

Shakespear's Employment of Malapropism in “Much ado about Nothing” and The Merchant of Venice”

Marzooqa T.Raheel¹, Zahraa Ammar Abd²

Abstract

Malapropism, according to the Encyclopedia Britannica, is a linguistic mistake occurs when one term is replaced with another that sounds similar but has a different meaning. The current article aims to find out how malapropism is used in Shakespear's “Much ado about Nothing” and “The Merchant of Venice” and to investigate the most common type of malapropism used in these two plays. The article mainly draws on Fay and Cutler's(1977) division of malapropism to analyze the selected data. The study concludes that malapropism is used by the plays' characters basically to create a sense of humor by using a word or a phrase that is different from what they intended to say. It was also found that classical malapropism is the most common used type in both selected plays.

Keywords: *Malapropism, Classical Malapropism, Spoonerism*

Introduction

Malapropism is the intentional or frequent misuse of similar-sounding words, sometimes with amusing outcomes. The oldest English usage of the word cited in the Oxford English Dictionary is from 1630. Sometimes the resulting utterance is meaningless or nonsense, these features place malapropism apart from other types of speech or writing errors such as eggcorns or spoonerism. It is called malapropism based on the name of Mrs. Malaprop, a character in Richard Brinsley Sheridan's play “The Rivals” (1775). Mrs. Malaprop is a legendary wordsmith known for her proverbs "she is a headstrong as an allegory on the banks of the Nile" and "he is a pineapple of politeness". The French phrase "ma propose" which meaning is 'inappropriate' is the literal source of Mrs. Malaprop's name. It later became associated with the type of speech error known as malapropism. (Rubin, 2015)

Malapropism, also known as catachresis, is the improper substitution of one word or phrase for another that has a similar sound but a different meaning. According to Crystal (2001) when someone uses malapropism he/she may not fully comprehend a complex word but he/she nonetheless attempt to substitute a word that sound right.

Types of Malapropism

According to Fay and Cutler (1977) there are two categories of malapropism, classical and non-classical malapropism. Classical malapropisms arise when a speaker genuinely confuses form and meaning. Mrs. Malaprop, for example, is self-taught and believes that "pineapple" is a suitable synonym for "pinnacle." Non-classical malapropisms, often known as "temporary slips," are induced by connections of concepts or memory gaps; the speaker is aware of the word he intended, but his brain chooses the one that sounds the closest. (WWW.studysmarter.co.uk)

According to Fay and Cutler's (1977) approach, non-classical malapropism is defined as an utterance with the three key traits. The speaker is merely mispronouncing concepts that have the same pronunciation, but the incorrect word is the genuine word from the dictionary. Non-classical malapropism occurs when a term is used wrongly and has a comedic impact. An example of non-classical malapropism is when a speaker is in a hurry and says something she didn't mean. These slips of the tongue can also lead to malapropism,

¹ Assistant Professor. Department of English, College of Education for Humanities, University of Thi-Qar, Email: marzooqa.t.raheel.utq.edu.iq@gmail.com.

² MA student Department of English, College of Education for Humanities, University of Thi-Qar, Email: zahra.a.abd.ouda@utq.edu.iq

such as accidentally saying "I can't bear the heat" instead of "I can't bear the heat," which is a simple slip but still a malapropism.

In one sense or another, malapropism is more than just a humorous error; knowing it enhances one's ability to understand and value language. It demonstrates how language can be imaginative and flexible.

Reimer(2004) suggests that in order to explain why it makes sense for speakers to characterize malapropisms in terms of distinction, a separation should be proposed between saying and meaning. So through communicative intentions might what is spoken be determined. According to Reimer, it is determined by linguistic convention; the speaker simply states and maintains what the words "conventionally mean" in the language in question while uttering the malapropism. Reimer interprets this to mean, at the very least, that by using the language and engaging in its regulated activity, the speaker implicitly consents to having their words understood in accordance with language conventions. This is without assuming a comprehensive theory of conventionality. As stated, speaking a language is similar to playing a game.

Donald Davidson introduces malapropisms as a problem for the concept of language. Davidson argues that malaprops can't be comprehended using the basic concepts of linguistic competence, which are widely recognized by philosophers and linguists. He adds that malapropisms result in utterances that are not covered by previous knowledge. These examples demonstrate successful communication when language standards and meanings are disrupted or ignored (Chandler.2023)

In his paper "A Nice Derangement of Epitaphs" (1996), he suggests a solution to the meaning problem and discusses the consequences for natural language interpretation and application. Malapropisms occur when a speaker's intended meaning is absurdly different from what is usually regarded as the "standard" interpretation of their words. It describes successful language usage in communication as using a term or phrase in a way that one or more parties would consider unsuitable "through ignorance, inadvertence, or design." To explain Davidson's position, effective communication may be defined as an encounter in which the speaker's intended meanings are seen as intended.

Causes of Malapropism

According to Clark and Clark (1977) there are reasons for speech errors; cognitive difficulty, people can take longer to produce sentences on a topic using abstract words than concrete words. In addition, at the level of words selection, doubts arise when speakers need help finding the right word, it causes hesitancy when speaking. As a type of speech errors, malapropism is produced due to different reasons, mainly lack of knowledge or carelessness. However, there are certain common causes that lead to malapropism; (Clark and Clark, 1977):

The Role of Phonetics

Phonetic similarity is one of the primary causes of malapropism. When two terms have similar sounds, it's simple to confuse them, as Mrs. Malaprop does when she uses "pineapple" for "pinnacle." In everyday conversation, a speaker may employ the terms "compliment" and "complement," which sound similar enough that they are frequently confused by mistake.

Lack Of Word Knowledge

A significant reason of malapropism is a basic lack of word knowledge. Sometimes a speaker believes they understand the meaning and application of a word, but in reality, they are simply marking it off. For example, if someone says "pacific" when they meant to say "specific," they have engaged in malapropism.

Memory and Context Confusion

Mispronunciations can result from memory errors and the environment in which words are learned. It's possible to confuse the terms "monotonous" and "monogamous" if one learns the former in a scenario that was actually the latter. Even though it's a minor error, it nevertheless causes confusion and laughter

All of these examples demonstrate how malapropisms can be an effective writing tool, giving characters humor and depth while also entertaining readers.

Malapropism and Spoonerism

Spoonerism is a subtitle of sound error. It is called spoonerism after the Rev. William spooner, an Anglican clergyman at Oxford University who had a nervous manner that led him to produce many slips of the tongue. Most of his slips involve the interchange of two initial sounds, for example, 'long shory stort'[lo o i stort] for 'long short story' [lo o t stori] (Yule, 1996)

Word reversal can also occur, such as 'use the door to open the key' for 'use the key to open the door'. The most famous spooner's slip is 'queer old dean' [kwi uld di n], for 'sweet old queen'. Transposing sounds in consecutive words leads to spoonerisms. It occurs when someone gets twisted in their tongue or gets their tang all tangled up.

According to all accounts, Spooner said a few strange things very frequently, albeit certainly not all of the more complicated Spoonerisms that have been attributed to him. He allegedly informed a student that they will be thrown out of all of his perplexing classes. You've experienced the entire worm. Oxford must be the next town to crumble. Long sequences like that are most likely the result of undergrads imitating him. In his later years, he said that the hymn title "When kinkering kongs their titles take" was all he could remember. (Ali, 2017).

Spoonerisms and malapropisms vary primarily in that the former happens when two words with corresponding sounds are switched, while the latter happens when two words with similar sounds are switched. To put it succinctly, malapropism and spoonerism are consequences of substituting certain language elements. "(<https://grammatist.com>)

One difference between a malapropism and a spoonerism is that the former substitutes words, whilst the latter substitutes sounds. Furthermore, both have the potential to have a hilarious impression. Spoonerism is the switching of comparable sounds, particularly vowels, consonants, or morphemes, between two words in a phrase. Furthermore, spoonerisms might be man-made or natural. Natural spoonerism is a linguistic error that occurs when someone unwittingly tangles their words. Conversely, purposeful spoonerism is a type of wordplay that usually results in weird and funny phrases and sentences. (<https://pediaa.com>)

Shakespear's use of Malapropisms

Obviously, when it comes to literature, consciousness and purpose seem to be irrelevant. In fact, the author intentionally employs malapropisms for particular goals, which readers will therefore need to take into account. It will, however, inevitably be an existing phrase since it must be a word that is similar in sound but different in meaning. However, as it might also be the "distortion of a word,"⁶ it could also be a meaningless term that doesn't exist. Furthermore, phrase-level distortion is also acknowledged by the Merriam-Webster definition. likewise, even though some definitions agree that phonetic similarity is necessary, the broad or non-exclusive definitions provided by the OED and Merriam-Webster Dictionary also permit semantic irregularity to be the sole basis for some malapropisms, negating the need for any acoustic similarity with the intended term. (Civera, 2012)

Shakespearian wordplay has been the subject of several publications, some of which are specifically devoted to the issue of malapropism. They use a philological approach, demonstrating an interest in malapropism as a literary device AS. Malapropisms and related wordplay share this characteristic: when a word in a

sentence has an unusual quality, it also includes hints that help the recipient understand the oddity in the context—specifically, that the word is an example of a specific type of wordplay. (Keller, 2017)

Although malapropisms were called after Mrs. Malaprop, a character in Sheridan's *The Rivals* (1775) who tended to use words wrongly, malapropism was not founded by Sheridan, because long before Sheridan, in the 1590s, Shakespeare created several characters who were addicted to them. No writer developed these characters before Shakespeare, Bottom, Mistress Quickly, and Dogberry are his creations. It is known that writers like Fielding and Somerville created them in large numbers, but Shakespeare remains the most famous writer in the history of English literature for doing so. It must be realized that these words for Shakespeare are not just misused or misheard. (Vázquez, 2021)

Dogberry frequently employs malapropisms in *Much Ado About Nothing*; in fact, they are commonly referred to as "Dogberryisms" in his honor. Shakespeare could have been joking about, lightly (and quietly!) mocking the authorities by remarking, "Look at this officer; he doesn't even know what he's saying," given that Dogberry is an officer of the watch. However, it is insufficient for Dogberry to merely mispronounce words. His grammatical errors reveal an ignorance that frequently results in him saying something completely different from what he means, which may be amusing. In addition to Dogberry, there is Verges a character who frequently makes malapropism, both of these characters represent the play's use of wordiness and malapropism to criticize a pretentious manner that ultimately lacks substance. One may infer characteristics of two infamous "murders" of the English language from their speech. Their goal to attain a social and cultural standing that neither of them now possesses is what corrupts their language in addition to their ignorance. Dogberry and Verges pretend to have a high-class vocabulary due to their socioeconomic status and hierarchy. Similar to Launcelot and his father Gobbo in "*The Merchant of Venice*" Shakespeare's humorous characters serve as targets for ridicule because to their "inventiveness" with language. These models of language abusers will play two roles: the problem of linguistic corruption will be seen as a serious moral worry impacting society's well-being as well as a piece of grumpy, comedic fastidiousness. (Vázquez, 2001)

In *The Merchant of Venice* Shakespeare's ability to create a comic effect on the reader via deft use of malapropism is demonstrated in this play by two characters: the clown Launcelot and his father Gobbo. Launcelot is a clever figure who works as a servant. When he or his father speaks with a high class person, their frequent misuse of words—which are mostly Latin in origin—makes their conversation seem somewhat obscure. (Vázquez, 2001)

Data Selection and Method of Analysis

The data involved in the study are texts picked up from Shakespeare's plays "*Much ado about Nothing*" and "*The Merchant of Venice*". The first play contains most of the malapropisms in Shakespeare's work which are mainly produced by the character of (the constable) Dogberry.

Methodologically, the current article draws on Fay and Cutler malapropism (1977) including certain procedures such as

- Surveying the data from the two plays
- Providing a description for each selected text
- Analyzing the number and the frequency of malapropism types employed each play.
- Discussing the results and giving conclusions

Findings and Discussion

The analysis reveals that malapropism is basically used as a device of creating humor and causing laughter. Shakespeare usually makes the characters who produce malapropism appear as silly, not well educated and

having a low-level jobs to have an excuse for their misspeaking It's also shown that classical malapropism is the most frequently used type in both plays .

Below is the analysis of each text taken from “Much ado about Nothing”and “The Merchant of Venice”:

Much Ado about Nothing

Text(1)

Verges : Yea, or else it were pity but they should suffer

salvation, body and soul.(Act3/scene3/line3)

The first malapropism in the play is by Verges when answers Dogberry about the new watchmen he brought .Verges tends to say if they are not good enough they deserve "damnation"(punishment and torment after death) but instead he uses a word that might has similar sound but totally an opposite meaning that is "salvation " (to protect and save someone)the result is a classical expressive malapropism

Text(2)

Dogberry: Nay, that were a punishment too good for

them if they should have any allegiance in them,

being chosen for the Prince's watch .(3/3/5)

Dogberry is the main character who uses malapropism in this play it's almost surprising to hear him speaks normally .In this quotation Dogberry addresses his men .he is concerned that there might be men who are not loyal but instead of using a word referring to disloyalty he uses a word that means fidelity as having "allegiance "is a good thing to produce an expressive classical malapropism.This is the first step to Dogberry 's misusing words journey.

Text (3)

Dogberry: First, who think you the most desertless man to be constable?(3/3/8)

Dogberry returns back with a new classical (unintentional)malapropism ,speaking with Verges about who might be the suitable to be the prince's watchman ,wanting to say who "deserve "this job , Dogberry replaced the expected word with another seems similar in pronunciation who due to his ignorance sees no difference between them, giving readers another classical expressive malapropism

Text(4)

Dogberry: t, and for your writing and reading, let that appear when there is no need of such vanity (3/3/23)

Talking to Seacole one of the watchmen who can write and read ,Dogberry seems to be illiterate and jealous of Seacole that why he provides a new classical expressive malapropism . He should meant that Seacole's ability to read and write is a talent or an accomplishment not as he says "vanity" and it could be useful and needed ,but as usual Dogberry gets everything backwards.

Text(5)

Dogberry: You are thought here to be the most senseless and fit man for the constable of the watch (3/3/21)

In the same situation while Dogberry still trying to choose the appropriate "watch of night" he addresses one of the men to be the most suitable one to be a constable ,apparently Dogberry tries to describe him as a "sensible" person rather than what he actually says that he is "senseless " which is not a good qualification .It sounds that Dogberry mixes the two words based on their semantic opposition relation .instead of using a word he used its opposite to add a classical expressive malapropism to the list.

Text(6)

Dogberry: This is your charge:

you shall comprehend all vagrom men; you are to bid any man stand, in the Prince's name.(3/3/23)

The conversation between Dogberry and his men runs smoothly ,he seems to be understood by his listeners despite the repeated speech errors .this time Dogberry presents two malapropisms in the same line while giving directions to the new watchman ,first ,instead of saying "apprehend" to mean arrest or catch those are against the prince who supposed to describe them as "vagrant" which refers to one such as a prostitute or drunkard whose conduct constitutes statutory .but horribly mistaken the word with another of similar pronunciation."vagrom" supplying as usual a classical expressive malapropism.

Text (7)

Dogberry: You shall also make no noise in the streets; for, for the watch to babble and to talk is most tolerable and not to be endured (3/3/35)

The above quotation contains one more classical expressive malapropism .Constable Dogberry continues giving instruction to his new men ,he tries to make clear that any thing seems insufficient in their work will make them in trouble .Dogberry has the will to say that the watchman should not talk too much because it's "intolerable" unacceptable. Then as he used to do use the wrong word" tolerable" which is semantically related to the intended word as its antonym.

Text(8)

Dogberry: This is the end of the charge. You, constable, are to present the Prince's own person (3/3/69)

Dogberry carries on his misspeaking throughout the play providing one more classical expressive malapropism . wanting to make the watch man to feel like the prince representative of the prince authority ,he doesn't express the word correctly instead of saying" represent" he said "present" of course due to pronunciation similarity .

Text(10)

Dogberry: I pray you watch about Signior Leonato's door, for the

wedding being there tomorrow, there is a great coil

tonight. Adieu, be vigilant, I beseech you. (3/3/87)

Dogberry is very careful about his work but not about his speech , insisting on the new watchmen to be devoted to their job, in fact he is begging them to be careful at that night about Signior Leonato ,he wants to warn them to be "vigilant" which means watchful especially to avoid danger ,unfortunately he again lost the intended word and use another word similar in sound and form that is "vigitant" the confusion leads to classical expressive malapropism

Text(11)

First Watchman: We have here recovered the most dangerous piece of lechery that ever was known in the commonwealth.(3/3/155-156) A classical expressive malapropic item appears again. It seems that the speech errors infection spreads among other characters. One of the hired watchmen to tell Dogberry that the watchmen has discovered news of disloyalty and treachery. The watchman neither says discover nor treachery correctly, but instead he said recover and lechery (bribe) respectively obviously because of their almost identical pronunciation.

Text(12)

Conrade: A commodity in question, I warrant you.—Come, we'll obey you.(3/3/162)

Another character who follows Dogberry's style of misusing words is Conrade, a friend to the villain Don John. Conrade is easily persuaded to do something he might not otherwise will to do and he is one of the characters who provide a comic relief. The above quotation contains a classical expressive malapropism since Conrade is not intended to say obey but rather to say "order"

Text (13)

Dogberry comes back with a classical expressive malapropism due to his ignorance of the word's meaning, he actually wills to say a word that refers to wealth and richness but instead he uses "tedious" to mean boring or tiresome which is completely unrelated word but such a thing is not a matter for someone who speaks wrongly most of the time.

Text(14)

Dogberry: Marry, sir, I would have some confidence

with you that discerns you nearly (3.5.3)

Another two classical expressive malapropisms made by the icon of misspeaking, constable Dogberry during his conversation with signior Leonato, the first malapropism when Dogberry replaces the word conference with confidence in which readers might excuse him for his confusion as the two words differs only in the third syllable, further more have similar form. The next one is to replace the verb "concerns" with "discerns" based on the same sound similarity.

Text (15)

Dogberry: Goodman Verges, sir, speaks a little off the matter. An old man, sir, and his wits are not so blunt as, God help, I would desire they were, but, in faith,

honest as the skin between his brows (3/5/10)

Still at the same conversation with Leonato, Dogberry and Verges keep talking for some time telling him how honest they are despite that Leonato told them he is busy, once Dogberry tries to say they have a "sharp" wit he uses another word "blunt", apparently he confuses their meaning leads him to a classical expressive malapropism.

Text(16)

Dogberry: Comparisons are odorous. Palabras, neighbor Verges.(3.5.15)

The series of speech mistakes by Dogberry goes on, surprisingly more than one malapropism in the same quotation

,speaking to Verges as he shows himself as the most honest man ,Dogberry dislike his comparison and he wants to say that it's something offensive or nasty in fact "odious" by mistake he provide a classical expressive malapropism saying "odorous" which means something pleasant or charming ,obviously it's not the intended word.

Text (17)

Verges: Marry, sir, our watch tonight, excepting your Worship's presence, ha' ta'en a couple of as arrantknaves as any in Messina. (3/5/29)

The responsible for the current classical expressive malapropism is Verges while talking to Leanato ,he wants to tell him that all the watchmen are waiting for him ,he makes a wrong use for the word "excepting " for "respecting" ,the resulting meaning is just the opposite of what was intended

Text(18)

Dodberry: Yea, an 'twere a thousand pound more than 'tis, for I hear as good exclamation on your Worship as of any man in the city, and though I be

but a poor man, I am glad to hear it. (3/5/24)

Again Dogberry fails to choose the correct word he wants and commits a new classical expressive malapropism .The malapropism generated from replacing the first syllable of the intended word" acclamation" that refers to a loud affirmative cheers and praise)by another to produce a different word similar in pronunciation that is "exclamation" .

Text(19)

Dogberry: One word, sir. Our watch, sir, have indeed comprehended two aspicious persons, and we would have them this morning examined before

your Worship. (3/5/44)

Still having a talk with Leanato ,Dogberry invents an additional classical expressive malapropism ,in fact there are two of them in the same line .He is about to tell Leanto that his watchmen arrested some of the suspicious ,unexpectedly Dogberry commits a speech error that he has already made when he used a perceptive verb "comprehend "instead of a verb of a physical meaning "apprehend" blaming their sound similarity. Similarly, the second word he substitutes "suspicious "by "aspecious"

Text(20)

Dogberry: It shall be suffigance (3/5/49)

Dogberry's comic list of malapropism is repeatedly supported by a new items ,accidently he misuses the adjective sufficient or efficient to be substituted by a meaningless word according to Dogberry is quite similar to his intention which is "suffigance" this is what could be called "phonetic malapropism" result is an additional classical expressive malapropism.

Text(21)

Dogberry: Go, good partner, go, get you to Francis

Seacoal. Bid him bring his pen and inkhorn to the

jail. We are now to examination these men. (3/5/56)

Readers get used of Dogberry's ignorance ,even other characters become capable of understanding his wrong word especially this expressive classical malapropism when Dogberry misuses the correct grammatical item by replacing the verb "examine" by the name "examination" that he is supposed to use .it's a correct meaningful word but in the wrong place .

Text(22)

Dogberry: We will spare for no wit, I warrant you. Here's that shall drive some of them to a noncome. Only get the learned writer to set down our excommunication and meet me at the jail.(3/5/56)

Opposite to the pervious quotation ,this time the required word for the speech to be understood is "communication" ,nevertheless Dogberry still insists on using the unsuitable word depending on their "phonetic sameness" regardless to the difference in meaning or use. Thus he brings the word "excommunication" (exclusion from community) to create a classical expressive malapropism for "examination".

Text(23)

Dogberry: Is our whole dissembly appeared? (4/2/1)

Dogberry's humorous discourse is peppered with another classical expressive malapropism . The words "assembly" and "dissembly" are sometimes mistaken because of their striking phonetic similarities .The only difference between the two terms is the prefix; the remaining parts of the two words have the same phonetic transcription. It is noteworthy to add that, according to the Oxford English Dictionary, the word "dissembly" was a perversion of "assembly" throughout the 16th and 17th centuries.

Text(24)

*Dogberry :*by this time our sexton hath reformed Signior Leonato of the matter (5/1/265)

Dogberry continues to use word beyond him, again this classical expressive malapropism is classified as similar in form and sound malapropism" ,also it's a matter of misusing prefixes otherwise, the two words are identical , Dogberry intended to use the verb" informed " confusing the suitable prefix he says "reformed".

Text(25)

Verges: Nay, that's certain, we have the exhibition to examine.(4/2/5)

An observable return to the misspeaking competition made by Verges .He tells sexton that he and Dogberry have the permission to look for those who offend the law ,tended to say "commission" accidentally he provides a classical expressive malapropism that is "exhibition" due to sound similarity of the final syllable.

Text(26)

Dogberry: Dost thou not suspect my place? Dost thou not suspect my years?

The pseudo-learned Dogberry commits yet another classical expressive malapropism .His usual misuse of words based on sound and form similarity ,Dogberry wants to show that he is a valuable constable and must be respected by others, he substitutes the intended verb "respect" with the verb "suspect" to add another item to his long malapropism list.

Text (27)

Dogberry: O, villain! Thou wilt be condemned into everlasting redemption for this!(4/2/58)

A recent classical expressive malapropism supplied by(the master of malapropism) Dogberry .This one is an antonym malapropism to use a word opposite to what intended to say ,Dogberry wants to warn that the villain Borachio will bepunished by "damnation" ,but as always happens he misuses the correct word and uses its opposite(redemption) .

Text(28)

Dogberry: I would not hang a dog by my will ,much more a man who hath any honesty in him ,(3/3/63)

Indeed ,it's not expected from someone to mistake a frequent used words like "more and less" but of course not Dogberry ,in his current quotation he supposed to say" much less" for more acceptable speech ,though he says" much more" to have a stable speech that he would hang even a dog less than the man who has no honesty and loyalty .His confusion causes a classical expressive malapropism .

Text(29)

Sexton: Which be the malefactors?

Dogberry :Marry, that am I, and my partner.

Verges :Nay, that's certain, we have the exhibition to examine.

Sexton: But which are the offenders that are to be

examined? Let them come before Master Constable.(4.3.3)

Finally ,readers are introduced to the first classical perceptive malapropism by Dogberry .during the fulfillment of his mission to examine the anti-low people ,the church officer asks Dogberry and Verges who are those "malefactors" that commits offensive deeds against low .Dogberry mishears the question and says Verges and his name ,fortunately gets corrected by Verges

Results

Table (1) :The types ,numbers, and percentage of malapropism in "Much Ado about Nothing"

Type of Malapropism	Frequency	Percentage
Classical	31	100%
Non-classical	0	0%

The above table (4) shows the frequency of each sort of malapropism throughout the play.According to Fay and Cutler's classification, the most often used kind is the classical, and it is the only type used in "Much ado about nothing" with a complete proportion of 100%, proving the third hypothesis that the most frequently used form of malapropism is the classical one.

*The Merchant of Venice**Text (1)*

Gobbo: He hath a great infection, sir, as one would say, to serve— (2.2.124)

The first character who produces malapropism is Gobbo, in this quotation he says infection which refers to attack by a virus or a bacteria that causes an illness, what Gobbo actually wants to say is affection which means desire. Gobbo wants to say that his son Launcelot is very curious to work for Bassanio. However, the approximate pronunciation leads him to make this classical expressive words blunder.

Text (2)

Launcelot: I hope, an old man, shall frutify unto you. (2.2.132)

Line 132 of the same act and scene is another traditional emotive malapropism, this time delivered by Launcelot, Gobbo's son. Launcelot attempts to communicate in a language that does not correlate to his social standing when conversing to Bassanio, who is of high class. Not knowing how to pronounce the term "certify" Launcelot introduces a new word that sounds close to the original one, which is "fruitify."

Text (3)

Launcelot: In very brief, the suit is impertinent to myself, (2.2.136)

Launcelot appears to fail again in communicating his true intentions to Bassanio. As Launcelot speaks more, he makes more errors because he is frightened. Unconsciously, he combines two words with the same root but different affixes; instead of saying "pertinent," he says "impertinent," which denotes impolite or insulting. This time, his classical expressive malapropism stems from a semantic relationship between the two terms.

Text (4)

Gobbo: That is the very defect of the matter, sir. (2.2.142)

The given quotation contains a classic expressive malapropism. Gobbo intended to emphasize the significance of his son's request to serve Bassanio by saying "this is very effect of the matter..." but instead says "defect," which is a shortcoming and not what he wants to say. This is due to a semantic similarity between the two words, which belong to the same Latin root with different prefixes.

Text (5)

Launcelot: "I beseech you, sir, go. My young master doth expect your reproach"

(2.5.21)

When Launcelot finds out that his master Shylock is going to have dinner with Bassanio, he says reproach instead of approach; his error is due to the misuse of prefixes attached to the same Latin root, as well as the similarity in pronunciation, which contributes to a classical expressive malapropism. The incorrect word reproach was subsequently humorously employed by Shylock when he answered to Launcelot, "So do I his".

Text (6)

Launcelot: I was always plain with you, and so now I speak my agitation of the matter. (3.5.4)

Launcelot repeatedly makes one of his frequent blunders. The typical expressive malapropism here is the use of the term "agitation" instead of the word "cogitation," which indicates pondering. Launcelot's misspeaking stems from his attempts to learn the language of upper-class people..

Text(7)

Launcelot: Certainly the Jew is the very devil incarnal, (2.2.27) Wanting to depict Shylock as the devil himself (incarnation of the devil), Launcelot returns to make another inadvertent (classical) emotive malapropism by changing his intended word "incarnate" with the term "incarnal." Launcelot's numerous speech faults appear to be inherited from his father, Gobbo, who offers the play's first malapropism.

Results:

Table (2) Types, frequency and percentage of malapropism in "The Merchant of Venice"

Type of malapropism	Frequency	Percentage
Classical	7	100%
Non-classical	0	0%

Table (2) shows the numbers and percentages of malapropism included in "The Merchant of Venice ". Obviously, the results corroborate the study's initial premise, which is that classical malapropism is the most commonly accepted form, with a total proportion of 100% and 0% for non-classical.

Conclusion

As a conclusion of this study aiming to find out how to create malapropism and what is the most common type used in "much ado about Nothing "and "The Merchant of Venice". The researcher concludes that some characters have the tendency to replace a word or phrase they want to say by another similar in sounds and sometime in form to cause the audience laugh inventing what is called "malapropism". The most frequent occurrence is for the classical malapropism when the character misuses his words unintentionally.

References

- Ali,Z.(2007) The Relationship Between Tongue Slip and The Field of Linguistics .Al-Tikrit University Journal for Humanities Vol.(14).
- Chandler,H.(2023).Conventions ,Idiolects ,and Malapropism ; A Critical Evaluation of Davidson. Washington and Lee University.
- Civera,M.(2012) Malapropisms in the Spanish Translations of Joseph Andrews". Meta: Translators' Journal, vol. 57
- Crystal ,D.(2001) Dictionary of Linguistics and Phonetics .David Crystal
- Davidson,D (1996). "A Nice Derangement of Epitaphs." In The Philosophy of Language, third edition, Oxford University Press.
- Fay ,D& Cutler A.(1977) Malapropism and The Structure of Mental Lexicon .Linguistic Inquiry .
- Keller,M.(2017)."Saying Thus or To the Same Defect": A Linguistic Analysis of Shakespeare's Malapropisms .English Studies(Published online)
- Reimer ,M.(2004) What Malapropism means. A Reply to Donald Davidson .Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Rubin,R.(2015) Going to Hell in a Hen Basket : An illustrated Dictionary of Modern Malapropisms. Flatiron Books .
- Vazquez,A.S .(2001) Shakespeare's Use of Malapropisms and their Translation into Spanish . Universidade da Coruña.
- Yule, G. (1996). The Study of Language. Cambridge. Cambridge University Press.
- (WWW.studysmarter.co.uk)
- (<https://pediaa.com>)
- (<https://pediaa.com>).