

sentimental arrogance and tough prejudice, traditional phrases of admiration and catch words of contempt. We have all of us experienced this fight round the name of Schiller: we all know the once current fable of the antiquated, outgrown, dead Schiller. Whilst this fable was still wide-spread in the morass of Philistinism, workmen were already engaged in erecting on towering eminence a new Schiller-monument, in laying the foundation for a new conception and revival of the total personality of the poet. The times became ripe for a Schiller renaissance, and at last, in the May of 1905, the joyful tribute of a whole nation to the risen poet sealed and confirmed for the market-place, what scholars in quiet study had long known and asserted: the centenary of his death transformed itself into a celebration of the victory of the hero who once again through the power of mind had overcome the resistance of an obtuse world.

That, too, was an end and beginning! Since that centenary it has been deeply imprinted on the general consciousness, or at least it should have been, that no one can any longer attain his Schiller-majority by merely retailing the life-work of this mighty poet and seer in catch-words and moral snippets; rather the effort must be to understand him in the completeness and unity of his being and his endeavours, as man as thinker and as poet. And it is precisely at that point where preceding generations have been completely lacking in sympathy with his ideas, that our appropriation of them must begin: to the present age he is, and to posterity he will be of infinite importance as the herald and exponent of a culture based upon beauty and tragedy, as tutor and leader in the cultivation of personality. One of the main currents of thought of our times inclines to his view on this last point and it could not but be deepened and gain impetus by absorbing Schiller's ideas.

That the ideal of culture which this son of the 18th century set up for his contemporaries and for posterity has lost nothing of its significance, nay—that it is indeed to-day more "actual" than in the days of the French Revolution will be at once evident from an account of its origin and its nature. The problem of culture and education is for us citizens of the 20th century not less important, indeed is almost a more "burning" question than for the society of the 18th century. It is true that in the age of "Enlightenment" and of "Storm and Stress," in contrast with the much belauded "Present Day," nothing could count on universal sympathy to the same extent as this very subject of culture and education. Especially Rousseau in his didactic novel "Emil" (1762) stirred up the feelings of his contemporaries, and it was precisely in Germany that, since then the noblest and most vigorous minds had exerted themselves with passionate zeal to find a solution of the question: how can a new man be trained for a new time? In this century of specialists and speculation, of universal provision by the state for all its members, we have become unused to the interest to which their poets and thinkers like Lessing, Wieland, Herder, Goethe, Schiller, Jean Fichte, Pestalozzie, not to speak of others, directed their creative energy.

Of them all, none has seized more keenly on the essential points of the problem, none has undertaken the task of culture, as it presented itself to the thought of the 18th century, so thoroughly, so vividly and convincingly as Schiller. The task was to reunite the two sides in an opposition, which modern development