

were for the most part copied by Steinbach. The copyist of Z is unknown, at any rate it was not Biel himself.

The rules of punctuation and spelling agree with those which were applied in the *Editio Vaticana* of Scotus' commentary on the *Sentences*. There is a text-critical apparatus and another in which Biel's sources are given. At the end there are three appendices, which give the manuscript texts of q. 1-3 of the Prologue and of I, d. 1, q. 1 and 2 as these diverge too much from the printed text. The index of citations from Scripture and authors will appear when the whole *Collectorium* is edited. There is a list of sources which were consulted by Biel.

This publication is indispensable for anyone who wishes to study Biel's theology and for all who take an interest in the theological enterprise of the late Middle Ages. It is a valuable book, in more senses than one. The presence of one printing error (p. 188 *puod* = *quod*) merely demonstrates that nothing human is alien even to a book about God.

M. SCHRAMA O.S.A.

Beda MENZEL, O.S.B., *Abt Franz Stephan Rautenstrauch von Břevnov-Braunau* (Veröffentlichen des Königsteiner Instituts für Kirchen- und Geistesgeschichte der Sudetenländer e.V, Band 5), Königstein/Ts. 1969, 284 S. + 8 Bilder.

The figure treated in this book was the important director of theological studies during the study reforms under Maria-Teresa and Joseph II. The author candidly acknowledges that the judgment of the reader with regard to Rautenstrauch will depend in part upon his attitude towards the so-called *katholische Aufklärung*. Menzel himself holds what seems to this reviewer a sensible and balanced attitude in this regard, and hence the picture which he presents of Rautenstrauch is mostly a favorable one — we believe properly so. The matter is complicated and delicate when one speaks of *Aufklärung* and Josephinism, as Menzel is well aware. If his conclusions reflect to some extent his own sympathies, he does definitely not sin against honest historical procedure, since he is entirely willing to show not only the good sides of R's character, but frankly points out some of his weaknesses. Hence, we believe we can report honestly that Menzel's picture of R. is a scientific and an honest attempt to locate this important character in his proper and complete historical setting.

After a good introduction about Josephinism, the author gives us a well-written account of the life and works of R. He pays particular attention to the sad state of philosophical and theological studies in the German empire in the first half of the 18th century, and logically leads us up to the development of R. and of his well-meant reforms, some of which led to permanent improvement in courses of theology,

even though later times demanded new reforms. It is most fortunate that Menzel had at his disposition, when he first wrote this work as a doctoral dissertation about 40 years ago, valuable archival sources in the ČSSR of today, which are either no longer to be found or at least can not be easily reached. And with the passing of the years Menzel has continued to enrich his work by new findings and by comparisons with the writings of more recent authors, particularly Joseph Müller who has made valuable contributions to the study of R's reforms in theological studies.

For readers of our review, it will be of great interest to know that several Augustinians, contemporaries of R., are included in the present work. Thus the professor of Prague, Kosmas Schmalfuß, who was admired and favored by R., comes in for mention on several occasions, and the valuable doctoral dissertation of Paulus Sladek, O.S.A. is cited, even though this latter work is still unpublished. The two Italian Augustinian professors of Vienna, Gervasio and Bertieri, and the professor of Freiburg, the Augustinian Engelbert Klüpfel, are treated incidentally in their contacts with R. Hence, we can recommend this solid work to readers of Augustiniana, not only for the useful introduction to the important figure of R., but for the contemporary Augustinian theologians also, with whom R. frequently came in contact. A few documents in the Augustinian general archives in Rome could have been consulted, and would have shed even further light upon the sympathy which R. felt for the Augustinian school.

J.-J. GAVIGAN, O.S.A.