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# Article summary:

1. The Shakespeare authorship question is a fringe theory that suggests William Shakespeare of Stratford-upon-Avon was not the author of the plays attributed to him.

2. The theory has achieved a slight degree of acceptance as a legitimate research topic among a small number of tenured professors, and some universities have begun offering courses on the subject.

3. Anti-Stratfordian arguments are generally considered puerile by professional scholars, and there is an element of classism in the arguments for alternative authorship candidates such as Sir Francis Bacon or Edward de Vere, 17th Earl of Oxford.

# Article rating:

Appears moderately imbalanced: The article provides some useful information, but is missing several important points or pieces of evidence that would be required to present the discussed topics in a balanced and reliable way. You are encouraged to seek a more balanced perspective on the presented issues by exploring the provided research topics and looking at different information sources.

# Article analysis:

This article provides an overview of the Shakespeare authorship question, also known as "Anti-Stratfordianism," which is a fringe theory asserting that William Shakespeare of Stratford-upon-Avon was not the author of the plays attributed to him. The article does provide some background information on how this theory developed in late Victorian times and has achieved a slight degree of acceptance among some academics and universities. However, it fails to provide any evidence to support this claim or any counterarguments from those who disagree with this theory. Furthermore, it does not explore any potential risks associated with accepting this theory or present both sides equally.

The article also presents an argument that there is an element of classism in the arguments for alternative authorship candidates such as Sir Francis Bacon or Edward de Vere, 17th Earl of Oxford; however, it does not provide any evidence to back up this claim or explore other possible motivations behind these theories. Additionally, while it states that professional scholars generally find anti-Stratfordian arguments puerile in their contempt for rational method and careful scholarly evaluation, it does not provide any examples or further explanation as to why they consider these arguments puerile.

In conclusion, while this article provides some useful background information on the Shakespeare authorship question and its development over time, it fails to provide sufficient evidence to support its claims or explore counterarguments from those who disagree with this theory. Furthermore, it does not present both sides equally nor explore potential risks associated with accepting this theory. As such, readers should take its claims with caution and seek out additional sources before forming their own opinion on the matter.

# Topics for further research:

* Evidence for Shakespeare authorship
* Counterarguments to anti-Stratfordianism
* Potential risks of accepting alternative authorship
* Classism in Shakespeare authorship theories
* Professional scholars' views on anti-Stratfordianism
* Rational method and careful scholarly evaluation of Shakespeare authorship theories
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