Stylometry
ISSN 2283-8759
pp. 75-110 (2020)

Selfish Bastards? A Corpus-Based Approach to Illegitimacy in Early Modern Drama*

Jakob Ladegaard, Ross Deans Kristensen-McLachlan

Early modern theatre bred a steady stream of bastards. No doubt, this abundance reflected public concerns about illegitimacy as a challenge to the institutions of marriage and patrilineal inheritance as sanctioned pillars of the social order. Parents of illegitimate children, particularly mothers, were often publicly shamed and punished (Macfarlane 1980, 73)[1]. As the fruit of illicit sexual passion, illegitimate children were imagined to inherit a propensity

* Ladegaard wrote the article, while Kristensen-McLachlan did the data extraction, the computational analysis, the tables and co-authored the section "Keyword Analysis: Method and Corpus". This work was supported by the Independent Research Fund Denmark under Grant number DFF – 6107-00301. The authors would like to thank our colleagues in the research project "Unearned Wealth: A Literary History of Inheritance, 1600-2015" and Paulina Kewes, Michelle Dowd and Alison Findlay for helpful feedback on presentations of earlier versions of this work.

1 As Michael Neill points out, a common synonym for "bastard" was a "whore's son" (Neill 2000b, 150). For a nuanced view of the consequences for fathers to illegitimate children, see Shepard 2013.

for moral transgression from their parents[2]. They were stereotypically characterized as passionate, duplicitous and even monstrous (Neill 2000a, 134). The social experience of illegitimate children was surely not the same across the social spectrum, but illegitimacy uniformly entailed legal restrictions, especially for males. For example, common and canon law barred illegitimate males from the patrilineal inheritance of land, title or membership of trade guilds, although they could inherit land by deed or will (Macfarlane 1980, 73; Findlay 1994, 30-32; see also Dowd 2015, 33-49). This was a potential source of conflict that helps explain why over 90% of the bastard characters in early modern drama were males (Findlay 1994, 5).

The arguably most well-known of these characters, Edmund in Shakespeare's *King Lear* (1605-6)[3], unfolds this conflict potential in his rebellion against the settled line of succession, in the process both defying and ironically confirming the cultural stereotypes of bastardy. He thereby embodies the ambivalent critical potential that several scholars have identified in early modern representations of bastardy. The most comprehensive work on the subject, Alison Findlay's *Illegitimate Power: Bastards in Renaissance Drama*, explores how bastard characters confirm or subvert cultural binaries such as natural/unnatural, good/evil, male/female (Findlay 1994). Michael Neill's *Putting History to the Question* also discusses the ways dramatic bastards "threaten the distinctions" of the social order (Neill 2000a, 147). Recently, Helen Villa Bonavita likewise considers the bastard as a "liminal" figure who challenges social hierarchies (Bonavita 2017, 16-17). Illuminating as these studies are, their generally thematic orientation also leaves some things out. One such omission is the question of genre. Findlay works on all dramatic genres, while Neill and Bonavita mainly focus on

---

2 As Henry Swinburne put it in his influential *A Briefe Treatise of Testaments and Last Willes*: "being encouraged with the example and patterne of their fathers filthinesse, they ["the brood of bastardes"] are not onely prone to follow their sinfull steppes, but do sometimes exceede both them and others in all kinde of wickednesse" (Swinburne 1590, 201). For discussions of other legal sources with similar viewpoints, see Findlay 1994, 23-28 and Bonavita 2017, 21-25.

3 Dates refer to the chronological limits for the year of first performance given in Harbage 2013.

Shakespearean tragedies and histories, but none of them systematically compare bastard characters from different genres. However, since genres often mediate cultural and political concerns differently, generic distinctions may help explain some of the differences between bastard characters that Findlay in particular notices. Another neglected question is that of literary historical development. Neill and Bonavita deal only with Elizabethan and early Jacobean drama, while Findlay covers 1588-1642 and groups works across the period according to the thematic binaries that structure her argument. She thereby highlights a historical continuity in the themes and motives related to bastardy, but the approach might obscure tendencies of change over time in the characterization of bastards.

In this study, we compare major bastard characters in comedies, tragedies and history plays from 1588-1642 to look for generic and historic patterns of characterization. We find that the most marked generic difference is that between comedies and tragedies, the two genres that make up most of our corpus and to which we dedicate most of our discussion. The difference in their characterization of illegitimacy, we argue, has to do with the social function of bastard characters in their respective dramatic universes. Briefly put, major bastard characters in tragedies almost invariably instigate strife, while comedy bastards more often play a part in the resolution of social conflicts. Historically, we find that there is a tendency towards a more positive depiction of bastards in the Caroline period than in earlier plays. Bonavita's view (echoing Neill) that "the bastard in early modern drama is almost invariably depicted as monstrous or evil" (Bonavita 2017, 15) thus holds for the earlier period they deal with, but not for Caroline drama. This development correlates with an increase in comedies with major bastard characters in Caroline drama and a decrease of major tragedy bastards. The generic and historical differences find emblematic expression in two of the most significant plays from the two ends of our historical spectrum, Shakespeare's tragedy *King Lear* and Richard Brome's comedy *A Jovial Crew* (1641), which we briefly compare at the end of this study.

Our results are built on a study of 20 bastard characters from the period using keyword analysis, a stylometric method developed in the field of corpus linguistics. We are particularly inspired by Jonathan Culpeper's work on characterization and keywords in Shakespearean drama[4]. While keyword analysis is good at capturing large-scale linguistic trends in a textual corpus, close reading and historical contextualization are required to make sense of the results. Methodologically, this article thus stands up for bastards by mixing quantitative and qualitative approaches in something approximating Andrew Piper's "computational hermeneutics", whose analytic process moves "back and forth between distant and close forms of reading in order to approach an imaginary conceptual center" (Piper 2015, 68). In our case, this centre is the bastard character in early modern drama.

Keyword Analysis: Method and Corpus

We work from the assumption that dramatic characters are primarily characterized by the words they use (other sources of characterization are actions and the words other characters use about them). In our keyword analysis of bastard characters, we therefore compare a *target corpus* consisting of the words spoken by bastard characters with a *reference corpus* consisting of the words spoken by all other characters in the same plays. This comparison can be done using the raw count of words, but since this does not reflect the different sizes of the corpora, the more revealing approach is to compare the *frequency* with which specific words are used in the two corpora. We hereby find keywords or "style-markers" in the target corpus, that is "words whose frequencies differ significantly from their frequencies in a norm" (Culpeper 2014a, 11). Keywords, then, are words in the target corpus whose frequencies are significantly above *or* below those of the reference corpus. We call the first type *positive* keywords, the second *negative*. In our analysis, we focus on the positive keywords, because characters are primarily characterized by the words they use rather

[4] For an introduction to linguistic characterization, see Culpeper 2001. For a keyword analysis of a Shakespeare play, see Culpeper 2014a and 2014b.

than by those words that they do not use or use less than other characters on average. We thus find clear semantic clusters of positive keywords, while the (fewer) negative keywords are less coherent with the exception of one grammatical category: first person plural pronouns. We include tables of negative keywords, but mainly refer to them when, as we shall see with the pronouns, they offer secondary evidence for the primary patterns found in the tables of positive keywords.

When we say that keywords are used "significantly" more (or less), we mean it in the sense of statistical significance, calculated using a measure of Log-Likelihood (LL), which has been shown to be useful when comparing corpora of different sizes (Rayson, Berridge, and Francis 2004). This technique compares the observed frequency of a word in the target corpus with an expected frequency derived from the reference corpus, in order to pinpoint statistically significant variations[5]. However, statistical significance values in and of themselves have been shown to be poor measures of keyness (Gabrielatos 2018). In order to counteract this, we incorporate a measure of what is known as the "effect size", understood as "a standardized measure […] that expresses the practical importance of the effect observed in the corpus or corpora" (Brezina 2018, 14; see also Cumming 2012). We choose to work with Log Ratio (Hardie 2014) as our preferred measure of effect size, due to it being simple to calculate and easy to interpret[6]. Taken together, these two measures allow us to show which words most characterize the lines spoken by bastard characters relative to the lines of other characters in those same plays. Before we proceed to our results, we briefly present the process and decisions involved in compiling our corpora.

---

5 In this study, we use an LL score of 6.63 ($p < 0.01$) as the threshold for statistical significance.

6 'Log Ratio' is shorthand for the binary logarithm of the ratio of the relative frequencies of a word in the reference and target corpus. By taking the binary logarithm, each successive point in the ratio represents a doubling of the magnitude of the difference between the two corpora studied. So a Log Ratio of 1 means that a feature is 2 times as likely to appear in the target corpus than in the reference corpus, a ratio of 2 means that it is 4 times as likely, etc.

Alison Findlay lists 70 plays from 1588 to 1642 containing bastard characters and characters "threatened with bastardy", that is characters who at some point believe that they are illegitimate, but turn out to be legitimate (Findlay 1994, 253-57). It is a tricky issue to decide which of these plays to include in our corpus. As Findlay shows, they can all yield information about cultural perceptions of bastardy. However, the category "threatened with bastardy" is rather fluid and includes characters who think they are bastards for several acts, such as Captain Ager in Middleton and Rowley's *A Fair Quarrel* (c. 1615-17), as well as characters like Arbaces in Beaumont and Fletcher's *A King and No King* (1611), whose legitimacy is quickly revealed. From a quantitative perspective, only a small fraction of Arbaces' words would reflect his (mistaken) identity as a bastard. Such differences led us to discard the plays with characters "threatened by bastardy" and build a corpus of confirmed bastard characters. We hereby lose some information, but gain in consistency by comparing characters with a shared trait. For the same reasons of consistency and comparability, we include only plays from three main genres: Tragedy (TR), Comedy (CO) and Histories (HI), using the genre labels provided by Alfred Harbage with some minor alterations[7].

This process left us with a total of 28 plays (CO=15; HI=5; TR=8) (Table 1). The plays were mostly downloaded in XML format from the Early Print Library[8]. Notable exceptions to this are those plays

[7] Harbage (2013) lists Richard Zouche's *The Sophister* (c. 1614-20) and Heywood and Brome's *The Late Lancashire Witches* (1634) as respectively a "moral" and a "topical play". However, both plays were labeled as comedies when first printed in 1639 and 1634 respectively, and we do not see any reason to change this. Harbage calls W. Smith's *The Hector of Germany* (c. 1614-15) a "pseudo-history"; we agree with Jesse M. Lander that such labels reflect "modern standards of historical accuracy" (Lander 2006, 490) and thus simply term it a "history" (like its first print version from 1615). Arguably, the most troubling generic categorization with the biggest potential influence on our results is Shakespeare's *Troilus and Cressida* (1602-3). We count it among the tragedies, but we have run the analysis with the play in the comedy corpus, too, and although this leads to a little more overlapping between keywords in the two corpora, the difference is still clear.

[8] This corpus contains some 860 plays written between 1550 and 1700, sampled from the transcriptions of EEBO-TCP, but linguistically annotated and manually

in our corpus that are attributed to Shakespeare, which, at the time of collection, were absent from the Early Print Library. For these we chose to use the editions of Shakespeare's plays found on Folger Digital Texts[9]. Lastly, we decided to exclude bastard characters with fewer than 500 spoken words from our study. The reasoning behind this was that such bastard characters were unlikely to be very developed characters, and so were less likely to yield valuable insight into the dramatic characterization of bastardy. This pruning gave a final target corpus comprising a total of 20 bastard characters in 19 plays (CO=9; HI=3; TR=7), with two bastards appearing in Nabbes' *The Unfortunate Mother* (1639) (Table 2). The bastards' dialogue comprises just over 47,000 words compared with just over 342,000 words in the reference corpus. With the corpora prepared in this manner, we were ready for our keyword analysis[10]. We first did an analysis of all the bastard characters compared to the whole target corpus in order to see how bastard characters are generally characterized. We then proceeded to do separate keyword analysis of the bastard characters in each of our three main genres in order to compare differences in characterization across genres.

Keywords I: Selfish Bastards?

Table 3 shows the top 50 keywords of all bastard characters measured against the reference corpus. The keywords are ranked after their LL score with the highest score at the top[11]. The LL scores range from 39.36 to 7.56. As mentioned in footnote 5, this means that in principle all the keywords are statistically significant ($p \leq 0.01$). However, the most telling results are those with more than a

---

curated by Martin Mueller and his team at Northwestern University. For more about this process, see https://earlyprint.org.

9 These plays were downloaded via the public API available at https://shakespeare.folger.edu.

10 The keyword analysis was conducted using the well-known corpus linguistics tool AntConc (Anthony 2017), with minimal adaptation to the default settings.

11 In order to draw out the most salient keywords, we excluded words that occurred less than 5 times. This filtering was performed manually outside of AntConc. We also manually excluded names, locations, and demonyms (a name for an inhabitant or native of a specific place).

few overall occurrences. For example, 5 instances of "ox" in a target corpus of 47,000 words hardly characterize bastard characters. We look for something more solid: results that have 1) a relatively high occurrence, 2) a significant frequency rate, and 3) results that form part of larger semantic clusters[12]. In addition, we need to consider the Log Ratio score of the tokens that meet these criteria to measure a cluster's overall effect in the corpus.

We find two such clusters in Table 3. The first (marked with *) has to do with first person references. "I", "my" "me", "am" are all in the top 10 and so form a solid pattern along with "self" in the 50th place. However, although the LL scores for these keywords are generally high, they have relatively low effect sizes – between 0.26 for "I" and 0.59 for "am". This is not surprising; most characters use first person singular pronouns, so even if bastards use them significantly more, their effect in terms of differentiating the two corpora is modest. However, the fact that we are dealing with not just one word, but a cluster of words widely distributed across the target corpus, makes us more confident that we are looking at a stylistic marker for bastard characters. Furthermore, the *negative* keywords (words used significantly *less* by bastard characters) point in the same direction (Table 4). First person plural pronouns ("we", "our", "us") that indicate collective identification are among the top scorers. Other personal pronouns like "her", "your", "you", "ye", "him", "they" are in the top 20.

The second cluster in Table 3 comprises words (marked with †) related to the concept of bastardy and its negative connotations in this historical period: "begot", "mother", "bastard(s)", "lechery", "father", "whore", "base", "birth", and "legitimate." Not all instances of these words necessarily refer to bastardy, but their co-occurrence and wide distribution across the corpus is hardly coincidental. The effect size of these more unusual words is predictably higher than for the first cluster, leaving little doubt that they characterize our target corpus.

---

12 Another relevant parameter is dispersal (see Culpeper 2014a, 20-21). In principle, if a word only occurs in a few texts, it is not representative for the whole corpus. But since we are looking at semantic clusters of related words, we consider the dispersal of the clusters rather than individual words.

The high frequency of first person references (and the relatively low frequency of other pronouns) indicates that bastard characters talk more about themselves than other characters. This might mean that they are particularly self-reflective or self-centred. This could be linked to the second cluster of words related to the negative perception of bastardy, perhaps indicating that bastards are more concerned with their individual identity because of the social stigma of illegitimacy. Perhaps a sign of this are the several central instances of self-characterization in our target corpus where first person references coexist with words from the bastardy cluster:

EDMUND
I should
have been that I am, had the maidenliest star in the
firmament twinkled on my bastardizing.
(Shakespeare, *King Lear*, I.ii.138-40)[13]

SPURIO
Adultery is my nature;
[…]
I feel it swell me; my revenge is just,
I was begot in impudent Wine and Lust.
(Middleton, *The Revenger's Tragedy*, I.ii.177, 190-91)

PHILIP
And I am I, howe'er I was begot.
(Shakespeare, *King John*, I.i.180)

WHETSTONE
Howsoever I was begot, here you see I am,
And if my Parents went to it without fear or wit,
What can I help it.
(Brome and Heywood, *The Late Lancashire Witches*, I.i.115-17)

[13] All quotations are from the editions used in the keyword analysis. *King Lear* appeared in print in different versions. The version used in this study is Folger Library's edition of the First Folio text. See https://shakespeare.folger.edu/shakespeares-works/king-lear/an-introduction-to-this-text/.

All of these examples are from first acts, and mostly from the scenes in which the bastard characters first speak. From early on, these plays thus present the problematic relationship between bastardy and individual identity as a central component of their character. The subtle differences between the quotes indicate that this relationship can play out differently. The tragedy characters, Edmund and Spurio, directly link their inner nature to bastardy. Edmund denies the influence of stars, but not of "the lusty stealth of nature" with which he was begotten on his "composition and fierce quality" (I.ii.11-12). The "just" revenge Spurio in Thomas Middleton's *The Revenger's Tragedy* (1605-6) plans for his father's adultery is to lie with his stepmother. The two villains thus embody the notion that illegitimate children inherited the sins of their parents. They do not quietly accept their disadvantage, but the quotes above invite the audience to consider their rebellion against their fathers, legitimate half-brothers and indeed the social stigma of bastardy, to be a *result* of their transgressive bastard nature.

The cases of Philip Faulconbridge and Whetstone are different. The former at first denies that he is illegitimate, but when he learns that his father was Richard Lionheart, he embraces the fact because it helps his "mounting spirit" (I.i.212) to rise socially. As James P. Saeger remarks, this personal choice of genealogy is a sign of a "potential for self-determination, individual autonomy, and personal agency", which characterizes Faulconbridge throughout the play (Saeger 2001, 6). Faulconbridge is an ambitious individualist like Edmund and Spurio and displays some of the same traits as a potentially duplicitous outsider, before he in the end helps the legitimate heir to the throne[14]. However, contrary to the tragedy characters, Falconbridge does not experience bastardy as an obstacle, but as a stepping-stone. This divergence is a result of different responses to the social asymmetry between the parents of the bastard characters. In the three plays in question – and this is almost invariably the case for the bastard characters in our corpus

[14] This ambivalence in Faulconbridge's character is discussed in Van de Water 1960. See Slights 2009 for a reading that explains the inconsistencies in Faulconbridge's character as the expression of a development of "self-reflective moral awareness" (218). The similarities between Edmund and Faulconbridge are also noted in Hunt 1997.

– bastard characters' fathers belong to a higher social stratum than their mothers. For tragedy bastards like Spurio and Edmund, their mothers exert a downward pull on their social status. The moral stain of maternal sin is also the stain of social inferiority. For Faulconbridge, the reverse is true. When his mother admits her infidelity, he thanks her for it, because it allows him to identify with his legendary father and enter the close circle of the king's counsellors. Bastardy holds a potential for upward mobility for Faulconbridge. But crucially, this is partly so because his father is dead, which means that Faulconbridge can benefit from his status without resorting to violence to take his place like Edmund and Spurio.

The motif in *King John* (1590-91) of the recovered high-status father with its positive potential of social elevation for the illegitimate child is picked up in later comedies, especially, as we shall see, by Richard Brome – but this time with living fathers (and thus a potential for comic resolution in family reconciliations). In Brome's early comedy with Thomas Heywood, *The Late Lancashire Witches*, the bastard character Whetstone does not follow this trajectory, but in the quote above he does challenge the social stigma of bastardy in a good-natured, naïve way by publicly advertising his base birth and asserting that he should be judged on his personal merits instead of the sins of his parents. These examples suggest that bastardy is a predominantly negative characteristic in tragedies, while it can have a more positive function in other genres. Our keyword analysis of the three genres in our corpus confirms this.

Keywords II: Tragedy, Comedy, History

In the table of positive keywords for the tragedies (Table 5), we see a diminished but still important cluster of first person reference. On the list of negative keywords (Table 6), however, the first person plural pronouns ("we", "our", "us") have moved to the top with a more pronounced effect size than in the table for all plays, indicating that tragedy bastards more rarely identify with collectives. The second cluster relating to bastardy has a more

pronounced presence than in Table 3. Words from this cluster have moved to the top – "bastard" (19 out of 25 mentions in the corpus occur in the tragedies), "lechery" (7 out of 7) and "whore" (10 out of 13) – and additional related words like "sin" and "cuckold" also appear. The rise of "whore" and "sin" is perhaps an indication of the negative role of the mother for tragedy bastard characters. As Findlay puts it: "The quest for masculine selfhood is all the more difficult for bastards because their maternal legacy, which corrupts them at the point of origin, is so much more powerful" (Findlay 1994, 185). The bastardy cluster in Table 5 confirms the tendency in the quotes above, namely that tragedy bastard characters often embody contemporary negative cultural associations of bastardy. Their predominant negative role is further corroborated by the cluster of words in Table 5 (marked with °) that indicate violent rebellion ("sword", "kill", "jealousy", "ambition", "envy", "rise", "bleed", "die", etc.)[15].

These results seem to confirm previous studies that have noted a dialectic between social stigma and a need to assert individual worth in rebellious tragedy bastards like Edmund in *King Lear* and later characters modelled on him, like Spurio in *The Revenger's Tragedy* (Holdsworth 2017, 379), Antipater in Markham and Sampson's *Herod and Antipater* (c. 1619-22) (Markham and Sampson 1979, xxvii and 192) and Notho in Nabbes' *The Unfortunate Mother*. According to Findlay, such bastards respond to marginalization by striving to act as "autonomous subjects" with a "sovereignty of self" and "independence" (Findlay 1994, 48). She also notes that "[b]astard villains who cause disorder in the family and the State seem committed to an anarchic alternative, a world where the individual position is paramount" (119). Michael Neill similarly claims that "the stage bastard repeatedly insists on his own self-begotten sufficiency in overreaching language that insolently travesties the divine 'I am'" (Neill 2000a, 139). Our results confirm that this line of interpretation points to a central aspect of tragic

[15] Without *Troilus and Cressida* in the tragedy corpus, the first person cluster is intact. The bastardy cluster is slightly diminished with 12 instances of "bastard", while "lechery" and "whore" disappear from the top 50. "Envy" and "bleed" disappear from the rebellion cluster, while "dead" (14 instances) enters.

bastard characters, but, as we shall see, it less clearly characterizes bastard characters from other genres.

If we move to the comedy table (Table 7), the picture is very different. The first person cluster is almost as prevalent as in Table 3 with "I" in the first place. The bastardy cluster, however, has all but disappeared. The only word in that cluster left from Table 3 is "father"[16]. This goes some way towards confirming the importance of the regained-father motif that we mentioned before and which we find in all of the comedies written solely by Brome in the corpus: *The Sparagus Garden* (1635), *The Damoiselle* (1637-38) and *A Jovial Crew*. In contrast to the negative social relations indicated by the "rebel words" in the tragedy table, we find in Table 7 words indicating positive social relations ("friends", "bless") as well as the second person pronoun "you" in the 20th place, indicating a measure of other-orientedness. It might thus seem that the bastards in the comedy corpus have achieved what Whetstone in *The Late Lancashire Witches* hoped for: to be judged as individuals rather than heirs of parental sins. To some extent, this is true of Brome's comedies, which carry a lot of weight in the comedy corpus, since he has authored 3 and co-authored 1 of the 9 plays. However, the comedy corpus is not as homogeneous as the tragedy corpus. The latter is dominated not so much by a single author as by a single character type whose earliest exemplar is Shakespeare's Edmund. The earliest plays of the comedy corpus – the anonymous *A Knack to Know a Knave* (1592), Shakespeare's *Much Ado About Nothing* (1598), Lording Barry's *Ram Alley* (1608-10) and Richard Zouche's *The Sophister* – all contain villainous bastard characters. In fact, Don John in *Much Ado About Nothing* is a rebel against his legitimate brother in line with the usurping tragedy bastards. The difference is that his rebellion has failed when the play begins and he is reduced to a brooding melancholic and petty schemer without any of Edmund's grandiloquent lamentations on bastardy. Only in later Caroline playwrights, Brome in particular, do we begin to encounter comedy bastard characters with more positive traits in

[16] "Mother" (25 instances) is the only parent left on the tragedy list, but that is in part explained by its prevalence in James Shirley's tragedy *The Politician* (c. 1639), where the bastard character, Haraldus, uses it 18 times.

our corpus. The results in Table 7 thus do not reflect a uniformly positive view on bastards, but rather the absence in the earlier plays of an emphasis on bastardy as a specific *problem* for the bastard characters. Instead, these comedies simply assert the illegitimate status of their bastard characters and then rely on the audience's knowledge of the negative cultural associations of bastardy in order for this status to function as an off-hand explanation of the characters' villainy[17].

In the table of positive keywords for the history plays (Table 9), the clusters from the general Table 3 are nearly absent. "Begot" and "mother" are the only remnants. Instead of the first person singular pronouns (one of which, "my", has moved to the list of negative keywords in Table 10), the plural "our" is in the top 49 (but with an LL score below the threshold)[18]. Alternative clusters indicate distinguishing features of the histories. Words like "honor", "land", "king(s)", "courage", "men" in the top 20 (marked with □) point to the hierarchy and masculine values of the feudal state, while words like "arms", "stir", "away", "bloody", "face", "hand" and "head" (marked with △) could be signals of the physicality of battle and revolt in which power and glory are lost and won. With the exception of the first scene of Shakespeare's *King John*, the focus in the small group of plays in this corpus is not on the bastard's inner struggle with his parental prehistory, but on personal identity as a function of group identity. In *The Hector of Germany*, the bastard Henry of Trastomare is not driven by any disadvantage related to bastardy to usurp the Spanish throne. He is simply not concerned with his illegitimate birth. The same goes for the eponymous Jack Straw in the anonymous history of the popular rebellion he led, and Falconbridge in Heywood's *1 Edward IV* (1592-99). Instead, like in the early comedies mentioned above, their bastard status functions more like an easy 'explanation' to the audience of their violently overreaching characters.

---

[17] With *Troilus and Cressida* in the comedy corpus, the first person cluster is intact. The bastardy cluster grows slightly: "bastard" (11 mentions), "lechery" (7) and "whore" (12) enter the top 50.

[18] Only 49 keywords in the history plays met our filtering criteria (see note 11).

An Unexpected Encounter: Edmund and Springlove

The most compelling finding in our keyword analysis, we believe, is the difference between the two largest sub-corpora in our study, tragedies and comedies, which, on closer inspection, indicates that a generally more positive characterization of bastard characters begins to appear in Caroline comedies and in particular in Richard Brome. This is an aspect of Brome's work that has not been treated independently in existing scholarship. However, Brome seems to have been conscious of the contrast his bastard characters represent to the tradition of usurping tragedy bastards. At least, he seems to present in Springlove, the bastard in his last comedy, *A Jovial Crew*, a knowing reversal of the most influential tragedy bastard character, Shakespeare's Edmund. A brief comparison between the two can help us better understand how and perhaps why bastard characters play a different role in Brome's work.

There is little precedent for comparing these two plays, whose tone could hardly be further apart. But Brome had already partly modelled one play, *The Queen's Exchange* (1629-32), on *Lear* (see Butler 1984, 265-66; Steggle 2004, 56); *A Jovial Crew* does contain a textual allusion to *Lear*[19]; and, most importantly, there are parallels in plot structure. Like *Lear*, *A Jovial Crew* has at its centre an aging authority figure, the country gentleman Oldrents, with only female heirs, Meriel and Rachel. They are estranged from their father because of the gloom and strictures of his "Rule and Government" (II.i.19)[20] and decide to leave with their lovers to join 'a jovial crew' of vagabonds, "[t]he onely Freemen of a Common-wealth" (II.i.198). They are led by Springlove, a foundling who has grown up with Oldrents and works as his steward but, it turns out, is in fact his bastard son. Springlove's mother was a vagabond, which (in this dramatic universe) explains his instinctive urge to abandon the estate against his master's will to enjoy the freedom of the open

[19] An echo in III.i.471-72 of Lear's imaginary chastisement of the beadle (see Brome 2014, 183).

[20] All quotations from *A Jovial Crew* are from Brome 1652, which does not contain scene divisions and line counts. For easier referencing, we give scenes and line numbers from equivalent lines in Brome 2014.

road. Structurally, Meriel and Rachel resemble Goneril and Regan, while Springlove echoes Edmund (the two plot lines in *Lear* are thus reduced to one in Brome's play). *A Jovial Crew* echoes *Lear*'s central theme of travelling, too. When Oldrents' children leave him, he starts visiting friends, drinking and eating excessively, leaving his servant Randall to run his estate. This itineracy echoes Lear's travels and reliance on the hospitality of his daughters. There is an element of madness in this that can be read as a comic parallel to Lear's raving. As Oldrents' companion, Hearty, a Kent-like figure, comments: "If this be madness, 'tis a merry Fit" (II.ii.212).

An aging master with an increasingly errant behaviour, discontent female heirs, a rebellious bastard son – these can all be read as elements of a comedy version of *King Lear*, where, true to form, everyone is reconciled in the end. *A Jovial Crew* is not a parody or direct comic rewriting of *Lear*, but it clearly alludes to Shakespeare's play, a common practice among Caroline dramatists (see Butler 1984, 106-7 and Steggle 2004, 4). One effect of this is to alert us to the similarities and differences between the bastard characters in the two plays. Let us briefly consider some of them.

Firstly, Edmund and Springlove are both intimately tied to nature. Edmund's first monologue on bastardy begins: "Thou, Nature, art my goddess. To thy law / My services are bound" (I.ii.1-2). On Springlove's first appearance, he hears a nightingale and exclaims: "O, Sir, you hear I am call'd", and when Oldrents says he had hoped Springlove had changed, he replies: "You thought I had forsaken Nature then" (I.i.156-58). For both of them, nature is more than external reality (although for Springlove it is that, too). It is a super-personal, even divine force that forms their inner nature. This reflects their status as 'natural children', a common term for illegitimate children, and in particular their relationship to their mothers: Edmund's nature is a goddess; Springlove's desire for the open road is his maternal legacy. However, the similarity covers a considerable difference. For Edmund, nature resembles the Christian idea of man's fallen nature related to sinful woman. To make this nature his goddess is to rebel against his father and brother. In contrast, Springlove, true to his name, represents the

idea of female nature as regeneration, fertility and love, celebrated by comedy since Antiquity[21].

To be a natural son thus means two different things in these plays. But in both cases, following nature is a move towards freedom from social constraints. We have already discussed this with respect to Edmund. In *A Jovial Crew*, the vagabonds embody personal freedom. As Springlove, who feels an "inborn strong desire of liberty" (I.i.252), says: "And among Beggars, each man is his own" (I.i.262). We noted in relation to tragic bastards a dialectic between social stigma and the need to assert an individual worth. This dialectic means that an imagined view from the outside is constitutive of the conflicted self-formation of the tragic rebels; they do not form their identity out of nothing, but in a dialogue with the social perception of bastardy. This is emblematically borne out in Edmund's first soliloquy:

> EDMUND
> why "bastard"? Wherefore "base",
> When my dimensions are as well compact,
> My mind as generous and my shape as true
> As honest madam's issue? Why brand they us
> With "base", with "baseness", "bastardy", "base", "base"
> (Shakespeare, *King Lear*, I.ii.6-10)

For Edmund, the shame and outrage of the social categories (in quotation marks) drives his desire to overturn "[l]egitimate Edgar" (I.ii.17). In Springlove's case, the trajectory is reversed. His desire for personal liberty is a natural instinct, not a result of social exclusion. But he also experiences a moment of self-reflective shame on one of his excursions, when, dressed as a crippled beggar, he accidentally runs into his master. When Springlove retrospectively tells this story, he tellingly identifies with Oldrents' perspective:

---

21 Findlay does not compare the two characters directly, but notes the same fundamental difference in their connection to nature (Findlay 1994, 124 and 166).

SPRINGLOVE
My head was dirty clouted, and this leg
Swadled with Rags, the other naked, and
My body clad, like his upon the Gibbet.
Yet, He, with searching eyes, through all my Rags
And counterfeit Postures, made discovery
Of his Man Springlove; chid me into tears;
And a confession of my forespent life.
(Brome, *A Jovial Crew*, II.i.339-45)

Springlove is recognized and recognizes himself as a subject to social obligations and love. His challenge – and that of the play as a whole – is to reconcile the liberty of the open road with the duty of work and family. This happens when he is discovered to be Oldrents' illegitimate son and Oldrents bestows on him an independent estate worth 1,000 pounds a year, bypassing his legitimate heirs and the traditional restrictions on bastard's inheritance rights that provoked Edmund's move from inclusion in Gloucester's family to rebellion. Springlove moves from initial disobedience to a reconciliation of filial duty and liberty as a grateful heir with economic independence.

Whereas for Edmund bastardy is wholly negative, its function in *A Jovial Crew* is reminiscent of *King John*, but has a wider meaning. Springlove's recognition as Oldrents' bastard son is a step up the social ladder – from the obligations of a steward to the independence of landed wealth. In addition, there is no 'stain' of maternal sin, because his mother was an impoverished noblewoman who resorted to begging because Oldrents' grandfather cheated her family out of their estate. Bastardy, then, is not only an occasion for individual social mobility. Springlove is an embodiment of resolution in a time of impending national crisis: he reconciles liberty and filial duty, the common people and the gentry, and he expiates the crimes of the past, bringing together separated families, repairing a social fabric torn by old rents.

From Selfish to Benevolent Bastards: Concluding Reflections

Edmund cannot bridge the gap between his mother and father, or between his individuality and social judgment. Conversely, Springlove, *because* he is a bastard, is able to straddle the social spheres and principles that need to be reconciled. Brome uses the bastard character in similar ways in *The Sparagus Garden* and *The Damoiselle*. Both Tim Hoyden in the former and Phillis in the latter are united with their lost fathers and thereby rise socially as well as expiate past crimes and reconcile old enemies. Brome's bastards, then, are no longer the evil incarnations of their parents' sin, but the blameless victims of parental transgressions and social prejudice as well as agents of their correction. This is particularly clear for Phillis, the only female bastard in our corpus, the child of a noblewoman, who was deserted by her lover and fled her family. Much like Springlove's (dead) mother in *A Jovial Crew*, this family history makes Phillis a beggar. Her true identity is discovered by her uncle and father, and Brome fully exploits the sentimental possibilities of these reunions with no lack of tears and sighs. This emotional investment in bastardy is also seen in another late Caroline drama, James Shirley's *The Politician*, the only tragedy bastard in our corpus who is not a villain. Indeed, the gentle Haraldus dies of grief when he discovers his mother's infidelity.

These examples point to a historical trend in our corpus: from the 1590s and 1600s, where major bastard characters are almost exclusively negative in all genres, to the 1630s and first years of the 1640s, where Brome's comedies in particular explore their sentimental, unifying potential. This is a trend, but not a unidirectional development. There are still villainous bastards in Caroline tragedies like Thomas Nabbes' *The Unfortunate Mother*, and Bostock in Shirley's comedy *The Ball* (1632) is a ridiculous pretender to nobility whose cowardice matches his low birth. Conversely, as we have seen, there is a partial precursor of Brome's upwardly mobile bastard characters in *King John*[22].

[22] Another forerunner (too minor for our corpus) is the cashier Cash in Ben Jonson's *Every Man in His Humour* (1598).

This historical trend seems to continue into the post-war era. Richard Brome's "influence on subsequent theatre was immense: numerous revivals and adaptations attest to his continuing success after the Restoration and into the eighteenth century" (Steggle 2004, 1). This influence perhaps contributed to the construction of a sentimentalized, virtuous bastard character[23]. In *Bastards and Foundlings: Illegitimacy in Eighteenth-Century England*, Lisa Zunshine argues that the eighteenth century witnessed an "excision of the vile bastard as a nearly ubiquitous literary type […] accompanied by the introduction of the similarly ubiquitous virtuous foundling" (Zunshine 2005, 19). In comedies and novels, these foundlings were often sentimentalized female figures who turned out to be legally born and were duly reintegrated into society through inheritance. It is tempting to see Brome's bastard characters as precursors to and, in some cases, perhaps inspiration for these indulgently treated eighteenth-century foundlings.

A complex set of historical factors probably contributed to the tendency towards a more positive characterization of bastards in our corpus. One could point to the fact that the ratio of illegitimate births falls from a peak in the 1590s and 1600s to the 1640s and stays low for the rest of the seventeenth century (Adair 1996, 49-50). One could speculate that, as a result, illegitimacy became a less contentious issue in Brome's time than in Shakespeare's. But this is doubtful. For one thing, since the plays were written in London for the local stage, they are more likely to reflect London trends than any correct conjecture of national average ratios involving great local and regional differences. According to Richard Adair, illegitimacy ratios in seventeenth-century London did not in fact follow the average national curve, but were consistently lower and flatter. This view is disputed (Fox and Ingram 2014, 31-32), but even if London ratios resembled the rest of the Southern regions (which were generally lower than the North and West), we cannot infer that public attitudes changed as a result. Indeed, there is little to suggest that they did. Laws targeting illegitimate children and

---

[23] According to Tiffany Stern, *A Jovial Crew* "would become one of the first dramas mounted after the interregnum, perhaps even shaping what Restoration comedies were to become" (Brome 2014, 2).

particularly their mothers were passed throughout the period. And instead of declining illegitimacy ratios resulting in greater permissiveness, it is quite possibly the other way around: increasingly influential Puritan moralists and ministers' condemnation of illicit sexual activity might have led mothers to make greater efforts to avoid having illegitimate offspring and conceal it if they did, thus causing registered illegitimacy to fall in the 1640s (Adair 1996, 40-41).

If anything, the tendency towards a more positive characterization of bastards in our corpus contradicts prevailing official attitudes. Richard Brome's bastard characters could be a deliberate act of opposition against such attitudes, especially as they were embodied in and shaped by the literary tradition of rebellious Edmunds. But possibly his interest was not in the grievances of illegitimate children per se – one could argue that his plays in fact gloss over the misfortunes of real illegitimate children who were not miraculously reunited with their repenting, noble fathers. Instead, his interest might primarily have been the structural potential of this character type to bring about comic resolution and symbolically embody a wishful idea of shared values and forgotten interconnectedness beneath the contradictions of late Caroline society. Maybe as a combined result, in Brome's dramatic work illegitimate children stopped being just bastards.

In central aspects, the findings of our keyword analysis are in line with previous research. We have provided linguistic evidence for the notion that bastard characters tend to be self-oriented. But we have added that their self-assertion can take different paths depending on genre and historical time: Edmund recognizes himself through the social stereotypes as an outsider; Springlove sees himself through the eyes of his father as a member of the community. Compared to the range of plays and the detail in which Alison Findlay's book analyses them, our stylistic approach to a smaller corpus is limited. To compare our results to ideas about bastardy in early modern drama as a whole, a future quantitative study would need to find a way of also including minor or suspected bastard characters. However, by only considering the most talkative bastards in three genres and by combining linguistic

corpus analysis with close reading, we can more clearly see that genre contributed to the formation of different bastard types and spot signs of a gradual shift in preference for one type over another in our period. Finally, our method unexpectedly led us to consider Richard Brome, who is sometimes dismissed as derivative, as a central and original figure in the shift from selfish to benevolent bastards.

Table 1: List of all plays with confirmed bastard characters

Year[24]	Author	Play	Genre	Bastard
1590	Wilson, Robert	*The Cobbler's Prophecy*	CO	Ruina (f)
1590	Shakespeare, William	*1 Henry VI*	HI	Bastard of Orleans
1591	Anon.	*Jack Straw*	HI	Jack Straw
1591	Shakespeare, William	*King John*	HI	Philip
1592	Anon.	*A Knack to Know a Knave*	CO	Perin
1594	S., W.	*Locrine*	TR	Sabren (f)
1598	Shakespeare, William	*Much Ado About Nothing*	CO	Don John
1598	Jonson, Ben	*Every Man in His Humour*	CO	Thomas Cash
1599	Heywood, Thomas	*1 Edward IV*	HI	Faulconbridge
1602	Shakespeare, William	*Troilus and Cressida*	TR	Thersites
1605	Shakespeare, William	*King Lear*	TR	Edmund
1606	Middleton, Thomas	*The Revenger's Tragedy*	TR	Spurio
1608	Barry, Lording	*Ram Alley*	CO	Throat
1613	Middleton, Thomas	*A Chaste Maid in Cheapside*	CO	Wat; Nick
1614	Zouche, Richard	*The Sophister*	CO	Fallacy
1614	Smith, Wentworth (?)	*The Hector of Germany, or The Palsgrave, Prime Elector*	HI	Henry of Trastomare
1617	Middleton, T. and Rowley, W.	*A Fair Quarrel*	CO	Captain Ager
1622	Markham, Gervase	*Herod and Antipater*	TR	Antipater
1622	Dekker, Thomas	*The Noble Spanish Soldier*	TR	Sebastian
1632	Shirley, James	*The Ball*	CO	Bostock
1632	Tatham, John	*Love Crowns the End*	CO	Scrub
1634	Heywood, T. and Brome, R.	*The Late Lancashire Witches*	CO	Whetstone
1635	Brome, Richard	*The Sparagus Garden*	CO	Tim Hoyden
1638	Brome, Richard	*The Damoiselle, or The New Ordinary*	CO	Phyllis (f)
1639	Nabbes, Thomas	*The Unfortunate Mother*	TR	Spurio; Notho
1639	Shirley, James	*The Politician*	TR	Haraldus
1640	Brome, Richard	*The Court Beggar*	CO	Boy
1641	Brome, Richard	*A Jovial Crew, or The Merry Beggars*	CO	Springlove

[24] Most likely year of first performance given by Harbage 2013.

Table 2: Bastard characters with + 500 words included in this study

Year	Author	Play	Genre	Bastard
1591	Anon.	*Jack Straw*	HI	Jack Straw
1591	Shakespeare, William	*King John*	HI	Philip
1592	Anon.	*A Knack to Know a Knave*	CO	Perin
1598	Shakespeare, William	*Much Ado About Nothing*	CO	Don John
1599	Heywood, Thomas	*1 Edward IV*	HI	Faulconbridge
1602	Shakespeare, William	*Troilus and Cressida*	TR	Thersites
1605	Shakespeare, William	*King Lear*	TR	Edmund
1606	Middleton, Thomas	*The Revenger's Tragedy*	TR	Spurio
1608	Barry, Lording	*Ram Alley*	CO	Throat
1614	Zouche, Richard	*The Sophister*	CO	Fallacy
1614	Smith, Wentworth (?)	*The Hector of Germany, or The Palsgrave, Prime Elector*	HI	Henry of Trastomare
1622	Markham, Gervase	*Herod and Antipater*	TR	Antipater
1632	Shirley, James	*The Ball*	CO	Bostock
1634	Heywood, T. and Brome, R.	*The Late Lancashire Witches*	CO	Whetstone
1635	Brome, Richard	*The Sparagus Garden*	CO	Tim Hoyden
1638	Brome, Richard	*The Damoiselle, or The New Ordinary*	CO	Phyllis (f)
1639	Nabbes, Thomas	*The Unfortunate Mother*	TR	Spurio; Notho
1639	Shirley, James	*The Politician*	TR	Haraldus
1641	Brome, Richard	*A Jovial Crew, or The Merry Beggars*	CO	Springlove

Table 3: Positive keywords for all bastard characters

Index	Total	Direction	LL	Log Ratio	Word
1	21	+	39.36	3.0765	aunt
2	1422	+	39.19	0.2602	I *
3	17	+	32.61	3.1342	acquaintance
4	34	+	26.99	1.6936	wit
5	766	+	25.32	0.2881	my *
6	493	+	23.06	0.3462	me *
7	15	+	22.43	2.591	begot †
8	32	+	21.62	1.5321	sword
9	5	+	21.08	6.176	calfskin
10	150	+	18.84	0.587	am *
11	55	+	18.01	0.9988	mother †
12	24	+	16.64	1.5564	bastard †
13	5	+	15.93	5.176	tomorrow
14	23	+	15.75	1.5447	small
15	9	+	15.32	2.8541	ignorance
16	14	+	14.58	2.0176	heads
17	7	+	14.51	3.3395	lechery †
18	84	+	13.4	0.6689	father †
19	5	+	13.22	4.176	dad †
20	53	+	13.15	0.8541	gentleman
21	7	+	13.12	3.0765	statute
22	13	+	13.05	1.9695	whore †
23	26	+	12.54	1.2507	base †
24	67	+	12.24	0.7205	could
25	17	+	12.12	1.584	birth †
26	7	+	11.92	2.8541	scurvy
27	5	+	11.27	3.591	jests
28	5	+	11.27	3.591	ox
29	15	+	11.22	1.6317	clear
30	7	+	9.91	2.4915	satisfy
31	5	+	9.75	3.176	contradiction
32	5	+	9.75	3.176	legitimate †
33	31	+	9.08	0.9379	friends
34	7	+	9.07	2.3395	stole
35	11	+	9.02	1.7285	lye
36	9	+	8.8	1.9365	clown
37	8	+	8.51	2.0467	cloak
38	8	+	8.51	2.0467	complement
39	5	+	8.51	2.8541	doubts
40	5	+	8.51	2.8541	drinks
41	5	+	8.51	2.8541	esteem
42	8	+	8.51	2.0467	proclaim
43	5	+	8.51	2.8541	sleeve
44	225	+	8.31	0.307	by
45	7	+	8.3	2.202	nobility
46	6	+	8.25	2.439	bastards †
47	6	+	8.25	2.439	opposition
48	10	+	8.11	1.7166	slaves
49	10	+	7.63	1.6524	pox
50	83	+	7.56	0.4944	self *

First person reference = *; Bastardy = †

Table 4: Negative keywords for all bastard characters

Index	Total	Direction	LL	Log Ratio	Word
1	108	-	43.32	-0.8668	we
2	88	-	29.3	-0.7976	our
3	6	-	18.92	-2.0528	daughter
4	155	-	17.67	-0.4864	her
5	11	-	14.13	-1.4347	yes
6	379	-	14.06	-0.2842	your
7	7	-	13.38	-1.6873	wee
8	5	-	11.81	-1.8352	boy
9	762	-	10.09	-0.1715	you
10	15	-	8.93	-1.0335	ye
11	18	-	8.67	-0.9418	house
12	185	-	8.6	-0.3176	him
13	39	-	8.5	-0.6582	us
14	33	-	8.26	-0.7015	son
15	12	-	8.24	-1.1001	grace
16	10	-	7.27	-1.1278	prince
17	103	-	7.24	-0.3872	they
18	168	-	6.96	-0.3005	sir
19	36	-	6.8	-0.6163	has
20	28	-	6.8	-0.6917	before
21	215	-	6.42	-0.2565	so
22	5	-	6.3	-1.4239	want
23	5	-	6.15	-1.409	merry
24	8	-	5.9	-1.1346	woman
25	91	-	5.85	-0.3712	she
26	10	-	5.69	-1.0138	fellow
27	65	-	4.94	-0.402	love
28	329	-	4.93	-0.1833	for
29	16	-	4.89	-0.768	long
30	26	-	4.81	-0.6104	pray
31	5	-	4.63	-1.2503	bid
32	8	-	4.58	-1.0163	child
33	108	-	4.16	-0.2904	good
34	41	-	3.89	-0.4466	tell
35	6	-	3.86	-1.0688	sent

Table 5: Positive keywords for tragedy bastard characters

Index	Total	Direction	LL	Log Ratio	Word
1	19	+	34.1	2.6512	bastard †
2	5	+	30.21	7.6079	honor °
3	7	+	26.49	4.7714	lechery †
4	17	+	25.15	2.329	fool
5	18	+	23.28	2.1339	sword °
6	311	+	23.02	0.4195	my *
7	16	+	22.67	2.2636	sin †
8	10	+	21.63	3.0229	whore †
9	7	+	21.26	3.9234	ignorance
10	202	+	20.01	0.4909	me *
11	8	+	19.38	3.2859	error
12	5	+	18.24	4.6079	legitimate †
13	49	+	17.13	0.9788	king
14	6	+	16.96	3.701	satisfy
15	11	+	16.9	2.3878	birth †
16	5	+	16.85	4.2859	drinks
17	5	+	16.85	4.2859	sleeve
18	17	+	16.38	1.7735	kill °
19	5	+	14.61	3.8005	scurvy
20	15	+	14.59	1.7834	duty
21	7	+	14.45	2.9234	begot †
22	14	+	14.39	1.8454	wit
23	25	+	14.21	1.2932	mother †
24	11	+	14.19	2.1307	knowledge
25	6	+	13.22	3.0636	jealousy °
26	8	+	13	2.4786	ambition °
27	516	+	12.13	0.2296	I *
28	11	+	11.72	1.8874	crown
29	9	+	11.64	2.1339	fears
30	7	+	11.57	2.5083	envy °
31	5	+	11.43	3.1484	instruct
32	7	+	11.17	2.4494	brain
33	70	+	10.18	0.6047	would
34	16	+	10.15	1.3791	nature
35	7	+	9.72	2.2353	rise °
36	29	+	9.5	0.9443	could
37	15	+	9.29	1.3599	duke
38	6	+	8.63	2.2859	ass
39	6	+	8.63	2.2859	bleed °
40	5	+	8.33	2.5204	cuckold †
41	5	+	8.33	2.5204	innocence
42	25	+	8.05	0.9355	both
43	76	+	8.04	0.5101	thy
44	5	+	7.92	2.438	cure
45	5	+	7.92	2.438	moon
46	11	+	7.68	1.46	act
47	11	+	7.52	1.4416	base †
48	14	+	7.48	1.2478	kings
49	8	+	7.2	1.701	die °
50	11	+	7.2	1.4055	something

First person reference = *; Bastardy = †; Rebellion = °

Table 6: Negative keywords for tragedy bastard characters

Index	Total	Direction	LL	Log Ratio	Word
1	25	-	48.76	-1.66	we
2	224	-	30.26	-0.5059	you
3	24	-	23.27	-1.2402	our
4	7	-	14.56	-1.7044	us
5	96	-	14.08	-0.5284	for
6	49	-	13.79	-0.7159	her
7	7	-	11.8	-1.5649	tell
8	20	-	11.15	-0.9752	lord
9	5	-	11.03	-1.7453	before
10	129	-	10.92	-0.4072	your
11	18	-	8.88	-0.9235	man
12	30	-	8.19	-0.7065	good
13	87	-	6.85	-0.3939	this
14	8	-	6.7	-1.1653	most
15	26	-	5.85	-0.6466	well
16	5	-	5.75	-1.3346	poor
17	6	-	5.55	-1.2166	been
18	62	-	5.27	-0.4091	all
19	7	-	4.83	-1.0716	pray
20	66	-	4.62	-0.3727	him
21	12	-	3.94	-0.7693	has

Table 7: Positive keywords for comedy bastard characters

Index	Total	Direction	LL	Log Ratio	Word
1	49	+	50.58	1.8707	gentleman
2	17	+	49.7	3.9014	aunt
3	738	+	50.49	0.41	I *
4	15	+	46.24	4.0834	acquaintance
5	21	+	34.69	2.5433	small
6	31	+	28.43	1.7384	money
7	20	+	23.98	2.0579	wit
8	7	+	22.31	4.2063	statute
9	25	+	22.04	1.697	came
10	31	+	21.77	1.4787	gentlemen
11	24	+	21.19	1.6985	friends
12	369	+	20.59	0.3642	my *
13	9	+	19.35	3.0664	clown
14	8	+	18.04	3.1765	complement
15	5	+	18.01	4.7209	jests
16	78	+	17.6	0.7734	am *
17	81	+	17.21	0.7482	know
18	7	+	16.81	3.3318	nobility
19	9	+	15.08	2.5689	lye
20	473	+	14.96	0.2704	you
21	14	+	14.61	1.8844	beg
22	7	+	14.5	2.9839	cloak
23	6	+	13.93	3.2469	stole
24	7	+	12.63	2.7038	season
25	48	+	12.41	0.8341	self *
26	16	+	12.25	1.5576	uncle
27	14	+	12.17	1.6827	gracious
28	13	+	12.08	1.7536	amongst
29	5	+	11.89	3.3058	opposition
30	8	+	11.67	2.34	heads
31	226	+	11.67	0.3508	me *
32	9	+	10.52	2.0245	able
33	6	+	10.05	2.5689	lawyers
34	34	+	9.51	0.8717	could
35	25	+	9.38	1.0278	master
36	20	+	9.08	1.1459	law
37	8	+	9.06	1.9839	ten
38	41	+	9.04	0.764	father †
39	10	+	8.76	1.6911	bless
40	7	+	8.25	2.0364	gentlewoman
41	22	+	8.22	1.0255	right
42	8	+	8.14	1.8546	clear
43	18	+	7.59	1.0985	thank
44	13	+	7.43	1.3093	hundred
45	7	+	7.3	1.8844	lend
46	6	+	7.12	2.0453	pox
47	53	+	6.68	0.5646	some
48	8	+	6.35	1.5916	themselves
49	198	+	6.12	0.2689	but
50	5	+	5.99	2.0579	enjoy

First person reference = *; Bastardy = †; Rebellion = °

Table 8: Negative keywords for comedy bastard characters

Index	Total	Direction	LL	Log Ratio	Word
1	42	-	49.24	-1.33	we
2	25	-	36.76	-1.4834	our
3	29	-	17.17	-1.0052	thee
4	8	-	14.47	-1.616	son
5	40	-	11.2	-0.7179	thy
6	14	-	10.83	-1.1306	king
7	25	-	10.2	-0.852	o
8	5	-	7.4	-1.4886	ye
9	483	-	6.7	-0.1692	the
10	8	-	5.59	-1.0822	away
11	10	-	5.34	-0.961	heart
12	9	-	5.33	-1.0061	true
13	7	-	5.12	-1.1036	brother
14	6	-	5.05	-1.1726	honor
15	18	-	4.64	-0.6917	did
16	25	-	4.59	-0.5914	such
17	9	-	4.56	-0.9389	life
18	6	-	4.26	-1.0894	god
19	96	-	3.94	-0.2899	so
20	29	-	3.84	-0.51	us

Table 9: Positive keywords for history bastard characters

Index	Total	Direction	LL	Log Ratio	Word
1	5	+	37.61	8.7133	calfskin
2	5	+	37.61	8.7133	honor □
3	69	+	27.29	1.0272	thou
4	15	+	24.68	2.4156	land □
5	6	+	20.1	3.9763	commodity
6	6	+	19.53	3.8889	limbs
7	29	+	17.92	1.3275	king □
8	6	+	17.07	3.5169	lion
9	5	+	16.37	3.9059	didst
10	12	+	16.23	2.1308	kings □
11	9	+	14.39	2.3715	wilt
12	5	+	14.37	3.5434	begot †
13	42	+	13.47	0.9149	on
14	6	+	12.91	2.8889	rascal
15	9	+	12.67	2.1862	arms △
16	5	+	11.44	3.0128	stir △
17	14	+	11.4	1.5621	mother †
18	6	+	11.39	2.6544	mouth
19	5	+	11.14	2.9584	courage
20	20	+	10.57	1.2134	men □
21	155	+	10.23	0.3887	of
22	252	+	10.22	0.2997	the
23	16	+	9.85	1.3253	away △
24	5	+	9.34	2.6258	bloody △
25	12	+	8.56	1.4449	whom
26	9	+	8.46	1.7033	face △
27	5	+	8.29	2.4279	damned
28	27	+	8.29	0.8936	like
29	67	+	8.2	0.5416	as
30	13	+	8.12	1.3369	doth
31	14	+	7.66	1.2387	hand △
32	11	+	7.66	1.4245	head △
33	6	+	7.06	1.954	seek
34	73	+	6.53	0.4584	this
35	8	+	6.48	1.5585	thine
36	35	+	6.41	0.6736	thee
37	5	+	6.04	1.9854	field
38	5	+	5.65	1.9059	lie
39	8	+	5.5	1.4141	get
40	7	+	5.39	1.5122	villain
41	11	+	5.34	1.1573	whose
42	39	+	5.16	0.5656	our
43	6	+	4.82	1.5501	follow
44	42	+	4.78	0.5216	if
45	6	+	4.65	1.5169	hang
46	6	+	4.56	1.5006	doubt
47	9	+	4.28	1.1434	right
48	12	+	4.22	0.9651	thus
49	5	+	4.16	1.584	city

Bastardy = †; Masculinity, hierarchy, feudalism = □; Battle, physicality = △

Table 10: Negative keywords for history bastard characters

Index	Total	Direction	LL	Log Ratio	Word
1	65	-	58.71	-1.1855	you
2	14	-	19.03	-1.4178	her
3	16	-	13.87	-1.1709	are
4	10	-	9.42	-1.2145	they
5	7	-	7.08	-1.2525	can
6	6	-	6.65	-1.3021	love
7	5	-	6.2	-1.3662	too
8	12	-	6.05	-0.923	good
9	40	-	5	-0.4852	have
10	86	-	4.81	-0.3296	my
11	110	-	4.54	-0.2842	a
12	9	-	4.44	-0.9145	which

References

Adair, Richard. 1996. *Courtship, Illegitimacy and Marriage in Early Modern England*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Anthony, Laurence. 2017. *AntConc* (Version 3.4.4) [Computer Software]. Tokyo, Japan: Waseda University. Available from http://www.laurenceanthony.net/software.

Bonavita, Helen Vella. 2017. *Illegitimacy and the National Family in Early Modern England*. Abingdon: Routledge.

Brezina, Vaclav. 2018. *Statistics in Corpus Linguistics: A Practical Guide*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Brome, Richard. 1652. *A Joviall Crew: Or The Merry Beggars*. London: I. Y. https://texts.earlyprint.org/works/A29637.xml.

Brome, Richard. 2014. *A Jovial Crew*. Edited by Tiffany Stern. Arden Early Modern Drama. London: Bloomsbury.

Brome, Richard, and Thomas Heywood. 1634. *The late Lancashire VVitches*. London: Thomas Harper. https://texts.earlyprint.org/works/A03258.xml.

Butler, Martin. 1984. *Theatre and Crisis, 1632-1642*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Culpeper, Jonathan. 2001. *Language and Characterisation: People in Plays and Other Texts*. Harlow: Longman.

Culpeper, Jonathan. 2014a. "Keywords and Characterization: An Analysis of Six Characters in *Romeo and Juliet*." In *Digital Literary Studies: Corpus Approaches to Poetry, Prose, and Drama*, edited by David L. Hoover, Jonathan Culpeper, and Kieran O'Halloran, 9-34. New York: Routledge.

Culpeper, Jonathan. 2014b. "Developing Keyness and Characterization: Annotation." In *Digital Literary Studies: Corpus Approaches to Poetry, Prose, and Drama*, edited by David L. Hoover, Jonathan Culpeper, and Kieran O'Halloran, 35-63. New York: Routledge.

Cumming, Geoff. 2012. *Understanding The New Statistics: Effect Sizes, Confidence Intervals, and Meta-Analysis*. London: Routledge.

Dowd, Michelle. 2015. *The Dynamics of Inheritance on the Shakespearean Stage*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Findlay, Alison. 1994. *Illegitimate Power: Bastards in Renaissance Drama*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Fox, Eleanor, and Martin Ingram. 2014. "Bridewell, Bawdy Courts and Bastardy in Early Seventeenth-Century London." In *Cohabitation and Non-Marital Births in England and Wales, 1600-2012*, edited by Rebecca Probert, 10-32. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Gabrielatos, Costas. 2018. "Keyness Analysis: Nature, Metrics and Techniques." In *Corpus Approaches to Discourse: A Critical Review*, edited by Charlotte Taylor and Anna Marchi, 225-58. Abingdon: Routledge.

Harbage, Alfred. 2013 [1989]. *The Annals of English Drama, 975-1700*. 3rd ed. Revised by Sylvia Stoler Wagonheim. Reprint, London: Routledge.

Hardie, Andrew. 2014. "Log Ratio – An Informal Introduction." ESRC Centre for Corpus Approaches to Social Science (CASS). Accessed May 26, 2020. http://cass.lancs.ac.uk/?p=1133.

Holdsworth, Roger. 2017. "Shakespeare and Middleton: A Chronology for 1605-6." In *The New Oxford Shakespeare: Authorship Companion*, edited by Gary Taylor and Gabriel Egan, 366-84. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Hunt, Maurice. 1997. "Shakespeare's *King Richard III* and the Problematics of Tudor Bastardy." *Papers on Language & Literature* 33, no. 2 (March): 115-41.

Lander, Jesse M. 2006. "William Shakespeare: The History Plays." In *The Oxford Encyclopedia of British Literature*, edited by David Scott Kastan, vol. 4 of 5, 489-94. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Macfarlane, Alan. 1980. "Illegitimacy and Illegitimates in English History." In *Bastardy and Its Comparative History: Studies in the History of Illegitimacy and Marital Nonconformism in Britain, France, Germany, Sweden, North America, Jamaica, and Japan*, edited by Peter Laslett, Karla Oosterveen, and Richard M. Smith, 71-85. London: Edward Arnold.

Markham, Gervase, and William Sampson. 1979. *A Critical Edition of The True Tragedy of Herod and Antipater (1622)*. Edited by Gordon Nicholas Ross. New York: Garland.

Middleton, Thomas. 1607. *The Revengers Tragædie*. London: G. ELD. https://texts.earlyprint.org/works/A13843.xml.

Neill, Michael. 2000a. "'In Everything Illegitimate': Imagining the Bastard in English Renaissance Drama." In *Putting History to the Question: Power, Politics, and Society in English Renaissance Society*, 127-48. New York: Columbia University Press.

Neill, Michael. 2000b. "Bastardy, Counterfeiting and Misogyny in *The Revenger's Tragedy*." In *Putting History to the Question: Power, Politics, and Society in English Renaissance Society*, 149-65. New York: Columbia University Press.

Piper, Andrew. 2015. "Novel Devotions: Conversional Reading, Computational Modeling, and the Modern Novel." *New Literary History* 46, no. 1: 63-98.

Rayson, Paul, Damon Berridge, and Brian Francis. 2004. "Extending the Cochran Rule for the Comparison of Word Frequencies between Corpora." Paper presented at the 7th International Conference on Statistical Analysis of Textual Data / Journées internationales d'Analyse statistique des Données Textuelles (JADT 2004), Louvain-la-Neuve, Belgium, March 10-12, 2004, 926-36. Accessed May 26, 2020. https://eprints.lancs.ac.uk/id/eprint/12424/1/rbf04_jadt.pdf.

Saeger, James P. 2001. "Illegitimate Subjects: Performing Bastardy in King John." The Journal of English and German Philology 100, no. 1 (January): 1-21. https://www.jstor.org/stable/27712026.

Shakespeare, William. 1623. *King John*. Folger Shakespeare Library. Accessed 26 May, 2020. https://shakespeare.folger.edu/shakespeares-works/king-john.

Shakespeare, William. 1623. *King Lear*. Folger Shakespeare Library. Accessed 26 May, 2020. https://shakespeare.folger.edu/shakespeares-works/king-lear.

Shepard, Alexandra. 2013. "Brokering Fatherhood: Illegitimacy and Paternal Rights and Responsibilities in Early Modern England." In *Remaking English Society: Social Relations and Social Change in Early Modern England*, edited by Steve Hindle, Alexandra Shepard, and John Walter, 41-64. Woodbridge: Boydell & Brewer.

Slights, Camille. 2009. "When Is a Bastard Not a Bastard? Character and Conscience in *King John*." In *Shakespeare and Character: Theory, History, Performance, and Theatrical Persons*, edited by Paul Yachnin and Jessica Slights, 214-31. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Steggle, Matthew. 2004. *Richard Brome: Place and Politics on the Caroline Stage*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Swinburne, Henry. 1590. *A Briefe Treatise of Testaments and Last Willes*. London: John Windet. https://quod.lib.umich.edu/e/eebo2/A13252.0001.001.

Van de Water, Julia C. 1960. "The Bastard in *King John*." *Shakespeare Quarterly* 11, no. 2 (Spring): 137-46. https://www.jstor.org/stable/2867202.

Zunshine, Lisa. 2005. *Bastards and Foundlings: Illegitimacy in Eighteenth-Century England*. Columbus: Ohio State University Press.