

# 10 REASONS WHY SHAKSPERE WAS NOT SHAKESPEARE

by Paul Streitz



## 1. There Was No Person Named “Shakespeare”

“Gulielmus filius Iohannes Shakspere” (William son of John Shakspere) was Christened on April 23, 1564. This family name was used consistently on church and legal documents before and after his death. The name “Shakespeare” first appears in 1593 with the publication of *Venus and Adonis*.

## 2. Shakspere Was Not Literate

There are no letters from him to anyone. There are no journals, memos or notes written by him. Not a sentence can be found in his handwriting. His signatures appear to be by several different legal clerks who were authorized to sign legal documents for illiterates. His daughter was illiterate.



## 3. Shakspere Was Not An Actor

There are no playbills, acting company records, reviews of his performances, letters, diaries or any other such evidence that Shakespeare was an actor or a prominent actor. “William Shakespeare” in the First Folio ahead of known prominent actors is deliberately misleading.

## 4. The “Sweet Swan Of Avon” May or May Not Refer To Shakspere

There are several Avon Rivers in England. Nothing links the First Folio to any particular Avon River.

## 5. Shakspere Was Not Recognized by Anyone As An Author

There are no accounts by any townspeople of the famous writer. His son-in-law was a doctor who wrote a book in Latin, but never made mention of his father-in-law. There are no contemporary letters, advertisements, diaries or public notices that refer to the man from Stratford-upon-Avon as an author.

## 6. The Statue Now In The Stratford-upon-Avon Church Is A Fraud

The first original and second statues show a man holding a woolsack. When Stratford-upon-Avon became a tourist destination, the town fathers erected a fraudulent statute of a man holding a pen.

## 7. The Engraving On The First Folio Is Not A Portrait of Anyone

The engraving on the First Folio is a caricature with an unnaturally high forehead and one shoulder on backwards. “Honest” Ben Jonson says “look not on his picture, but his book.”

## 8. Shakspere Did Not Have The Necessary Knowledge of Latin and Greek

Supporters of the man from Stratford say that he made mistakes, like having a clock strike in ancient Rome. Oxford’s deep reading of Latin and Greek made him aware that there were water clocks since ancient Greece that struck the time in major cities. Shakespeare’s knowledge of the classics was superb, not simply a perfunctory knowledge of grammar school Latin.

## 9. Shakspere Never Went To Italy

Professor Ernesto Grillo, of the University of Glasgow, wrote that Shakespeare went to Italy. “Shakespeare’s accurate knowledge of the geography of Italy is all the more noteworthy as it contrasts strikingly with his ignorance of other European countries, France, for example.”

## 10. The Works of Shakespeare Do Not Reflect the Life of a Rural Man

Delia Bacon says Shakespeare, “carries the court influence with him, unconsciously, wherever he goes. He looks into Arden and Eastcheap from the court standpoint, not from these into the court.” When Shakespeare portrays a non-aristocrat, they are comic characters, foils or buffoons. None of the works portray the interests or concerns of a rural man of England.

**Paul Streitz** is the author of *Oxford: Son of Queen Elizabeth I*. The book states that Edward de Vere, 17<sup>th</sup> Earl of Oxford was the man behind the pen name, William Shakespeare, and further, that he was the son of Queen Elizabeth I and her stepfather, Thomas Seymour.