CECILIA TRIFOGLI, *Liber Tertius Physicorum Aristotelis. Repertorio delle Questioni. Commenti inglesi ca. 1250-1270*. Firenze: Sismel-Edizioni del Galluzzo, 2004. 393 pp., ISBN 88-8450-039-7

The concepts of motion and infinity, the two primary topics of *Physics* 3, are central to Aristotle's natural philosophy. Moreover, ever since the work of Anneliese Maier, it has been well known that these issues were pivotal to medieval understandings of nature. By the late Middle Ages, a number of thinkers used logical analyses of infinity and continuity and applied these analyses to a wide a range of topics in natural philosophy including the latitude of forms and the dimensions of the universe. Maier's arguments typically began by outlining the views of Avicenna and Averroes and then recounted the positions taken by Albertus Magnus, Thomas Aquinas, Giles of Rome, and later thinkers. Thus, the first and middle parts of the thirteenth century until recently has represented a gap in our knowledge of many aspects of medieval Aristotelian natural philosophy. Cecilia Trifogli's *Liber Tertius Physicorum Aristotelis. Repertorio delle Questioni. Commenti inglesi ca. 1250-1270* takes significant steps to fill this lacuna.

The volume under review is part of a larger project that is being carried out by Trifogli, Francesco del Punta, and Silvia Donati and has as its goal the presentation of the exegetical and doctrinal background to Giles of Rome's commentary on the *Physics*. In order to do this, the contributors have painstakingly detailed a number of aspects of the thirteenth-century commentary tradition on the *Physics*. While students of Thomas and Giles of Rome will want to take note of this volume, it also provides much substance to our growing knowledge of Aristotelianism in thirteenth-century England.

The *Repertorio* is a precise enumeration of the entirety of philosophical positions and arguments found in eight manuscript versions of commentaries on Aristotle's *Physics* 3. The authors of only two of the manuscripts are known: William of Clifford and Geoffrey of Aspall. A lengthy introduction clearly explains a large number of positions and arguments and a series of charts show the commonality and frequency of questions, opinions, arguments, solutions, and responses thereby allowing the reader to gauge the similarities and differences among the various commentaries. Trifogli self-admittedly privileges the logical and conceptual aspects of these works; thus the reader will learn little about authorities, language, or rhetoric in these works. In the *Repertorio* each logical point is described and enumerated for every question in each manuscript. Reading this work is like reading stripped-down, simplified, translated medieval *quaestiones*. Because only the essential parts remain, it is relatively easy to follow each of the arguments; and this volume will become even more valuable when its companion on the fourth book of the *Physics* is published with a CD-Rom containing transcriptions of the manuscripts, most all of which have only one extant exemplar. In any case, ample indices allow for pinpointing particular questions and concepts, thereby making this volume an excellent reference tool. Because this work directs it attention almost entirely to the enumeration of the texts those who are searching for the larger intellectual setting would be wise to consult Trifogli's *Oxford Physics in the Thirteenth Century (ca. 1250-1270). Motion, Infinity, Place, and Time*, a work that considers the manuscripts found in the *Repertorio* with deeper considerations of background and influence.

Trifogli characterizes the contents of these manuscripts as homogeneous, which is accurate, but also self-fulfilling, because their provenance was determined partially by their likeness to identified manuscripts. A striking example of their homogeneity, is the universal rejection of Averroes' position that motion is a *forma incompleta*, and their adoption of the realist view that motion is a "being distinct from the final form of motion." While their rejection of Averroes is shared, how they understand motion as a real substance is not uniform. Motion was variously categorized as a passion, a quality, or as a flux of indeterminate being.

Similarly, there is nearly complete agreement among these commentators that infinity is an *ens succesiva*, although a variety of arguments are employed to reach this conclusion.
For Trifogli, the homogeneity of these commentaries suggests a lack of originality, an adjective only rarely bandied about when the subject is Aristotelianism. Despite the repetitious nature of these commentaries, this charge is not entirely accurate. While it is not clear which authors were original, undoubtedly someone was. The arguments found in these works are complex, integrate theology with natural philosophy, and demonstrate a versatile knowledge of the *Physics* and Averroes, as well as possibly other authors such as Grosseteste. Furthermore, if we are to be confident in the chronology of these texts, we see an upward spiraling of conceptual complexity. In the half-century after the introduction of Aristotle into the Latin West, the analyses of his texts was routinely sophisticated, and this sophistication is owed to the ingenuity and originality of a number of scholars, even if their identities remain unknown.
In sum, Trifogli's work will be a lasting guide to future readers of these commentaries. Her extremely high level of scholarship has transformed these works so that they are more easily read, understood, and digested. Whether or not this book helps explains the philosophical context of Giles of Rome, it has immensely clarified the status of thirteenth-century English commentaries on *Physics* 3.

Craig Martin