



1986

Review Essay: James Weisheipl, *Nature and Motion in the Middle Ages*

Richard Harper
University of Wyoming

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarsarchive.byu.edu/rmmra>

 Part of the [Comparative Literature Commons](#), [History Commons](#), [Philosophy Commons](#), and the [Renaissance Studies Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Harper, Richard (1986) "Review Essay: James Weisheipl, *Nature and Motion in the Middle Ages*," *Quidditas*: Vol. 7 , Article 14.

Available at: <https://scholarsarchive.byu.edu/rmmra/vol7/iss1/14>

This Review is brought to you for free and open access by the Journals at BYU ScholarsArchive. It has been accepted for inclusion in Quidditas by an authorized editor of BYU ScholarsArchive. For more information, please contact scholarsarchive@byu.edu, ellen_amatangelo@byu.edu.

Nicholas' study helps to destroy several misconceptions concerning medieval society: that childhood was discovered only in modern times; that the conjugal family in preindustrial Europe was an economic but not an emotional unit; that affection and sexual attraction had little place in marriage; and that women were either systematically oppressed or overly protected.

Ghent, the fourth largest city of Europe at the time, is often neglected because of attention to the more famous Bruges. Nicholas illuminates social life in Ghent and contributes significantly to our understanding of the European family. However, one would wish to learn something of Jews in this center of commerce and industry. The author is always sensible about the available evidence and does not fall to the temptation to say more than the evidence allows. The book has ample notes, 12 tables and 4 graphs, and a nearly comprehensive index. The few typos it contains detract only a little from its handsome presentation. Nicholas' readable book will occupy a respected place in medieval social history.

Francis X. Hartigan
University of Nevada, Reno

James Weisheipl, *Nature and Motion in the Middle Ages*, Catholic University of America Press, 1985. \$31.95

The late Professor James A. Weisheipl's *Nature and Motion in the Middle Ages* is Volume II in the *Studies in Philosophy and the History of Philosophy* series published by the Catholic University of America Press. It is made up of eleven essays that were originally published between 1954 and 1981, a small portion of Weisheipl's contribution to the literature of the history of and philosophy of science. Although each of the essays was originally written as a separate study, the collection is unified and a coherent whole because of its limited focus: the concepts of nature and motion in the Middle Ages. Many of the essays can be read with profit by anyone interested in medieval science. Weisheipl was a gifted writer who, without simplifying or distorting, was able to make clear many of the complexities of the medieval science of motion.

It should be pointed out, however, that the scope of the book is limited, not only by its concentration on the problems of nature and motion, but also because of its focus on the natural philosophies of St. Thomas Aquinas and Albertus Magnus. The collection is not a history of the concepts of nature and motion in the Middle Ages, but a discussion and clarification of those concepts from the point of view of a Thomas. *Omne quod movetur ab alio movetur* appears as an almost Wagnerian *leitmotif* in almost all the essays. But the author's refined and sophisticated discussion of that Aristotelian-Thomist principle can also serve as an object lesson to students and historians of science

and philosophy. One must take great care to read sources correctly and to understand them as they were originally intended. “. . . [P]ractically all historians, and many philosophers interested in medieval thought, have mistranslated and misunderstood the Latin phrase. It does not mean, and never did mean, that everything here and now moving needs a mover” (pp. 123–4).

The essay, “The Principle *Omne quod movetur ab alio movetur* in Medieval Physics,” corrects the erroneous interpretations of the phrase that have been made by modern historians of medieval science.

One essay in particular I would recommend to be included in the syllabus for any medieval history course: “Classification of the Sciences in Medieval Thought.” It is a very useful history of the development of a medieval curriculum of study as well as an analysis of the evolution of the idea of what *scientia* was.

The book is cleanly printed, and it is free of the sort of typographical carelessness that seems, unfortunately, to have become standard in recent book production. William E. Carroll, the editor, is to be congratulated. There is also a very useful, selected, bibliography of Weisheipl’s works. The Index is limited almost exclusively to proper names, which, because of the limited focus of the work, is not a great handicap to the reader.

Richard Harper
University of Wyoming

Stephen C. Ferruolo, *The Origins of the University: The Schools of Paris and Their Critics, 1100–1215*, Stanford University Press, 1985. \$45.00

In his classic *Universities of Europe in the Middle Ages*, first published in 1895, Hastings Rashdall concluded that the origins of the University of Paris were rooted above all in the assumption that there is an essential unity to knowledge. He believed it was generally recognized in Paris that university studies should reflect the full cycle of learning, as best embodied in the medieval liberal arts tradition.

But recent studies of Paris University beginnings have shifted the focus from the ideal of liberal education to more practical questions such as what particular groups or interests seem most significant in the coalescence of a true university out of the local cathedral schools. In this respect, the “lucrative arts” of law and medicine, as well as the cultivation of logic, have been accorded a decisive role in professionalizing and narrowing the new Paris curriculum. This view also holds that the university emerged largely out of the struggles of the Paris corporation of masters and scholars for academic freedom against the pressure of outside authorities, both church and state.

Professor Ferruolo reacts to this conventional interpretation by reviving