

In lieu of a traditional conclusion, the volume ends with a series of short commentaries coauthored by Jürgen Renn and Florian Schmalz that focus on the life cycle of scientific academies: their composition, emergence, development, and demise. The collection of essays coheres as a whole, with a strong emphasis on actors in London and Paris and topics like astronomy and natural history. Throughout there is a deep interest in beginnings and the methodological importance of not projecting fully established habits or agendas onto protean institutions. This is a volume for specialists interested in the history of science and intellectual sociability in early modern Europe who will appreciate both the granularity of the essays and Brill's continued dedication to printing footnotes and reproducing quoted text in original languages.

Hannah Marcus, *Harvard University*
doi:10.1017/rqx.2021.223

Receptions of Hellenism in Early Modern Europe: 15th–17th Centuries.

Natasha Constantinidou and Han Lamers, eds.

Brill's Studies in Intellectual History 303. Leiden: Brill, 2020. xxii + 562 pp. €165.

The greatest feat of this intriguing publication is having managed to encompass so many facets of the “complex cultural phenomenon” (25) that is the reception of Hellenism. Its seventeen essays are divided into three parts, which are given abstract titles that allow for the organization of disparate material, with more tangible subcategories. In the introduction, the editors state clearly that the publication does not strive for completeness but aims “to catalyse a more concerted debate” (2); it has been conceived “as a varied source of inspiration rather than a companion or a handbook” (3). One should, therefore, not expect to find “definitive answers” (25) but, rather, matter for a future dialogue among different areas of specialization. A valuable “Mapping of the Scholarship” gives bibliographical updates on the various fields of research.

Part 1 comprises papers on learning, teaching, and printing Greek. Paola Tomè (d. 2017) presents a little-known pamphlet of linguistic exercises published by Aldus, which ran to forty editions. Luigi-Alberto Sanchi adopts an ingenious plan for structuring his text—four metaphors popular at the time—and offers a useful table on fifty years of Greek studies in Paris (1490–1540). Malika Bastin-Hammou shows that Aristophanes was treated not as a comic playwright but as an author useful for teaching the Greek language. Raf Van Rooy concludes his paper on Louvain professor of Greek Hadrianus Amerotius (ca. 1495–1560) with the observation that early modern scholars conceptualized the Greek language as “a hybrid variety of Ancient Greek” (105). Last, Anthony Ellis's contribution is a methodological model in its own right: through the close study of unrevised notes taken during a university course in Jena, we come to understand what Herodotus meant for people in Lutheran Germany.

Part 2 deals with issues relating to “Migration, Exchange and Identity.” Aslihan Akişik-Karakullukçu examines the ways in which late Byzantine representations of Constantinople served the agendas of their authors. Michele Bacci, in his paper on Greek-Venetian artistic interchange, shows how in the mid-fifteenth century Byzantine icons began, due to their distinctive stylistic features and sets of forms, to be perceived as objects with a specific ethnic character and inherent holiness, and thus were seen as being more efficacious. Peter Bell scrutinizes the visual and textual images of Greek scholars; despite his impressive methodology—the use of a computer vision algorithm—he seems to overinterpret his material. Federica Ciccolella deals with Maximos Margounios’s (ca. 1549–1602) Anacreontic hymns, which their translator, Conrad Rittershausen (1560–1613), adapted to the precepts of his own Protestant faith: Christ thus is not born from Mary (*ἐκ Μαρίας* [hymn 1, line 33]), not even from a *virgo* (virgin), but from a *puella* (girl). Niketas Siniosoglou adds a philosophical dimension to the discourse: in his thought-provoking essay on Neo-Latin poet Marullus Tarchaniota (ca. 1452–1500) he demonstrates that the condition of the exiled is the basis for the formation of an identity. Calliope Dourou suggests that Loukanes’s portrayal of the Trojans in his shortened Neo-Hellenic version (1526) of the *Iliad* is “willfully denigrating” (264), his aim being to allude to the Ottomans. Niccolò Fattori closes this part with a study of the various categories of sixteenth-century Greek exiles.

Part 3 investigates cases of cultural and religious appropriation. William Stenhouse demonstrates how the occasional use of ancient Greek inscriptions—real or forged—helped local historians construct a pre-Roman past for their cities. Michail Chatzidakis studies Pirro Ligorio’s predominantly philological reception of Greek antiquity, while Maria Luisa Napolitano uses Hubertus Goltzius’s (1526–83) innovative numismatics treatise on Magna Graecia to explain the importance of saving Greco-Roman heritage in a context of religious wars. Stefan Weise concludes the volume conceptually, with a contribution on Georg Lizel (1694–1761), who defended humanist Greek writing in Germany against the attacks of the French *modernes*; Janika Päll demonstrates that writing’s geographic limits, with a paper on classical studies in lands around the Baltic Sea.

The concept of the volume leaves one puzzled at first. Yet once one has read the book cover to cover—which is how it should be read in order to benefit from it fully—its utility becomes obvious: its holistic character and the questions it raises in each field do indeed deepen our understanding of how the Greeks and their heritage, both immaterial and material, were perceived in the early modern period, and what work in this area remains to be done (e.g., “how early modern audiences conceptualised connections between the ancient non-Christian and Christian Greek literature” [9]; when the “dividing line between ancient Hellas and medieval (Byzantine) history” began to be perceived [10]; whether Byzantine artifacts were “regarded as ‘ancient’ and ‘Greek’” [11]). Even so, in a volume with a “deliberately inclusive” (2) understanding of Hellenism that aspires to stimulate reflection on the complex issue of early modern

Greek identities, a separate, more technical section on the use of terminology (Greek, Hellene, Roman/*Ρωμηός*, Byzantine, Neohellene, Graecus, Greekness, Hellenism) would have been a welcome tool here, given the diverse readership to which this book is addressed.

Natalia Agapiou, *Independent Scholar*
doi:10.1017/rqx.2021.224

Familial Properties: Gender, State, and Society in Early Modern Vietnam, 1463–1778. Nhung Tuyet Tran.

Southeast Asia: Politics, Meaning, and Memory. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 2018. xvi + 258 pp. \$68.

There remains a great deal of important work to be done on pre-nineteenth-century Vietnam, so it is with joy that I greet Tran's work on gender during the fifteenth through eighteenth centuries. Her book successfully overturns existing assumptions in the field; establishes a useful framework to study gender and broader social, economic, legal, and political issues of the period; and delivers a virtuoso performance in deploying a broad range of sources. Along the way, Tran introduces hitherto-untouched types of sources, including wills and testaments and legal investigation manuals.

Familial Properties seeks to answer fundamental questions about gender: What was the role of women in a patriarchal society? What were the roles of state and ideology in ideas and practices of gender? Most importantly, what were the responses of women? Previous historians have argued that women in Southeast Asia enjoyed more freedom, power, and rights than their counterparts in East Asia and other parts of the world. The standard work for early modern Vietnam has been Yu Insun's *Law and Family in Seventeenth and Eighteenth Century Vietnam* (1979), where he argued that in law women had equal rights of inheritance and that this was a function of the essentially Southeast Asian cultural traditions of Vietnam, which stood in contrast to the traditionally patriarchal societies of East Asia.

Tran's revisionist work overturns this consensus and broadens the inquiry beyond legal history. Tran argues that Yu and others have grossly misinterpreted the key articles in the Le legal code, and rejects the thesis that women in early modern Vietnam had equal rights to inheritance or property. Tran establishes that the legal code was essentially patriarchal, enforced by the state to promote patrilineal principles and to ensure state access to taxes and labor. Tran then situates the questions of gender in the broader context of incessant warfare among the Vietnamese kingdoms of the time and argues that this warfare had two effects. First, the state pursued greater control of local society in order to extract the resources it needed to sustain this warfare. Second, the disruptions caused by this warfare, including the massive absence of men from village and