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**Abstract**

This article focuses on a dream embedded within a description of the conversion and baptism of a Muslim man in London in 1657. The Baptized Turk (1658), written by the royalist Thomas Warmstry, tells the story of Rigip Dandulo, a twenty-four-year-old from Smyrna who was baptised by Dr. Peter Gunning at Exeter House chapel. In The Baptized Turk, Warmstry describes and analyzes an elaborate dream experienced by Dandulo and also provides his readers with an extensive guide to dream interpretation. Dream accounts appear frequently in mid-seventeenth-century radical Protestant conversion narratives, but Warmstry makes a case for the role of dreaming in substantiating the converting power of moderate Protestantism. This frames the narrative as a riposte to the gathered churches’ dreaming converts, and demonstrates the extent to which royalists utilized and transformed the discursive strategies of their religious and political rivals when promoting their own agenda.

While both Protestant and Catholic martyrologies from the early modern period often incorporate dream narratives in order to prove that God favors a particular believer, it is notable that the mid-seventeenth century saw a significant increase in the prevalence of dream accounts in Protestant works, particularly those associated with conversion. This phenomenon can be linked to the rise, during the Civil War and Protectorate, of Protestant sects who wished to advertise the spiritual experiences of their believers. Dreams were often ascribed to divine or demonic influence and were frequently conflated with visions and afforded the status of prophecy, which meant that they provided converts with a useful barometer of their own spiri-
tual conditions. Dreams also had scriptural precedent in the form of the dreams of Joseph, Daniel, Abraham and Jacob; they were used as a diagnostic tool by physicians (Montaigne, for example, connected dreams to diet); and Spanish priests were trained in dream interpretation. It is this diagnostic quality which potentially informs the use of dreams in texts concerned with religious or spiritual transformation. Due to the inherent difficulty in giving substance to an invisible change in an individual’s spiritual complexion, writers had to develop a sophisticated system of proof when composing an account of a conversion, and dreams provided a useful site for epistemological analysis and a form of self-generated authority that might validate one’s newfound spiritual status.

Despite the prevalence of dreams in religious works, however, dream interpretation was a contentious process in the early modern period, not least because dreaming was often associated with the Devil as well as with the eating of particular foods or an imbalance in the humors. Reginald Scot and Thomas Nashe were famously sceptical of their value, with Nashe calling dreams “a bubbling scum, or froth of the fancy” (C4v). Dreams therefore had the potential to act as a powerful heuristic aid for converts, but their interpretation was subject to debate.

Mid-seventeenth century Protestant texts that discuss conversion and incorporate dreams include: The Spirituall Experiences (1653), endorsed by the Welsh Independent minister Vavasor Powell, which contains a number of dream narratives; the Independent-Baptist minister Henry Jessey’s The Exceeding Riches of Grace Advanced (1647), which includes the dream of the convert and prophet Sarah Wight; and the Fifth Monarchist John Rogers’ Obel or Beth-shemesh (1653), which is directed at separatist congregations in Ireland and includes dream narratives among the conversion accounts produced by both Rogers and his followers. Powell, Jessey and Rogers were all churchmen from the more radical end of the Protestant spectrum. They were also associated with the gathered churches (independent congregations of both separatist and non-separatist believers) that operated outside the central church hierarchy. The incorporation of dreams into their conversion texts is a common trait of mid-seventeenth century accounts of religious experience, and at least a third of the texts produced by Independent ministers included dreams or visions. This trend is also reflected in the work of John Bunyan, whose autobiography Grace Abounding (1666) records how he experienced both nightmares and elaborate dreams during a period of spiritual crisis between 1649 and 1655.
Rather than focusing on the dreams of radical Protestants such as Bunyan, this paper explores a dream narrative that is embedded within a description of the conversion and baptism of a Turkish man named Rigep Dandulo in 1657. *The Baptized Turk* (1658) belongs to a diverse group of texts concerned with the baptism of strangers in early modern London, although the process by which these individuals were brought into the church community remained “haphazard” and “improvisatory” (Dimmock 258) until the introduction of a service for those of “riper years” in the 1662 *Book of Common Prayer* (Cummings 419–25). This haphazard approach is reflected in the description of the baptismal ceremony in *The Baptized Turk*, with the author Thomas Warmstry recording that the rites for infant baptism were modified so that the convert “answered the questions concerning the Christian Covenant and Profession for himself, which have been usually answered by the Godfathers and Godmothers at the Baptism of Children” (L2r).

In a number of significant ways *The Baptized Turk* does not fit the radical generic model and instead makes a case for the role of dreaming in substantiating the converting power of moderate Protestantism. The text’s inclusion of a dream narrative therefore provides a hitherto unexplored point of continuity between moderate and sectarian texts which utilize dreams and dream interpretation when shaping Protestant communities. In *The Baptized Turk*, however, Warmstry makes a clear distinction between the efficacy and validity of Dandulo’s dream and the “strange Fancies” (E2v) of dreamers such as the Anabaptists and Quakers. This distinction is further emphasized in a lengthy treatise on the nature of dreams which outlines how the dreamer can successfully identify and interpret divine dreams while avoiding the errors and fantasies of their radical peers. Warmstry’s exploration of dream analysis is an important, but relatively neglected, example of dream interpretation from the early modern period, and it extends beyond the analysis of Dandulo’s individual dream in an attempt to systematise an orthodox Protestant dream-hermeneutics. This frames the narrative as a riposte to the gathered churches’ dreaming converts and demonstrates the extent to which royalists utilized and transformed the tropes and methodologies of their religious and political rivals when promoting their own agenda. As we will see, this is most obviously the case when Warmstry uses Dandulo’s dream to promote the power and efficacy of baptism.

A further difference lies in the text’s concern with the conversion of an individual from one religion to another—in this case from Islam to Christianity—
rather than a heightening of spiritual feeling or a move from one form of Protestantism to another, as is found in the conversion accounts previously mentioned. This allies Warmstry’s description of Dandulo’s conversion and baptism to the eschatological impatience of Protestants who believed that the coming apocalypse would be presaged by the conversion of Muslims and Jews. In the process of analysing *The Baptized Turk*, this article thereby highlights the importance of dreaming for different religious factions during the Interregnum, but also emphasizes how the dream experiences of individual converts could act as potent exempla in the battle for souls waged between different Protestant groups as they prepared for the imminent End of Days.12

*The Baptized Turk* recounts the story of Rigep (later Philip) Dandulo, the son of a Greek Orthodox mother and a Muslim father who grew up near Smyrna (now Izmir), Turkey. He was aged “about Twenty four years” (B7v) when he converted to Christianity and was baptized on November 8, 1657, at “Excester-house” (L1v) chapel in London. Sir William Cecil, Lord Burghley, built Exeter House in the mid-sixteenth century, and during the Interregnum its chapel was one of the few places where the use of *The Book of Common Prayer* was tolerated.13 The chaplain at the time of Dandulo’s baptism was Dr. Peter Gunning, a royalist who would later become Bishop of Ely. The author of *The Baptized Turk*, Thomas Warmstry, was a royalist and eventual Dean of Worcester. Dandulo was probably named Philip at his baptism in honor of Philip Warwick who, alongside the Countess of Dorset and Lord Gorge, acted as a witness. Warwick is likely to be Sir Philip Warwick, a known royalist who, like Gunning, spent time in Oxford when it was under the control of the King.14 The argument that Dandulo was named for Warwick is rendered more plausible by the witnesses’ apparent adoption of the role normally given to godparents.15 Following convention, Dandulo was provided with one witness or godparent of the opposite sex and two of the same sex, with the more senior of the same sex giving their name to the baptised.16 The political and religious affiliations of Dandulo’s mentors and witnesses indicate that his conversion had the backing of important members of the royalist and moderate communities in England. His story may have partly operated as a form of religious propaganda designed to advertize the ability of these men and women to proselytise despite their affiliation to a community that was currently under siege.

The text begins by recounting how, when he was six years old, Dandulo was kidnapped by “Moors” and taken to Egypt, before escaping and later
meeting an “Agent” (perhaps an agent for the Levant Company) in Algiers who talked of England. Intrigued by the agent’s stories, Dandulo determined to see this “strange Nation.” In Warmstry’s words, “God appointed [the agent] to be his Convoy to waft him over not only from that Turkish Region into this Nation, but also . . . to convey him from the Turkish Religion into the bosom of the true and orthodox Christian Church” (C2v). When Dandulo first arrives in London, he stays at the home of Lady Lawrence in Chelsea, having apparently met her son while he was travelling in Smyrna. Lady Lawrence may be Grissell Lawrence (d. 1675), widow of Sir John Lawrence (d. 1638) who was a prominent London merchant; or her daughter-in-law Mary Lawrence, wife of another Sir John.17 The Lawrence family lived at Chelsea Old Manor. Dandulo is persuaded to stay in England by Lady Lawrence’s son-in-law who is a “Turkish merchant” (C2r), perhaps so that Dandulo can help him with business matters. Warmstry was a member of the Lawrence household at Dandulo’s arrival, and it is at the instigation of Lady Lawrence that Warmstry and Gunning, alongside a Westminster divine named Reverend Thirsecross, work to secure his conversion. This is done with the help of a former Catholic named Mr. Samois, who acts as a translator.

The description of Dandulo’s dream appears relatively early in the text, shortly after Warmstry’s brief narration of Dandulo’s life prior to his travelling to England. Warmstry initially reads the dream as a sign that God is pleased with the churchmen’s efforts to convert Dandulo: “The Relation of this Dream raised some hope in us, that God had been pleased to own and second our endeavours” (C5v). It is worth quoting Warmstry’s description of Dandulo’s dream in its entirety:

He thought he saw a Table with a very fair Vessel like a Bason, standing upon it, and two men standing by it. And presently after he dreamt that he was standing by a strame, wherein he had a great Desire to wash himself; but the stream, was such a filthy stinking puddle water, that he could not wash himself in it: In this filthy stream he thought he saw a Hen lie dead with her head or neck cut, and that a woman came and took this dead Hen out of the puddle water, and when she set it down upon its leggs, it ran away alive. After this as he was troubled, that he could not wash himself in that filthy stream that was then before him, he thought he saw upon the suddain a very fair full and clear chrysfal stream break forth of a certain place, which came with a great force and gushed upon the
filthy stream and drove it clear away, and presented itself in the place of it. Into this pure stream he entered, (though with some fearfulness at the first) and but by degrees, washed himself in it, and swam over it. When he was gotten over the stream, and now as it seemed at some distance from it, he began to be very thirsty and knew not how to get water to drink: but in this his necessity, there fell a shower from Heaven, which when he saw he betook himself unto a poor house and knockt at the door; upon that a woman came out unto him, who upon request, gave him a little dish, with which he took some of the heavenly showre that fell, and therewith quenched his thirst. (C4v–C5r)

Warmstry states that “the interpretation . . . is clear and easie” (F2r). The dream is full of images of baptism and purification by water, and he argues that the table with a vessel simultaneously represents the font, the sacrament of baptism, and the last supper, while the stinking puddle represents Islam. The two men standing by are two ministers labouring for Dandulo’s conversion, presumably Gunning and Warmstry. The dead hen is interpreted by Dandulo himself as his soul which “lay dead in the puddle of my errors” (F3v). The fair stream is the holy water of baptismal regeneration; Dandulo’s thirst is the desire for holy things; the poor house represents the Church, as does the woman; and the dish that she gives to Dandulo is “the Ordinances and means of grace” (F4v). There may also be a tangential connection to the fable of washing the Ethiope white and the Islamic practice of Wudu—the washing of the body before prayer or handing the Qur’an—so that in the dream the sacred washing associated with Islam has degenerated into a “filthy stream” which is replaced with the purifying “chrystal stream” of Christianity.

The cumulative effect of these images is to emphasize both Dandulo’s need for a spiritual cleansing in the form of baptism and his receptiveness to conversion. Warmstry states that Dandulo had a “Great desire” to wash himself, but that he avoided the unclean stream. He then willingly enters the “pure stream” despite being afraid. He also requests the “little dish” from the woman, which he uses to collect the “heavenly showre” rather than having it given to him unprompted. The dream consequently highlights the notion that Dandulo has a certain agency within his conversion experience—he is not only ripe for a religious transformation, but also willing. Similarly, the dream evidences an acute self-awareness, as Dandulo recognises his own spiritual filthiness and looks for the means to cleanse himself. The fact that the dream is not de-
scribed by Dandulo himself, but rather by Warmstry, also shows that Warmstry is privileging dream interpretation by an outside expert as part of a collaborative process rather than advocating a personal system of dream analysis. This focus upon guidance and collaboration in the interpretative process is also underlined in Warmstry’s more general discussion of dream interpretation later in *The Baptized Turk*.

While Dandulo’s dream is saturated with the symbolism of baptism and regeneration, there are no specific biblical images beyond the general conflation of (clean) water with purity. This is in contrast to the dreams of more radical Protestants, which often incorporate numerous images taken from the Bible, in particular from the book of Revelation. For example, the convert T. M. from *The Spirituall Experiences* dreams that he or she is pursued by a “great red Dragon” until they reach the top of a hill where “there appeared a brightnesse from Heaven, which gushed forth like a flash of Lightning, and split the Dragon in peeces” (R5v–R6v). The dragon can clearly be mapped onto the dragon which appears in Revelation 12:7–9, where it is defeated by the archangel Michael. In Revelation the dragon is equated with the devil, “the great dragon was cast out, that old serpent, called the Devil, and Satan, which deceiveth the whole world: he was cast out into the earth, and his angels were cast out with him” (12:9), and while T. M. is troubled by the dream, the defeat of the dragon suggests that God will also defeat the Devil in the form of his or her sinfulness. The implication is that despite their misgivings, he or she is a member of the elect. The woman E. R. from *The Spirituall Experiences* also dreams in a manner reminiscent of Revelation. She recounts how she is led over a “burning lake” by a “little child in white” who creates a bridge with a “wand” (R2v). Upon waking, her friends tell her that this means she is “redeemed out of Hell” (R3r). A “lake of fire” is a repeated image in Revelation, appearing at 19:20, 20:10, 20:14, 20:15 and 21:8. The Christ-like child who acts as a guide over the abyss thereby provides proof of E. R.’s status as one of the saved. E. R.’s and T. M.’s dreams are given legitimacy by their use of symbolism from Revelation, the book from the Bible that is most frequently associated with Protestant eschatology, and both converts make the assumption that their readership will recognize the connections to scripture. The dreamer and their witnesses are therefore expected to use the Bible as a primary interpretative guide.

The dream which is incorporated into Henry Jessey’s description of the life, conversion, and prophecies of Sarah Wight, *The Exceeding Riches of Grace*...
Advanced, similarly displays a reliance upon scriptural imagery, although in this instance the dreamer retrofits the dream into conformity with an episode from the Bible rather than allowing the symbolism to speak for itself. Wight dreams that she is rescued from falling violently down a “very steep hill” and trampled by horses, by a man who “took [her] in his armes” (L2v–L3r). While still within the dream, Wight identifies the hill as that which appears in Mark 5:13 “where the Swine that were possessed with Legion, ran down violently into the Sea” (L2v). Upon awaking, she is immediately “brought to mind” of various readings from Ephesians concerned with the grace of God. These are identified with short quotations and references, including “Riches of his Grace” from Ephesians 2:7, the same quotation that Jessey uses for the title of his work. Wight then “caused Hanna Guy the Maid that attended on her, to turne to the places, and to read them” (L3v). Wight emphasizes the scriptural precedent for her dream while she is still dreaming, and then frames the dream as a catalyst for a waking reflection upon the role of grace in scripture.

In contrast, Dandulo’s dream is of a divine nature not so much because it has any obvious connection to scripture, but because (in Warmstry’s words) “It exactly answereth, in all the parts thereof, unto that holy business that was then in hand, and had been in motion the very evening before, for the conversion of the soul of him that dreamed it to God” (F2r). The link which Warmstry draws between the two churchmen’s conversation with the potential convert and his later dream signals its immediacy; it proceeds directly from the day’s events and can be firmly connected to the efforts of the clergymen to secure his soul. This indicates that Warmstry believes religious dreams can be partly symptomatic of human argument and counsel rather than exclusively an experience produced by an act of grace. Warmstry’s stress on human community and ritual agency is another point of contrast between his narrative and many of the dreams incorporated into radical Protestant texts, which are more likely to contain direct messages from God, often in the form of scriptural quotation, rather than emphasizing human guidance. For example, the woman M. K. in The Spirituall Experiences dreams about murdering a friend of her husband’s whom she blames for turning “his minde to drinking” (H12v), but when faced with an array of weapons, she hears the voice of God saying “Vengeance is mine” (I1r). This is both a quotation from Romans 12:19 and a direct communication from the divine. Upon awaking she finds herself “in very good charity with him, and left my wrong to God” (I1v).

As well as connecting Dandulo’s dream to human counsel, the lack of any
definite scriptural precedent for its imagery may have a number of further effects. Firstly, it bypasses the problem inherent in Dandulo’s inability to read the Bible. Secondly, the dream’s fixation on water distances it from the scripturalism associated with some Protestant groups, in favor of sacramental imagery that confirms the centrality of baptism to the creation of religious community. The upholding of baptism as a sacrament was one of the points of argument between moderate Protestants and radical groups such as the Baptists, Anabaptists, and Quakers, who promoted adult baptism and eschewed many of the trappings of the rite, including the use of salt, kneeling and making the sign of the cross.20 Dandulo’s dream therefore neatly foregrounds the centrality of baptism’s imagery and practices to this important conversion, and acts as a clever rebuttal to those who would downplay or modify the role of baptism when shaping Protestant communities.

Significantly, the repeated references to Dandulo’s need and aspiration for a spiritual cleansing echo the language of the baptismal rites taken from The Book of Common Prayer. In the guide to public baptism, the priest offers a prayer that connects episodes from scripture to the sanctification of the water of baptism. Listing examples such as the parting of the Red Sea, Noah and his family’s deliverance from the flood, and Christ’s baptism, the prayer states that God “diddest sanctifye the floude Jordan, and al other waters, to the mystical washing away of synne” (Cummings 142). The correspondence between Dandulo’s watery dream and this prayer book imagery again foregrounds the role of baptism in securing conversion, but also endorses The Book of Common Prayer as an interpretative guide when analyzing dreams, a decisive departure from the scriptural symbolism found in radical dream texts and a provocative, if subtle, rejoinder to parliament’s ban on its use in 1645. There is also a supersessionist theme to this excerpt from The Book of Common Prayer which may be of particular importance to The Baptized Turk’s focus upon the conversion of a Muslim to Christianity. The prayer’s listing of biblical waters charts a trajectory from Judaism to Christianity via the Old Testament flood and the parting of the Red Sea to the New Testament waters of Christ’s baptism. This watery legacy is particularly apparent in relation to the river Jordan: the Hebrews crossed the Jordan into the Promised Land, and John the Baptist would later use water from the Jordan to baptize Christ. The passage from Judaism to Christianity potentially corresponds to the movement from one watery body to another or the transformation of the same water to different religious uses. Dandulo’s dream’s focus upon the watery metamorphosis of the “filthy
stream” of Islam into the “chrystal stream” of Christianity may thereby connect his conversion to the supersessionist language of The Book of Common Prayer, as the faith of the Muslim, like that of the Jew, is washed away by the waters of Christianity.

The Book of Common Prayer also appears to have played a role in Dandulo’s conversion prior to his baptism as Warmstry recounts that the morning after his dream “he was with us in the performance of the service of the Church for that morning, at my house [Lady Lawrence’s], and kneeled down & joined with us when we used the Lords Prayer; in this we made use of the help of his Interpreter, that he might repeat it after us” (F4r). The translation and vocal repetition of the Lord’s Prayer symbolises Dandulo’s new position as a member of the Anglican community. It is also notable that the 1559 Book of Common Prayer features a Good Friday prayer for the conversion of “Jews, Turks, Infidels, and Hereticks” (Cummings 317). Warmstry’s repeated allusions to the prayer book’s role in Dandulo’s conversion and baptism suggest that the place in which the baptism occurred, Exeter House chapel, was a sanctuary for those who wished to ignore parliament’s prohibition of the text, but these allusions to The Book of Common Prayer also speak of Warmstry’s and Gunning’s self-confidence when promoting the liturgical structure of orthodox worship.

The Baptized Turk’s focus upon baptism is not confined solely to the imagery contained in Dandulo’s dream, however. The postscript reproduces a conversation which precipitates Dandulo’s decision to be baptized. It takes place after the discussion between Warmstry, Gunning and Dandulo that triggers the dream. Dandulo asks Gunning, “may I not hold this Religion . . . without being baptized, which is the onely thing will bring danger to me from my Country-men?” Gunning replies that he “must . . . confess the Faith of Jesus Christ . . . and receive the seal of Gods Covenant.” Dandulo then asks, “where is that in your Books required, that I must needs be Baptized?” Gunning turns to his Bible—“hear me read out of that Book of God I pray you”—and provides Dandulo with a number of quotations from John and Mark, including John 3:5: “I say unto thee, except any one be born of Water and of the Spirit he cannot enter into the Kingdom of God.” Dandulo instantly replies: “Tomorrow, tomorrow I will be baptized” (*4r). Gunning counsels patience, stressing that Dandulo must “be more fully instructed in the necessary works of Repentance, and Articles of Faith,” but promises that all the preparations will be made “immediately” (*4v). The importance of this discussion in securing Dandulo’s acquiescence to baptism accords with Matthew Dimmock’s observation
that texts concerned with the baptism of strangers tend to use “conversation” as a catalyst for baptism rather than “conversion” (465–66), and Gunning’s foregrounding of baptism, rather than conversion, as the fundamental point of transformation in the dialogue is an example of the dream’s general fixation on images of water. In this way, one of the more prosaic and documentary elements of The Baptized Turk subtly reinforces the veracity of Warmstry’s reading of Dandulo’s dream. The dream, the dialogue, and even The Baptized Turk’s title, consequently signal that the primary, and public, manifestation of Dandulo’s miraculous transformation is the sacrament of baptism as it is outlined in The Book of Common Prayer.

Gunning was active in defending the scriptural basis for baptism (particularly for infants) and took part in a disputation with the Baptist Henry Denne on this subject, which was published by Denne in the same year as The Baptized Turk. It is therefore likely that the preeminence afforded to baptism in the text is designed to both mirror and reinforce the defense of the sacrament that was then being undertaken by members of the clergy. Dandulo’s dream is one component of a wider effort to counter the influence of Anabaptists and Quakers who wished to modify or even dispense with the baptismal rites; it is also an advertisement of The Book of Common Prayer’s efficacy in securing the souls of strangers for Protestantism. The incorporation of Dandulo’s dream into The Baptized Turk clearly has a very particular religious and political agenda: to promote the principles of moderate Protestantism in the face of the gathered churches’ erosion of traditional sacramental theology.

There is a further component to Warmstry’s promotion of a system of dream analysis, one that couples divine dreaming with the pursuit of rationalism. When questioning Dandulo in the appended dialogue, Gunning repeatedly invokes the work of the Czech teacher and writer John Amos Comenius, in particular Comenius’ focus upon the “Light of Nature and Right Reason” (*1r), which he says is common to both Christian and Muslim. Comenius was a bishop in the Moravian church, a follower of both Francis Bacon and Jacob Boehme, an advocate of universal education and a promoter of the conversion of Jews and Muslims as a means of achieving universal peace. Another of Dandulo’s mentors, Dr. John Gauden, Dean of Bocking in Essex and presumed author of the Eikon Basilike, has been linked to Comenius’ teachings. Nabil Matar argues that Gunning’s use of Comenius is symptomatic of the narrative’s focus upon the “rationality” of Dandulo’s conversion and its framing as an “intellectual act” (144). Matar does not address The Baptized Turk’s dream
narrative, but Gunning’s use of Comenius can also be linked to the role played by dreaming in securing conversion. In 1657 Comenius published an account of the dreams and prophecies of the German mystics Christopher Kotterus, Christiana Poniatovia and Nicolas Drabicus. All three experienced dream visions and related prophecies focused upon the conversion of Muslims, a phenomenon that they believed presaged the collapse of Catholicism. R. Codrington translated the work into English, and it was published in London in 1664. The text’s fascination with the conversion of the “great Turk” (C8v) is represented on the English edition by an elaborate frontispiece that depicts a turbaned man holding aloft a scimitar on which is impaled an infant. In his remaining hand he holds a copy of the Bible while behind him lays the body of the defeated Pope. Beneath reads the inscription “The greate Turke and his cruelty in Germany, his conversion by the Bible, The downfall of the Pope and his Religion in 1666.” It is worth noting that the apocalyptic connection between the conversion of Muslims and the fall of Rome may also be a tacit message in Warmstry’s text, as the “filthy stream” in Dandulo’s dream not only represents Islam but potentially signifies baptism as construed by Catholics.

Dreaming, prophecy, and rationality were certainly not mutually exclusive for Comenius, particularly when it came to the conversion of Muslims, and this is also the case for Warmstry. In The Baptized Turk, Warmstry uses Dandulo’s dream to organise and elucidate a systematic methodology for dream interpretation, something that is not attempted by any of the writers of radical works concerned with both conversion and dreaming. This effort to outline a process for accurate dream analysis explicitly contrasts moderate rationalism with what Warmstry calls the “fancies” of radical dream texts in order to foreground the faith’s claims to a logical superiority in the face of the allegedly disordered and chaotic practices of the gathered churches. It also operates as an alternative to dream guides connected with more radical brands of Protestantism, many of which actually provided a systematic approach to dream analysis. These include the Mystery of Dreames written by the clergyman Philip Goodwin and published in the same year as The Baptized Turk. Goodwin’s text uses scripture as a means of distinguishing between dreams that are “false and deluding” (B8r) and those that are “admonishing and instructing dreames from God” (C4v). Goodwin, unlike Warmstry, was linked with Parliament, and he would be ejected from his Watford ministry for nonconformity in 1661.
Warmstry’s lengthy discussion of the interpretation of dreams is broken into two parts: “An Occasional Discourse concerning Dreams” (C5v) and “Of the Nature of Dreams” (D3r). These appear directly after the description of Dandulo’s dream but prior to Warmstry’s interpretation of its meaning (presumably so the reader can absorb the principles of dream interpretation more generally before applying them to Dandulo). In the section on “the Nature of Dreams,” Warmstry goes to some lengths to explain why divine messages can be read in dreams:

The soul is . . . usually fitted thereunto by a twofold advantage. First by the advantage of the night, whereby it is delivered from those noises and lights, and other objects which are apt to distract the notions, and hinder the intentions of the mind; which may be the reason (as I think it is) that there is no time so fit for study and meditation as the silent night. And then secondly, Because of the advantage of sleep, whereby the soul is in a great part delivered from bodily operations, and from the business of the outward Sences, and from the commerce with external and worldly matters . . . the more quiet the soul is, and the more sequested from earthly and outward things, the more apt it is to enjoy the benefits of internal light. (E3v–E4r)

Warmstry argues that the sensory deprivation of the night removes distractions and thereby aids study and meditation. Similarly, the soul benefits from sleep as it becomes divorced from “bodily operations” and “the business of the outward Sences.” A quiet soul, cut off from the concerns of the world, is more susceptible to what Warmstry calls “internal light.” It is notable that Warmstry appears to view dreams as emanating from inside the dreamer rather than being the result of external forces. This indicates that dream interpretation can result in a form of greater self-knowledge or even soul-knowledge. As with the link he forges between Dandulo’s dream and the role of religious counsel, Warmstry dilutes the emphasis placed on divine grace by radical dreamers.²⁴

Warmstry acknowledges that “many and most Dreams may go for the idle and impertinent issues of the wandering and extravagant fantasies of men” (C5v), and yet “all Dreams are not to be despised, but that some are seriously to be weighed, and made use of, as admonitions from God” (D2v). Identifying precisely which dreams should be afforded this status is the primary impetus
behind his work on dream interpretation. As previously noted, Warmstry has no qualms about dismissing the dreams and visions of radical Protestants, particularly Anabaptists and Quakers, as “strange Fancies and irregular practices” (E2v), thereby associating radical dreamers with disorderly fantasists, but he also directly links the chaos of his times with the misuse of dream interpretation: “there is great mischief that proceeds from miscarriages concerning dreams; whereby too many, it may be feared, have been and are at this day ensnared both in errors of Judgement, and evil and vile Practices, in Affection and Conversation, contrary to the Truth and Holiness of God” (D3r). Warmstry believes that the failure to successfully interpret dreams has had serious ramifications for people’s behavior, to the extent that they live a life defined by heresy, error and bad conversation. His aim in The Baptized Turk is therefore to provide a didactic interpretative system whereby dreamers can avoid the mistakes and fantasies of radical dreaming in favor of a cautious rationalism, but also to contribute to the religious stability and truth of the age. The intended effect is to wrestle the interpretation of divine dreaming from radical Protestants in order to claim it for the moderate community.

In order to provide evidence for divine dreams, Warmstry cites examples of dreaming from scripture and classical sources, and discusses Monica’s dream from Augustine’s Confessions (C8v). He also mentions the work of more contemporary dream theorists including the Jesuit Leonardus Lessius, whose work de Justitia Jure (1605) he mines repeatedly for references to dream interpretation.25 Warmstry comes to the conclusion that “though both Inspirations and dreams may be good where they proceed from a right principle, and are entertained and used as they ought to be... yet are they very apt to be mistaken, because they come often in the dark... It is therefore a matter of concernment that we should be rightly guided in that strange conversation which we have with ourselves, and spiritual natures in Dreams” (D4r). Warmstry’s compelling description of dreams as a “strange conversation which we have with ourselves” emphasizes that dreams have the quality of a dialogue, even if the interlocutors initially reside within the individual dreamer, but that this dialogue requires external mediation. Within the text it is Warmstry who operates as this guide both when providing Dandulo with an interpretative framework for his individual dream and when outlining a wider system of dream interpretation for the reader.

The need for dream guidance is addressed very specifically in the text by a detailed list of “marks or Characters” whereby the dreamer can identify the
nature of their dream (D6r). Warmstry asserts that all dreams must be thoroughly examined in this way in order to ensure that the dreamer is not brought into error: “we must first be careful to examine them and try them according to the Rules; and then when we have found them to be such, we may and must regard and make the best and the fullest, and the holiest use of them we can” (E5r). Using scriptural precedents, Warmstry argues that divine dreams should fall into three categories: those which make their messages known “By word or clear declaration” (Joseph); “By clear presentation of the object, or by Vision” (Paul); and “By way of typical or Enigmatical representation” (Joseph, Pharaoh, Nebuchadnezzar) (D6r). The weight that Warmstry affords to the clarity of the dream’s meaning, whether expressed by word or object, and the commonplace analysis of its emblems or symbols, is designed to undercut any fanciful or tenuous readings of dreams which result in error. A dream must be clear and obvious in its intent if it is to be identified as divine, and if it proves to be “Enigmatical,” then it must be analyzed by an outside expert in the manner that Daniel interpreted the dream of Nebuchadnezzar. Most of all, a dream’s potential ability to convey prophecy must stem from its clarity of meaning:

Those Dreams that without affectation offer themselves unto us in a sober and calm temper, and are of a wise and orderly, of a just and pure, of an holy and religious frame and method, not contradictory, but consonant to the holy word of God, and sound Reason . . . they are to be prudently regarded and weighed, so as to take encouragement and admonition from them, and sometimes they may intimate unto us things that are to come. (F1r–F1v)

A “sober” dream, one which is “orderly” and corresponds to the language of scripture, should firstly be analyzed and “weighed,” but may also (but not always) contain a grain of foresight. It is therefore of fundamental importance that the overlap between dreaming and prophecy be vigilantly policed by the reasoned dreamer. A dream should never be assumed to be prophetic but must rather correspond to the various criteria diligently laid out by Warmstry before it can be tentatively identified as such. For Warmstry, Dandulo’s dream is a perfect example of this cautious and reasoned mode of divine dreaming as “it hath no stamp but of sobriety, purity, prudence, and holiness upon it. . . . It came not upon any superstitious expectation, or preparation thereunto . . . it excellently comlieth with the holy Word, and sound Reason” (Fiv–F2r).
The emphasis that Warmstry places on the need for dream guidance is in direct contrast to the modes of self-examination utilized by his radical opponents, who only rarely ask for outside help when interpreting their dreams and generally accept the verity and accuracy of dream-visions.26 For example, the convert F. P. from *The Spirituall Experiences* quickly interprets a dream as a source of spiritual comfort:

In my sleep in the night, I dreamed that I saw my Saviour the Lord Jesus lying in a Grave, and after againe, I saw him risen from death; when I awaked, and had taken in some thoughts into my minde about my dreame, I found comfort in my soule, and begun more sweetly to hope, that Christ Jesus hath dyed for my sins. (L10v–L11r)

The image of Christ resurrected provides F. P. with hope of salvation, and the dream thereby contributes to his or her movement away from despair. Similarly, Edward Wayman, a convert whose experience is described in Rogers’ *Ohel or Bethshemesh*, dreams that “a great black terrible dog” held him by the ear. Terrified and nearly “distracted,” Wayman interprets the dog as the Devil and claims “this was sent to raise me out of my sins” (Ggg1r). In contrast, for Warmstry the “strange conversation” that the dreamer has with himself or herself must be articulated and explained with the help of intermediaries, specifically members of the clergy. This reinforces the legitimacy of the structures of the established church and the efficacy of its ministers in securing souls for their version of Protestantism. There is an interesting (though perhaps unwelcome) similarity here to the role played by the Catholic Inquisition in dream interpretation, however. Carlo Ginzburg’s study of benandanti (“good walkers”), who believed they did battle with witches in their sleep, has shown that the Inquisitorial courts in northern Italy readily accepted dreams as evidence of divine or demonic intercession and put considerable effort into locating the source and meaning of individual dreams.27 While Warmstry would doubtless stress the differences between Catholic and moderate Protestant dream practices (despite his reliance on the work of the Jesuit dream-theorist Lessius), his radical enemies could easily conflate his vision of clerical dream guidance with the investigations of the Inquisitorial courts in Continental Europe. They could also plausibly argue that by providing a detailed interpretative framework for the reader, he offers potential converts the option of analyzing their own dreams as a component of
their religious experiences. This ironically connects his work to the very forms of individual self-examination that his focus on clerical guidance appears to repudiate. Despite these inconsistencies, however, his text is designed to go some way in helping believers to identify and successfully interpret their divine dreams as part of a rational, collaborative process that would expand and strengthen the moderate community.

Dandulo’s dream in The Baptised Turk is a transformation of the sort of conversion account that was more commonly utilized by independent ministers and their congregations. This transformation foregrounds both prayerbook baptism and the role of the clergy in winning souls for Protestantism in order to emphasize rationality at the expense of radical systems of dream interpretation. The content of Dandulo’s watery dream is held up as a powerful example for the importance of baptism in securing conversion and a validation of adherence to the sacrament, while the model for dream interpretation outlined in “Of the Nature of Dreams” wrests divine dreaming from the textual accounts of religious experience composed by the gathered churches, claiming it for the moderate cause via a detailed exposition of rational dream analysis. The distinction that emerges between dreams as dangerous “fancies” and dreams as “admonitions from God . . . to be weighed, and made use of” (D2v) allows Warmstry to claim divine dreams as evidence for the legitimacy of moderate Protestantism and to bestow on ministers a powerful interpretative role as mediators between their God and the dreaming convert. Dreaming (and its interpretation) is thereby appropriated as a potent weapon by those believers who wish to counter what they see as the “errors of Judgement, and evill and vile Practices” (D3r) emanating from the gathered churches and other radical groups.

By embedding a dream narrative and a system for dream interpretation within a text concerned with the conversion and baptism of a Muslim, Warmstry also allies a moderate Protestant dream hermeneutics with an eschatological system that connects the conversion of Jews and Muslims to the return of Christ. In The Baptized Turk it is Dandulo’s dream that provides the strongest argument for both the validity of his individual conversion and for the rational authority of the community associated with Exeter House chapel as it competes for the souls of Muslims and Jews whose conversions will supposedly accelerate the millennial project. The effect of this is to prioritize dreaming as a way of identifying and safeguarding converts whose original faith means that they are valuable commodities within the competitive market.
for souls. In *The Baptized Turk* Warmstry demonstrates considerable frustration caused by his belief that the religious conflict within England has slowed millennial progress:

> If there had been but the tenth part of those lives ventured upon a suffering account for the propagating of god's truth that have been hazarded and lost in the bloody quarrels of Ambition, Covetousness and Revenge . . . in all probability the world ere this time might have been reduced unto the holy Gospel of Christ Jesus, and that Prophesie fulfilled which we yet hope for . . . that in the last days the mountain of the Lords house shall be established in the top of the mountains, and set above the hills, and all Nations shall flow unto it [Isaiah 2:2]. (K1r–K1v)

Warmstry argues that the English, blinded by the petty concerns of civil war, have missed an opportunity to gain and disseminate salvation. His work in securing Dandulo’s soul is exhibited in *The Baptized Turk* as an effort to redress this imbalance, and we must not discount the importance of Dandulo’s dream as evidence for the success of his and his fellow moderates’ larger conversionary endeavors. Indeed, such was the provocation of *The Baptized Turk* that more radical Protestants may have read it as a challenge to their millennial ambitions; a year later they found their own Muslim convert, a man named Isuf, who was baptised and named Richard Christophilus, apparently after Cromwell’s son. Isuf’s story, however, did not include a dream.

**Postscript**

After Dandulo’s baptism in 1657, he remained in England and evidently lived as a Christian. Warmstry notes in *The Baptized Turk* that at the time of publication Dandulo is residing “in Holborn, at the house of the honourable and virtuous Lady Hatter” (L3r). Four years later, the records of the Privy Council for March 8, 1661, show that a Philip Dandulo, who has since married, had petitioned for letters patent that would allow him to obtain financial aid in different English counties and from Oxford and Cambridge universities. Due to his conversion, Dandulo argued that he was “disabled to returne to his Native Country or of Receiving any subsistence from his Father a Silk Merchant of Chio” and consequently “hee haveing no other Subsistance hath not been able therby to pay his debts contracted in this Kingdome nor in any
ways enabled to provide for his wife & Family or to settle himselfe in any
imploymint” (Privy Council Records 163). His request was granted. The let-
ters patent extended the area in which Dandulo could petition for financial
relief to areas beyond London, where he had previously sought aid but faced
considerable competition for charity: “the said Collections . . . have been so
small by Reason of severall other Briefes being put up together on each Lords
day” (163).

There is evidence that Dandulo quickly utilized his letters patent in order
to secure charitable income following his petition to the Privy Council. On
October 13, 1661, the parish records of St Peter Boxworth in Cambridgeshire
note that the sum of two shillings and four pence was granted “towards the
Relief of Phillip Dandulo a Turke, converted to the Christian Faith” (Parish
Records of St. Peter Boxworth 35). In the same year, the parishioners of St.
Peter’s granted monies to the town of Buckingham, to the “distressed” mariner
Henry Harrison, and to Richard Dutton of the city of Chester, amongst
others. This shows that St. Peter’s often granted aid to both individuals and
communities who resided well beyond the parish boundaries, and that a Mus-
lim convert to Christianity, probably living in London and (crucially) holding
letters patent from the crown, qualified as a similarly suitable beneficiary for
the church’s wide-ranging charity.29

Incidentally, Dandulo received exactly the same donation as Richard Dut-
ton, demonstrating that their plight was deemed to be comparable and that
Dandulo’s status as a converted stranger did not necessarily reduce the level of
charity he was eligible to receive (although the mariner Henry Harrison was
given the considerably larger sum of five shillings). Dandulo’s mentor Peter
Gunning had a close relationship to Cambridge University; before the Civil
War he had been a fellow at Clare College, and in 1660 his fellowship was
swiftly restored. In the same year, he was made Lady Margaret professor of
divinity, and in 1661 he became master of Corpus Christi College. In June 1661
he gave up these posts for the more prestigious regius chair in divinity and the
mastership of St John’s College.30 Dandulo may have chosen to take his letters
patent into the parishes of Cambridgeshire—Boxworth is northwest of the
city, on the old Roman road towards Huntington—at the instigation of Gun-
ning, or may have thought to follow in his footsteps in the hope of preferment.
What happened to Dandulo after 1661 is currently unknown.
NOTES

Many thanks to Matthew Dimmock, Alex Davis, Simon Ditchfield, Alec Ryrie and the readers at JEMCS for their invaluable suggestions.

1. See Levin 64–68. Ryrie argues that the rise in Protestant dream narratives dates from around 1630 and can be linked to growing “confessional conflict” (see 88).

2. See Levin 61–91, 3–4. Ekrich notes that the early modern habit of dividing the night into two periods of sleep meant that dreams which took place after midnight, in the second sleep, were more likely to be absorbed and interpreted as significant and prophetic than those which occurred in the first sleep (see 322).

3. Goodwin argues that it is “commendable” to “attain knowledge in Dreames” because dreams appear in scripture, as is testified to by the stories of Joseph and Daniel in the Old Testament (see A3v–A4r). See also Holland 140.

4. Ryrie posits that Protestantism was driven by an intense fear of hypocrisy, and dreams thereby provided an authentic “spiritual gauge” by which a believer could ascertain the nature of their religious condition (see 91).

5. See Thomas 151–53; Levin 40–45, 50–53.

6. Le Goff argues that dreams went from being a source of interest to early Christians, and associated with conversion, to a source of anxiety and uncertainty in the medieval period (see 203). On the distrust of dreams by the “learned minority” who connected dreaming to physiology rather than the supernatural, see Nigel Smith 75–76.

7. See Hindmarsh 43.

8. See Nigel Smith 74.

9. For Bunyan’s references to nightmares and dreams, see 7, 18–19.

10. For a partial overview of documents concerned with strangers in early modern London, see Habib. Habib reads the baptism of strangers as a “proto-colonial” strategy (see 241). In contrast, Dimmock argues that the ad lib nature of these ceremonies belies any systematic effort to possess and control the other (see 474–75).

11. On the popularity of dream-books, see Ekrich 313. Notable texts concerned with the interpretation of dreams in the period include Thomas Hill’s The Pleasant Art of the Interpretations of Dreams (1571) and Goodwin’s The Mystery of Dreames (1658).

12. Dimmock observes that published sermons attached to the baptism of strangers operated as “manifestoes” for Anglican baptism in opposition to the practices of both the Catholic church and radical Protestant congregations (see 458). A comparable sermon by John Foxe, A Sermon Preached at the Christening of a Certain Jew (1578), is analysed in detail by Adelman 23–36.

13. An eighteenth-century history of Corpus Christi College, Cambridge, where Gunning was briefly master in 1661, records that when he was chaplain at Exeter House “notwithstanding his duely performing all Parts of his Office according to the Form of the Church of England, he met with no other molestation from the Usurper, than that of being now and then sent for and reproved by him” (see Masters 156).


15. On the widespread use of the term “witnesses” instead of godparents, see Cressy 151–52.


17. Many thanks to Matthew Dimmock for providing this information.
18. On E. R.’s dream see Levin 78–79. E. R. is also notable for eating her pillow in a moment of spiritual distress (see The Spiritual Experiences Q11v–Q12r).

19. On the controversies surrounding baptism, see Cressy 98–103.

20. It is notable that the full title of The Baptized Turk references both baptism and conversion.

21. This concept is expressed in Comenius’ Via Lucis (“The Way of Light”), which was composed in 1642 and widely circulated in manuscript before being published in Amsterdam in 1668.

22. Gauden praised Comenius in a sermon preached at the Houses of Parliament on 17 November 1640. This was likely done at the behest of Comenius’s patrons, who included John Pym. See Trevor-Roper 261–62 and Matar 144.

23. Comenius published Lux in Tenebris Hoc est Propheciae Donum quo Deus Ecclesiam Evangelicam in Amsterdam in 1657. This was translated into English in 1664 by Codrington as The Prophecies of Christopher Kotterus, Christiana Poniatovia, Nicolas Drabicus being three Famous and Eminent Prophets in Germany. All three prophets recount how “the Turk” will destroy the Pope after invading Germany, and Kotterus and Drabicus explicitly predict the conversion of the “great Turk” (see C8v) while Drabicus foretells the translation of the Bible into Turkish.

24. The identification of dreams as emanating from a sense of the subjective self, rather than directly linked to divine or demonic intercession, is not uncommon in the early modern period. Campbell connects the rise of the “individualist” dream to the early capitalism of the seventeenth century, and she contrasts this phenomenon with the communal dream experiences of the peoples of the New World (see 47). Crawford argues that women’s dreams in particular act as a form of self-knowledge and provide important access to their “inner lives.” She cites examples of both Protestant and Catholic dreamers in “Women’s Dreams in Early Modern England” (see 130).

25. For references to Lessius, see C8r–C8v and D5r–D5v in particular.

26. See Nigel Smith 76. In The Spirituall Experiences E. R. is notably the only convert who asks her friends for help interpreting her dream and it is clear from the narrative that she is a very young girl and therefore in need of guidance.

27. See also Jordán’s study of the Inquisition’s investigation of the Spanish dreamer and visionary Lucrecia de León, “Competition and Confirmation in the Iberian Prophetic Community.”

28. Isuf’s story is recounted in White, A true relation of the conversion and baptism of Isuf the Turkish chaous. See also Matar 146–52.

29. Dandulo was not the only Muslim convert to forge a relationship with St Peter’s; on June 29, 1670, the register records the baptism of “Thomas Riad, a stranger” (see Parish Records of St. Peter Boxworth Cambridgeshire Archives P15/1/1, 19).

30. See Stevenson.
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