Thomas S. Maloney (trans.)

In many ways, the volume under review constitutes a magnificent and significant achievement. It makes available in English the last of the four surviving logic manuals which represent logical doctrine in the middle of the thirteenth century, when logic was the focus of university arts teaching, and was about to embark on one of the most creative periods in its history. However, there is a major methodological problem with the way the project of translation has been executed which threatens to undermine its usefulness.

The roots of medieval logic in the Latin west lay in the ancient world, the logic of Aristotle transmitted primarily by the Latin translations, commentaries and summaries of Boethius made in the early sixth century CE. The old logic (*logica vetus*), essentially the logic contained in Aristotle’s *Categories* and *De Interpretatione*, had always been in circulation. Starting in the early twelfth century, the rest of Aristotle’s *Organon* (the *Analytics*, *Topics* and *Sophistical Refutations*) became available, initially through contact in the Iberian peninsula with the world of Arabic learning, later directly from the Greek in Boethius’ translations and ultimately in new translations. This still wholly Aristotelian logic constituted (contrary to what Maloney writes, p. 397, n. 1) the so-called new logic (*logica nova*). But it stimulated a really new logic (*logica moderna*), original logical theories centring on the so-called “properties of terms,” new logical concepts designed to explain and systematize the logical doctrines of Aristotle. At first, these were developed in textbooks in various schools and centres of learning. Eventually, around 1250, four textbooks came to dominate the field, those of Peter of Spain, William Sherwood, Roger Bacon and Lambert of Auxerre. Sherwood’s *Introductiones in Logicam* received a modern edition by Grabmann in 1937 (and a critical edition by Brands and Kann in 1995) and an English translation (*Introduction to Logic*) by Kretzmann in 1966; Peter of Spain’s *Tractatus* (or *Summulae Logicales*) was edited by De Rijk in 1972 and
given its first full English translation (as *Summaries of Logic*) by Copenhaver in 2014; Bacon’s *Summulae Dialectices* was edited by de Libera in 1986–7 (and earlier, by Steele in 1940) and translated into English by Maloney (as *The Art and Science of Logic*) in 2009; and Lambert’s *Summa* was edited by Alessio in 1971 and now at last appears in English.

Lambert’s treatise starts by rehearsing much of the old logic, the theory of propositions (from *De Interpretatione*) in chapter 1, and that of predicables and categories in chapters 2–4; followed by a brief account of syllogisms in chapter 5. Roughly one-third of the book, chapters 6–7, consists of a discussion of the topics and fallacies (from the *logica nova*); and the final chapter contains the theory of properties of terms, that part of the *logica moderna* which had developed in the late twelfth and early thirteenth centuries.

Maloney’s English version of the *Summa* has three important virtues: besides being rendered in very readable and smooth English, Alessio’s rather off-putting unbroken text has been split into short numbered paragraphs (each linked to the corresponding passage in Alessio), giving an attractive and inviting structure to the work, allowing easy and precise cross-reference, and easing the reader’s difficulties in approaching theories from a different philosophical world. In addition, the translation is accompanied by numerous helpful end-notes, giving the background to the claims and doctrines in the text, and comparing Lambert’s views with those of Peter of Spain, Sherwood and Bacon, and also with those in the earlier (anonymous) treatises. Sometimes the choice of which passages deserve comment is a little idiosyncratic, but for the most part the comments are reliable and well judged. One may sometimes feel that other passages would more usefully benefit from comment: e.g., on p.109 (§537) the reader without Latin must be puzzled why placing water over a fire (*aqua superponitur igni*) is an objection to defining action as acting on what is subjected (*id quod subicitur agere*), until one sees the pun (*superponitur/subicitur*). But all in all, the notes do an excellent job.

The Introduction does not attempt to explain or summarize Lambert’s doctrines—that is left to the notes. The Introduction concentrates instead on one issue: who was the author? Just as we can know that the *Summule Logicales* was composed by Peter of Spain, but still not know who Peter (of Spain) was (see note 50 on p. 404), so too we may know the present work as *Summa Lamberti*, but which Lambert is that? Alessio, in the Introduction to his edition, argued that the Lambert in question was born in Ligny-le-Châtel, a teacher at the cathedral school of Auxerre (from which he took his name, Lambert of Auxerre) who joined the Dominican Order in the 1240s and composed the *Summa* for use in the order, with it only coming into general circulation much later. This attribution was challenged by de Libera, who