Like his *Missal of Dubrovnik, Liturgy and Law in a Dalmatian City* is destined to be a rich resource for the interdisciplinary study of medieval Latin liturgy and law in the east Adriatic coast.

**Vadim Prozorov**, Moscow State University


This volume is the third bilingual edition of the *Jeu d’Adam* to appear in France over the past five years, preceded by Véronique Dominguez’s book (Paris, 2012) and my edition (Orléans, 2014). However, Hasenohr’s edition is actually the oldest of the three. It was prepared a decade ago for a collective volume devoted to medieval French theater in the Pléiade collection, which, unfortunately, was never published. Despite the fact that bilingual editions of this title are now available, Hasenohr explains that she decided to publish her volume because its editorial philosophy differs from that of the other editions. As an editor, she acted as a chartiste (viii), in other words a philologist, a paleographer, and an historian rather than a student of medieval theater. We can only welcome her decision, as Hasenohr is indeed one of the best French philologists and paleographers, and much important data offered in the book could only be provided by an expert in these fields. In addition, her work benefited from two seminars devoted to the *Jeu d’Adam* that she offered at the École Pratique des Hautes Études in 2001–2002 and 2002–2003.

The book includes a lengthy introduction, a critical edition and translation of the play, and a substantial critical apparatus. The introduction offers much new information about the codex, the relationship between the three sections of the play (Adam, Abel, and the procession of Prophets episodes), the linguistic origin of the play, and the relationship between the responsories and the French text. Because it is the oldest French literary paper manuscript, critics long thought that MS Tours 927, the only witness of the *Jeu d’Adam*, was created in the Middle Ages. In reality, it was probably assembled in the eighteenth century by the monks of Marmoutier. While its contents may have been written down in the same southern scriptorium, they were not copied at the same time. The first forty-six folia, which include the *Jeu d’Adam*, were apparently written around 1250, while the remaining one hundred eighty (fols. 47r–226v) were copied before 1225 (xxi–xxii). The first forty-six folia probably circulated as an independent libellus regrouping compositions used during various clerical festivities throughout the year (lvi–lxiv). One tantalizing suggestion is that the play, as we know it, is actually an assemblage. Based on differences in the scripta of the first two episodes and the procession of Prophets, Hasenohr suggests that they were originally independent and it is only at a later stage that they were assembled by the author (lxvii). She even hypothesizes that the Adam and Abel episodes themselves, although written by the same author, may have been used independently before being put together (lxvii). Concerning the relationship between the responsories and the vernacular text, Hasenohr rejects the traditional interpretation which suggests that the chants are the source of the play. According to her, these liturgical texts were added to the vernacular text after its composition (lxvii–lxx). I completely agree with this interpretation, which I defended in my edition. The last important issue treated in the introduction is the linguistic origin of the composition. Here again Hasenohr questions the accepted wisdom which claims that the play is an insular composition. The numerous Anglo-Norman characteristics probably appeared as the result of transmission and are not original; for instance, all the lines that are irregular because of Anglo-Norman forms...
become regular once replaced by their continental counterparts (lxxxviii). She thus believes that the play was composed by a native of Poitou (xcvi) where some rhymes usually attributed to an Anglo-Norman author were acceptable (xc). In my edition, I also defended the continental origin of the play and thus find Hasenohr’s analysis very credible.

In his lengthy essay (xcviii–cxxxii), Bordier recontextualizes the Jeu d’Adam in the history of medieval theater. He offers an interesting overview of the development of dramatic activities in the clerical milieu. The gist of his argument is that young clergics, in particular students in schools attached to large secular churches, played an important role in ecclesiastical dramas, in particular during the Christmas season. In his opinion, the Jeu d’Adam hails from a large secular church, probably a cathedral, and was likely performed during the end-of-the-year clerical festivities. I subscribe to these ideas and my only criticism concerns two issues. First, Bordier does not make a distinction between dramatic rituals proper, included in the liturgy as revealed by the manuscripts that transmitted them, and compositions from the same ecclesiastical milieu but whose links to liturgy are tenuous. I believe this distinction to be necessary as the function of these compositions was different. For instance, the Jeu d’Adam is an ecclesiastical drama but it was certainly not included in a liturgical service. Second, Bordier does not offer a pedagogical rationale for the young clergics’ participation in such compositions. Here it is important to insist that the majority of these students were future clergics undergoing professional training. Participation in plays allowed them to put into practice—especially in large non-liturgical compositions like the Beauvais Ludus Danielis or the Jeu d’Adam—various skills needed for their vocation, such as the ability to memorize, recite, sing, move with confidence, and so forth.

Given Hasenohr’s qualifications as a philologist, the edition is beyond reproach. On a side note, Hasenohr breaks, albeit timidly, with the non-interventionist approach prevalent in France since Joseph Bédier. Considering that the author hailed from France, she replaced the Anglo-Norman forms with their continental equivalent to correct some irregular lines. The notes offer new and valuable interpretations, for example of the meaning of figura or platea. The errata are scarce but take note that the reference on p. lxv to a nowhere-to-be-found note j in the critical apparatus concerns note k.

This dense little volume is packed with information and will contribute much to our knowledge of the Jeu d’Adam.

Christophe Chaguinian, University of North Texas
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This volume contains a study and critical edition of an anonymous set of Latin glosses on parts of Priscian’s Institutiones grammaticae (GL 2.1–53; 3.107–22), on all of Porphyry’s Isagoge, and on most of Aristotle’s Categories (chs. 1–13). The glosses are found in a single manuscript, Luxembourg, Bibliothèque nationale MS 9, which once belonged to the abbey of Echternach and seems to date from the early twelfth century.

The glossator apparently studied under a magister Thietboldus, who is described as being “of eternal memory” (ęternę memorie) and whose interpretations are mentioned once in the glosses on Priscian and four times in the glosses on the Categories. Two other medieval interpreters are also mentioned: Lanfrancus (three times) and Wichmundus (once), both in the glosses on Priscian. These latter two are perhaps to be identified as the later archbishop of Canterbury and his student Guitmund, later bishop of Aversa. Magister Thietboldus may then,