

CHAPTER SEVEN

The Witness of Engelbert Krebs

THOMAS F. O'MEARA

In the expanding and deepening world of American Catholic thought over the past three decades, Gerald McCool, S.J., has played an important role. His studies on the history of Roman Catholic theology before Vatican II offered to English-speaking Catholics an understanding of the history of philosophy and philosophical theology in the past century and a half. Prior to 1970, although clergy and teachers had lived in the neo-scholasticism reaching from 1840 to 1960, few Americans understood how that recent all-dominant philosophy had come into existence, and fewer still understood the diversity of neo-Thomisms and their conversation with modern thought. To a large extent, American Catholic theologians and historians were unaware that neo-Thomism, neither perennial nor eternal, had been preceded in the nineteenth century by a Catholic engagement with German and French modern philosophies, or that the theologians of Vatican II had not sprung up within a castle surrounded by a cultural void but were continuing lines of Catholic philosophies and theologies from earlier, more creative times prior to 1860. These themes — the plurality of neo-Thomism, its origins and course, its relationship to modern philosophers and to contemporary Catholic theologians — Gerald McCool helped bring to light.

In homage to his work treating the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, this essay describes a Catholic theologian who is little known outside of Germany but whose life and writings recommend

some acquaintance with him. Engelbert Krebs, professor at Freiburg in Breisgau, student of Thomas Aquinas and Hervaeus Natalis, theologian in the line of Franz Anton Staudenmaier, counselor to Martin Heidegger and Romano Guardini, was a historian of Catholic Christianity and a theologian open to modern trends. He was devoted to medieval philosophical traditions but was also intent on addressing his own age and the opportunities it offered to the mission of church and Gospel. His career reached from the beginning of the twentieth century to World War II. He examined medieval scholarship, phenomenology, and philosophies of values; he pondered the end of monarchy and the role of women in church and academy; and while explaining the glory of the arts, he rejected the degradation of German Jews.

Life and Works

Engelbert Krebs lived from 1881 to 1950, and most of his life was spent in Freiburg in Breisgau, where the lakes and woods of the upper Black Forest slope down to the Rhine. Along with Martin Heidegger and Bernhard Welte, he was a product of the culture and region between the lower Rhine and the higher beginnings of the Danube. He was ordained a priest in 1906 and became in 1919, at the end of World War I, professor of dogmatic theology in Freiburg. In 1936 he was removed from his teaching position by the Nazi government, but in 1945 French occupational forces offered him his professorship again which, however, he held for reasons of health for only a year. The brief article in the second edition of the *Lexikon für Theologie und Kirche* concludes: "Influential in various ways and with a certain powerful effect on educated groups, Krebs particularly emphasized the life-values of dogma."¹

Engelbert, son of a banker, was born in 1881 into a family of nine brothers and sisters. Upon completion of his qualifying examinations at the *Gymnasium*, the *Abitur*, he entered the Freiburg University at the beginning of the winter semester 1900/1901 and chose at once to study theology. A year later, he spent a semester in Munich, where he found the lectures of Georg

Freiherr von Hertling (1843-1919) encouraging and stimulating. Hertling, son of the Palatinate upper classes, had studied under neo-Aristotelian mentors like F.J. Clemens and Adolf Trendelenburg. He was saddened by the alienation of his relative, Franz Brentano, a priest-professor in Würzburg with the philosophical sympathies of late idealism who left the priesthood, moved to Vienna, and taught both Husserl and Freud; but he was more disturbed by divisions within German theological faculties and by Prussian measures against the Catholic Church. He founded the *Görresgesellschaft*, named after the creative philosophical theologian and polymath of the earlier Munich of Ludwig I and Schelling, Joseph Görres.² Often elected to parliaments, he was a force in the Center Party's struggles to provide a legal framework for Wilhelminian Germany. Increasingly active in politics after 1880, he tackled issues like workers' rights and the conditions of mothers. In 1909 he was the leader of the Center Party, and by 1912 he was Bavarian minister-president: five years later, he served briefly as *Reichskanzler*. He wrote responses to the theological writings of D.F. Strauss and Albrecht Ritschl and published legal-philosophical studies on John Locke and natural law theory.

Hertling advocated limiting the power of the state and enhancing the rights of persons. *Das Princip des Katholicismus und die Wissenschaft*, his important and widely sold work on Catholicism and modern culture, appeared in 1899. It begins by stating that religion is not about myth and the Catholic faith is not about the unreal:

In Catholicism religion . . . has an objective, doctrinal content: a system of truths responds to the ultimate and highest questions about the origin and destiny of our poor earthly existence. Catholicism presupposes a faith in the facts of revelation and clearly grounds the credibility of the individual truths so that they form this revelation.³

Advocacy for the cause of the church joined to a career at high levels of university and government perhaps served as a model to

In this view, the themes and forms of the Bible should be explained genetically and causally — that is, in terms of the borrowing of forms from other religions. Thus, history inevitably brought syncretism. Krebs particularly studied Richard Reitzenstein (1861-1931) and his interpretation of Greek-Egyptian and early Christian literatures. His work on hermetic literature (sometimes called, after its first text, *Poimandres*) interpreted, even derived Johannine theology in terms of an Egyptian-Hellenistic community whose religion combined magic, astronomy, and gnosticism.⁸

“I went in August back to Rome,” Krebs wrote, “and by the end of the year was deep in research on the history of religion. From this came a study, *Der Logos als Heiland im 1. Jahrhundert* with an appendix on *Poimandres* and John which led to my promotion on February 22, 1910.”⁹ That dissertation appeared in 1910. Krebs recognized some community of ideas at the end of the first century, shared language and themes between Christianity and the surrounding religious world:

But we have also emphasized — and this is easily forgotten by the non-theological movement of the history of religions — that despite an extensive sharing of images, discourse, and customs, Christianity assumed in the pagan world a position which is isolated, attacked, and often mocked. . . . What sets Christianity apart from the religions around it? That lies in a mature concept of God far above that of other religions and in its spiritual and moral teaching concerning redemption.”¹⁰

Although he had already earned two doctorates, Krebs, if he wanted to be a candidate for a position at a German university, was still required to write a third dissertation, a *Habilitation*. He received the suggestion from the pioneering scholar of medieval studies at Munich, Martin Grabmann (1875-1949): he should look at Hervaeus Natalis (c. 1250-1323), the Dominican defender of Aquinas.¹¹ Material already gathered in Rome enabled him to complete quickly *Theologie und Wissenschaft nach der Lehre der*

Hochscholastik an Hand der ungedruckten Defensio doctrinae divi Thomae des Hervaeus Natalis, O.P."¹²

His life of being a university professor extended out into the pastoral life of a parish priest; his writings were often concerned with the ministry of the priest and with the structure and mission of the local and universal church, but in both fields Krebs now faced the hurdle of the oath against modernism set up by Pius X. While some German Catholic scholars, those in important positions, received a local dispensation, the young Krebs did not receive any release. Through the intercession of Professor Cornelius Krieg, the pioneer of pastoral theology in the twentieth century in Germany, the chancery did give him a dispensation, but only a temporary one.¹³ A few years later, when Krebs routinely asked that his faculties for hearing confessions in the cathedral and other churches be renewed, he was told that he must take the oath, which he did at the end of 1912. He commented: "I regard the oath against Modernism as an undeserved vote of non-confidence by Pius X, something which simply represents a formal tightening-up of the existing constraints imposed by dogma."¹⁴ Later his taking the oath would be used against him by professors and deans. So Krebs was entangled in the *politique* of the oath: on his own from the first, he had refused on his own to take the oath in academic circumstances, but then he had been refused an academic dispensation by the church; he had taken the oath for pastoral reasons, and that incidental act was used to hold him back from an academic position.

Krebs' early publications give an indication of how his intellectual and religious interests went beyond patristic and medieval research. He wrote on the contemporary problem of religious indifferentism, the Christian evaluation of the ethics of Kant and Nietzsche, and the iconography behind the sculpture of the Freiburg cathedral. A dogmatic theologian drawing on history, he wrote on dogma but also on church and culture, on sculpture and poetry, and on mysticism and charity.

When Cornelius Krieg died, Krebs did not accept the offered chair of pastoral theology but continued in the field of medieval thought. His first courses on Aquinas and Bonaventure were given as a *Privatdozent* in 1911. He lectured in philosophy, however,

from 1913 to 1916 as only an adjunct faculty member. His contribution to educating seminarians and others was welcome, but the philosophy faculty was reluctant to hire a priest for the permanent positions that fell vacant.

The year 1914 brought the beginning of war and the death of the Pope: Krebs praised Pius' efforts to expand Eucharistic communion, to combat modernism, and to reform the curia and canon law, but those positive directions had come from an isolated and authoritarian personality. His rigid pontificate with its excessive oath and embarrassing encyclical had injured the Catholic Church in Germany, while Rome was consistently appointing unqualified men to important positions in the church.¹⁵ Reactionary attacks on the Reich's politics, along with imprecise views on the phantom of modernism, weakened the position of Catholic Germany. As the First World War began, German Catholics were embattled by both Vatican and Reich, for the government suspected their allegiance, and the papacy severely curtailed theological and intellectual efforts.¹⁶ Krebs wrote:

The Pope is dead. . . . This would have been an impressive shock in other times, but today it is *one* impression among others equally important or more important. We in Germany have had to suffer a great deal because of this pope. In various groups people had longed for his death, for he had an often unhappy style in the execution of his good intentions.¹⁷

During the First World War, Krebs was active in political movements: in ameliorating the conditions of the camps of prisoners of war and in Catholic movements for social assistance to Germans injured by the war. He was a supporter of the war, seeing in it a union of Christianity and legitimate German claims. During the difficult years of the war, still without a permanent professorship, he lectured on areas of dogmatic theology. But apparently by 1920, Krebs' politics had changed, for he worked with those urging the abdication of the Grand Duke of Baden, and he came to interpret war and politics not in political and

nationalist terms but in theological and ecclesial ones. Subjectivism, moral relativism, secular movements — they were the source of Europe's violent disintegration. Only the Catholic Church stood against them.

Krebs had a new program, and it was a theological one. In *Die Kirche und das neue Europa*, he presented a brief theological compendium for the 1920s. The six chapters began with an analysis of the political, social, and economic problems of the time and then moved to the powerful Christian themes which had empowered society in the Roman empire, in the Middle Ages, and in recent centuries. Without being rigid or condescending, Krebs placed church office and dogma as central to religious renewal, forces which had already shown their importance in history. The new community, the third united Europe, is only possible through the ordering of it, away from excessive subjectivism, to the objective potentialities of the reign of God found in the realities of church and sacrament.¹⁸ The sacraments, the liturgy, mysticism, and love were the mediations of grace in human life, and this real, causal, but ministerial and human working of grace was essential to the Catholic vision.

Krebs was an open, welcoming personality: he did not fear contemporary intellectual currents, and he helped a variety of people. Romano Guardini was a student in Freiburg from 1912 to 1915 — a beautiful age of science, he called it — but his plans for a doctoral dissertation had run into obstacles. Carl Braig's meticulous and agonizing suggestions were of no help. Guardini recalled in 1944:

A friend suggested I go to *Privatdozent* Engelbert Krebs, who was viewed as prudent and always ready to help; he was praised as someone possessing a grand spiritual and intellectual openness. I went and never regretted it. He directed me to St. Bonaventure, whose critical edition from Quaracchi was appearing, and offered the initial suggestion for a systematic study, one moreover treating the Franciscan's teaching on redemption.¹⁹

Krebs was Guardini's *Doktorvater*, and a theme from Bonaventure was also chosen for the later *Habilitation* in Bonn.²⁰

Although the *Kulturkampf* had faded away, the laws touching the Jesuits from July 4, 1872 remained on the books. In 1917 the government agreed to remove those proscriptions, and Krebs greeted the end of an injustice lasting forty-five years: "I salute this flock tested by storm which now confronts struggles over world views appearing in Germany after this war; for their missions after 1850 did so much to save the church in Germany."²¹ More than a decade later, Krebs wrote a monograph on the possible lines of influence from the German medieval mystics to Ignatius Loyola. He used this survey of scholarship as an occasion to contrast obedience to God with obedience to civil power, to distinguish Christian life within a society and in search of religious, scientific, and humanist truth from "the new *Reich*," "the Hitler-State."²²

In the early years of teaching philosophy and medieval thought, Krebs came to know Martin Heidegger, who was studying theology, natural science, and philosophy at the University and publishing essays and book reviews on logic, neo-Kantianism, and Husserlian phenomenology. Krebs gave him advice and encouragement for both doctorate and *Habilitation*.²³ In 1913 Heidegger paid Krebs a visit, and Hugo Ott describes it: "The meeting with Krebs proved immensely important and fruitful for Heidegger, even though there is no mention of it in Heidegger's autobiographical notes — or perhaps precisely for that reason."²⁴ Krebs mentioned Heidegger in his diary: "An acute mind, modest but assured in his demeanor,"²⁵ and shortly thereafter he wrote: "Ten days ago I was hired to teach philosophy. Under Heidegger's influence I have been studying Husserl as well as Heidegger's little study and Geyser's *Grundlagen*. I talk to Heidegger often. He helps me much more than he perhaps knows."²⁶

Krebs foresaw that Heidegger might be hired for his own temporary position in philosophy, even if the latter's course, "Basic Questions of Logic," although popular with the students in general, was not particularly helpful or intelligible to the seminarians. Krebs advised Heidegger on his choice of a topic for his *Habilitation*, not something in the philosophical analysis of

mathematics but a theme in scholasticism so that he might qualify for the chair in philosophy set up for the education of seminarians. Heidegger disliked the new instructions coming from Rome on the tightening of philosophical teaching in seminaries, and he wrote to Krebs: "Perhaps you, as an 'academic' could propose a better procedure, whereby anyone who feels like having an independent thought would have his brain taken out and replaced with Italian salad."²⁷

In Freiburg Krebs could learn at first hand of contemporary philosophy, of its themes of value and life, through Heinrich Rickert (1863-1936), who had directed Heidegger's *Habilitationschrift*, but for which work Krebs wrote the main evaluation because Rickert knew little of medieval history and philosophy — namely, the philosophy and logic of Duns Scotus.²⁸ Soon it was clear that Krebs and Heidegger were indirectly competing for similar positions: Krebs was already teaching in philosophy, but his priesthood, as we saw, raised problems for a permanent position in philosophy. In 1916, Edmund Husserl, then at Göttingen, was appointed to succeed Rickert as the representative of idealist directions. Also Krebs seemed likely to receive a position in theology, and so friends counseled Heidegger to be careful about what he said of neo-scholasticism so that he might receive the position in philosophy which taught the seminarians.²⁹ But Heidegger was passed over in favor of a more well-known figure.

Krebs at this time knew Edith Stein, who had followed Husserl from Göttingen to Freiburg in 1916. From 1916, the year in which she attained her doctorate *summa cum laude*, to 1918, she prepared his manuscripts for publication. She returned to her family home in Breslau toward the end of 1918. In 1922, after a night of reading the autobiography of Teresa of Avila, her interests in religion and Catholicism led to conversion. Unable to pursue a *Habilitation* because she was a woman (Husserl viewed her as a brilliant assistant but could not imagine a woman as a professor), she taught at the Dominican sisters' school in Speyer from 1923 to 1931 and entered Carmel in 1933.³⁰ Returning to Freiburg, she visited Krebs in April 1930, as her last year in Speyer began; most likely she wanted to discuss her problems with

moving further into academic life, for Husserl had now stated a new, more positive position for a *Habilitation*.³¹

Krebs' diary entry at that time is perhaps contrasting her to the meteoric Heidegger: "Edith Stein had earlier a considerable reputation but she became modest and humble and, as a Catholic, rather submerged herself in quiet work in the Dominicans' school in Speyer."³² They discussed her translation of Thomas Aquinas' *De Veritate*. As World War I had drawn to a close, Krebs became involved in pastoral ministry, which included ministry to the increasing number of women studying at the University. We do not know the details of their conversation. How positive was he towards her academic plans, and how frank was she about her attraction to Benedictine or Carmelite life? Still, he had just published in 1929 an essay on the "important questions of the Catholic woman academician." "At German universities," he wrote,

the woman who is a Catholic lives in a double alienation: first as woman since the university was founded by men, exists for men, and is conducted in a male spirit; as a Catholic because the majority of academic teachers have a different spirit and so their lectures and seminars exclude the Catholic, that is, universal viewpoint. As a woman and as a Catholic those students have serious reasons not to be caught up in the stream of life all alone but to guard and to let mature — with others who think like them and have the same goal — their womanhood and Christianity.³³

Naturally he could not foresee the variety and authenticity of ministries open to men and women appearing rapidly after Vatican II, but he wrote and spoke of new roles for women which would be similar to, but not the same as, the widows and deaconess of the early church.³⁴

To return to Heidegger, in his relationship with the younger philosopher (by seven years), one can see three periods: first, when they were young academics; second, when they were in competition for positions in the philosophy faculty and slightly later

when Heidegger set aside any allegiance to Catholicism; third, during Heidegger's rectorship and sympathetic stance toward Nazism. All this Hugo Ott has chronicled in detail.³⁵ Heidegger taught in 1915 and 1916, but, when Krebs began to teach in theology, he was not given that permanent chair in philosophy. On March 21, 1917, Krebs presided at the marriage of Heidegger and Thea Elfride Petri, a Protestant student at the university. Elfride thought of conversion, but Krebs advised against it, telling her to wait for a while before taking such a serious step.³⁶ After the marriage, contacts between Heidegger and Krebs became less frequent. The couple had their own life; Heidegger, beginning to study Luther and Schleiermacher, was entering more closely into the circle around Husserl. It was to Krebs that in January 1919, Heidegger wrote dramatically of his new relationship to the Catholic Church:

Epistemological insights applied to the theory of historical knowledge have made the *system* of Catholicism problematic and unacceptable for me — but not Christianity *per se* or metaphysics, the latter albeit in a new sense . . . I have not allowed myself to sacrifice objectivity of judgment, or the high regard in which I hold the Catholic tradition, to the peevish and intemperate diatribes of an apostate. That being so, I shall continue to seek out the company of Catholic scholars who are aware of problems and capable of empathizing with different points of view. . . . It means a very great deal to me — and I want to thank you most warmly for this — that I do not have to forsake the precious gift of your friendship.³⁷

As Heidegger taught his own courses, and not ones for seminarians and young students, his new directions must have startled Krebs. For instance, in 1921, lectures on “Augustine and Neo-Platonism” treated theories on history by liberal Protestant theologians like Troeltsch, Harnack, and Dilthey.³⁸ “This evening after dinner, my colleague Heidegger came . . . he is going to

Marburg as Ordinarius. We spoke about philosophers and books, and theological studies . . . I think this evening joined us together even more."³⁹ But the friendship faded away. "It was as much as they could do to get together for a drink on the eve of Heidegger's departure for Marburg in 1923, where he had at last succeeded in obtaining a professorship. . . . Krebs followed Heidegger's subsequent meteoric rise with a keen eye and a sorrowful heart, but the only further contact he had with him was in a purely official capacity."⁴⁰ When Heidegger returned to Freiburg as the successor of Husserl, celebrated as a result of the publication of *Sein und Zeit* in 1927, Krebs was disappointed at his institutional and intellectual exit from Catholicism, and relations cooled. They met when Heidegger was rector because Krebs, as dean of the faculty of theology, took part in the deliberations that led to Heidegger being chosen rector.

At the meeting of the administrative council when Heidegger was elected rector in April 1933, Krebs made a statement of sympathy for dismissed Jewish colleagues, but the University found silence a better course.⁴¹ On June 2, 1933, pro-rector Josef Sauer noted in his diary that he had learned from the rector's office that a complaint had been lodged against Krebs as well as against an economist and a moral theologian, Franz Keller, a pacifist.⁴² Sauer had been professor of art history and Christian archaeology and the editor of the Catholic literary journal, *Literarische Rundschau für das Katholische Deutschland*, in which the promising philosopher published his first book reviews. Sauer encouraged the talented young man for over a decade. In the winter semester of 1910/1911, Heidegger had attended Sauer's course on "The History of Medieval Mysticism," and for some years Heidegger planned a book on Meister Eckhart. The *Habilitation* of 1916 contained references and allusions to Eckhart, and originally his course touching on the phenomenology of religion was to look at the Dominican mystic as well as at Bonaventure and Teresa of Avila rather than First Thessalonians and Augustine.⁴³ As pro-rector prior to Heidegger's election in April 1933, he furthered Heidegger's candidacy, not aware of the cadre of Nazi sympathizers behind the selection and hoping that Heidegger would be an independent force.⁴⁴ Even before the

delivery of the inaugural address with its espousal of the *Führerprinzip*, Heidegger had shocked his colleagues, and Sauer, the acting rector, wrote in his diary: "Heidegger was acting as though he wanted to run the whole show himself, on the principle of the *Führer* system. He obviously saw himself as the natural philosopher and intellectual leader of the new movement — and as the only truly great thinker since Heraclitus."⁴⁵ Within a year, it was clear to Sauer, Krebs, and others that Heidegger's rectorate was to be part of a Nazi quasi-coup and a deception. Sauer wrote:

This was Heidegger's doing. *Finis universitatum*. . . . And we're in this mess because of that fool Heidegger, whom we elected to the rectorship in order to bring about a new intellectual flourishing of the universities. What an irony! For the moment we can do nothing except hope that the other German universities, particularly in Prussia, will not take this step into the abyss.⁴⁶

Heidegger had proved himself to all sides as unsuited to the administrative work of the rectorate: he was clearly an advocate of the Nazi Reich and yet had not managed to work with or be independent from its administrative levels.

The Jews and Christianity

Early on, Krebs was a Catholic activist in the ecumenical movement with Protestants. He urged Catholic participation in the international ecumenical assemblies beginning to take place, although by 1940 he had insightfully come to the conclusion that corporate unions (including the dream of corporate return to the Catholic Church) were not to be the gift and future of ecumenism.⁴⁷ His engagement on behalf of Judaism and Jews is significant. In an article in the secular press in 1922, he noticed that the increased number of Jews at universities since World War I had led to manifestations at times of a vulgar anti-Semitism. Catholic students, he wrote, must not be drawn into this. Love is the characteristic of a follower of Christ, and love never permits

despising others or viewing any human being as someone of lesser value. Catholics should display the riches of the church by effective love and intellectual work. "If the percent of Jews in academia is greater than in the general population, that is just a serious warning for us Catholics to accomplish the same thing."⁴⁸ Anti-Semitism fostered by a "*Deutsch-völkisch*" ideology, he said, contains nothing that is truly German or truly Catholic.

In 1929 he published a book on the early church and Judaism. By this time, anti-Semitism was an open political atmosphere. Krebs began by rejecting the view of Adolf von Harnack that Christianity must separate itself fully from Judaism, and repudiating the false anthropology of Joseph Gobineau, intended "to isolate the races in nationalistic and racial mis-education."⁴⁹ Krebs at once confessed that the praxis of the church and the behavior of popes and bishops toward the Jews left much to be desired. All forms of anti-Semitism must be rejected: first, because Judaism is the *Mutterboden* of the church, and the Jewish inheritance in the Catholic Church is still alive; second, because the idea of a fulfillment of the Messianic hopes implies no possibility of separation or rejection; and finally, because what is Jewish perdures in the teaching and usages of the church. Christianity can only present itself as the gift of Judaism and as living from its heritage.

The teachings of Jesus find their central expression in his views on the kingdom of God and in the sermon on the mount, but these themes, as well as Jesus' prayer, cannot be understood apart from the books of the Hebrew Scriptures and the more recent writings of Enoch, Daniel, and the Psalms of Solomon. Jesus was a Jew and a Jew of his own times. Krebs pointed out that Christianity did not begin with radical separation, nor is it accurate to find in *Acts of Apostles* only Jews rejecting the Gospel or behaving in a hostile way. In fact, most do not. Judaism and Christianity went their own way over the broadening of the mission to the gentiles, but Paul was a critic of sparks of anti-Semitism in the Roman church.

Naturally Krebs sees Christ as the fulfillment of messianic hopes and the entry of the corporate reality of Jews into the church, but his only proselytism is a positive perspective joined to

prayer. Interestingly, he stressed the role of the liturgy: he compared the Catholic liturgy with the Jewish morning prayer of Sabbath to argue for structural and minor similarities. "It is wrong to want to derive the prayer of thanksgiving [the preface and Eucharistic prayer] from only Hellenistic paganism."⁵⁰ Far from accepting popular slogans of excluding Jews, the Catholic Church lives always in the expression of gratitude for all that it has received from the Jewish people and in the prayer for that people which is the people of the Messiah.

Interestingly, Krebs found Protestant liberal biblical criticism of the Hebrew Scriptures to have served as a preparation for the current anti-Jewish ethos. No part of the Hebrew canon, like liturgical prayer and messianic hope, can be rejected by Catholics. Perhaps his critical studies of theories on oriental and Hellenistic religions supposedly mixed into Christian forms made him critical of academic directions excising or demeaning books of the Hebrew scriptures.

He recommended "a guideline for positive comportment":

The hate and contempt and the rough rejection in daily society which is demanded, in the name of Christianity, from so many sides of our already so divided people *vis-à-vis* our Jewish co-citizens can never be furthered by the Catholic Church . . . [which] views the Jews only in a double mode: on the one hand, with gratitude for all that we have taken over as our inheritance and which we today still keep holy . . . and, on the other hand, with prayer, since we believe to have the fulfillment of Jewish hopes in the Savior.⁵¹

A summary of this book appeared in 1927 in the first volume of the American Jesuit periodical *Thought*.⁵² In 1933 and 1935, Krebs published further articles in this area, both against Alfred Rosenberg's *Mythos des 20. Jahrhunderts*, disputing his perverse use of the German medieval mystics to support anti-Semitism and his caricature of authentic Christianity.

Theology

Krebs continued to write on the most varied topics. While he maintained theological and historical areas of research, his essays and books treated Dante and Augustine, Aquinas' proofs for the existence of God, excavations at St. Peter's in Rome, organ music, foreign missions, and sexuality and psychology. Apparently his career in teaching philosophy and theology led Krebs beyond historical research to dogmatic theology, and he did not remain a scholar of medieval texts nor one of gnosticism and Christianity in the third century. His first major work in systematic theology was developed during the war years. It was to present how dogma could be and had to be related to life. At the end of 1920, the first volume of *Dogma und Leben* appeared, with the second volume following four years later. The author wanted to show "how the faith of our church, and indeed, how the salvation of our life is grounded in the content of dogmas (in the strict sense of the word). . . and how general human values or supernatural goals, blessings, empowerments and mediations of salvation are contained in these truths."⁵³ Each major dogma, an ecclesial definitive statement, is examined as a moral act, as an enrichment of life, and as an expansion of the area of knowing and of willing.⁵⁴

The second volume treats the church and eschatology. Its ecclesiology gives an interesting picture of a theologian in the 1920s facing the issue of which central themes should present the church, and the problem of the forms and limits of authority. The influence of the Body of Christ and the nature of an organic collective body are present in the mystery of the church in history. Krebs described the ordinary *magisterium* not only as the bishop but also as the publications, preachers, and catechists commissioned by the bishop. Not all that is contained therein is from revelation, and neither the individual bishop nor those of a single country have any guarantee of infallibility. That pertains to all the bishops throughout the world and throughout past tradition. Krebs did not mention an ordinary *magisterium* of the bishop of Rome but treated the extraordinary *magisterium* of councils and popes. Preservation from error is not an official entitlement but a gift of

grace, and the pope himself can certainly err in matters of faith: "It is not the pope as a person who is infallible but the pope as speaker of the extraordinary teaching office of the church."⁵⁵ The large work concludes with a pondering of how the times of world history are in fact being governed by good and being influenced by the church.

In the Third Reich

On a trip to China and Japan, Krebs spent some months of 1926 in the United States, giving many sermons and lectures and attending in Chicago during June the end of the Eucharistic World Congress.⁵⁶ He returned to a Germany shaken by social and political disturbances. We know only a little about Krebs' reactions to the Nazi era because his diaries have not survived beyond 1932. Obviously an outspoken critique of anti-Semitism would attract the attention of the Nazi party. After the signing of the Concordat with the Vatican, Krebs spoke of its value in guaranteeing the rights of the churches (he cited Hitler's words to this effect) and in other lectures in 1933 spoke of the value of authority. But even those lectures were seen by Nazi youth movements as provocative, and they called for his removal.⁵⁷ One grasps the times by learning of crowds of students breaking into the seminary yelling, "Down with Rome!" "Hang All Jews!" The student newspaper for May 15, 1935 proclaimed: "We are fighting in close ranks against political Catholicism, against Jesuitism, against Judaism and against Freemasonry."⁵⁸

In the Catholic journal *Hochland* in 1935, Krebs wrote on Johann Adam Möhler's *Athanasius*. The book on the Alexandrian bishop challenging Constantine could inspire the church confronting anew the state: "Now is the time to speak, for the time to be silent is past. Are we waiting for Christ, for the Anti-Christ dominates. The shepherds must call out, for the robbers are all around."⁵⁹ Krebs' freedom to travel was curtailed, and by 1936 officials were seeking his removal from the University, which followed in 1937. Diocesan officials supported him to some extent, and he lectured in the seminary and was given the honor of *Geistlicher Rat* (Monsignor). If Hitler's goal for the Concordat was to "domesticate" the Catholic Church, Pius XI's encyclical *Mit*

brennender Sorge of March 1937 (which the Gestapo described as a “highly traitorous attack”) was the signal for a broad offensive against the church.⁶⁰

Defended by his colleagues and students in theology, nonetheless, he was disciplined by a temporary removal from teaching by the *Kultusministerium* of Baden, and soon after, in 1937, he was retired from the University. His theological chair was removed from the theological faculty and given to the areas of law and politics. During the war years, Krebs worked as a priest and as a seminary professor outside of Freiburg. In 1943, a lieutenant in the *Luftwaffe* cited him to the Gestapo after hearing one of his sermons, and only his poor physical condition kept him from being sent to a concentration camp.⁶¹ He was forbidden by the government to preach, hear confessions, or say Mass in public. In the same year, Archbishop Conrad Gröber (called “brown Conrad” because he had at times supported the Nazi movement) decided that there were too many new ideas circulating, and he attacked aspects of what became the liturgical movement, theologies outside of scholasticism, interest in Eastern patristics or Protestant dogmatics, ecumenism, and new ecclesiologies of ministry and organic diversity. Gröber was blind to the value of reappropriating venerable theologies of the past or of initiating any theological or pastoral renewal, and the Archbishop wished to remain totally within the seminary theology of the end of the nineteenth century.⁶² Undistracted by a world war, he issued a document critical of new theological ideas.

Krebs criticized Gröber’s views, as did Karl Rahner.⁶³ Typical of Krebs’ openness to the new was an enthusiasm for the deepening liturgical knowledge and participation taking place during those years. That movement, furthered by the Benedictines, “pursues the goal of instructing people on the history and the content of liturgy and to introduce a co-celebration of the holy uses in the spirit of an authentic worship service.”⁶⁴ Liturgy, especially during Holy Week, is part of the new approach to evangelization. Krebs praised the writings of Guardini for making Catholicism attractive to young people and intelligible to Protestants.

On November 27, 1944, Krebs was celebrating the evening Mass in the majestic cathedral as all around buildings collapsed

during one of the great bombing raids on Freiburg. Much of the city was destroyed; his lodgings were gone and with them his atmosphere for work. In May 1945, he was invited back to the University, but he was physically and emotionally spent and retired in 1946. Subject to exhaustion and depression, he was distant from academic and church circles; in silence or in distant and hesitant conversation with visitors, this once energetic and powerful personality had either from illness or shock been reduced to someone waiting for death, an end which came in 1950.⁶⁵

Conclusion: A Theologian of His Times

Krebs was a German theologian of the early twentieth century who, like Carl Braig and Hermann Schell, sought to fulfill the perennial task of the theologian to enable historical research and contemporary thought to give the Gospel new expression. Medieval scholasticism, he learned from Grabmann and Denifle, was itself a rich and complex union of Augustine, Platonic currents, and Aristotelianism. A philosophy of being remained necessary for theology, and the masters of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries never lost their potential for philosophy or theology. The Freiburger theologian, accepting the tradition of F.A. Staudenmaier, heir of the Tübingen school and professor in Freiburg, also stressed the leitmotif of the reign of God, so prominent in such Enlightenment theologians as Bernhard Galura and J.S. Drey. As with Drey, Möhler, Staudenmaier, and Schell (to whom he refers in his studies on dogma and values⁶⁶), Krebs was not threatened by contemporary philosophies, not by Nietzsche or by Troeltsch. He studied extensively the philosophy of values and its proximate and remote sources from Kant to neo-Kantianism, asking, Why do certain values appear constantly and traditionally? In the last analysis, being is greater than value: a philosophy and ethics of values which is not drawn somewhat from being is in the danger of sliding into a subjectivism, even ultimately into an irrational faith in a philosophical milieu.⁶⁷

Contemporaries observed that Krebs' work was an alternative to textbook neo-scholasticism and handbooks of positive theology. In contrast to many other studies, his books on the history of

dogma of the era before and after World War I struggled to find a broad viewpoint of what was happening in that history. God is the most important source of the historical stream of human life on earth and in nature and history, and has become as co-worker of humanity. Because of freedom and revelation and grace, God both enables the human person and commits the deity to limitations. The mission of Jesus and the return of Christ give the meaning of world history, and true revelation offers the ground and answer to the struggles from Hegel to Troeltsch to find a philosophy of history.⁶⁸ Karl Eschweiler said that behind the two volumes on “dogma and life” was the motif of nature and grace.⁶⁹

The time between the two world wars in Germany was a time of considerable theological and pastoral renewal, taking many forms: the thought of Romano Guardini and Erich Przywara; liturgy and church architecture; dialogue with modern philosophy; the disclosure of the holy in literature and other arts; a deepening of knowledge of the Middle Ages; a commitment to a theology for the twentieth century. Krebs belonged to a slightly earlier generation, but the variety of his writings and interests displays his intention of belonging to a dynamic church, and unafraid of leaving antique enclosures to address contemporary issues, he aids the unfolding of German Catholicism leading to Vatican II.

Notes

1. Studies on Krebs are few: Friedrich Stegmüller, “Krebs, Engelbert,” *Lexikon für Theologie und Kirche*, 2nd. ed., 6 (1963): 600; “Engelbert Krebs,” *Oberrheinisches Pastoralblatt* 52 (Karlsruhe, 1951): 10-19; Linus Bopp, “Engelbert Krebs,” *Freiburger Diözesan-Archiv* 71 (1951): 260-65; Wolfgang Müller, “Krebs, Engelbert,” *Neue Deutsche Biographie* 12 (Berlin: Duncker & Humblot, 1979): 726f.; Albert Junghanns, *Der Freiburger Dogmatiker Engelbert Krebs (1881-1950): Ein Beitrag zur Theologiegeschichte* [Doctoral Dissertation for the Albert-Ludwigs-Universität in Freiburg in Breisgau (1979)]; Hugo Ott, *Martin Heidegger: A Political Life* (London: Basic Books, 1993), and “Engelbert Krebs und Martin Heidegger 1915,” *Freiburger Diözesan-Archiv* 113 (1993): 239-46; Peter Walter, “Krebs, Engelbert,” *Lexikon für Theologie und Kirche*, 3rd ed., 6, 434f. A bibliography of his writings is found in Albert Junghanns’

dissertation; the few English translations of his writings include *A Little Book on Christian Charity* (St. Louis: B. Herder, 1927).

2. See Thomas F. O'Meara, "Joseph Görres," *Romantic Idealism and Roman Catholicism: Schelling and the Theologians* (Notre Dame: University of Munich, 1982), 126-35.

3. Georg Freiherr von Hertling, *Das Princip des Katholicismus und die Wissenschaft* (Freiburg: Herder, 1899), 22; see Thomas F. O'Meara, *Church and Culture: German Catholic Theology, 1860-1914* (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1991), 155-59.

4. Adolf Dryoff wrote a book on Catholic thinkers at the time of Fichte and Schelling: *C.J. Windischmann und sein Kreis* (Cologne, 1916).

5. The Lutheran Preger (1827-1896) published a number of studies on medieval German mysticism; see Kurt Ruh, "Preger, Johann Wilhelm," *Lexikon für Theologie und Kirche* 8 (1963): 719. Denifle was the famous scholar on Luther and on medieval mysticism and scholasticism; see Martin Grabmann, *P. Heinrich Denifle, O.P. Eine Würdigung seiner Forschungsarbeit* (Mainz: Kirchheim, 1905).

6. Cited in Junghanns, *Der Freiburger Dogmatiker*, 21.

7. Engelbert Krebs, "Der Knechtsdienst des katholischen Priesters," (1920); "Tat und Geheimnis in der Seelsorge," *Die Seelsorge* 6 (1932): 409ff.

8. Richard Reitzenstein, *Die hellenistischen Mysterienreligionen* (Leipzig: Teubner, 1920).

9. Personal Documents of Engelbert Krebs in the University Archives Freiburg cited in Junghanns, *Der Freiburger Dogmatiker*, 28.

10. Engelbert Krebs, *Das religionsgeschichtliche Problem des Urchristentums* (Münster, Aschendorff, 1913), 78f.; see *Die Religionen im Römerreich zu Beginn des 4. Jahrhunderts* (Freiburg: Herder, 1913); *Heiland und Erlösung: Sechs Vorträge über die Erlösungsidee im Heidentum und Christentum* (Freiburg: Herder, 1914).

11. A student directed by Meister Eckhart, provincial of France and master general of the Dominicans, he acquired a deep knowledge of Aquinas and defended his positions against those of Duns Scotus and Durandus de S. Porciano.

12. Engelbert Krebs, *Theologie und Wissenschaft nach der Lehre der Hochscholastik an Hand der ungedruckten Defensio doctrinae divi Thomae des Hervaeus Natalis, O.P.* (Münster: Aschendorff, 1912).

13. Junghanns, *Der Freiburger Dogmatiker*, 31

14. Ott, *Martin Heidegger*, 80; see Ott, "Krebs und Heidegger," 240. For studies on the German discussion concerning the oath at that time, see O'Meara, *Church and Culture*, 172-73, 247.

15. An encyclical, *Editae saepe*, was issued at the Vatican on May 29, 1910 to mark the three-hundredth anniversary of St. Charles Borromeo; the text was to be a lesson for Germany, implying that as at the time of St. Charles with Protestantism, so now in the midst of modernisms, Germany was in danger. The Reformers were referred to, in the phrase of Philippians 3:19, as enemies of the cross of Christ. In Berlin six thousand people assembled to protest the letter, and it was withdrawn by the Pope (although it had already been published in the *Acta Apostolicae Sedis*). For historical studies of the encyclical and its times, see O'Meara, *Church and Culture*, 173-76.

16. See Thomas Nipperdey, *Religion im Umbruch: Deutschland 1870-19187* (Munich: Beck, 1988); O'Meara, *Church and Culture*, 185-86.

17. Diary of 1914, in Junghanns, *Der Freiburger Dogmatiker*, 69.

18. Engelbert Krebs, *Die Kirche und das neue Europa* (Freiburg: Herder, 1924), 28. Krebs wrote a brief but rich book on the state of Catholicism in the 1920s. He began with the greatness of the romantic period, following the "airy Enlightenment" and "exhibitionist Rococo," but then deplored the last seventy years of bad development in education and in subtle oppression of the church based on a pretended "omnipotence of the state." He saw a new age in the making with many Protestants and socialists sympathetic to the church and seeing in liberal Protestantism a reduction which was an impoverishment (*Die religiöse Unruhe der Gegenwart und die katholische Kirche* [Augsburg: Haas and Grabler, 1920/21], 4, 10, 12, 27). Krebs' theologizing on the salvation of those outside of the church exemplifies the difficulty of some theologians in the early part of the century with the theological expressions of this issue; his is worked out, with difficulty, amid the tension of holding that grace comes to those who seek and act in good will, and the general, solid principle that grace in the Catholic church and its sacraments is absolutely necessary for salvation (*Die Kirche und das neue Europa*, 150ff.); Thomas Ruster, *Die verlorene Nützlichkeit der Religion. Katholizismus und Moderne in der Weimarer Republik* (Paderborn: Schöningh, 1994), 312ff.

19. Romano Guardini, *Berichte über mein Leben* (Düsseldorf: Patmos, 1984), 26.

20. See Robert Krieg, *Romano Guardini. A Precursor of Vatican II* (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1997); Hanna-Barbara Gerl, *Romano Guardini, 1885-1968: Leben und Werk* (Mainz: Matthias-Grünewald, 1985).

21. Diary of 1917, in Junghanns, *Der Freiburger Dogmatiker*, 81.

22. Engelbert Krebs, *Jesuitischer und deutscher Geist: Geschichtliche Abhängigkeiten und gemeinsame Wesenszüge* (Freiburg: Waibel'sche, 1934), 32f.

23. See Karl Lehmann, "Metaphysik, Transzendentalphilosophie und Phänomenologie in der ersten Schriften Martin Heideggers," *Philosophisches Jahrbuch* 71 (1964): 332ff.

24. Ott, *Martin Heidegger*, 75.

25. Cited in Ott, *Martin Heidegger*, 78.

26. Cited in Junghanns, *Der Freiburger Dogmatiker*, 55.

27. Ott, *Martin Heidegger*, 81.

28. Ott, "Krebs und Heidegger," 240.

29. Heidegger wrote at this time to the cathedral chapter that he would dedicate his life "to the task of harnessing the intellectual and spiritual potential of scholasticism to the future struggle for the Christian-Catholic ideal" (Ott, *Martin Heidegger*, 90).

30. See Maria Adele Herrmann, *Die Speyerer Jahre von Edith Stein* (Speyer: Pilger, 1990).

31. In a letter to the ministry of education in 1930, Husserl concluded: "Edith Stein is a personality of unusual openness, energy, and practical prudence, but also a remarkably clear, reflective person" (cited in Imhof, 283).

32. Diary entry of 1930, cited in Junghanns, *Der Freiburger Dogmatiker*, 58; see Hugo Ott, "Edith Stein (1891-1942) und Freiburg: Ein Beitrag anlässlich der Seligsprechung am 1. Mai, 1987," *Freiburger Diözesan-Archiv* 107 (1987): 253-74; Beat W. Imhof, *Edith Steins philosophische Entwicklung: Leben und Werk* (Basel: Birkhäuser, 1987), 118; Rainer Martin, "Edith Stein und Martin Heidegger," *Annäherungen an Heidegger* (New York: Campus, 1996), 233-48.

33. Engelbert Krebs, "Lebensfragen der katholischen Akademikerin," *Stimmen der Zeit* 117 (1929): 100; see Junghanns, *Der Freiburger Dogmatiker*, 88ff.

34. Engelbert Krebs, "Eine neuer religiöser Frauenberuf," *Kölnische Volkszeitung* 71 (1920). He later explicitly concluded that women were not called to the ordained priesthood but would be involved through their ministries in the general priesthood; see Engelbert Krebs, "Vom Priestertum der Frau," *Hochland* 19 (1922): 211.

35. For Ott, Krebs' diaries were important for understanding Heidegger in Freiburg (*Martin Heidegger*, 4).

36. "We now know that Heidegger's Catholic marriage in March 1917 was annulled only a few weeks later under the terms of Catholic canon law as it then was followed by a Protestant wedding in Wiesbaden" (Ott, *Martin Heidegger*, 328f).

37. Cited in Ott, *Martin Heidegger*, 106f. Theodore Kisiel explores at length this letter in light of Heidegger's early development in *The Genesis of Heidegger's Being and Time* (Berkeley: University of California Press,

1993). Krebs recorded an earlier visit from Elfride Heidegger, which said that her husband had lost his faith and she had not found one, and that they both thought “along Protestant lines, i.e., with no fixed dogmatic ties,” and that children would not be baptized Catholics” (Ott, *Martin Heidegger*, 109). In a letter of 1919, Heidegger summed up a visit to the Baroque Benedictine Abbey of Beuron:

The past of human existence as a whole is not a nothing, but that to which we always return when we have put down deep roots. But this return is not a passive acceptance of what has been, but its transmutation. So we can only abhor contemporary Catholicism and all that goes with it, and Protestantism no less so: and yet “Beuron” — to use the name as a kind of shorthand — will unfold as the seed of something essential. This is already clear from your feelings about compline, which *had* to give you more than you could ever get from the High Mass. (cited in Ott, *Martin Heidegger*, 377)

Later, in the Nazi period, Heidegger turned the Catholic “system” into something to be attacked. “I have an intimate knowledge of the circumstances and personalities here that goes back many years. . . . People *still* haven’t realized how Catholics operate — and one day that will cost us dear” (letter to Dr. Stäbel, *Reichsführer* of the German Student Union in February, 1934, cited in *Martin Heidegger*, 95; on Heidegger’s hostility toward his own Catholic students see, 372ff.).

38. See Kisiel, *The Genesis of Heidegger’s Being and Time*, ch. 4.

39. Diary, 1923, cited in Junghanns, *Der Freiburger Dogmatiker*, 57.

40. Ott, *Martin Heidegger*, 110f.

41. Ott, *Martin Heidegger*, 143.

42. Ott, *Martin Heidegger*, 209; Remigius Bäumer, “Die theologische Fakultät Freiburg und das Dritte Reich,” *Freiburger Diözesan-Archiv* 103 (1983): 273; Artur M. Schneider, “Joseph Sauer,” *Historisches Jahrbuch* 62-69 (1949): 970-83; Franz Allgeier, “Joseph Sauer,” *Freiburger Diözesan-Archiv* 69 (1949): 7-14.

43. “What in time is scattered and isolated is in eternity or *aeternitas* all at once present in an ordered relationship. Young Heidegger takes over this metaphysical tradition; indeed he wants to fashion it anew from the point of view of modern philosophy. With the school of the Tübingen Catholic theology, he would like to recover Hegel’s simultaneous insight into history and system and with his teacher Rickert join anew the format of values in time with the conceptuality of eternal values” (Otto

Pöggeler, "Sein und Nichts — Mystische Elemente bei Heidegger und Celan," in Wolfgang Böhme, ed., *Zu Dir Hin. Über mystische Lebenserfahrung von Meister Eckhart bis Paul Celan* (Frankfurt: Insel, 1989), 273). See Theodore Kisiel, "Heidegger (1920-21) on Becoming a Christian: A Conceptual Picture Show," in Theodore Kisiel and John van Buren, eds., *Reading Heidegger from the Start: Essays in His Earliest Thought* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1994), 175f.

44. Ott, *Martin Heidegger*, 70.

45. Ott, *Martin Heidegger*, 169.

46. Ott, *Martin Heidegger*, 199. In a lecture during the summer semester of 1942 on Hölderlin's poetry, Heidegger observed: "We know that today the Anglo-Saxon world of Americanism has resolved to annihilate Europe, that is, the homeland, and that means: the commencement of the Western world. . . . America's entry into this planetary war is not its entry into history; rather, it is already the ultimate American act of American ahistoricity and self-devastation" (*Hölderlins Hymn "The Ister"* [Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1996], 33).

47. Engelbert Krebs, "Dass Sie in Uns Eins Sein," *Schönere Zukunft* 16 (1940/41): 193ff.

48. Engelbert Krebs, "Katholische Studenten und Juden," *Bädischer Beobachter* (May 26, 1922).

49. Engelbert Krebs, *Urkirche und Judentum* (Berlin: Philo, 1929), 3.

50. Krebs, *Urkirche und Judentum*, 28.

51. Krebs, *Urkirche und Judentum*, 31.

52. Engelbert Krebs, "The Primitive Church and Judaism," *Thought* 1 (1927): 658-75.

53. Engelbert Krebs, *Dogma und Leben 1* (Paderborn: Bonifacius, 1920), 11f.

54. Krebs, *Dogma und Leben 1*, 50-59.

55. Engelbert Krebs, *Dogma und Leben 2* (Paderborn: Bonifacius, 1925) 2, 41.

56. Junghanns, *Der Freiburger Dogmatiker*, 151; Krebs, in applying for financial support, gave as one of the reasons for the journey the furthering of the issue of exchanges between German and American theological faculties.

57. Bäumer, "Die theologische Fakultät Freiburg," 276f.

58. Cited in Bäumer, "Die theologische Fakultät Freiburg," 285. It remains to be researched whether Krebs had contact with other resistance personalities in Freiburg like Gerhard Ritter, Constantin von Dietze, and Gertrud Luckner. See Michael Phayer, *Protestant and Catholic Women in Nazi Germany* (Detroit: Wayne State, 1990), 220.

59. Engelbert Krebs, "Möhler's 'Athanasius,'" *Hochland* 32 (1935), 396f.

60. Manfred Heim, "Die Theologische Fakultät der Universität München in der NS-Zeit," *Münchener Theologische Zeitschrift* 48 (1997): 375, 377.

61. Bäumer, "Die theologische Fakultät Freiburg," 281.

62. Krebs' *Denkschrift* of March 9, 1943, as presented in Junghanns, *Der Freiburger Dogmatiker*, 206ff.

63. See Herbert Vorgrimler, *Understanding Karl Rahner* (New York: Crossroad, 1986), 68f.

64. Krebs, *Dogma und Leben* 2, 94.

65. After the last Mass celebrated by him on October 5, an infection of the kidneys caused his death; the last sacraments were brought on November 13 by the prior of the Dominican priory, and death came November 29 (Junghanns, *Der Freiburger Dogmatiker*, 220).

66. On Schell, see Junghanns, *Der Freiburger Dogmatiker*, 266ff.; on the Tübingen school, see 260ff.

67. Englebert Krebs, "Die Wertprobleme und ihre Behandlung in der katholischen Dogmatik," *Oberrheinisches Pastoralblatt* 128 (1917): 215-29, 247-60 (published as a small book in 1917).

68. Krebs, *Dogma und Leben* 2, 534, 675, 710ff.

69. K. Eschweiler, *Die zwei Wege der neueren Theologie* (Augsburg: Filser, 1926), 10; for a summary of reactions to Krebs, see Junghanns, *Der Freiburger Dogmatiker*, 296ff.

