

Question 14

If Shakespeare is a fraud, what about the historical evidence?

AJ Leon

What I cannot understand is the way people who say he didn't write the work have to ignore all the evidence that shows he did.

Let's get this story straight.

We are not talking about a belief that can be interpreted differently depending on our point of view. The evidence for William Shakespeare of Stratford-upon-Avon is not circumstantial. It is factual and multi-faceted.

Sure, we don't have personal letters or diary entries, but that's not at all unusual for people of that period.

At least fourteen other writers mentioned him by name as a playwright and poet and discussed his work. Printers and publishers worked with him. Seven of his plays were co-authored for God's sake. Readers, actors, and theatre audiences were part of the living and breathing testimony of thousands of people. On his death he was memorialized as a writer, and his reputation grew.

To claim that Shakespeare of Stratford didn't write the plays is no less than to deny history and slap the greatest writer the world has ever known in the face.