IPRPD
International Journal of Arts, Humanities and Social Sciences
ISSN 2693-2547 (Print), 2693-2555 (Online)
Volume 05; Issue no 12: December, 2024
DOI: 10.56734/ijahss.v5n12a2

SIR JOHN FALSTAFF: SHAKESPEARE'S MULTIDIMENSIONAL ANTIHERO

Öz Öktem[1]

[1]*Faculty Member, English Language and Literature Department, Istanbul Aydin University, Turkey*

Abstract

In this paper I explore the multidimensional character of Sir John Falstaff, one of Shakespeare's most iconic figures, who appears in *Henry IV, Part 1*, *Henry IV, Part 2*, and *The Merry Wives of Windsor*. Falstaff, a blend of comical antihero and tragic figure, challenges traditional ideals of heroism, honor, and masculinity through his wit, cowardice, and self-indulgence. His lighthearted but intricate friendship with Prince Hal reveals significant contrasts in their values, emphasizing Falstaff's role as both mentor and foil in Hal's journey from a reckless youth to a responsible king. Falstaff's comical misadventures in *The Merry Wives of Windsor* feature his blundering attempts at courtship and underline the strength and agency of the women who ultimately outwit him. While his humor and charm make him a beloved character, Falstaff's actions also prompt reflection on themes of loyalty, leadership, and social norms. I argue that Falstaff's complex character serves not only as comic relief but also as a critical lens through which Shakespeare examines the nuanced tensions between individual desires and societal expectations in early modern English culture.

Keywords

Falstaff, *Henry IV, The Merry Wives of Windsor*, Hero Vs. Antihero, Wit in English Literature

Introduction

Falstaff is one of Shakespeare's most iconic characters, who straddles the boundary between comedy and tragedy, possessing a surprising depth and complexity. Falstaff's significance as a fully realized character is primarily established in *Henry IV*, Part 1 and Part 2, where he serves as a companion to Prince Hal, who later becomes King Henry V of England. As an overweight, self-absorbed, and boastful knight, he spends much of his time drinking at the Boar's Head Inn alongside petty criminals, often relying on stolen or borrowed money to sustain himself. Although he encourages the seemingly wayward prince to engage in mischief, he is ultimately cast aside when Hal becomes king. Falstaff is a character defined by his wit, cowardice, and debauchery, however his interactions with other characters reveal deep insights into themes of honor, identity, and the human condition. Falstaff also appears as the comical suitor of two married women in *The Merry Wives of Windsor*. In this play Falstaff evolves into a farcical character, whose misadventures involve blundering attempts at courtship and underline the strength and agency of women. He is an unscrupulous fortune chaser who is easily outwitted by the two women whom he planned to seduce. While the farcical tinges may seem to render Falstaff a less intricate character in this latter play, he continues to simultaneously disturb and charm his audience and maintains an antiheroic multidimensionality.

Falstaff was initially featured in the *Henry IV* plays and it is generally taken for granted that the character was intended to represent a historical person, Sir John Oldcastle (c. 1378–1417), a Welsh knight and a prominent figure during the reign of King Henry IV. When Falstaff first appears in Part 1, Hal refers to him as "my old lad of the castle" (1.2.41). Thus, scholars commonly assume that Shakespeare originally wrote the part of Falstaff under the name of Oldcastle, but later renamed him Falstaff, possibly upon a backlash from the Oldcastle family, who were still prominent at the time (Hardy, 2024). Sir John Oldcastle was associated with the Lollard movement, which advocated for reforms in the Church and held beliefs that were considered heretical by the authorities of the time. He was a follower of John Wycliffe, who challenged certain doctrines of the Catholic Church. His Lollard beliefs led to tensions with the establishment and ultimately to his imprisonment and execution. Shakespeare probably had a negative view of the Lollards, but for many Elizabethans, he was reputed as a martyr and remained as a highly distinguished figure in the history of the Reformation (Hardy, 2024). In Shakespeare's plays the

Falstaff character does not reflect Oldcastle's serious historical legacy; instead, he embodies a comical and bumbling persona, a humorous antihero, who is known for his cowardice, wit, and penchant for indulgence. The fictional Falstaff seems to have overshadowed Oldcastle's historical significance, becoming one of Shakespeare's most beloved characters. Falstaff has inspired numerous works of art, including operas and films, and his jolly, debauched gusto for life gave rise to the term "Falstaffian," which has entered the English language. (McMahon, 2004, p.18).[i]

The fact that Shakespeare featured him in three plays, and promised his appearance in a fourth confirms that Falstaff was already quite popular with the play's original audiences. The early modern readers of drama well-liked him too: the quarto of *Henry IV*, Part 1 was reprinted seven times before the publication of the First Folio in 1623. As Shakespeare's greatest comic creation, both textually and figuratively Falstaff has a larger presence than any of the playwright's comical characters or fools. Falstaff's multidimensionality is what distinguishes his from his peers. He is a unique combination of various personas from the history of literature. To begin with, he embodies the archetype of the braggart soldier, a familiar character in ancient drama. This figure is typically a coward who boldly exaggerates his nonexistent military exploits. Next, he resembles the Vice figure of medieval morality plays. Just as Vice often draws characters into temptation and wrongdoing with charisma and cunning, Falstaff tempts Prince Hal into a life of indulgence, dodging responsibilities in favor of drinking, theft, and revelry. His charm makes these actions seem more like harmless fun than outright evil, thus softening the consequences of his behavior. Finally, Falstaff invokes the carnival figures of the early modern festivities who temporarily invert the existing order. He constantly flouts authority and mocks traditional values, much like the spirit of carnival, which disrupts established hierarchies. His profane humor aligns with the carnival's license for mockery, satire, and the breaking of serious taboos, creating a space, where laughter challenges solemn ideals. Still, enriched with layers of humanity and pathos and a blend of humor and moral ambiguity, Falstaff's character goes beyond the simplicity of any of these figures and transcends any particular theatrical tradition. With his multidimensionality which entertains and provokes at once and his textual prominence, Falstaff can be best described as an antihero. He lacks the conventional heroic qualities found in traditional heroes, yet he still appeals to audiences. He provides the drama with humorous value, blending good and bad traits in ways that feel authentic and relatable, at the same time, he reveals the complexities and contradictions of the established ideals of heroism and deconstructs them with his lawless lifestyle and disturbing philosophical conclusions.

Falstaff in *Henry IV*

C. L. Barber (2011) observes that through Falstaff, "Shakespeare expressed attitudes towards experience which, grounded in a saturnalian reversal of values, went beyond that to include a radical challenge to received ideas" (p.11). Falstaff certainly embodies a festive spirit: he consistently pursues immediate desires, showing a willingness to join in whatever is suggested or unfolding. He lives for the pleasures of the present, resisting the constraints of authority and rejecting regimentation for its own sake. While Prince Hal's wit often matches his, Falstaff's talent for inventiveness allows him to escape tight spots, revealing the versatile nature of his humor and cunning. Moreover, Falstaff's faults can be easily played down in the context of the world exhibited in the *Henry IV* plays. Compared with what Henry IV did in usurping the crown from Richard II, whose blood stained Pomfret's "stones," Falstaff's peccadilloes, or the more serious offence of being willing to take a purse, seem far less blamable. When estimating Falstaff as a "compound of sense and vice" Samuel Johnson (2022) rightly concludes: "He is stained with no enormous and sanguinary crimes, so that his licentiousness is not so offensive but that it may be borne for his mirth" (p.15).

The close relationship between Falstaff and Prince Hal is clearly one of Shakespeare most brilliant creative achievements. Marked by conspicuous disparities of age, rank, and emotional need, the friendship between these two characters is a challenging and an unlikely one. It would not be wrong to claim that in the *Henry IV* plays "without their friendship neither Falstaff nor the prince would engage our attention so fully" (Hardy, 2024, p.19). Falstaff serves as a kind of mentor to Hal, introducing him to a life of indulgence, camaraderie, and rebellion against the royal duties he is expected to perform. Their relationship allows Hal to explore his identity outside the constraints imposed on him because of his nobility. Their interactions are characterized by sharp, playful banter. Falstaff often uses humor and clever wordplay to engage Hal, creating a dynamic where both characters exhibit their intelligence. Still, this spirited relationship between the two is destined to a poignant end. While Falstaff revels in self-indulgence and avoidance of duty, Hal eventually confronts his royal responsibilities and recognizes the need to distance himself from Falstaff's lifestyle. As the prince moves closer to the throne and becomes fully involved in his intention to act to save the nation, the contrast between Falstaff's values and those of traditional heroism that Prince Hal embraces becomes sharper. Their conflicting interpretations of honor, masculinity, and leadership lead to tension, which culminates is Hal's final rejection of Falstaff after becoming the king.

In the two *Henry IV* plays, the dynamic that results from the juxtaposition of Falstaff's values and the attributes that Hal eventually adopts toward a responsible living in which he will act as a ruler, serves as a critical exploration of what it means to be a man and a leader in Elizabethan society. In this period, honor and masculinity

were closely tied to social status, reputation, and martial skills. Men were expected to show bravery and integrity in public, while managing their emotions in private. For the nobility and gentry, honor was a core virtue, often linked to the ability to defend one's own reputation. When a man's reputation was damaged, it was essential that he sought revenge, even fought duels to redeem his honor. As a roguish knight, Falstaff's behavior sharply contrasts with the early modern society's values that define masculinity. Falstaff is overweight and lazy, reveling in wine, women, and mischief rather than noble pursuits. His whimsical approach to life often leads him into absurd situations with humorous outcomes, which reveal both his quick thinking and his cowardice and penchant for self-preservation. Ian Frederick Moulton (2005) argues that Falstaff, within the context of the 1590s, embodies a cultural anxiety about the perceived decline of aristocratic English masculinity in the face of foreign military threats (p.237). The rise in popularity of English history plays coincided almost exactly with the war with Spain (1588–1603), mirroring national concerns about England's ability to confront a formidable continental adversary. Shakespeare's histories grapple with the question of whether England can overcome internal divisions to unite against external foes—and whether English masculinity is robust enough to meet such challenges. The *Henry IV* plays ultimately affirm England's strength, but this vision of national unity and masculine virtue hinges on the rejection of what Falstaff symbolizes (Moulton, 2005).

While traditional masculine virtues often dictate bravery and a willingness to face danger, Falstaff in both *Henry IV* plays is portrayed as an epitome of cowardice, who evades physical confrontation at all costs. In *Henry IV*, Part 1, he famously avoids battle by pretending to be dead. Though he is a coward, when he is criticized for his unacceptable behavior, he deftly quips saying, "The better part of valor, is discretion" (5.4.118):

> Honor pricks me on. Yea, but how if honor prick me off when I come on? How then? Can honor set to a leg? No. Or an arm? No. Or take away the grief of a wound? No. Honor hath no skill in surgery, then? No. What is honor? A word. What is in that word "honor"? Air. A trim reckoning. Who hath it? He that died o' Wednesday. Doth he feel it? No. Doth he hear it? No. 'Tis insensible, then? Yea, to the dead. But will it not live with the living? No. Why? Detraction will not suffer it. Therefore, I'll none of it. Honor is a mere scutcheon. And so ends my catechism. (5.1.131–42)[ii]

For Falstaff, honor is "a mere scutcheon," more of a social construct that can be manipulated. Avoiding danger is more sensible than seeking glory, which often leads to violence and unnecessary death. By trivializing honor, Falstaff challenges the notion that heroism is defined by martial prowess and invites the audience to reconsider its importance in defining a hero. Thus, he not only succeeds in redeeming his cowardly act, but also reflects a deeper truth about self-preservation, shared by every human being. While it is true that as Moulton argues the early modern English society required and maintained an idealistic view of honor, to modern audiences and even to some in the play's immediate audience who were skeptical about warfare, this speech might seem a practical, realistic disquisition on the subject.

Nevertheless, Falstaff's characteristics antithetical to heroism are not limited to the relatively understandable fear of death. Falstaff's primary motive in life seems to be self-interest. His actions, whether scheming to avoid responsibility or pursuing wealth and pleasure, are rooted in personal gain rather than altruism. His friendships are transactional, often using people for his own benefit, as seen in his manipulation of others for food and drink. This focus on self-preservation undermines the traditional heroic archetype. In Act 2, Scene 4 of *Henry IV*, Part 1 he delusively brags before Poins about his bravery in his encounter with the robbers and accuses the latter of being a coward. Yet, when Poins confronts him with the truth that all was a game played on him, Falstaff's blustering bravado immediately crumbles. His grandiose tale becomes laughable and the absurdity of his character is highlighted as he backs off, revealing his cowardice while keeping the audience entertained:

> I call thee coward? I'll see thee damned ere, I call thee coward, but I would give a thousand pound I could run as fast as thou canst. (2.4.151-152)

Falstaff's humorous but self-serving nature that prioritizes survival and comfort over bravery renders him a figure that subverts traditional heroic ideals. Falstaff is an antihero, reveling in the chaos of life rather than aspiring to lead. With his quick wit and cunning he navigates challenges and escapes tricky situations, but he does so not through physical prowess or virtuous actions, but through deception and manipulation. His blend of wit, charm, and self-indulgence makes him a both endearing and morally ambiguous figure. His failures and blunders invite laughter, while prompting reflections on the nature of courage, honor, and the human experience. His comical and relatable misadventures challenge the audience to rethink what it means to be a hero, presenting a figure who is deeply flawed, yet still beloved and memorable.

Falstaff's dynamic with Prince Hal further illustrates his status as an antihero. Their banter often blurs the lines between mentor and apprentice, highlighting a relationship of affectionate nature. Falstaff serves not only as a foil to Hal, embodying a life of indulgence and excess, but also a surrogate father, providing a sense of

companionship which Hal cannot receive from his stern and demanding father. Falstaff's insistence on being Hal's "shadow" reveals his desire for comradeship and affiliation, even if he lives a life of folly. Instead of embodying the virtues of bravery and sacrifice, Falstaff's relationship with Prince Hal reflects a nuanced and imperfect humanity.

Falstaff's manipulation of language is a key source of humor in his character and the foundation of his interaction with others, including Prince Hal. Falstaff often shares humorous yet poignant reflections on life, such as his famous remarks on honor quoted above, where he dismisses this chivalric virtue as a hollow concept that leads to death. His irreverent take on serious themes makes him an appealing figure, who challenges traditional notions of bravery and virtue with comical yet insightful observations. As Harold Bloom (2017) puts it, "When we listen to Falstaff, we are inundated by abundance and resonance and are seduced by the beauty of his laughter and his vitalizing diction" (p.4). Falstaff is a master of verbal duels and witty wordplay characterizes also his communication with Hal. The playful banter between them is filled with layered meanings and comical tension. In Act 1, Scene 2, of *Henry IV,* Part 1, Hal and Falstaff enter from opposite sides of the stage, with Falstaff rubbing his eyes as he emerges from the heavy sleep after much wine: "Now Hal, what time of day is it, lad?" (1). This amiable question is answered by a downpour of vehemence, clearly learned from Falstaff's own instruction:

PRINCE HAL Thou art so fat-witted with drinking of old sack, and unbuttoning thee after supper, and sleeping upon benches after noon, that thou hast forgotten to demand that truly which thou wouldst truly know. What a devil hast thou to do with the time of the day? Unless hours were cups of sack, and minutes capons, and clocks the tongues of bawds, and dials the signs of leaping-houses, and the blessed sun himself a fair hot wench in flame-colored taffeta, I see no reason why thou shouldst be so superfluous to demand the time of the day. (2-10)

Hal warns Falstaff that he will one day be hanged for theft to which Falstaff replies insisting that, when Hal becomes king, thieves will have a friend in court:

FALSTAFF Marry then, sweet wag, when thou art king, let not us that are squires of the night's body be called thieves of the day's beauty. Let us be Diana's foresters, gentlemen of the shade, minions of the moon, and let men say we be men of good government, being governed, as the sea is, by our noble and chaste mistress the moon, under whose countenance we steal. (20-25)

Falstaff instantly recovers from Hal's taunting with his audacious request that in the reign of Henry V, highwaymen like himself will not be called thieves but "gentlemen of the shade" governed by the moon whose light enable them to do their job. Falstaff's prose style derives its richness from the incorporation of qualities more commonly associated with poetry. "The sources from which he draws his images, range from the Bible to the belly, but the images themselves are always wonderfully apt" (Bloom, 2017, p.5). In addition, Falstaff's witty prose contaminates the language of any speaker in his presence. His intelligence causes other men to become quick witted too, as they emulate his style and cadence.

Despite initially embracing the carefree lifestyle that Falstaff indulges in, Hal gradually begins to prove himself through acts of courage and responsibility, adopting a traditional view of honor tied to valor in battle and noble behavior. In "Invisible Bullets", Stephen Greenblatt (1988) suggests that Hal's association with Falstaff and the tavern world is not a genuine companionship but rather a strategic apprenticeship. Through this calculated engagement, the prince learns about the common people and explores different facets of society from a safe distance. By immersing himself in Falstaff's world, Hal temporarily adopts a subversive stance without truly committing to it, gaining a broader perspective that will later serve him as king. According to Greenblatt, Hal's eventual rejection of Falstaff signals his reassertion of authority and order, consolidating his power (1988, p. 41).

Building on this interpretation, Hal's redemption in Act 3, Scene 2, when he appears before his father and reconciles with him, may also be seen as a calculated act. First, Hal listens to the king, who pours out his disappointment. Then, demonstrating an acute awareness of the expectations placed upon him, the prince passionately seeks forgiveness, signaling his readiness to fulfill his royal duties:

God forgive them that so much have swayed
Your Majesty's good thoughts away from me.
I will redeem all this on Percy's head,
And, in the closing of some glorious day,
Be bold to tell you that I am your son,
When I will wear a garment all of blood
And stain my favors in a bloody mask,

Which, washed away, shall scour my shame with it.
(1, 3.2.135-142)

He promises reform by declaring he will "be more myself" and swears to fight the rebels and defeat Hotspur. He acknowledges that he must rise to the occasion and face his responsibilities. As the father and the son make their exit together in unity, the following scene takes us to the Boar's Head with Falstaff and Bardolph. The subject is still repentance and reform, with this crucial difference, that these things are now the target of a devastating mockery and disbelief. The scene opens thus:

FALSTAFF Bardolph, am I not fallen away vilely since this last action? Do I not bate? Do I not dwindle? Why, my skin hangs about me like an old lady's loose gown. I am withered like an old applejohn. Well, I'll repent, and that suddenly, while I am in some liking. I shall be out of heart shortly, and then I shall have no strength to repent. An I have not forgotten what the inside of a church is made of, I am a peppercorn, a brewer's horse. The inside of a church! Company, villainous company, hath been the spoil of me.

BARDOLPH Sir John, you are so fretful you cannot live long.

FALSTAFF Why, there is it. Come, sing me a bawdy song, make me merry. (1, 3.3.1-12)

When Hal arrives on the scene and eventually tells Falstaff of his reconciliation with the king, which will, he says allow him to do anything, Falstaff replies: "Rob me the exchequer the first thing thou doest, and do it with unwashed hands too" (181-3). Falstaff fails to see the serious implications of Hal's desire to change and loses his position as a mentor for Hal, becoming the epitome of what the prince needs to move away from. Structurally, the juxtaposition of these two scenes amplifies Hal's growth by setting an opposition between the values that Falstaff embodies and those that Hal wants to embrace. Hal's decision to distance himself from Falstaff marks a significant turning point in the prince's character arc, symbolizing his transition from a reckless youth to a more serious ruler.
Hal's transformation culminates in the Battle of Shrewsbury, where he courageously risks his life for his nation's honor. As he prepares for the battle against Hotspur, he demonstrates his growth as a leader, as he expresses a desire to earn honor through valor in combat. After acknowledging Hotspur's admirable heroic qualities Hal states:

For my part, I may speak it to my shame,
I have a truant been to chivalry,
And so I hear he doth account me too.
Yet this before my father's majesty:
I am content that he shall take the odds
Of his great name and estimation,
And will, to save the blood on either side,
Try fortune with him in a single fight.
(1, 5.1.94-101)

Hal understands that true leadership requires sacrifice and moral integrity. His speech reflects his repentance for his previous irresponsible behaviors and his commitment to his role as a future king. His success in the duel with Hotspur in which Hal kills the leader of the rebels, proves that he is worthy of honor and respect as England's future king.

Still, in Hal's development into a true leader, Falstaff serves not only as a contrasting example, but also as a crucial catalyst. The life of revelry and rebellion that he has experienced with Falstaff allows Hal to explore his identity outside the confines of royal expectations and helps him understand the allure of freedom and pleasure. Falstaff inadvertently teaches Hal valuable lessons about human nature, loyalty, and the complexities of friendship. Through their interactions, Hal learns the importance of authenticity and the need to balance personal desires with the responsibilities of leadership. Falstaff's antics and misguided schemes provide a backdrop for Hal's evolution. Each humorous encounter serves as a moment of reflection for Hal, prompting him to reconsider his values and the path he wishes to take as the future king. As Hal witnesses Falstaff's escapades, he begins to recognize the limitations and pitfalls of such a lifestyle. The bond between Hal and Falstaff adds emotional depth to Hal's journey. Hal's ultimate rejection of Falstaff, is not just a loss of a friend; it signifies Hal's acceptance of his royal identity. As a matter of fact, the emotional weight of this act makes Hal's transformation more poignant and dramatic, underscoring his transformation and commitment to his new role as king. This moment occurs at the very end of *Henry IV, Part 2*, after Prince Hal has become King Henry V. Falstaff, having always believed that Hal would reward him upon ascending to the throne, eagerly approaches the new king in a public setting, expecting

recognition and favor. However, Hal, now fully embracing his responsibilities as monarch, denies him in front of everyone. He declares:

> I know thee not, old man. Fall to thy prayers.
> How ill white hairs becomes a fool and jester.
> I have long dreamt of such a kind of man,
> So surfeit-swelled, so old, and so profane;
> But being awaked, I do despise my dream.
> (2, 5.5.47-51)

This public rejection not only signals Hal's break from his past but also is symbolic of his turning away from his "former self" (Greenblatt, 1988). The scene is powerful and painful in the sense that it highlights the personal cost of Hal's transformation into a serious, responsible king.

In fact, Falstaff's rejection by Hall has been a subject of dissension among critics. Many view the scene as a turning point not only for Hal in embracing his new role, but also for the play's reader in shifting their outlook on Falstaff from a traitor to a victim. Falstaff dies shortly after Hal publicly rejects and humiliates him, allegedly of a broken heart. A. C. Bradley (1919) considers Falstaff as "the most unfortunate of Shakespeare's famous characters" (p.247). He claims the reader's feelings toward Falstaff at the moment he is shunned and banished by the new king is a measure of their own generosity of character:

> "if we regard Sir John chiefly as an old reprobate, not only a sensualist, a liar, and a coward, but a cruel and dangerous ruffian, I suppose we enjoy his discomfiture and consider that the King has behaved magnificently; otherwise, what one experiences is a good deal of pain and some resentment" (p.251).

In both parts of *Henry IV*, Falstaff's charm lies in his humanity; he may be a scoundrel, but he is a scoundrel we cannot help but favor. Despite his flaws, Falstaff is a master of language and possesses a certain charisma that wins over both other characters and the audience. His ability to articulate the human condition adds depth to his character. While he may not embody traditional heroism, his relatable struggles with desire, failure, and the search for meaning resonate with audiences, making him a beloved figure.

Falstaff in *The Merry Wives of Windsor*

As a character who disturbs and charms at once, Falstaff must have appealed also to Queen Elizabeth I. Following the success of the *Henry IV* plays, she reportedly requested Shakespeare to write more works featuring Falstaff. The playwright fulfills the queen's request with *The Merry Wives of Windsor* in which he depicts Falstaff in a more comical and farcical light. The play features Falstaff's attempts to woo two married women, highlighting his comical flaws and escapades. Instead of the serious themes of honor and bravery that the disreputable knight gets involved in in the previous histories, in *The Merry Wives* Falstaff is hooked in lighthearted themes of love and misunderstandings within the confines of a city comedy. Although he is still surrounded by some minor characters from the *Henry IV* plays, Hal's name is scarcely mentioned in this drama. The petty thievery Falstaff once relied upon now seems inadequate, prompting him to devise a new scheme: seducing two respectable Windsor housewives, Mistress Ford and Mistress Page, to extort their money. In *The Merry Wives*, Falstaff is portrayed as an unscrupulous fortune hunter, driven purely by greed and intent on undermining marital loyalty and debasing the essence of true love. However, his plan quickly unravels. When Mistress Ford and Mistress Page discover his bland and identical love letters, they are outraged by his brazen deceit and decide to "lead him on" (2.1.87). Through a series of cleverly orchestrated encounters, they exact revenge by subjecting him to personal humiliation and physical discomfort.

In *The Merry Wives* Shakespeare transforms Falstaff into a farcical figure, whose characteristics seem to contradict with his depiction in *Henry IV* plays in a number of ways. As Moulton suggests, "while Shakespeare is willing to build a comedy around Falstaff, he is not concerned to connect the world of that comedy closely with the very different world depicted in the histories" (2005, p.230). The contrast between the worlds of these plays is mirrored in the shift in Falstaff's social role and dramatic significance. In the history plays, Falstaff undermines aristocratic virtue and must ultimately be banished, whereas in the comedy, he challenges middle-class morality and faces the possibility of redemption. Critics frequently draw distinctions between the Falstaff of the *Henry IV* plays and the one in *The Merry Wives*, suggesting that in the histories, Falstaff possesses a dignity and philosophical depth that is notably absent in the later work. While it is true that, as discussed above, the history plays reveal his full complexity, Falstaff is equally at home as an all-out comical figure. His schemes to woo Mistress Ford and Mistress Page reveal a clear farcical side, emphasizing his ridiculousness rather than his past bravado. He becomes increasingly desperate as he tries to secure financial gain through his romantic pursuits. This

desperation adds a comical element as his plans unravel due to his miscalculation regarding the intelligence and agency of Mistress Ford and Mistress Page. His belief that he can easily seduce them both underestimates their cunning and resourcefulness, leading to his ultimate humiliation. As the women turn the tables on Falstaff, he finds himself in increasingly absurd situations. The wives decide the most effective way to rid themselves of Falstaff is to play along with his schemes, subjecting him to various humiliations, including dumping him into the Thames in a basket of filthy laundry, forcing him to disguise himself as an old woman, and ensuring he is thoroughly beaten. Ultimately, they arrange to meet him in the woods at night, setting the stage for a public humiliation. There, the would-be seducer is tormented by the town's children, dressed as fairies, who dance around him with candles while chanting, "Fie on sinful fantasy, / Fie on lust and luxury!" (5.5.92–93). Falstaff bemoans that it is "enough to be the decay of lust" (5.5.141). By the play's end, the defeated fat knight admits his failure, and all is forgiven.

Despite these comical flaws that highlight his declining status, Falstaff in *The Merry Wives* maintains his qualities as an antihero, who simultaneously provides humor and critical commentary on social norms and expectations. The two female characters of the play have a crucial role in Falstaff's downfall. The pranks that Mistress Ford and Mistress Page play on Falstaff show their intelligence, agency, and strength and, at the same time, bring a serious critique of masculinity. Their actions ridicule not only Falstaff but also the societal norms surrounding masculinity and courtship. Falstaff's manipulative schemes often backfire in humorous ways and illustrate his vulnerability and reveal his failure to control his surroundings, adding to the humorous and satirical nature of the play. By flipping traditional gender roles, the women in *The Merry Wives* expose the absurdity of Falstaff's behavior and flaws which at large are representative of the society's construction of masculinity. The camaraderie between the two women underscores the strength found in female solidarity. Their partnership allows them to confront Falstaff effectively, and their shared laughter at his expense reinforces their bond. This unity contrasts with Falstaff's isolation and serves to further highlight his vulnerabilities. Ultimately, the women teach Falstaff a moral lesson about respect and humility. Their actions, while humorous, also convey a message about the consequences of male arrogance and deceit. Falstaff's downfall serves as a reminder for men in general that underestimating women can lead to one's own embarrassment and failure.

While he ends up being a laughingstock, Falstaff retains moments of genuine charm and humor in *The Merry Wives*. His overconfidence and blundering nature make him a figure of fun, yet he remains oddly relatable in his pursuit of love and acceptance. His clever quips and reflections on life continue to add depth to his character, making him a sympathetic character even in his absurdity. After being thrown into the Thames in a basket of dirty laundry in Act 3, Scene 5, Falstaff recounts the episode with both indignation and humor, refusing to be humiliated:

> Have I lived to be carried in a basket like a barrow of butcher's offal, and to be thrown into the Thames? Well, if I be served such another trick, I'll have my brains ta'en out and buttered, and give them to a dog for a new-year's gift. (4-7)

Even in disgrace, Falstaff's exaggerated self-pity and whimsical threats are undeniably funny, showing his resilience and charm. At the end of the play, even when Falstaff is the target of ridicule in the forest, he maintains a sense of humor about his own situation, saying "I do begin to perceive that I am made an ass" (5.5.126). Spoken amid his recognition of the elaborate ruse played against him, this emphasizes Falstaff's ability to laugh at himself. Realizing that his schemes have failed, he is ultimately forced to accept his place in the social hierarchy. Yet, he still maintains a sense of humor about his situation, suggesting that he has adapted to his circumstances, albeit reluctantly.

Conclusion

In conclusion, Falstaff remains one of Shakespeare's most complex and enduring characters, seamlessly blending humor with explorations of honor, friendship, and self-indulgence. Despite his flaws and frequent failures, his resilience and wit imbue him with remarkable depth and universal appeal. Across the *Henry IV* plays and *The Merry Wives of Windsor*, Falstaff demonstrates his versatility as both a comical antihero and a figure of poignant tragedy. Through him, Shakespeare challenges conventional notions of heroism and honor, offering a character who is refreshingly human in his imperfections and irreverence. His relationship with Prince Hal, while rich in comical moments, emphasizes Hal's transformation into a responsible leader. Falstaff's ultimate rejection by Hal is both a personal tragedy and a symbolic break, signaling Hal's embrace of duty over indulgence.

In *The Merry Wives*, Falstaff's role as a blundering schemer highlights his enduring charm and susceptibility to self-delusion. Here, his misadventures at the hands of clever, resourceful women emphasize his role as a humorous yet flawed figure, while celebrating the ingenuity of his female adversaries. Whether as a companion to royalty or a target of mockery, Falstaff's larger-than-life personality invites audiences to reflect on the complexities of human nature. His irrepressible wit and folly ensure his place as a timeless symbol of charm, humor, and the delightful imperfection of the human spirit.

[i] Falstaff has been featured in various works beyond Shakespeare's plays, including operas by Giuseppe Verdi, Ralph Vaughan Williams, and Otto Nicolai, as well as Edward Elgar's *symphonic study*. He also takes center stage in Orson Welles's 1966 film *Chimes at Midnight*. The operas primarily focus on Falstaff's role in *The Merry Wives of Windsor*, while Welles's film blends elements from *The Merry Wives* and the *Henry plays*. Welles, who portrayed Falstaff in the movie, famously regarded him as "Shakespeare's greatest creation."

[ii] All quotations from *Henry IV*, Part 1 and the other plays by Shakespeare mentioned in this essay are taken from *The Norton Shakespeare*, edited by Stephen Greenblatt et al. New York and London: W. W. Norton & Company, 1997.

References

Barber, C. L. (2011). *Shakespeare's Festive Comedy: A Study of Dramatic Form and Its Relation to Social Custom.* Princeton: Princeton UP.

Bloom, H. (2017). *Falstaff: Give Me Life*. New Yok: Scribner.

Bradley, A. C. (1919). *Oxford Lectures on Poetry*. London: Macmillan.

Greenblatt, Stephen (1988). *Shakespearean Negotiations.* Berkeley: University of California Press.

Hardy, J. (2024). *Rereading Shakespeare's Prince Hal and Falstaff*. Cambridge: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.

Johnson, S. (2022). *Preface to Shakespeare*. https://www.google.com.tr/books/edition/Preface_to_Shakespeare

McMahon, M. (2004). "Introduction." In *CliffsComplete – King Henry IV, Part I*, edited by Sidney Lamb, 1-27. Foster City: IDG Books.

Moulton, Ian Frederick (2008). "Fat Knight, or What You Will: Unimitable Falstaff." In *A Companion to Shakespeare's Works: The Comedies*, edited by Richard Dutton, Jean E. Howard, 223-242. Oxford: Wiley.

Shakespeare, William. (1997). *The History of Henry The Fourth*. In *The Norton Shakespeare*, edited by Stephen Greenblatt, Walter Cohen, Jean E. Howard, Katharine Eisaman Mausand, and Andrew Gurr, 1147-1224. New York: W. W. Norton & Company.

Shakespeare, William. 1997. *The Merry Wives of Windsor*. In *The Norton Shakespeare*, edited by Stephen Greenblatt, Walter Cohen, Jean E. Howard, Katharine Eisaman Mausand, and Andrew Gurr, 1225-1292. New York: W. W. Norton & Company.

Shakespeare, William. 1997. *The Second Part of Henry The Fourth*. In *The Norton Shakespeare*, edited by Stephen Greenblatt, Walter Cohen, Jean E. Howard, Katharine Eisaman Mausand, and Andrew Gurr, 1293-1380. New York: W. W. Norton & Company.