von Braunschweig’s Daniel, Bressand’s Doppelte Freude der Musen, Postel's Gensericus and Iphigenia.3 Flemming sees in the opera not the extinction of the literary drama but a transformation determined by the favour and dignity enjoyed by court musicians. ‘Die Oper ist eben durchaus Luxusgeschöpf des barocken Absolutismus.’ K. Hayens’s4 volume on Grimmelshausen is not only a sound piece of biographical criticism, but a well-written book that can be enjoyed by the general reader as well as the German specialist. There is no systematic bibliography, and the names of G. Könnecke and J. H. Scholte at least might have found a place in the preface. Mr. Hayens has not followed up P. A. Becker’s hint (Zs. f. vgl. LG., N. F. 15, 1904) as to John Barclay’s influence on Grimmelshausen, nor does he seem to have accepted the present writer’s arguments for the view that Opitz was the reviser only, not the author, of the German translation (1629) of Sidney’s Arcadia. In the brief space of sixty pages H. Brinkmann5 supplies a mass of information on the beginnings of modern drama in Germany. His chief theme is the relation of sixteenth-century drama to the towns, but the inquiry includes an examination of the social and economic conditions of the age.

GERMAN LITERATURE FROM 1740 TO 1880

By L. A. WILLOUGHBY

As in politics, so too in literary criticism, Germany has returned to the Romantic methods of a hundred years ago. The ‘Volk’ is again conceived of as a living organism, conscious of its being, and capable of giving it expression through its poets and artists. The critic is to be a unit of the nationalist state like any other member of the community: his duty is to glorify the genius of the German race as expressed in its manifestations in art, poetry, music, religion, laws, politics, political economy, and sociology. ‘Deutschkunde’ is to be the axis round which the teaching of school and

3 Die Oper, hrsg. W. Flemming (Deutsche Literatur, Reihe Barock), Leipzig, Reclam, 1933.
4 K. C. Hayens, Grimmelshausen, Oxford Univ. Press (for St. Andrew’s University), 1932.
5 H. Brinkmann, Anfänge des modernen Dramas in Deutschland. Versuch über die Beziehungen zwischen Drama und Bürgertum im 16. Jahrhundert (Jenaer Germanistische Forschungen, 22), Jena, Frommannsche Buchhandlung, 1933.
university must revolve, and knowledge and scholarship are to be pursued and practised solely as they further the aims of educating the political man. The emphasis has been shifted from ‘Geisteswissenschaft’ to ‘Kulturkunde’, implying that the organic life of the nation is of greater importance than the intellectual spirit of internationalism. Truth is relative, and objective criticism a delusion, and there are no absolute values in aesthetics: before certain manifestations of the German spirit criticism must be dumb in reverence.

It is obvious that with such a revised scale of values German scholarship, which in the past has stood for objectivity and truth, must, in the future, be of doubtful worth for non-German peoples; that the implicit faith which hitherto we have placed in the honesty and reliability of German ‘Forschung’ must give place to doubt and confusion if every piece of research, as is apparently the intention, is to be at the same time a pamphlet of cultural propaganda and a profession of faith in Hitlerism.

For the year under review these new methods have scarcely had time to declare themselves fully, although signs are not wanting that they are on the way. The new standard of values which has made a clean sweep of the ‘Dichterakademie’, and replaced the old members by writers subservient to the new régime, is a case in point. Or again, Hans Grimm with his Volk ohne Raum is placed above Thomas Mann and Buddenbrooks, not because of its intrinsic merit, but because of its political aspirations. The ‘völkische’ standpoint leads to partisan judgements, such as that which exalts the Nibelungenlied above Homer and Dante, or Schiller above Goethe, or Sudermann above Hauptmann. Generally, the


