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and philosophy. One must take great care to read sources correctly and to understand them as they were originally intended. "... practically 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.
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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
and expanding the Rashdall thesis. To this end he draws upon a wide variety of letters, sermons and treatises by critics of the creeping vocationalism at Paris during the formative years, ca. 1150–1210. The author contends that the nascent University of Paris responded less to the "pragmatic need of scholars to . . . secure their interests against an external adversary" than to the preservation of "certain exalted educational principles and values." These principles transcended narrow professional self-interest by aspiring to benefit society generally through the cultivation of educational goals much broader than those encompassed by the "lucrative arts." In a sense the struggle was for the soul of the emerging university, with internal pressures for more specialized and practical programs successfully resisted by advocates of the liberal arts and of teaching excellence.

More particularly, Professor Ferruolo ascribes the crucial role in the victory over excessive specialization to the cumulative impact of a diverse collection of monastic contemplatives, satirists, humanists and moral theologians. These critics the author ranges along a continuum from the "Evangelical Cistercians," like Bernard of Clairvaux, to humanist scholars like John of Salisbury and the canonist-prelates like Stephen of Tournai. Whatever their differences, these critics were at one in their opposition to subordinating the arts in general to any single discipline like logic, law or medicine.

While the author has significantly illuminated the complex intellectual milieu out of which the University of Paris emerged, there is a serious difficulty with the book's thesis. The identification of a decisive influence by the critical opposition on those with the power to make educational decisions is not persuasively sustained. There is no consistent, direct evidence that the verbal assaults of the many critics, mostly outside the university, were effective in reversing or modifying the trend toward more pragmatic and professional studies. The accumulation of testimony, however interesting and valuable in itself, thus remains largely circumstantial, attenuated by the scantiness and ambiguity of the data at crucial points.
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This book studies narrative and pictorial dimensions of medieval iconography and examines Chaucer's use of this tradition in the first five of the Canterbury Tales. The first chapter explores an unrecognized aspect of medieval aesthetic principle and demonstrates (with wide reference to literary and pictorial evidence as well as to faculty psychology) that medieval poets saw