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Although much criticism of Aphra Behn’s *The Widdow Ranter* (first performed 1689) has focused on questions of race, gender, and colonialism, politics have come to figure with increasing prominence in critical studies of the play, which was likely written in 1688 during the crisis engulfing the regime of James II. Critics attentive to the play’s politics have been particularly interested in deciphering the political meaning of Behn’s depiction of Bacon’s rebellion. Some have interpreted Bacon as a representative of Monmouth or James; others, more reticent about reading the play allegorically, have detected in its pages a more opaque commentary on contemporary political conflicts and debates. Despite these significant differences of approach, it is probably fair to say that most of these critics have read *The Widdow Ranter* as an essentially conservative text giving voice to Behn’s loyalist politics and impassioned support for the beleaguered James II.

As so often in Behn criticism, it is the treatment of class, in this instance the corrosive satire directed at the low-born members of the Virginia council, which is seen as a primary indicator of the author’s loyalism. This reading rests on the assumption that *The Widdow Ranter* adheres to a strategy characteristic of Tory comedy of the Exclusion Crisis and Tory Reaction, itself borrowed from much earlier Restoration comedies: the representation of the king’s opponents as uppity parvenus intent on encroaching on the hereditary prerogatives of the elite. Behn had certainly written comedies in this vein, most recently *The Lucky Chance* (1686), which pits the gallant Gayman against two old, rich, and corrupt city aldermen. Janet Todd sees the clowns in *The Widdow Ranter* as “colonial versions of Behn’s City aldermen” in *The Luckey Chance* (1686), while Derek Hughes observes that the play shares with the rest of Behn’s late work a preoccupation with “a world where the gentry is losing its grip” (Todd 415; Hughes 181). There is no doubt that Behn does deploy the conventions of Tory comedy in the play, representing the low-born councilors as profoundly unfit for the public offices they hold in a colony run by a council in the absence of a governor; their expulsion from the council in the closing scene leaves the colonial government in the exclusive control of gentlemen supposedly entitled
This essay will argue, however, that such exclusionary class politics are at best only half the story which this mixed-plot tragicomedy tells about its clowns. *The Widdow Ranter* is remarkable for the number of allusions it contains to the role of Falstaff in *Henry IV, Part One*. Most of these serve to establish connections between Behn’s clowns and Shakespeare’s fat knight, links which strongly suggest that Behn endows her lowly upstarts with a more complex and interesting role than most previous studies of the play have allowed. This essay will seek to demonstrate that, far from treating the low-born justices of the peace with unalloyed contempt, Behn adopts the traditional tragicomic strategy of using their “low” comic plot to reflect on and critique her serious “high” plots. It will suggest, moreover, that Behn finds in both mixed-plot tragicomedy and Shakespeare’s history play a model for dramatizing a national emergency with a surprising lack of partisan zeal – an approach that calls further into question critical views of the play’s politics as uncomplicatedly loyalist.

Behn wastes little time in showing her upstarts in the worst possible light. In Act I, scene ii, she associates them with the most sordid political scheming, as Dunce, the farrier turned Church of England parson, hatches the conspiracy to offer Bacon a safe conduct and then capture and murder him. He enlists the two justices Whimsey and Whiff to help him implement the assassination plot, which is only foiled thanks to the prudent suspicions of Dareing, Bacon’s Lieutenant General. However, even at this point in the play, when Behn seems intent on damning the clowns in our eyes, she inserts an episode that complicates our response to them...
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