusing grammatical category.

The ambiguous nature of this category has attracted the attention of many linguists and researchers for a long time. (cf. (Gudmundsson 2012)). Corbett in his detailed and valuable book deals with different aspects of gender in natural languages. According to Loporcaro et al., the neuter gender in Old Italian (ancient Tuscan) still existed and the historical linguists' idea about the disappearance of the neutral gender in the Late Latin period is wrong, and by examining the origin of the Italian language and other Romance languages, you can determine the period in which Romance languages had had a three-gender system in their historical past. In this regard, it is sufficient to have in mind the three-gender system of Latin from the early centuries until the emergence of the Romance languages. (Loporcaro, M. and Faraoni V. and Gardini F. 2014) It is noteworthy that some researchers have considered dual plurals as necessary proof for the presence of the neutral gender in standard Italian, from their point of view the Italian language is also similar to the Romanian language as far as having a three-gender system. (Merlo, C. 1952, Bonfante, G. 1961, Bonfante, G. 1964, Bonfante, G. 1977) But most linguists are of the opinion that standard Italian does not have a neuter gender structure. (cf. Dressler and Barbaresi 1994, Dressler and Thornton 1994) On the winding path of comprehending the philosopher's writing style and its relationship with the concepts used, the book *Style, Method and Philosophy in Wittgenstein* has been very helpful. (Pichler, A. 2023) In Persian works of research, the article *The Relationship between Logic and*

Language According to Wittgenstein accurately describes the limitations of the logical and essentialist view of language and criticizes Wittgenstein's claim about the equality of the number of the components between image and reality: "Now consider the sentence "Shiraz is west of Kerman". This sentence consists of three logical parts: "Shiraz", "Kerman" and "being located in the west". But in the corresponding world, there are only two parts, "Shiraz" and "Kerman", and there is no mention of "being located in the west"... However, Wittgenstein cannot claim that this proposition is not an image representing reality since it has all the characteristics that he considered necessary for an image of reality to have." (Ebrahimpour and Hosseinzadeh 2014) By describing the limitations of Wittgenstein's logical view, this article explains the process of evolution of the Austrian philosopher's thought from Tractatus to Philosophical Investigations, and at the end, it identifies the place of logic in the late Wittgenstein's "world-image" theory. The relationship between the Italian language and early Wittgenstein's thought has not been studied in any work of Persian, English or Italian literature. The studies are either focused on concepts derived from Wittgenstein's thought or deal with the concepts of Italian grammatical structures.

Methodology

In this article comparative research method is used. Thus, the illogical structures of the Italian language are divided into three main categories according to early Wittgenstein's thought and the importance of simple and small structures in the formation

of elementary propositions: 1. Names 2. Verbs and verb tenses 3. Pronouns, adjectives and definite articles. In this categorization, the overlap of the illogical and ambiguous structures of the Italian language is taken into consideration in order to make the explanation of the link between these structures easier and more apprehensible. Regarding the study of the semantic aspects of dual plurals, the methodology of historical linguistics has been utilized, which is consistent with Wittgenstein's thought in understanding the illogical dimensions of language and with his essentialist view of this phenomenon and moreover, this methodology is a useful tool in understanding the complex nature of language. It is quite obvious that if we consider three genders in Italian (Merlo 1952, Bonfante 1961, 1964, 1977) the illogical aspect of the dual plural structure disappears. But we have set the general consensus of the researchers as the criterion of our comparative study. (cf. Dressler and Barbaresi 1994, Dressler and Thornton 1994). To explain the great importance of polysemous words in natural human languages the result of a study in the field of Italian vocabulary is briefly mentioned. We started off by the examination of the logical structures of the Italian language from the simplest and the first aspects that every language learner faces to pave the way for the examination of more complex grammatical structures. This method corresponds with the principles of Wittgenstein's philosophy of language, which is in search of breaking down complex elements to reach simple elements.

In order to cite the *Tractatus*, three English translations and two Persian translations have been reviewed. (English translations by C. K. Ogden, G. E. Moore, F. P. Ramsi, and L. Wittgenstein, (1922), the translation by D. Pears, and B. McGuinness (1961), the translation by D. Kolak (1998) and Persian translations by Mir Shamsuddin Adib-Soltani (2007) and Mahdi Ebadian (1990). Ogden's translation is the basis for explaining Wittgenstein's thought due to the philosopher's own participation in the translation, Ebadian's Persian translation has been used for the quotations due to its fluency and simplicity.

Discussion and analysis

We start off the study of the illogical structures of the Italian language from the simplest and yet the most important components to reach the elementary propositions and its equivalent in the Italian grammatical structure, to paint a clear picture of the relationship between the structure of the Italian language and the logical structure of language according to the sharp-sighted vision of the early Wittgenstein. As an example, the logical argument on the subject of names is critical in the *Picture Theory of Language*, because each name is a representative of something in the outside world. Due to this fact, our study begins with the subject of names. In this article, we try to search for and analyze the illogical aspects of the grammatical structures of the Italian language that do not correspond to their image. "In order to discover whether the picture is true or false we must compare it with reality." (Wittgenstein 1922) One of the important points of the *Tractatus* is the

author's attention to the irregular aspects of language. This attention finds form in a metaphoric explanation of the musical writing system: "And if we penetrate to the essence of this pictorial nature we see that this is not disturbed by apparent irregularities (like the use of sharp and flat notes in the score). For these irregularities also picture what they are to express; only in another way." (Wittgenstein 1922) These superficial irregularities can be defined as the illogical aspects of language because the nature of language (similar to the world and the thought) is logical, and for this reason it is possible to consider this article as an attempt to understand the logical nature of natural languages from the perspective of the early Wittgenstein.

The illogicality of names

Wittgenstein explicitly and clearly claims on the subject of the relationship between names and elementary propositions in this manner: "One name stands for one thing, and another for another thing, and they are connected together. And so the whole, like a living picture, presents the atomic fact." (Wittgenstein 1922) And adds: "The elementary proposition consists of names. It is a connexion, a concatenation, of names. It is obvious that in the analysis of propositions we must come to elementary propositions, which consist of names in immediate combination." (Wittgenstein 1922) Regarding the nature of names the Austrian philosopher clearly says: "The simple signs employed in propositions are called names." (Wittgenstein 1922) And: "The name means the object. The object is its meaning." (Wittgenstein 1922) In which structures of

the Italian language the name is not indicative of the object? If you ask this question to students of Italian language You will probably find an answer regarding the names that do not match the object in the category of gender. The gender of many names can be considered as one of the illogical aspects of the Italian language: the word masculinity "mascolinità" is feminine itself. In the category of gender, we inevitably come across the issue of incompatibility of the semantic and grammatical aspects of the language. A number of names that are usually used to refer to men are feminine: la sentinella, la recluta, la spia, la guardia, la vedetta. On the other hand, some of the names that are used to refer to both women and men are masculine: il contralto, il mezzosoprano, il soprano. In these examples, the names used correspond with grammatical gender not with natural gender and this shows the illogical side of the category of gender in the Italian language. For example the proposition "La sentinella è stata assalita dai rapinatori" can be noted or the statement "Mia sorella è un buon soprano" can be reviewed.

In the category of gender of names, like some other illogical structural aspects of the Italian language, we are faced with the efforts of the speakers in the field of rationalizing the language in everyday use:

la celebre soprano Maria Callas (Treccani sub voce Soprano)

Certainly, using a feminine word to denote a masculine entity or vice versa cannot be consistent with the Picture Theory of Language of the early Wittgenstein. In Wittgenstein's logical language, names are

used only to refer to simples, and we cannot give two names to one thing or one name to two things: "Either a thing has properties which no other has, and then one can distinguish it straight away from the others by a description and refer to it; or, on the other hand, there are several things which have the totality of their properties in common, and then it is quite impossible to point to any one of them." (Wittgenstein 1922) As evidence, we can point to the word "fronte", which means both the forehead (in its feminine use) and the front line of the campaign (in the masculine use of the word) and in the absence of textual clues, it leads to linguistic ambiguity (for example in a composition like ogni fronte). This itself shows some of the most important and inconsistent aspects of the Italian language in terms of names: one of these aspects that is less mentioned is the double plurals of singular words: a word that logically should have one plural form sometimes has two plurals and different genders denote different meanings of the singular word. "Two signs, one a primitive sign, and one defined by primitive signs, cannot signify in the same way. Names cannot be taken to pieces by definition (nor any sign which alone and independently has a meaning). (Wittgenstein 1922) There are many evidences for double plurals, and we will briefly discuss some of the most common ones: il braccio (i bracci, le braccia), il muro (i muri, le mura), il grido (i gridi, le grida), l'urlo (gli urli, le urla), l'osso (gli ossi, le ossa), il dito (i diti, le dita), il fondamento (i fondamenti, le fondamenta). Here, two points are very important: first, it seems that the singular name refers to two different

things, which has two plural forms with two different meanings, and this is completely inconsistent with the logical thought of early Wittgenstein. Another interesting point is the irregular form of the plurals of these singular words, which is ambiguous considering the usual form of singular words in the Italian language and it increases the possibility of being confused with feminine singular words. The reason for these ambiguous plurals that end in “a” is the patrimony of Latin in Italian. Thus, the Latin language has a neutral gender in addition to the masculine gender and the feminine gender. In general, in the course of transformation of the Latin language into the Italian language, the Latin neuter words have become Italian masculine words: ferru(m) □ (ferro, ferri) Most Latin neuter singular words end with the ending um and the plural ending a: geniculum (ginocchio) □ genicula (ginocchia) When in the course of transitioning from Latin to modern Italian, the neuter singular form became the masculine singular form according to the usual procedure, but the plural form of the ending of the word continued its existence, we are faced with this illogical aspect that a word is of the masculine singular form and the feminine plural form. An aspect that seems very strange and difficult for many language learners at the beginning of the journey of learning the Italian language. Here, in order to better understand this inconsistent aspect, we will briefly explain the semantic difference between these two forms of plurals: plurals that end in “a” usually have a general meaning and indicate the entirety of the concept. For example, the masculine form

“i muri” is used to describe the walls of a room, and the feminine form “le mura” is used to refer to all the defensive walls of the city. It should be noted that Italian speakers have sometimes used the Latin neuter plural to refer to the general aspect of words that are masculine in Latin: such as murus (muro), digitus (dito). In this way, the words that originally did not have this plural form in Latin and did not end in “a”, have taken this form due to the creation of meaning by Italian speakers. This linguistic process was certainly common in very distant past, but it has become obsolete with the passage of time, and this can also indicate the effort of Italian speakers to rationalize the inconsistent aspects of the language. The author of *Tractatus* himself explains the need to address the semantic aspects of language in order to rationalize this encompassing phenomenon as follows: “The meanings of the simple signs (the words) must be explained to us, if we are to understand them. By means of propositions we explain ourselves.” (Wittgenstein 1922) In other words, in order to get from the clothes to the form of the body wearing the clothes, we have to leave behind the irregularities of the appearance, and this is only possible by addressing the semantic aspects of the names. Wittgenstein himself in the text of his *Tractatus* proposes a solution to rationalize dual plurals for certain: “It can never indicate the common characteristic of two objects that we symbolize them with the same signs but by different methods of symbolizing. For the sign is arbitrary. We could therefore equally well choose two different signs and where then would be what was common in the

symbolization.” (Wittgenstein 1922) Wittgenstein's solution can be used not only in the field of rationalizing words that have double plurals, but also in the field of polysemous words, which are very common in Italian poetry as well as in Persian literature. One of the few common viewpoints among different approaches to textual semantics is the acceptance of the fundamental importance of the phenomenon of polysemy in spoken language. In one of the quantitative studies of polysemous words in natural human languages, by referring to Zingarelli's Italian dictionary and comparing the number of entries and the number of meanings, a ratio of 2 to 6 was obtained, that is, on average, six different meanings are mentioned for every two entries in this dictionary. (Casadei 2014)

In line with the examination of the names in modern Italian, one of the most confusing parts is the names indicating family ties, each of which can refer to several different people at the same time, unless the speaker or the listener asks for clarification about the name mentioned. The best example in this regard is the word “nipote”, which refers to various members of the family, including nephews and nieces, as well as male and female grandchildren, etc., however, Italian is grammatically a gendered language and this ambiguity can create many deficiencies in it. In the category of names and their relationship with logic, it is noteworthy to mention another principle of Wittgenstein's philosophy of language and its relationship with poetry, literature and Italian vernacular, that is, the principle of "Occam's razor". "Entia non sunt multiplicanda praeter

necessitatem" considering this principle that refers to the avoidance of repetition and pleonasm, the illogicality of important aspects of Italian poetry is revealed. As an example, it suffices to refer to the famous poem of the Florentine orator, Petrarch: “Di me medesimo meco mi vergogno.” Here, the words “me”, “medesimo”, “meco” and “mi” all refer to the poet in the semantic analysis, and the pleonasm (multiple references to the same entity) is obvious in this sentence. It is clear why Wittgenstein considers art and poetry and everything in that realm belonging to the illogical sphere of silence. The philosopher himself certainly uses literary figures such as simile and rhetorical question to "show" his aim: “Can we not make ourselves understood by means of false propositions as hitherto with true ones... No!” (Wittgenstein 1922)

Illogicality of verbs and tenses

The sequence of tenses between the main clause and its subordinate clause(s) sometimes leads to linguistic ambiguity. Both simultaneous and sequential temporal relationships can be expressed using a simple past tense main clause and a past continuous tense dependent clause. (Nocchi 2011) The future perfect tense is one of the other illogical aspects of the Italian language. This future tense can be used both to refer to the past and to refer to the future. In reference to the future, it indicates a future action that takes place before another action, and in reference to the past, it indicates doubt and uncertainty about the occurrence of an event. The verb “piacere” is one of the most problematic aspects of the Italian language because the subject of this verb refers to

something we like, not to ourselves. On the other hand, this verb is limited in the animate meaning and cannot be used for an inanimate entity. The difficulty of using this grammatical structure, as well as its irregularity and illogicality, is due to the different word order of this verb and the basic word order of Italian language sentences. The basic word order of sentences in the Italian language is as follows: subject, verb and object. The presence of the indirect pronoun before the verb and the grammatical subject after the verb and at the end of the sentence shows the different order of the structures containing this verb. For this reason, it is difficult for the students of Italian as a foreign language to learn the correct usage of this verb. (Gilardoni 2022) More precisely, the logical subject and the grammatical subject of the verb *piacere* are not the same. The verb “*mancare*” is also logically following the model of the verb *piacere*. All structures in which the grammatical aspect and the semantic aspect of the Italian language are not consistent are illogical according to the Picture Theory of Language. In all Italian passive structures, which are very common in this language, unlike Persian, the logical subject and the grammatical subject are not the same and as a result, according to the Picture Theory of Language, are illogical.

Illogicality of pronouns, adjectives and definite articles

Ambiguity is one of the generic elements of language that sometimes arouses the attention of speakers, especially when it interferes with the delivery of the message. (Sperti 2011) This point of view, which considers ambiguity as a generic part of

language, is completely incompatible with Wittgenstein's idea, which defines the relationship of logic and language as isomorphism. Ambiguity in pronoun reference is one of the important examples of illogicality in Italian pronouns. Ambiguity in pronoun reference or nominalized adjective may cause the artistic creation of amphiboly in literature, but it is linguistically ambiguous from Wittgenstein's logic-oriented point of view. For example, in the phrase “*Anselmo vuole sposare una norvegese.*” The noun “*una norvegese*” can refer to any Norwegian woman or to a specific Norwegian woman. As mentioned before, according to the thought of early Wittgenstein, we cannot give two names to one thing or one name to two things, and for this reason, all these ambiguous examples are illogical. (Wittgenstein 1922) On the other hand, in Italian, adjectives are conjugated in several plural forms, while in terms of logic, adjectives are not pluralizable: by examining the Norwegian adjective that we mentioned earlier, according to logic, a Norwegian person can be pluralized, not their adjectives. For example, in the grammatical structure “*gli autori norvegesi*”, pluralizing the adjective is not only redundant but also logically senseless. On the subject of the illogicality of pronouns, the best example in Italian and some other European languages is the use of the honorific pronoun “*Lei*” (singular third-person feminine). The ambiguity of this pronoun instead of “*Voi*” (plural second person pronoun), which is still used in southern Italy, is so much that it becomes a source of humor even in drama series. On the other hand, the use or removal

of the definite articles with many semantic shades in countless structures of the Italian language is one of the biggest challenges for the students of Italian as a second language. Then again, what is called a possessive pronoun in European languages, since it is gendered in Italian, is a source of ambiguity. In Italian, the possessive pronoun is compatible with the possessed, not with the possessor, and as we said, this is the result of this category of the grammar being mixed with gender: for example, if we consider “suo zio” structure in Italian, not only is it not known whether we are talking about the father’s brother or the mother’s brother but also, the gender of the referent of the pronoun (the possessor) is not known in any way. Furthermore, the use of the definite article has undergone a transformation in various periods of the evolution of the Italian language, and this adds to the complexity and thus can create linguistic ambiguity. A very famous example of this is the omission of the definite article next to the abstract noun justice in the third canto of Dante's *Inferno*. According to modern Italian grammar, this omission can be an example of a grammatical error, but it is common in literary Italian and this fact on the basis of the criterion of register in linguistics creates a great amount of ambiguity in the choice regarding the function of the linguistic register.

Giustizia mosse il mio alto fattore (Dante, *Inferno*, III 4)

The same noun can be used with a similar or even the same function alongside the definite article:

La giustizia è un fine assegnato alla politica sociale ed economica.

It should not be forgotten that the use of a grammatical feature like the definite article, which is also subject to number, gender, and animacy, is inherently ambiguous in any language. This is especially true when such a structure has acquired incongruous usages over the centuries and has become intertwined with concepts such as women's rights and LGBTQ+ rights. The challenge extends beyond definite articles to feminine suffixes in Italian as well. A widely discussed example in this regard is "la poetessa" which some consider a sign of sexism in Italian and propose the less used form "la poeta" for a female poet. This act of placing a feminine definite article next to a Greek-derived word that has taken on a masculine form in Italic dialects itself constitutes a violation of norms and a re-establishment of norms.

Conclusion

The narrow scope of elementary propositions and what is logically permissible in natural languages and Italian reflects the dynamic process of thought from the early Wittgenstein to the later Wittgenstein. This is because he evaluated language and its logicity through the narrow lens of propositional truth value, leaving little of it intact. In *Tractatus*, language is described in an idealized way, this prevents us from being able to use it to analyze everyday language. Wittgenstein came to the conclusion that language is too complex to be prescribed in a single formula. He accepted the differences between languages, abandoned his previous metaphysical method, and leaned towards an empirical approach. (Ebrahimpour and Hosseinzadeh 2014) As Wittgenstein's

thought evolved, his essentialist view of language began to fade. By examining the logical structure of language, we can see that there are broad and significant aspects of natural languages that defy logic. This notion challenges the idea of a fundamental isomorphism between language, logic and the world and leads us closer to Wittgenstein's concept of language games in his *Philosophical Investigations*. (Mansub Basiri and Lucchesini 2022)

For researchers seeking to delve deeper into the logic-defying nature of names in the Italian language, Frege's philosophy of language offers a rich foundation. In Frege's view, logical propositions are essentially names. This notion of philosophy of language forms the basis of one of Wittgenstein's fundamental critiques of Frege. Logic-defying names in Italian constitute a significant portion of this article. By examining this phenomenon through the lens of Frege's language philosophy, from which Wittgenstein drew inspiration, we can gain a more comprehensive understanding of how early 20th-century philosophers of language viewed the illogicality of names. Additionally, this article can serve as a bridge between foreign language and literature students and the concepts of the philosophy of language, which are often associated with seemingly complex and symbolic logical language. It can also pave the way for numerous interdisciplinary studies between foreign languages and literature and logic. One of the themes explored in this article is the Italian language's inherent ambiguity and its efforts to achieve logicity. This topic alone warrants extensive investigation, as

spoken language holds a fundamental position in Wittgenstein's portrayal of language: "Colloquial language is a part of the human organism and is not less complicated than it. From it it is humanly impossible to gather immediately the logic of language. Language disguises the thought; so that from the external form of the clothes one cannot infer the form of the thought they clothe, because the external form of the clothes is constructed with quite another object than to let the form of the body be recognized. The silent adjustments to understand colloquial language are enormously complicated." (Wittgenstein, 1922) In the context of the trends of natural languages towards simplification and logicalization, one can also examine the perspective that suggests that a larger number of speakers of human languages leads to simpler grammatical forms and more extensive vocabulary.

The relationship between formal logic and human natural language is well-defined, as logicians have traditionally used natural language to explain the science of valid inferences. However, the relationship between modern logic and natural language is more ambiguous, as modern logicians use their own symbolic language. This article examines the relationship between modern logic and natural languages, thereby contributing to the generalization of the philosophy of language. Furthermore, it is important to consider that the thought of the early Wittgenstein is often not taken very seriously, as the philosopher himself later went on to reject all the theoretical assumptions of the Picture Theory of

Language. Therefore, this article is also significant in its re-examination of the basic ideas of Wittgenstein's Tractatus. Wittgenstein sees the explanation and clarification of propositions as the goal of philosophy, and for him the nature of philosophy is intertwined with this act. In this essay, we have endeavored to gain an understanding of the logical nature of Italian from the perspective of the author of the Tractatus by clarifying the most fundamental aspects of its irregular, illogical, and ambiguous features.

References

- Bonfante, G. (1961). *Esiste il neutro in italiano?* Quaderni dell'Istituto di Glottologia di Bologna 6. pp 103-109. (Reprinted in *Studii romeni*, by Bonfante, G. (1973). pp 161-170. Rome: Società accademica romena.)
- Bonfante, G. (1964). *Il neutro italiano, romeno e albanese.* Acta Philologica della Societas Academica Dacoromana 3. pp 27-37 (Reprinted in *Studii romeni*, by Bonfante G. (1973). pp 173-187. Rome: Società accademica romena.)
- Bonfante, G. (1977). *Ancora il neutro italiano e romeno.* L'Italia Dialettale 40. pp 287-292.
- Casadei, F. (2014). *La polisemia nel vocabolario di base dell'italiano.*
- Casalegno, P. (2011). *Brevissima introduzione alla filosofia del linguaggio.* Roma: Carocci.
- Corbett, G. G. (1991). *Gender.* Cambridge University Press.
- Dressler, W. U. and Barbaresi, L. M. (1994). *Morphopragmatics: Diminutives and intensifiers in Italian, German and other languages.* Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Dressler, W. U. and Thornton, A. M. (1996). *Italian nominal inflection.* Wiener Linguistische Gazette 55-57. pp 1-26.
- Ebrahimpour, M. and Hosseinzadeh M. (2014). *Wittgenstein on Logic and Language.* Shiraz University's Journal of Religious Thought.
- Gilardoni, S. (2022) *La grammatica valenziale per la didattica dell'italiano L2. Un'indagine sperimentale.* Studi di Glottodidattica 2, 68-88.
- Gudmundson, A. (2012). *L'accordo nell'italiano parlato da apprendenti universitari svedes: Uno Studio sull'acquisizione del numero e del genere in una prospettiva funzionalista.* Tesi di dottorato, Dipartimento di Lingue francesi, italiane e classiche, Università di Stoccolma
- Loporcaro, M. and Faraoni V. and Gardini F. (2014). *The third gender of Old Italian.* Diachronica, vol. 31 pp 1-22
- Mansub Basiri, I., Lucchesini, L. (2021). *Linguistic Analysis of Epic Formulas between Western Epos and Shahname.*
- Merlo, C. (1952). *Ital. le labbra, le braccia e sim.* Italica (Bulletin of the American Society of Teachers of Italian) 29(4). pp 229-234.
- Nocchi, S. (2011). *Nuova grammatica pratica della lingua italiana.* Firenze: Alma Edizioni

- Pichler, A. (2023). *Style, Method and Philosophy in Wittgenstein*. Cambridge University Press.
- Realì, F., Chater, N., Christiansen, M. H. (2018). *Simpler grammar, larger vocabulary: How population size affects language*.
- Shaqiqi, H. (2021). *The rise and fall of the idea of the "ideal language" in the two streams of analytic philosophy*. Institute for Humanities and Cultural Studies (IHCS) Biannual Journal.
- Sperti, S. (2011). *L'ambiguità sintattico-semanticà: indagine sperimentale sul ruolo della prosodia in produzione e in percezione*.
- Trebaul, D. (2012). *The early Wittgenstein's truth-conditional conception of sense in the light of his criticism of Frege*.
- Wittgenstein, L. (1969). *Briefe an Ludwig von Ficker*.
- Wittgenstein, L. *Tractatus Logico-Philosophicus*. (2007). Translation by Adib-Soltani, M.
- Wittgenstein, L. *Tractatus Logico-Philosophicus*. (1922). Translation by C.K. Ogden, G. E. Moore, F. P. Ramsey and L. Wittgenstein.
- Wittgenstein, L. *Tractatus Logico-Philosophicus*. (1998). Translation by D. Kolak.
- Wittgenstein, L. *Tractatus Logico-Philosophicus*. (1961). Translation by D. Pears and B. McGuinness.
- Wittgenstein, L. *Tractatus Logico-Philosophicus*. (1968). Translation by Ebadian, M.