bility not clearly projected by Cromwell, and a widespread conservatism among the ruling nation meant old forms would die-hard. Again, Cromwell was only as “great” at circumstances allowed.

Davis’s contextualization of Cromwell’s reputation has produced anything but a paradox, and instead Cromwell the enigma has been reduced to Cromwell the sincere and moderate leader. But while Davis’s approach allows him the latitude to ask significant questions, his answers do not always comport to the context he so vigorously purports to evince. For example, while he recognizes that the language of liberty by the mid 1640s contained multiple meanings, he is unwilling to engage its implications for Cromwell and Independents. A more thorough examination of the ecclesiastical debate among Protestants about the nature of and style of a national church may have further elucidated Cromwell’s political strategy. Finally, it is not churlish to demand a greater understanding of Cromwell’s role at Putney than seeing it as a moment of attempted consensus building and adherence to the principles of The Heads of Proposals. A variety of political understanding were present there, and Davis’s reticence on this significant debate is symptomatic of his own warning that the ultimate meaning of Cromwell’s reputation depends on the narrative form given to the English Civil War.


The essays comprising this volume first were presented at a conference organized by the National Maritime Museum and the School of Slavonic and East European Studies in 1998 to mark the tercentenary of Peter the Great’s unprecedented expedition to
the West. The conference honored the occasion and also announced a most welcome reinvigoration of scholarly interest in the West in the career of this astonishing figure. That year also saw the publication of Lindsey Hughes's own important book, *Russia in the Age of Peter the Great*, as well as a collection sponsored by the School of Slavonic and East European Studies, *Britain and Russia in the Age of Peter the Great: Historical Documents*. The appearance in 2001 of yet another major study of Peter and his reign, Paul Buskovitch's *Peter the Great: The Struggle for Power*, might suggest that Peter as a subject of historical investigation has been exhausted for the next three-hundred years. The essays in this volume belie such a conclusion, proposing numerous avenues for further promising research.

The organization of this volume follows that of the conference, beginning with Anthony Cross's opening address. Professor Cross's essay wends its erudite way from British theatre of the period and an alleged liaison between Peter and the admired English actress Letitia Cross, to portraits of Peter and their painters, gracefully reminding us that scholars and scholarship need not necessarily be dry and humorless.

Section II of the volume presents two essays focusing on the famous Petrine reforms in their context. Alexander Kamenskii's contribution offers a useful précis of his previously published arguments that the Petrine reforms made it possible for Russia to surmount a systemic crisis that had matured by the end of the seventeenth century. Andrei Medushevskii argues for the application of a comparative approach to the Petrine reforms and Russian modernization, again summarizing his previously published work on the topic. These essays are provocative and useful for the non-specialist; specialists would do well to consult the originals.

In Part III, three essays examine the connection between Peter and his reforms and Great Britain. Janet Hartley traces the evolving attitude of successive British government to Peter the Great and Russia, an attitude which progressed from curiosity to concern. At the time of the Great Embassy in 1698, Russia was perceived as being of only peripheral importance in Europe and
of no threat to England” (53). By the 1720s Russia had become “a power of European significance and a potential disturber of the European peace” (62). British policy towards Russia was sensitive to trade concerns and changes of government personnel, with the former perhaps being dominant. Hartley’s discussion is enhanced by extensive quotes from relevant British archives, quotations which suggest that there is more to be discovered here. In fact, W. F. Ryan’s essay in Part IV of this volume utilizes many of the same archives and papers to explore the transfer of maritime technology from England to Russia in this period. Judiciously analyzing the evidence, Ryan argues convincingly that British maritime expertise and technology “did give Peter an extraordinary boost to build his navy during the period of his visit to England and immediately thereafter” (150). One of the most interesting essays here is Joan Lane’s report of her discovery of the records of a number of young Russian men apprenticed to craftsmen in England in accordance with the wishes of Peter the Great. Lane is an historian of early modern England and her findings vividly illustrate the importance of cultivating an active exchange among specialists in different fields. Perhaps historians of Russia will continue Lane’s work and discover the fate of these apprentices upon their return to their homeland. Dmitrii Fedosov’s contribution explores the “Scottish Dimension” of the Petrine reforms, discussing the careers of some of the prominent Scotsmen who served Peter. The Scottish influence in Peter’s Russia was significant, Fedosov argues. One wonders if there were any discernible Russian influences in Scotland.

In the section entitled “Maritime History,” essays by Richard Warner and W. F. Ryan complement each other. As noted above, Ryan argues that the transfer of British technology to Russia contributed to the building of Peter’s navy. Warner’s contribution reveals the extent to which British merchants in pursuit of profit transferred not just technology, but fully fitted men-of-war to Peter’s Baltic fleet in the period 1712-1716. Aleksei Karimov traces the evolution of Russian forest cadastral surveys in the eighteenth century to illustrate the dynamic between state needs and
the introduction of Western science and its methods to Russia. The needs of the fleet prompted a search for the required resources, which in turn stimulated “the first attempt at a systematic, regular survey of Russian forests” (121). Ultimately these surveys “became a means for the geographical exploration of the country, not only for practical needs but also in the interests of knowledge” (127). Karimov makes creative use of new sources to shed fresh light on old questions.

Diplomatic and Military History is the theme that links the four essays included in Part V. Graeme Herd closely examines Peter’s conquest of Azov (1695–96), finding in that campaign themes that would come to fruition in the Great Northern War. David Kirby offers a reassessment of Peter’s activities in the Baltic, arguing that the emphasis must be revised. He concludes that while “(l)ess dramatic than the war against Sweden, and lacking the definitive character of the peace of Nystad, Peter’s Polish policy was arguably of far greater importance for the future” (187). Robert Jones asks why Peter created St. Petersburg. Certainly economic considerations, Peter’s desire to create a port for shipping Russian products to the West, were important. Equally important, Jones asserts, was Peter’s intention “to create an imperial metropolis” that would replace and surpass the fallen Constantinople (201). Thomas Eekman extracts interesting and important nuggets from the generally dry official correspondence of Jacob de Bie, the Netherlands States General resident in St. Petersburg from 1699 to his death in 1710.

This volume concludes with two essays under the rubric of “The Court and the Arts.” John Alexander’s analysis of “Catherine I, her Court and Courtiers” raises interesting questions about the impact of the Petrine reforms on women’s lives. Alexander’s discussion of Catherine I and her court reveals Peter’s consort to be an extraordinary woman. It also suggests the drastic changes Peter introduced and enforced in the lives of female members of the elite. Lindsey Hughes’s essay explores the iconography of Peter the Great and the unresolved contradictions about “the man and his meaning” which find reflection in that iconography.
As the preceding suggests, this collection is a rich mélange. The essays included explore diverse issues in regard to Peter the Great and his reign on the basis of multiple sources, offer a multitude of answers, and raise further questions for discussion and research. In a number of cases, the offerings are diamonds in the rough that perhaps might have benefited from further polishing. Nonetheless, the collection as a whole is provocative and stimulating and should inspire continued interest and further research in this area.


Leeds Barroll’s account of the cultural and political activities of Anna, Queen of England 1603-1619, reverses the usual scholarly impression of her. Up to now, the daughter of the King of Denmark has been viewed by historians as a frivolous and inconsequential appendage to the culture of a royal court dominated by James and his son Henry. Barroll brings forth startling evidence to the contrary. Far from being insignificant, Anna was a force to be reckoned with; she was not only able to assert her will and thwart the king’s wishes in the political arena, but she also created her own courtly culture with the masque at its centre, performed by Anna and her inner circle of carefully chosen noblewomen. Barroll’s research into Anna’s life in Scotland, before following James to England in 1603, reveals a remarkably determined and capable young woman. Barroll argues that she transferred the political energy exhibited in Scotland to the creation of a court based on alliances with aristocratic patrons of the arts at a time when Donne, Jonson, and Shakespeare were writing.

After an introduction giving an overview of his argument, Barroll begins his cultural biography of Anna by considering in Chapter 2, “Anna in Scotland: Style and Substance,” her role as the