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**ABSTRACT**

Critics have always connected Bajazet’s character in Nicholas Rowe’s *Tamerlane* with Louis XIV of France. Indeed, Louis does share various ideological views with Rowe’s character, a factor that validates such an association. However, I propose to offer another reading of Bajazet’s character and argue that he stands for James II of England rather than for the French monarch. English images of Muslim Turks have always exhibited a general demonization. Most of the time they are portrayed as cruel tyrants and sexual transgressors. This attitude has a long and deeply rooted tradition in Europe as it can be traced back to the early Medieval period, when it found its way onto the stage and dramatists employed Muslims and Turks as allegorical figures in order to comment on sensitive political and religious issues with impunity. In an attempt to undermine the Catholic Stuart James II and champion the Protestant cause through William III, Rowe employs Bajazet to perfection. He uses him as a vehicle to exhibit James’ position as a political and religious threat to his own people. To achieve this he changes the character of the historical Bayazed I and allows him to display James’ political and moral faults. These faults have been accentuated through establishing a contrast between the character Bajazet and his enemy Tamerlane who has long been associated with William III of England.

**Keywords:** Bajazet’s, Nicholas Rowe, Louis XIV.

When *Tamerlane* was first staged in December 1701 the political–religious conflict between the Catholic Stuarts and their Protestant subjects was far from being resolved. James II died on September 16th 1701, just a few months before the performance of the play and after doomed attempts to restore himself to the throne. On his death, Louis XIV recognized James’ Catholic heir, Prince Edward Francis as James III of England. The Whigs, who supported the Glorious Revolution of 1688, and to some extent the Tories, were determined to keep James and his Catholic heirs away from the English Throne. Like the Whigs, William III, who was crowned along with Mary, James II’s daughter, as joint ruler in 1689, was committed to the Protestant cause in England. Moreover, the majority of Protestant English people supported the Glorious Revolution and the coronation of William whom they saw as the protector of their religious and political freedom. In his dedication to *Tamerlane*, Rowe writes:
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Some people...have fancy’d, that in the person of Tamerlane I have alluded to the greatest Character of the present Age [King William III]. There are many Features, 'tis true, in that Great Man’s Life, not unlike His Majesty: His Courage, his piety, his Moderation, and his Fatherly Love of his people, but above all, his Hate of Tyranny and Oppression. Rowe insists that his Tamerlane has not been designed to stand for William III. However, he argues that he is aware of the common ground between the historical Timurlink and William III that encourages “some people” to make such an association. In spite of the fact that Rowe elaborated upon the possible connections between his theatrical figure Tamerlane and William III, he refrains from associating Bajazet with any specific historical figure. As a result critics have speculated about the real man behind the dramatic Persona and conclude that Bajazet stands for Louis XIV of France (1638–1715). John Loftis believes that Bajazet is the “allegorical eulogy of Louis XIV.” Douglas Canfield states, “It is at least certain that there is an analogy between Bajazet and Louis XIV.” Indeed Louis
shares various ideological beliefs with Rowe’s Bajazet, a factor that validates the association. However, I propose to offer another reading of Bajazet’s character and argue that he stands for James II of England, rather than Louis XIV of France. We need to keep in mind that when Rowe was writing his play James was still alive and the Jacobites posed a serious threat to the shaky political and religious stability of England. The English were experiencing serious internal tensions as a result of deposing their legitimate king and crowning the foreign William of Orange as William III of England. To ease the situation, the government was in need of propaganda to win people’s support for their own measures. This being the case, it was more logical to address this problem by undermining its main cause James II (Bajazet) and, by association, his Catholic heirs, and to promote William. It is worth noting that William was unpopular among his new subjects for his lack of sociability, … his preference for old friends from the Netherlands over Britons, and for the endless drain of resources to maintain his wars. 

Therefore, it was necessary to promote William’s moral and political superiority through constructing a contrast between him and the legitimate monarch, James II, he was replacing. In such a context, the French Louis stands as a distant threat rather than an immediate one like James and his Catholic heirs. Another factor that would render my argument regarding the historical figure behind Bajazet feasible is the political conduct of both James and Louis. Louis was one of the most powerful and feared monarchs in Europe who turned France into a modern State. He was a skilled politician who valued advice and surrounded himself with professional men to help him run the country. As a result, during his reign France achieved not only military and political pre-eminence but also cultural dominance. The same thing could not be said about James who, as Duke of York, was far from satisfactory. In fact he was less worthy than his brother Charles II, who in spite of his faults, was a charming man. After the Restoration, the King his brother appointed him Lord High Admiral, a post which he did not take seriously. He showed no interest in his military duties and he failed to prevent the humiliating defeat of the English in the Second (1665–1667) and Third (1672–1674) Anglo-Dutch Wars. 

W. A. Speck argues that James allowed the Navy to disintegrate through promoting men who were loyal to the Stuarts but had no merits. When he resigned from the Navy in 1673, it was in such a state of decay that it ranked third behind the French and the Dutch. The same year James declared that he was a Roman Catholic and married the Catholic Mary of Modena. His actions increased the tension and led to the Exclusion Crisis in which Parliament and the Commons insisted on excluding him from Succession. As a King, James’ performance was disastrous: he “aimed for Popery and arbitrary power.” By 1700 there was a feeling that if the Catholic Stuarts regained the throne, England would become part of a totalitarian French Empire.

To warn the people against restoration of the Stuarts, Rowe ensures that Bajazet embodies many of James II’s notorious moral shortcomings and unpopular political views. As a method to emphasize James’ faults, undermine the Stuarts’ claims to the English Throne, and champion William III and the Protestant cause, Rowe constructs a moral and political contrast between his two characters (Bajazet/James II and Tamerlane/ William III).

In search of a savior:

To solve the political and religious unrest of the period, England was in desperate need of a savior. The middle-class Rowe who was known for his “Whig principles [and]…love of…freedom” attempts to create a dramatic hero fit for their contemporary scene.

His Tamerlane turns out to be a subtle execution of the political desire of the Whigs who believed that their own principles were the only way to assert Britannia’s religious and political independence. Rowe executes his propaganda through a deliberate manipulation of historical figures, distant in time, culture and ideology. His historical figures were from the Muslim East of the fourteenth century. Bayazed, the Ottoman Sultan (1389–1402) appears as the tyrant King Bajazet. The Mongol conqueror, Timurlink (1336–1405) becomes Rowe’s virtuous protagonist Tamerlane. Given the political condition when Rowe was writing his play and the very nature of his chosen historical figures and the roles they played in European history, we can conclude that his choice was calculated and far from being accidental.

Between 1396 and 1402 Bayazed besieged Constantinople intermittently; the threat was so serious that the Europeans feared the extinction of the Eastern Empire. When Bayazed was threatening the Christian Domain, Timurlink was advancing swiftly across Asia Minor. In 1400, he appeared in Syria and destroyed
Allepo; Damascus’ bloody fate was sealed in January 1401. He defeated Bayazed at the battle of Angora in 1402.\textsuperscript{17} By defeating the Ottomans, Timurlink saved Europe and delayed the fall of Constantinople until 1453 by the hand of Bayazed’s great grandson, Sultan Mohammad the Conqueror.\textsuperscript{18} This historical event renders Timurlink to be a savior similar to William III who delivered the English from James’ Popery and arbitrary power. As a sign of gratitude, Europe overlooked Timurlink’s barbaric and bloody wars and turned him into an ideal military hero.\textsuperscript{19} By contrast, Bayazed stands for arbitrary power, tyranny and destructiveness.

Rowe’s audience were familiar with the story of Timurlink, the Ottomans’ threats and the long history of hostility and competition between Muslims and Christians.\textsuperscript{20} The English believed that Bayazed represented a hostile religion which was a threat to Protestantism, as was Catholicism.\textsuperscript{21} This concept explains the frequent dramatization of Mohammed as a Catholic Cardinal “who was thwarted in his ambition to become Pope.”\textsuperscript{22} Fourteenth-century Bayazed’s religious and political background renders him suitable to stand for the Catholic James II who in late seventeenth-century England posed a serious threat to the religious and political liberties of his Protestant subjects.

In the Prologue to \textit{Tamerlane}, the picture of the Turkish monarch is far from flattering, for he

\begin{verbatim}
Like spreading Flame, deform’d the Nations round:
With Sword and Fire he forc’d their impious way
To Lawless pow’r, and Universal Sway:
\end{verbatim}

Bajazet is an impious, arbitrary tyrant who enjoys destroying and humiliating other nations. This picture is typical of the medieval and early modern account of the Ottoman Sultans who were depicted as “…figure[s] of tyranny, pride, and pomp leading an evil empire in a violent effort to conquer Christendom and extinguish the true faith.”\textsuperscript{23} In stark contrast to this hellish picture stands the heavenly Tamerlane who

\begin{verbatim}
High with the foremost Names in Arms he stood,
Had fought, and suffer’d for his Country’s good,
Yet sought not Fame, but peace, in Fields of Blood.
\end{verbatim}

Rowe’s Tamerlane is a devoted and selfless ruler who seeks peace even in war. This flattering dramatic picture is historically inaccurate. Timurlink was notorious for his extremely bloody and barbaric wars. Ibn Taghribirdi (H812–874), whose father was an officer in the Syrian force that defended Damascus, recorded that Timurlink’s invasion of the city and that of Aleppo was savage in the extreme. In Aleppo, Timurlink massacred the inhabitants and built several towers of their skulls. Ibn Taghribirdi reports that the Tartars

\begin{verbatim}
…put the populace of Aleppo and its troops to the sword, until the mosques and streets were filled with dead, and Aleppo stank with corpses.\textsuperscript{25}
\end{verbatim}

Ahmed Ibn Muhammed Ibn Arabshah, the renowned Arab historian who was born in Damascus in 1392, witnessed the destruction of his city by Timurlink. A boy of twelve, he was taken prisoner along with his mother to Samarkand, Timurlink’s capital. His book, \textit{Ajaib al-maqdur fi akhbar Timur}, which appeared in Leiden in 1636, is a testimony of the savagery of the Tartar leader.\textsuperscript{26} Timurlink was responsible for the slaughter of hundreds of thousands of men, women and children. His massacres were frequent, “…more obviously sadistic and often served no apparent purpose.”\textsuperscript{27}

Apparently, Rowe’s prologue ignored these historical facts which were well known in Europe by the early sixteenth century. The prologue sets the mode of the historical figures’ dramatic presentation: Bajazet is turned into a political and moral transgressor.

\begin{verbatim}
Hunting Leviathan:
\end{verbatim}

Bajazet emerges as an ardent defender of an extreme version of patriarchal monarchy. As a captive, he tells Tamerlane, “…art thou a King/ Possest of Sacred Pow’r, Heav’n’s darling Attribute.” His words draw the audience’s attention to the current political situation which is marked by the conflict between the Stuarts’ desire for an absolute monarchy and the people’s desire for a constitutional one. To the Stuarts, patriarchy is not only a political ideology but also a religious belief as
Catholicism insists on passive obedience and absolute monarchy. In John Ayloff’s Britannia and Raleigh (1674–5), Britannia tells Raleigh, “too long in vain I’ve tri’d/ The Stuart from the tyrant to divide.” She concludes by promising England, “No pois’nous tyrant on thy ground shall live”(II.1). The insistence of the Stuarts upon sacred rule (absolutism) was behind the Civil War of 1642–51 which resulted in the beheading of Charles I in 1649. The same reason was behind the Glorious Revolution of 1688 and the deposition of James II. To confirm his belief in the absolute power of the monarch, Bajazet continues:

Can a King want a Cause when Empire bids
Go on? What is he born for but Ambition?
It is his Hunger, ’tis his Call of Nature,
The noble Appetite which will be satisfi’d
And like the Food of Gods, makes him Immortal. (II.2)

Bajazet boasts of “Ambition,” “Hunger,” “Call of Nature,” “Appetite” and “Immortal [ity].” The way he chooses to express himself is derived from Thomas Hobbes’ Leviathan (1651) which favors absolute government. Hobbes’ political construct champions the Leviathan, a supreme sovereign who has the right to absolute authority and command over his people. After 1680 Hobbes was perceived as the “pontifex maximus.” Hobbes’ “materialism and peculiar religious doctrines offended the Anglicans” who considered him an atheist. Furthermore, his support of absolute sovereignty was highly resented and a massive body of anti-Hobbesian writings found its way to the press. Rowe employs the typical negative image of Ottoman emperors and turns Bajazet into a Leviathan in order to bring him close to James II who, like his father Charles I, had no conception of a monarchy that was not absolute. The French envoy Bonrepaus believed that James “has all the faults of the King his Father, but he has less sense.” Barrillon, the French ambassador in his court, reported that “the King of England openly expresses his joy at being in a position to exercise his authority.” To be fully aware of Rowe’s political manipulation of his audience, we should consider the historical Bayazed. In Richard Knolles’ The General Histori of the Turkes (1603), Timurlink’s invasion of the Muslim East and the defeat of the Turkish Sultan Bayazed I in the battle of Angora and the defeat of James II who, like his father Charles I, had no conception of a monarchy that was not absolute. The French envoy Bonrepaus believed that James “has all the faults of the King his Father, but he has less sense.” Barrillon, the French ambassador in his court, reported that “the King of England openly expresses his joy at being in a position to exercise his authority.” To be fully aware of Rowe’s political manipulation of his audience, we should consider the historical Bayazed.
Make thy Demand to those that own thy power,
Know I am still beyond it; and tho’ Fortune
(Curse on that Changeling Deity of Fools!)
Has stript me of the Train, and Pomp of
Greatness, ..., yet still my Soul,
Fix high, and of it self alone dependent
Is ever free, and royal…(II.1)

Bajazet does believe in his superior nature which is
directly connected to the concept of sacred monarchy and
absolute power. In the light of this, his refusal to submit
to Tamerlane in spite of his defeat and captivity is not to
be perceived as a mark of free spirit but of defiance of the
moral norms and above all of the will of God. It is worth
noting that arrogance is a moral defect which Bajazet
shares with James II. In the dispatches of the French
ambassadors, Barrillon and Bonrepaus, the most
frequently mentioned element of the king’s character is
“hauteur.” To the French diplomats the English king did
not have his late brother’s easy-going manners, as he was
noted for his extreme arrogance and haughtiness.38 His
arrogance tragically manifested itself through his refusal
to show respect for the Church of England and his
insistence on converting his Protestant subjects to the
deply resented Catholicism.

On the other hand, Tamerlane distances himself from
Bajazet and displays a humble nature. He stresses his
entity as a human being. He tells Bajazet, “I think like a
Man,/Thou like a Monster.” To bridge the gap between
himself as a king and his best friend, the Christian Prince
Axalla, he tells him,
Oh! Axalla!/ Could I forget I am a Man, as thou
art,
Would not the Winter’s Cold, or Summer’s
Heat,
Sickness, or Thirst, and Hunger, all the Train
Of Nature’s clamorous Appetites (asserting
An equal Right in Kings, and common Men)
Reprove me daily? (II.2)

Obviously, Tamerlane is desperate to prove that being
a king does not make him less of a common man. He
rejects not only the status of kingship but also that of
army leadership. Conventionally, army leaders attribute
to themselves the military victories of their soldiers; however, Tamerlane proves to be an exception. He
rejects to accept the honor of defeating Bajazet. When
his officers attribute to him their victory, he tells them:
It is too much, you dress me
Like an Usurper in the borrow’d Attributes

Of Injur’d Heav’n: Can we call Conquest ours?
Shall Man, this pigmy with a Gyant’s pride,
Vaunt of himself, and say, Thus have I done
this?
Oh! Vain pretence to Greatness! (II.1)

He believes that accepting such honor is an injury to
God and man. As the instrument of Heaven, he cannot be
held responsible for the victory. At the same time, he
cannot deny the role of his soldiers whose bravery and
sacrifices make Bajazet’s defeat possible. This reverence
for Heaven and respect for his soldiers are merits which
Bajazet does not possess; his arrogance makes it
impossible to acknowledge any power above his own.

Rowe’s Bajazet is marked by an autocratic temper;
one of his former slaves reports the “Tyrant’s” redoubled
rage. He talks about “Some accidental Passion [that] fires
his Breast,/ And adds new Horror to his native Fury”
(I.1). Zama confirms:
I know his Temper well, since, in his Court,
Companion of the brave Axalla’s Embassy,
I oft observ’d him,…Impatient
Fond of…ruling without Reason…(I.1)
The picture we have of Bajazet is so close to James
who was liable to sudden bursts of anger. Bonrepaus once
reported that the “King is [not] so self-controlled.”39 One
contemporary letter which was believed to have been
written by William Penn reads: “Every mechanic knows
the temper of his Majesty, who will never Receive a
baffle in anything that he heartily espouseth.”40

Unlike Bajazet, Tamerlane displays remarkable self
control. One of his princes informs us that, “No Lust of
Rule, (the common Vice of Kings)/ E’er drew his
temperate Courage to the Field”(I.1). Bajazet notices
Tamerlane’s temperate nature and attempts to undermine
him by calling him “tame king” and “preaching dervish.”
Bajazet’s belittling of Tamerlane’s character serves to
emphasize his own tyranny. Indeed Tamerlane proves
himself to be a genuine preaching dervish: when faced
with an attempt against his life, he pardons the dervish
who tries to kill him:
Now learn the difference ’twixt thy Faith and
mine:
Thine bids thee lift thy Dagger to my Throat,
Mine can forgive the Wrong, and bid thee live.
(III.2)

The dervish is a Muslim Turk whose faith, in the eyes of the English audience is, similar to Catholicism, marked by a lack of tolerance and by violence. Tamerlane’s religious tolerance which has been manifested through his forgiveness of the zealous dervish can remind the audience of the Toleration Act of 1689 which had been passed immediately after the Coronation of William III. William, who was largely considered to be a Protestant champion in Europe, encouraged the passing of the Act that guaranteed religious toleration to certain Protestant nonconformists. On a personal level he permitted James II to safely leave England for France.

Effeminacy is one of Bajazet’s shortcomings. During the Restoration effeminacy stood for sexual enslavement to women and political incompetence. The initial information we receive about Bajazet is that he is passionately in love with a fair Grecian captive and that

For five returning Suns, Scarce was he seen
By any the most favour’d of his Court;
But in lascivious Ease, amongst his Women,
Liv’d …(I.1)

In this context, the Emperor is a slave to his sexual desires to the extent that he ignores his duties as a political and military leader. A prince in Tamerlane’s quarters observes that Bajazet

Liv’d from the War retir’d; or else, alone
In sullen mood fate meditating plagues,
And Ruin to the World, till yester Morn
Like Fire that lab’ring upwards rends the Earth,
He burst with Fury from his Tent, Commanding
All should be ready for the fight, this Day. (I.1)

Indeed Bajazet’s inability to act with responsibility causes his military defeat, subsequent humiliation and captivity. However, the historical Bayazed was defeated not because he was an irresponsible libertine but because his army was outnumbered by that of Timurlink. The Turks called him “Yildirim, the lighting Bolt,” as he had the ability to move swiftly from one battle in Asia to another in Europe. Ahmed ibn Arabshah reported on Bayazed’s noble character in his well known biography. Knolles reports that Bayazed was “most skilful in Martial Affairs…[and] Ambitious beyond measures.” Rowe had a copy of the 1603 edition since it appeared on the auction list of his own library after his death. Obviously Rowe’s dramatization of Bayazed as an effeminate figure does not correspond to the surviving account provided by his enemies and friends alike. Rowe intends to bring his dramatic Bajazet close to James II whose “royal effeminacy was not just… [a] moral…, but also…[a] political one.” The Earl of Rochester, John Wilmot has associated effeminacy with Charles II and his brother and heir, James. In one of the poems that caused his banishment, he writes:

His scepter and his prick are of a length,
And she may sway the one who plays with t’other
And make him little wiser than his brother.

Indeed James proved himself unwise. Rowe’s audience would not have found it difficult to recall James who had the reputation of being a committed libertine, incompetent politician and irresponsible military leader. During the Restoration, libertinism was the dominant theme as it was constantly associated with the Stuart brothers, Charles and James. We should keep in mind that, during the Restoration, libertinism was more than sexual freedom. Sue Owen argues that “hypocrisy, bad faith, double standards, predatoriness, and sexism are at the heart of libertinism.” Like the dramatic Bajazet, James neglected his duties only to chase women and indulge his sexual desires. He was dedicated to the “seduction of the wives of nobility and gentry.” This factor motivated the Venetian politician, Count de Grammont, to report that James “applies himself but little to the affairs of the country.”

Unlike Bajazet, Tamerlane is not effeminate. He does not seem to have any particular interest in women as he does not have a beloved. By denying him a beloved, Rowe defies dramatic conventions: a hero of his dramatic stature is supposed to be in the middle of a love story that adds to the complexity of the plot and reveals his human side. He encounters two beautiful captives, the daughter (Salima) and Queen (Arpasia) of his enemy. Tamerlane does not take advantage of their vulnerable positions; he treats them nobly. When Salima attempts to thank him for his “noble Usage,” he prevents her and insists that it is his duty to pay her homage. He says, “Pays Homage, not receives it from the Fair.” He offers her a safe place and honorable treatment:

Here, till the Fate of Asia is decided,
In safety stay. To Morrow is your own:
Nor grieve for who may conquer, or who lose;
Fortune on either side shall wait thy Wishes. (I.2)

When Tamerlane realizes that Arpazia is Bajazet’s queen, he immediately restores her to her husband. He
tells the Greek Moneses:

This morn a Soldier brought a Captive Beauty,
Sad, tho’ she seem’d, yet of a Form most rare,
By much the noblest Spoil of all the Field:
Ev’n Scipio, or a Victor yet more cold,
Might have forgot his Vertue, at her sight.
Struck with pleasing Wonder, I behold her,
Till by a Slave that waited near her person,
I learnt she was the Captive Sultan’s Wife;
Strait I forbid my Eyes the dangerous joy
Of gazing long, and sent her to her Lord. (III.2)

Tamerlane makes it clear that he is aware of Arpasia’s “rare” beauty and its temptation. However, his self-control proves to be strong enough to withstand the “dangerous joy.” His encounter with these two women in particular is meant to glorify his moral stance and his ability to control his sexual desires. Tamerlane’s generous treatment of Arpasia is in sharp contrast to that of Bajazet who has taken advantage of her position as a captive and wed her against her will. Refusing to be his queen she calls him barbarian and ravisher. She tells him:

Thou that has violated all Respects
Due to my Sex, and Honour of my Birth,
Thou brutal Ravisher! That hast undone me, (V.1)

Tamerlane is competent not only in controlling his sexual desires but also in executing his duties as a political and military leader. He strikes a balance between politics and war. As a politician he is aware of the destructive effect of the “furious War…[and] its bloody Front” on ordinary people. He tells Bajazet:

Yet would I chuse to fix my Fame by peace,
By Justice, and by Mercy, and to raise
My Trophies on the Blessings of Mankind;
Nor would I buy the Empire of the World
With ruin of the people whom I sway, (II.2)

Whereas Bajazet considers war as a “noble Appetite” that has an immortalizing effect, Tamerlane perceives it as a necessity that should be avoided if possible. To

Tamerlane, the soldier, the “End of war” is

…to redress an Injur’d people’s Wrongs,
To save the weak one from the strong Oppressor, (I.1)

Tamerlane the warrior goes to war with his people and soldiers in mind. His soldiers are immensely valued. Zama testifies:

E’er the mid Hour of Night, from Tent to Tent,
Unweary’d, thro’ the num’rous Host he past,
Viewing with careful Eyes each several Quarter; (I.1)

His soldiers are not anonymous figures who might die at the end of the day. They are individuals whose lives and well-being are valued. Such an attitude undermines Bajazet (James II) and his uninspiring military conduct. It also explains the reasons behind Tamerlane’s victory, Bajazet’s defeat and subsequent death. Surely this defeat would allow Rowe’s audience to remember the Battle of the Boyne in which William defeated James. Bajazet’s subsequent death in captivity would give them the hope of an end for the Stuarts’ aspiration to regain the throne of England.

Hope for the failure of the Stuarts’ attempts to be restored is at the heart of Tamerlane. With the help of the Tartar conqueror Timurlink and the Ottoman emperor Bayazed, Rowe constructs an intricate dramatization of the political and religious crises of his own time and the Whig solution for these crises which depends upon the impeachment of the Catholic Stuarts. In spite of Rowe’s attempt to screen his aim through denying any connection between William III and Tamerlane, his choice of dramatic personas with their particular historical, political and religious implications proves to be eloquent enough to ensure the delivery of his Whig message. The audience are tactfully guided to endorse the solution. Islam plays a decisive factor in enticing the audience’s condemnation of the Catholic Stuarts. Rowe turns his Muslim Bajazet into a central factor whose role reaches beyond the dramatic factors to embrace the ideological elements. Through his faulty character, Bajazet undermines the Catholic James II and stresses the divine qualities of William III, the protector of the Protestant cause.
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