

Who
was the REAL
Shakespeare? See
fascinating evidence at

bard.link

= *shakespeare*
oxford
fellowship
.org



the true author was
Edward de Vere,
17th Earl of
Oxford.

place
these circles
as bulletin board
stickers, ads in small
publications and online, etc.

for now
this QR code
is only a dummy

[QR code = [bard.link](#) lands here, mobile-optimized]



Exploring the evidence that the works of Shakespeare
were written by Edward de Vere, 17th Earl of Oxford

NEW EXCITEMENT ABOUT SHAKESPEARE

From massively abundant suggestive evidence which we invite everyone to examine for themselves with an open mind, we are strongly of the view that Edward de Vere, 17th Earl of Oxford (1550-1604), was true author of the works long attributed to William Shakespeare (1564-1616). Why does this matter? It matters because learning about Oxford's eventful life and times in the court of Queen Elizabeth I vastly enriches our understanding of the works, as we find extraordinary new connections and meanings, stunning new insights and revelations. These enhance even further, ever further, our already boundless love and admiration for the works. It has been creating a wonderful, momentous new era of rediscovery of Shakespeare. ***Join us!***

WHY DID HE WRITE AS "SHAKESPEARE"?

Oxford was mercurial in nature...brilliant...scandal-prone...tempestuously prominent in the court of Queen Elizabeth (1533-1603) where he had certain archrivals whom he lampooned in some of his works, including plays performed before royal gatherings. In effect he made his adversaries laughingstocks in front of the queen and the entire royal court. Sometimes he even satirized the queen herself, which we believe she tolerated and even enjoyed because she was fond of him. But all this could only work as "inside jokes". Disclosure of courtier Oxford as the playwright would have enabled gossipy outsiders to put 2 plus 2 together easily to figure out who he was making fun of, which might have subjected targeted nobles to derision far and wide...not to mention, the monarch! Therefore Oxford's identity as author had to be suppressed absolutely in favor of, supposedly, William Shakspere of Stratford-upon-Avon, a harmless ordinary citizen, businessman and sometimes theater investor and actor but who, so far as we know, never set foot in the royal court. Remarkably: certain influential family members of embarrassed courtiers gained control over Oxford's plays and other works after his death in 1604. Evidently they could tell the works were exceptional and might be very profitable to finance as a print run, but also they were fiercely determined to protect their loved ones' posthumous reputations permanently. Therefore, even though Oxford was now no longer living, they avidly preserved and reaffirmed the authorship myth right up through publication of the "Shakespeare" First Folio in 1623.

REALLY? THAT STRATFORD FELLOW WASN'T THE TRUE AUTHOR?

From town records, the last will and testament of William Shakspere (notice the spelling, different from "Shakespeare") (1564-1616) of Stratford-upon-Avon shows his estate had no books in it or any elements of writing and literature. Researchers have never found a single letter he wrote to anyone during his entire lifetime. None of his in-laws or friends or associates ever referred to him in their own correspondence or anywhere as being a writer. We believe he was completely illiterate, as were his parents, wife, and children. When he died in 1616, no one in literary circles paid any attention. These indications and many more, which scholars don't dispute, appear to render laughable any notion that Shakspere was author of the greatest works in the English language.

AS WITH GALILEO'S TELESCOPE: "LOOK AND SEE FOR YOURSELF"

Like Libri and Cremonini who, around 1610, reportedly refused to look through Galileo's telescope to see for themselves his discoveries they disparaged as being impossible, most in the worldwide literary+stage establishment, and in the mass media, categorically reject any discussion or inquiry whatsoever into whether Oxford may have been the true Bard. I.e. after four centuries the durable "Shakespeare" ruse is still working just as originally intended! But rather than taking our word for any of this, everyone should merely evaluate for themselves the extensive, largely uncontroverted evidence we point to. Soon everyone will understand that acknowledging Oxford as the true author is going to enhance, not detract from, studies of the Shakespearean canon for all ages to come.

<https://shakespeareoxfordfellowship.org/discover-shakespeare>