

---

## Okazaki Tōmitsu: Germany, the *Man'yōshū* and World Literature

Arthur Defrance (E.P.H.E., C.R.C.A.O.)

### Abstract

The little-known Okazaki Tōmitsu (1869–1912) left very few traces in the history of Meiji literature, although he is, by all account, the first man to ever write a history of Japanese literature in a Western language, his *Geschichte der japanischen Nationallitteratur*, written in German. Convinced as he was that Japanese literature was condemned to be misrepresented in books written by Westerners, he took it upon himself to elaborate what he deemed to be a fair account, which, he thought, was the necessary precondition to allow Japanese literature to take its rightful place within “world literature” (*Weltliteratur*). The aim of this paper is to situate Okazaki’s endeavour within the current of the 1890s literary history, especially in relation with the reappraisal of the *Man’yōshū* which comes to be viewed as the first monument of a properly “national” literature. For Okazaki who dedicated his doctoral thesis, also written in German, to this anthology, it becomes the model for all posterior literature.



Okazaki Tōmitsu (1869–1912)<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Picture in KEIJŌ DENKI KABUSHIKI-GAISHA, 1929: 18; <https://dl.ndl.go.jp/info:ndljp/pid/1188151> (accessed: 01.06.2021).

## Introduction

In the introductory chapter to his *Ten Lessons on the History of National Literature* 国文学史十講, Haga Yaichi 芳賀矢一 (1867–1927) takes stock of the development of literary history in the 1890s, arguably the most decisive decade in the history of the field in Japan:

The word “History of Japanese Literature” has recently gained currency and publications [on this topic] have progressively appeared. In Meiji 17 or 18, I had seen something in the Shigaku Kyōkai 史學協會 review written by the professors Kurita Hiroshi 栗田寛 and Kimura Masakoto 木村正辭 titled “Literary History” 文學史, but if we talk about the works that appeared as one book, the *History of Japanese Literature* 日本文學史 by Mikami Sanji 三上參次 and Takatsu Kuwasaburō 高津鯨三郎 is the first one ever published. Later on, the same authors wrote an abbreviated version under the title *Short History of Japanese Literature* 日本文學小史, Konakamura [Ikebe] Yoshikata 小中村義象 and Masuda Ushin 増田于信 wrote a *History of Japanese Literature* 日本文學史, after which Ōwada Takeki 大和田建樹 wrote his *History of Japanese Literature* 日本文學史. Apart from those, there is also Suzuki Hiroyasu’s 鈴木弘恭 *Abridged History of Japanese Literature* 日本文學史略, Shinbo Iwaji’s 新保磐次 *Middle-School History of National Literature* 中學国文学史 and Imaizumi Teisuke’s 今泉定介 *Short History of Japanese Literature* 日本文學小史. Other ones were released one after the other, such as Ōwada Takeki’s *Great History of Japanese Literature* 日本大文學史, Sassa Seiichi [Seisetsu]’s 佐々政一 *History of Japanese Literature* 日本文學史, Utsumi Kōzō’s 内海弘蔵 *History of Japanese Literature* 日本文學史, Fujioka Sakutarō’s 藤岡作太郎 *Manual of History of Japanese Literature* 日本文學史教科書, Fujii Otoo 藤井乙男 and Takahashi Tatsuo’s 高橋龍雄 *History of Japanese Literature* 日本文學史, Okai Shingo’s 岡井慎吾 *History of Japanese Literature* 日本文學史 and Ikebe Yoshikata’s 池邊義象 *History of Japanese Literature* 日本文學史. During his studies in Germany, Okazaki Tōmitsu 岡崎遠光 wrote a small book on literary history in German.<sup>2</sup>

The 1890s had witnessed the flourishing of a new genre of scholarly works, the literary histories. Some of the titles cited above have gained a reputation as classics (it is undoubtedly the case of the *History of Japanese Literature* by Mikami and Takatsu), while others are nowadays only known to specialists. The very last item on the list, on the other hand, seems not to be read by scholars of literature. It is simply titled *Geschichte der japanischen Nationallitteratur. Von den ältesten Zeiten bis zur Gegenwart* (“History of Japan’s National Literature from the most ancient times to the present”) and it was written in German and published in Leipzig in 1899 by an almost completely forgotten figure, Okazaki Tōmitsu 岡崎遠光 (1869–1912).

<sup>2</sup> HAGA 1899:1–2.

The fact that Okazaki's work has been skipped over in the larger flow of history is in no way surprising, as the 1890s have been rife with developments in the field of literary history and more broadly, in all forms of knowledge pertaining to Japan's history and culture. The end of the 1880s and beginning of the 1890s have often been defined as period of "Japanisation", in the words of Donald Shively.<sup>3</sup> This "Japanisation" was a consequence of the backlash against the indiscriminate importation of Western culture into Japan in early Meiji, but also of the anti-foreign resentment fostered by the unequal treaties. The drive to "Japanisation" manifested itself very evidently in intellectual circles, where writers, scholars and artists called for the preservation of "national essence" (*kokusui hozon* 国粹保存).<sup>4</sup> This willingness to defend Japanese culture against Western imperialism triggered the compilation of scholarly works on Japanese culture, notably on its history of art and history of literature, two fields that have received a great deal of scholarly attention.<sup>5</sup> Along with such an interest for Japanese culture came a willingness to showcase it to foreign powers, in an attempt to convince them of the legitimacy of Japan's position among cultured – and hence respectable – nations. Nowhere is this more eloquently illustrated than in the Hōō-den 鳳凰殿 pavilion, designed for the 1893 Chicago World Fair and built right across the American pavilion.<sup>6</sup> This showcasing of Japan's cultural heritage was also a scholarly one and many intellectuals were moved to take up their pen to write directly for the Western public, using Western languages. Such was of course the case of Okakura Tenshin 岡倉天心 (1863–1913),<sup>7</sup> but also of lesser-known figures, such as Fujishima Ryōon 藤島了穩 (1852–1918), the author of a short history of Japanese Buddhism in 1889,<sup>8</sup> and Hayashi Tadamasu 林忠正 (1853–1906) and Kuki Ryūichi 九鬼隆一 (1852–1931), who authored the first history of Japanese art written in a foreign language, in anticipation of the 1900 Paris Universal Exposition.<sup>9</sup> All these texts constitute attempts to articulate the perceived expectations of a Western readership with a Japanese narrative on Japanese culture that is itself the product of negotiations between native scholarly traditions and intellectual innovations.

In this respect, Okazaki's work is interesting as object for a case study, especially because of the central role played in his reflection on Japanese literature by the *Man'yōshū* 万葉集, to which he had devoted his doctoral thesis, also written in German.

<sup>3</sup> SHIVELY 1976.

<sup>4</sup> The expression was the motto of the journal *Nihon-jin* 日本人, founded in 1888 by Miyake Setsurei 三宅雪嶺 (1860–1945), Shiga Shigetaka 志賀重昂 (1863–1927), Inoue Enryō 井上円了 (1859–1919) and others (SHIVELY 1976:102).

<sup>5</sup> BROWNSTEIN 1987; SUZUKI 2006; LOZERAND 2005; CONANT 2006a.

<sup>6</sup> CONANT 2006b.

<sup>7</sup> CHARRIER 1999; MITTEAU 2013.

<sup>8</sup> Under the title *Les Douze sectes bouddhiques du Japon* ("The Twelves Buddhist Sects of Japan"). On this work, see FRANK 1983.

<sup>9</sup> Titled *Histoire de l'Art du Japon* ("History of Japanese Art"). See MARQUET 1999: 153–159.

The wide-ranging anthology, compiled during the Nara period (710–794), had occupied a peripheral position in the Japanese literary canon, before its revaluation by the Edo period scholars of the school of National Learning (*kokugaku* 国学), who were eager to reinstate this “pre-classic” in its rightful place as the true literary expression of Japaneseness.<sup>10</sup> The *Man'yōshū* also became the common ground for many heated discussions regarding the definition of a “national poetry” (*kokushi* 国詩) and, as such, it was reinterpreted within the new “national” framework as an expression of Japan’s national character. The anthology thus crystallised many of the cultural dynamics that the young generation of literary historians found itself confronted with.

Therefore, we shall try to show how Okazaki gave shape to an image of the Japanese literary tradition in a time where this tradition was constantly being reassessed and where writers of literary histories were facing a variety of oftentimes contradictory injunctions coming from within Japan and from the perceived necessity of engaging with the Westerners. The first part of our text will essentially be an attempt at a biographical sketch of Okazaki Tōmitsu, in which we shall highlight his ties to intellectual figures of Japan and Germany. We will then shift our focus to his works on literature that predate the *History of Japan’s National Literature*, in order to show how Okazaki elaborated his conception of literature, especially in his thesis on the *Man'yōshū*. We will finally try to propose an analysis of the overall structure of Okazaki’s *History of Japan’s National Literature* and show how it attempts to construe a full-length history of Japanese literature from the vantage point of the *Man'yōshū*.

## 1 Okazaki and his Environment

### Biographical Sketch

One might expect that Okazaki Tōmitsu 岡崎遠光 would not be a complete stranger, as he is mentioned by such a commanding figure as Haga. Yet it is extremely difficult to retrieve any biographical information from dictionaries or databases. As a consequence, the most comprehensive account of his life might well be that of his gravestone, which is to be found in Yanaka Cemetery 谷中 in Tōkyō. The text, presumably written by his first-born son, reads:<sup>11</sup>

先考遠光舊水戸藩士下野遠重之長子、明治二年九月二十三日生於水戸。自幼好學、弱冠負笈肄于東京帝国大学文科。卒業後爲岡崎惟素之嗣、配長女幸子。尋而遊學獨逸淹留三星霜、得哲学博士之稱稱號而歸奉職于日本銀行爲調査役。未幾辭之、企劃日韓瓦斯電氣株式會社創立。

<sup>10</sup> We borrow the expression of “pre-classic” applied to the *Man'yōshū* from DUTHIE 2009.

<sup>11</sup> We would like to express our gratitude to Mr. Yanis Deschamps and Mr. Davide Chiamonte, who were kind enough to provide us with high-quality pictures of the stele. Our thanks also go to Mr. Alain Briot for his help in deciphering its characters.

時值日露戰役之後、財界益多艱。先考乃東奔西走、投私財、竭全力。事成而被撰爲專務取締役。名重於京城後、被推爲商業會議所會頭、將大有所爲、會獲病。永眠時大正二年十一月十九日也。享年四十有五。先考爲人、明敏剛毅、裁斷如流、最好讀書、能詩文殊長。國風所著書有數種、爲世所重。晚年信基督教、爲教會盡瘁多矣。有二男、四女。不肖以長嗣後。

滝之助

大正三年十一月建

My late father Tōmitsu was the first-born child of Shimonotsuke Tōshige, retainer of the former domain of Mito. He was born on the 23rd day of the ninth month of the second year of Meiji. Since childhood, he loved learning and, after his coming of age, he left to seek education and he studied at the faculty of letters of Tōkyō Imperial University. After graduation, he became the heir to Okazaki Koremoto and married his daughter Sachiko. Soon after, he went to study abroad in Germany, where he remained for three years, before obtaining the grade of doctor in philosophy, after which he returned [to Japan] and occupied the position of assistant to a head of department at the Bank of Japan. After a short while, he resigned and made plans for the creation of the Nippo-Korean Gas and Power Company. In the aftermath of the Russo-Japanese War, the financial world was facing more and more difficulties. My late father made every effort he could, investing his personal funds and exhausting his own forces. The company was [finally] established and he was appointed as its executive managing director. Once his name has become well-known in Keijō [Seoul], he was elected as head of the Chamber of Commerce. He set about accomplishing great things when he was struck by an illness. He died on the 19th day of the 11th month in the second year of Taishō, at the age of forty-five. My late father was a very astute and quick-witted man, with a strong will and an ability for judging things promptly. He enjoyed reading above all things and was very skilled at composing Sino-Japanese prose and poetry. He also wrote numerous books in the national style [in Japanese], which earned him general respect. In his later years, he became a Christian and he made great expenses for the Church. He had two sons and four daughters who, unworthy as they may be, will take up his succession.

Takinosuke

Erected in the eleventh month of the third year of Taishō

We obtain further information from a short text appended by Okazaki himself to the doctoral thesis he wrote in German at the University of Leipzig. The thesis, which presents itself as a relatively general study on the *Man'yōshū*, was given the title “The *Man'yōshū*: a critical-aesthetical study” (*Das Manyōshū. Eine kritisch-ästhetische Studie*) and was submitted in 1898. The final „*Lebenslauf*“ (“*curriculum vitae*”) reads:

Geboren bin ich am 26. September 1872 in Tōkyō und gehöre keiner Konfession an. Bis zu meinem elften Lebensjahre erhielt ich in der höheren Elementarschule zu Mito Unterricht. Dasselbst wurde ich durch Privatunterricht mit der chinesischen Litteratur vertraut gemacht und besuchte später drei Jahre lang dort das Gymnasium. Von meinem fünfzehnten bis zum siebzehnten Lebensjahre bildete ich mich auf dem Dōniusha-Privatgymnasium [sic] zu Tōkyō in Mathematik, Geographie, Geschichte, Physik, Chemie, Litteratur u.s.w., hauptsächlich in der englischen Sprache, weiter aus. Nach bestandener Reifeprüfung im Jahre 1890 bezog ich die kaiserliche Universität zu Tōkyō als Senkasei, wo ich bis Juli 1894 hauptsächlich die japanische Litteratur und Geschichte studierte und die Prüfungen bestanden habe. In meiner Universitätszeit verfasste ich folgende Bücher: „Der populäre Kommentar des Hyakunin-issu“ und „Die Geschichte der japanischen Frauenlitteratur“.

Im Jahre 1895 habe ich mit dem Oberlehrer N. Kumada „Die moderne Geschichte von China“ bearbeitet, welche auf seinen Namen herausgegeben wurde. In demselben Jahre habe ich eine japanische Elementargrammatik verfasst und herausgegeben. Hier in Deutschland hörte ich im Wintersemester 1895 und im Sommersemester 1896 die Vorlesungen der Herren Professoren Haym, Conrad, Erdmann, Diehl und Schultze an der Universität zu Halle a. S. Im Wintersemester 1896 ließ ich mich bei der philosophischen Fakultät zu Leipzig immatrikulieren und hörte die Vorlesungen der Herren Professoren Heinze, Wundt, Volkelt und Conrady.

28 Mai 1897

I was born on the 26th September 1872 in Tōkyō and do not belong to any religion. Until my eleventh year, I was educated at the elementary school of Mito. There, I also became acquainted with Chinese literature through private classes and I later attended high-school for three years. From the age of fifteen to the age of seventeen, I completed my education in mathematics, geography, history, physics, chemistry, literature and so on, mostly in the English language, at the Dōniusha private high-school (Dōjinsha 同人社) in Tōkyō. After graduating from high-school in 1890, I enrolled at the Imperial University of Tōkyō as a special course student (*senkasei* 選科生). At this university, I mainly studied Japanese literature and history and took the exams. During my time at university, I authored the following books: *A Popular Commentary on the Hyakunin-Isshu* (百人一首略解) and a *History of Japanese Women's Literature* (日本女學史).

In 1895, I worked with Prof. N. Kumada [Kumada Nenoshirō 熊田子之四郎] on the *History of Modern China* [*Shina-kinsei-shi* 支那近世史], which was published under his name. The same year, I wrote and published an elementary Japanese grammar. Here in Germany, during the winter semester of 1895 and the summer semester of 1896, I attended the lectures taught at the University of Halle by Professors [Rudolf]

Haym,<sup>12</sup> [Johannes] Conrad,<sup>13</sup> [Benno] Erdmann,<sup>14</sup> [Karl] Diehl<sup>15</sup> and [Alfred] Schultze.<sup>16</sup> During the winter semester 1896, I enrolled at the University of Leipzig and attended the lectures given by Professors [Max] Heinze,<sup>17</sup> [Wilhelm] Wundt,<sup>18</sup> [Johannes] Volkelt<sup>19</sup> and [August] Conrady.<sup>20</sup>

28th May 1897<sup>21</sup>

It should be noted that this German biographical sketch doesn't give the same birth year and birthplace of Okazaki as the gravestone and that no mention is made of his adoption by Okazaki Koremoto.

On the basis of both texts and with the combined help of the catalogue of the National Diet Library and two "company histories" (*shashi* 社史),<sup>22</sup> it becomes possible to retrace the main events of Okazaki's short life as follows :

- He was born between 1869 and 1872, presumably in Mito, the son of Shimotsuke Tōshige 下野遠重, retainer of the Mito domain.
- He studied at Dōjinsha High School 同人社<sup>23</sup> in Tōkyō, before enrolling in the faculty of letters at Tōkyō Imperial University.<sup>24</sup>

<sup>12</sup> Philosopher (1821–1901). All information on the teaching staff of the University of Halle draws from MARTIN-LUTHER-UNIVERSITÄT HALLE-WITTENBERG.

<sup>13</sup> Economist (1839–1915).

<sup>14</sup> Philosopher (1851–1921).

<sup>15</sup> Economist (1864–1943).

<sup>16</sup> Law historian (1864–1946); Information on the teaching staff of the University of Leipzig comes from UNIVERSITÄT LEIPZIG (2011).

<sup>17</sup> Philosopher (1835–1909).

<sup>18</sup> Philosopher and physiologist (1832–1920).

<sup>19</sup> Philosopher (1848–1930).

<sup>20</sup> Linguist and specialist of Indian and Nepalese languages (1864–1925).

<sup>21</sup> OKAZAKI 1898: 69.

<sup>22</sup> CHŌSEN DENKI JIGYŌ SHI HENSHŪ IINKAI 2005; KEIJŌ DENKI KABUSHIKI-GAISHA 1929; KEIJŌ DENKI KABUSHIKI-GAISHA SHOMU-KA 1935. The immense utility of the *shashi* database curated by the Shibusawa Eiichi Foundation (SHIBUSAWA EIICHI MEMORIAL FOUNDATION) for the research into Japanese companies' personnel should be underlined here.

<sup>23</sup> The Dōjinsha school 同人社 was founded in Tōkyō in 1873 by Nakamura Masanao 中村正直 (1832–1891), who had been one of the students sent to England by the *bakufu* in 1866. On the influence exerted by the British education system on Meiji Japan, see COBBING (1998: 166–170).

<sup>24</sup> It should be mentioned that the faculty of letters underwent numerous changes of name and status at the end of the 19th century: in 1877, the newly established University of Tōkyō 東京大学 features a faculty of letters 文学部, further divided into a department of history, philosophy and politics 史学、哲学及政治学科 and a department of Sino-Japanese literature 和漢文學科. In 1885, this department is split up into the department of Chinese literature 漢文學科 and the department of Japanese literature 和文学科, in anticipation of the creation of the Imperial University 帝国大学 in 1886. In 1889, this department will then be further divided into a department of national history 国史学科 and a department of national literature 国文学科, the latter being, in all likelihood, the one



- Tōmitsu is then adopted by Okazaki Koremoto 岡崎惟素 (1840–1905), retainer of the Okayama domain, who, after the Restoration, went to work at Mitsubishi 三菱商会, before being elected as a trustee of the Tōkyō Stock Exchange 東京株式取引所.<sup>25</sup> Tōmitsu marries his daughter Sachiko 幸子 and takes the name of Okazaki.
- In 1895, Tōmitsu goes to Germany, where he enrolls at the University of Halle, then at the University of Leipzig. He studies economy and philosophy and obtains his PhD in philosophy in 1898.
- In 1899, he enters the Bank of Japan 日本銀行 (where he assumes the position of assistant 調査役 to the head of the National Debt Bureau 国債局).
- In 1908, along with Shibusawa Eiichi 渋沢栄一 and Takamatsu Toyokichi 高松豊吉, he sets up the Nippo-Korean Gas Company 日韓瓦斯株式会社.<sup>26</sup> On Sone Arasuke's 曾禰荒助 invitation – then Resident-General of Korea under Japanese rule – Okazaki moves to Korea to assume his functions as executive managing director 専務取締役 at the newly created company, which is run by Shibusawa himself until the following year. The same year, the company buys the Korean-American Power Company 韓美電気株式会社,<sup>27</sup> to become the Nippo-Korean Gas and Power Company 日韓瓦斯電気株式会社.
- In 1911, Okazaki founds the Daejeon Power Corporation 大田氣電氣株式會社 and becomes its president.
- In 1912, he falls ill and is repatriated. He dies in Japan on the 24th of November.

We shall conclude this short biographical account by a succinct list of Okazaki's works, which are, for the most part, accessible through the National Diet Library database. The names of the authors of forewords and prefaces – who are often quite illustrious – are included alongside the titles when they are relevant to the description of the literary milieu Okazaki evolved in:

Works published under the name of Shimotsuke:

- *Hyakunin-isshu ryakuge* 百人一首略解 (*Popular Commentary to the Hyakunin-isshu*<sup>28</sup>), Tōkyō, Hakubun-kan 博文館, "Complete Works for Women's Education Series" 女学全書, 1892.
- *Nise-genji* 似而非源氏 (*Pseudo-Genji*), Tōkyō, Keigyō-sha 敬業社, 1892.

---

Okazaki enrolled in. The Imperial University changed its name in 1897 and became Tōkyō Imperial University 東京帝国大学. For practical reasons, we shall refer to this institution as "Tōkyō University" throughout this article.

<sup>25</sup> As his gravestone, located in the same lot as Tōmitsu's, informs us. Koremoto is also a man of culture, well-versed in poetry and calligraphy, and the author of a book on tea ceremony: *The Methods for Infusing Tea: a Comparison of the Various Traditions* (点茶活法: 各伝比較).

<sup>26</sup> CHŌSEN DENKI JIGYŌ SHI HENSHŪ IINKAI 2005: 14–17; 46.

<sup>27</sup> The company is the Hanseong Electric Company 漢城電氣會社, established by Henry Collbran in 1898 and renamed in 1904.

<sup>28</sup> The name 略解 signifies "abbreviated commentary", but we translated it as "popular commentary" in keeping with Okazaki's German translation as „populärer Kommentar“ in his „Lebenslauf“.



- *Nihon-bungaku-shūran* 日本文学集覧 (*Collection of Japanese Literature*), coauthored with Yamazaki Kōgorō 山崎庚午郎, Tōkyō, Hakubun-kan 博文館, 1892. With corrections by Takatsu Kuwasaburō 高津鯨三郎. Japanese preface by Naitō Chisō 内藤恥叟, Sinitic preface by Masuda Ushin 増田于信.
- *Nihon-jogaku-shi* 日本女學史 (*History of Japanese Women's Literature*<sup>29</sup>), Tōkyō, Keigyō-sha 敬業社, 1893. Sinitic preface by Inoue Tetsujirō 井上哲次郎.
- *Shina-kinsei-shi* 支那近世史 (*History of Modern China*) co-authored by Kumada Nenoshirō 熊田子之四郎, Tōkyō, Hakubun-kan 博文館, 1895.

#### Works published under the name of Okazaki:

- *Yesu-kyō no kiki* 耶蘇教の危機 (*The Christian Peril*), Tōkyō, Inoue Sokichi 井上蘇吉, 1893.
- *Nihon-shōbunten* 日本小文典 (*A Short Japanese Grammar*), amended and revised by Kumada Nenoshirō 熊田子之四郎, Tōkyō, Shōeidō 松榮堂, 1895.
- *Das Man'yōshū. Eine kritisch-ästhetische Studie* (*The Man'yōshū: a critical-aesthetical study*), Leipzig, Duncker & Humblot, 1898.
- *Geschichte der japanischen Nationalliteratur. Von den ältesten Zeiten bis zur Gegenwart* (*History of Japan's National Literature from the most ancient times to the present*), Leipzig, Brockhaus, 1899.
- *Keisei-hyōron : bungaku, bijutsu, keizai, seiji no kansatsu* 警世評論: 文学・美術・経済・政治之觀察 (*Essays to Caution the Time: observations on literature, the arts, economy and politics*), Tōkyō, Hakubun-kan 博文館, 1899.
- *Chochiku-yōron* 貯蓄要論 (*The Essentials of Saving*), Tōkyō, Keizai-shoten 經濟書店, 1901.
- *Fujin-mondai* 婦人問題 (*The Woman Question*), Tōkyō, Keigyō-sha 敬業社, 1902.
- *Ginkō-seisaku* 銀行政策 (*Banking Policies*), Tōkyō, Hakubun-kan 博文館, 1902.
- *Kin, Gin, Kawase* 金・銀・為換 (*Gold, Silver, Exchange*), self-published, 1906.
- *Chōsen-kin'yū oyobi sangyō-seisaku* 朝鮮金融及産業政策 (*Financial and Industrial Policies in Korea*), Tōkyō, Dōbun-kan 同文館, 1911.

One cannot help but notice that the man who, so his epitaph tells us, converted to Christianity in his old age started off as a vehement critic of the dangers posed by the very same faith to the Japanese state (in his *Christian Peril*).

### **Okazaki and the literary milieu of Meiji Japan**

In many respects, Okazaki resembles other better-known figures of the Meiji era's literary milieu. He is also only slightly younger than the generation of scholars who authored the

---

<sup>29</sup> The word 女學 usually refers to “women's education”, as in the name of the “Complete Works for Women's Education Series” 女学全書. Here, however, it very clearly refers to the literature written by women, hence the German translation „Frauenlitteratur“ in Okazaki's „Lebenslauf“, quoted above.

first literary histories of Japan, such as Ochiai Naobumi (1861–1903), Ueda Kazutoshi (1867–1937), Haga Yaichi (1867–1927), Mikami Sanji (1865–1939) and Takatsu Kuwasaburō (1864–1921).<sup>30</sup> He shares a great number of the common characteristics of this generation described by Emmanuel Lozerand:<sup>31</sup> he belongs to the first generation of students at Tōkyō University (even if he entered it as *senkasei* 選科生 – limited status student, rather than as regular student) who grew up in the aftermath of the turmoil caused by the Restoration, he has a keen interest in *waka*<sup>32</sup> and in linguistic issues.<sup>33</sup> He has experienced Western-style education, first at Dōjinsha, where classes were taught in English, then during his time in Halle and Leipzig.

Above all, his enrolment in the faculty of letters at Tōkyō University allowed him to come into contact with numerous intellectuals of the time. On the side of the faculty members, one thinks first and foremost of Inoue Tetsujirō, author of a short preface to Okazaki's *History of Women's Literature*. Also a returnee from Germany, where he studied for seven years (1884–1890), Inoue will go on to teach philosophy at the faculty of letters. Then comes Naitō Chisō, author of a short preface to Okazaki's *Collection of Japanese Literature* (1893), who, like him, came from Mito and who taught Chinese literature.<sup>34</sup> Okazaki also presumably followed the classes of Kimura Masakoto (1827–1913) on the *Man'yōshū*, in which Kimura seems to have mostly dealt with phonetics and prosody („Laut- und Reimlehre“).<sup>35</sup> On the side of the students, it is noteworthy that Okazaki was acquainted with Takatsu Kuwasaburō, co-author of the first *History of Japanese Literature* 日本文学史 (1890), who corrected and amended the *Collection of Japanese Literature*. Lastly, Kumada Nenoshirō (1864–1945), whom Okazaki assisted in the writing of his *History of Modern China*, was also a student at the same faculty.

At this end of this brief overview of the literary milieu whose atmosphere Okazaki was steeped in during his time at Tōkyō University, we shall remark that he was involved in a number of publishing projects led by Hakubunkan 博文館, a publishing house well-known

<sup>30</sup> On these figures, see LOZERAND 2005: 73–140.

<sup>31</sup> LOZERAND 2005: 88–89.

<sup>32</sup> As evidenced by his commentary on the *Hyakunin-isshu*, his doctoral thesis on the *Man'yōshū* and the prominent position of *waka* in his *History of Women's Literature* and his *Collection of Japanese Literature*. In the foreword to his thesis on the *Man'yōshū* (OKAZAKI 1898: v), Okazaki also recounts how, in his childhood back in Mito, he studied Japanese and Chinese poetry under the guidance of a private tutor, as was often the case (one thinks of Masaoka Shiki or Ochiai Naobumi).

<sup>33</sup> The *Short Japanese Grammar*, as its preface makes clear, aims at correcting the many faults that Okazaki finds with the quality of his contemporaries' writings. The style for which he proposes a set of rules is the literary style (*bungo* 文語) and not, as could be expected, the Sinitic register (*kanbun-chōshi* 漢文調子), which he adopts in most of his works.

<sup>34</sup> LOZERAND 2005: 101–103. Okazaki's *Christian Peril* repeatedly alludes to Inoue's idea of fundamental contradiction between Christianity and the loyalty to the sovereign, which he developed in his *Conflict of education and religion* 教育と宗教の衝突 (1893).

<sup>35</sup> OKAZAKI 1898: 9. Okazaki also mentions Kimura's commentary on the *Man'yōshū* at the end of his list of the various Edo and Meiji commentaries.

for the instrumental role it played in the constitution of literary history. Its founder Ōhashi Sahei 大橋佐平 (1835–1901) had established the company in 1887 and he attempted to foster his own image as a patron of Japanese letters by starting several series of major literary works of the Japanese literary tradition, such as the “Complete Works of Japanese Literature” 日本文学全書 (1890–1892) and the “Complete Works of Japanese Poetry” 日本歌学全書 (1891–1893). Hakubunkan also launched the literary magazine *The Sun* 太陽 (from 1894 onwards), which was to become a major forum for cultural and literary debates in later years.<sup>36</sup>

Okazaki thus was in close proximity to the leading figures of literary history, although he himself played but a small role in the movement, which he followed rather than spearheaded.

### Okazaki in Germany: August Conrady and Karl Florenz

As mentioned above, Okazaki studied economics and philosophy at the universities of Halle and Leipzig. Yet it should be noted that none of his professors in both disciplines are cited in his German writings, even though he cites contemporary German philosophical references, especially in his thesis.

On the other hand, the *History of National Japanese Literature* is explicitly dedicated to August Conrady (1864–1925). Conrady is the second professor of East-Asian languages („ostasiatische Sprachen“) at the University of Leipzig, taking over in 1897 after Georg Conon von der Gabelentz (1841–1893), one of the originators of German Sinology.<sup>37</sup> Conrady habilitated in 1891 and taught in Leipzig as *Privatdozent* since 1892.<sup>38</sup> A specialist of the Indian, Austronesian and Tibeto-Burman languages, Conrady authored the first-ever grammar of the Newari language.<sup>39</sup> Conrady seems to have shown some degree of interest for Chinese. Although he had taught a “reading class on a Sino-Japanese text” (the *Great Learning*, which was presumably read in *kundoku* 訓読) between 1895 and 1897, he had on the whole little curiosity for the Japanese language,<sup>40</sup> whose teaching he gladly relegated to André Wedemeyer a decade or so later. Thus, it seems hardly likely that Okazaki would

<sup>36</sup> On Hakubun-kan, see RICHTER 1997 and LOZERAND 2005: 297–319. Lozerand calls attention to the fact that many of the classical works in the series are made available in type set for the first time and that the volumes’ affordability (one volume costs 25 *sen*) ensures a large circulation.

<sup>37</sup> On this towering figure of German Sinology, author of an extraordinarily rich *Chinesische Grammatik*, see LEIBFRIED 2003: 25–49. On Conrady, LEIBFRIED 2003: 51–59.

<sup>38</sup> In Germany, Austria and Switzerland, the *Privatdozent* is a habilitated professor without tenure. Conrady was *Privatdozent* of Indian languages and of Tibetan from 1892 onwards. In 1895, he became *Privatdozent* of Indian languages, Tibetan and East-Asian languages.

<sup>39</sup> *Das Newâri. Grammatik und Sprachproben*, 1891.

<sup>40</sup> Von der Gabelentz, on the other hand, had apparently written a classical Japanese grammar in 1890, which was never published.

have received any influence regarding Japanese language and Japanese literature from Conrady, who seemingly made every effort to keep away from these subjects.

If we are to look for an influential figure in the German landscape, whose works on Japan would have exerted influence on the critical production of Okazaki, Karl Florenz (1865–1939), the father of German Japanology is undoubtedly a better candidate than Conrady. Through the good offices of von der Gabelentz, Florenz had met Inoue Tetsujirō 井上哲次郎 (1856–1944) in Leipzig in 1885.<sup>41</sup> Later on, Florenz would stay in Japan for an extended period of time, between 1888 and 1914, during which he taught at Tōkyō University. Once in Japan, Florenz devoted considerable time to his research on the history of Japanese literature, whose outcome would be published in 1906 in the form of a voluminous *Geschichte der japanischen Litteratur*.<sup>42</sup> Florenz also undertook a German translation of the *Man'yōshū* with the help of Fujishiro Teisuke 藤代禎輔 (1868–1927), whom he sent to attend the lectures of Kimura Masakoto on the anthology from 1891 onwards. The definitive translation was presumably started around 1909 and completed in 1914, the year Florenz left Japan to take up a position at the Kolonial-Institut in Hamburg.<sup>43</sup> The first complete draft having been lost in the course of the return journey to Europe,<sup>44</sup> Florenz undertook a second translation at the end of World War I, which was interrupted by his death in 1939. At this point, the hopes to see the completion of the German translation had vanished and the fate of Germany dealt the final blow to Florenz' endeavours as the manuscript kept by his wife Therese fell prey to the flames during the Allied bombing of Hamburg in July 1943. It appears from all this that Florenz shared many of Okazaki's interests, but yet it doesn't seem that the former had any knowledge of the latter's works. Florenz' *Geschichte* makes no reference to the literary history written by Okazaki a few years before, nor does it allude to his thesis on the *Man'yōshū*.<sup>45</sup> Okazaki doesn't allude to Florenz' *Geschichte* either, but in his thesis he does make a repeated use of Florenz' German translations of the *Man'yōshū* which he published 1894 in the short anthology *Dichtergrüsse aus dem Osten* ("Poetic Greetings from the East"), whose title is unambiguously cited. Okazaki also cites other translations by Florenz, of which one is without any doubt not borrowed from the *Dichtergrüsse*.<sup>46</sup> If this is not an error on Okazaki's part, it might mean that he had an early access to some of the translations

<sup>41</sup> SATŌ 1995: 133. Inoue studied at the universities of Heidelberg (two semesters), Leipzig (one semester, during which he heard the lectures of Wilhelm Wundt, as did Okazaki), then Berlin, where he was recruited to teach Japanese within the *Seminar für orientalische Sprachen*. Concerning Inoue's first encounter with von der Gabelentz and Florenz, see INOUE 1943: 217–221.

<sup>42</sup> On this seminal work, see SATŌ 1995: 10–44 and NAUMANN 1985.

<sup>43</sup> SATŌ 1995: 46–7; 143.

<sup>44</sup> INOUE (1943: 227–228) relates that the piece of luggage containing the complete manuscript of Florenz' German translation of the *Man'yōshū* was seized in Russia, as Florenz was returning to Germany via the Trans-Siberian railway.

<sup>45</sup> SATŌ 1995: 11–12.

<sup>46</sup> OKAZAKI 1898: 48. Compare with Florenz' translation in FLORENZ 1915: 48.

started by Florenz in 1891, which would in turn entail some degree of closeness between the two. It is nevertheless completely impossible to decide one way or another in this respect and we cannot assume a detailed knowledge of Florenz' scientific contributions on Okazaki's part. However, it must be reminded that Florenz taught at Tōkyō University when Okazaki was studying there and that he might have exerted an influence on Okazaki through the content of his lectures. Many of Florenz' early manuscripts on the history of Japanese literature were destroyed and it is therefore difficult to know the exact content of Florenz' teaching, but suffice to say that he encouraged the students in his German class to write their thesis on Japanese literature and that he had introduced them to Hermann Kluge's *Geschichte der deutschen National-Literatur* (1869), whose title bears a striking resemblance to that of the short book the young Okazaki was to compile a few years later.<sup>47</sup> It is therefore not completely unlikely that Florenz should have – directly or indirectly – influenced the young Okazaki's vision of literature and of the problems of literary history.

## 2 Before the History of Japan's National Literature

The *History of Japan's National Literature* is by no means Okazaki's first opus on Japanese literary history. It is not even his first work on the matter in a foreign language, since he has already published his thesis on the *Man'yōshū* as the *History* comes out. The small amount of works written before the *History*, most prominent among which the thesis written during Okazaki's period in Germany, allows us insights into Okazaki's intellectual progression, most notably into his reflection on literary history. It also enables us to discern his ideological positions regarding literature, which is to a great extent rendered possible by the intellectual centrality of the *Man'yōshū* in the era's reflection and reappraisal of literature. Okazaki's evolution is most evident in four areas: the definition of literature (and of national literature), the position of Japanese literature within the world's culture, the nature of the determining factors of literary history and the periodization of literary history.

### The definition of literature and national literature

Okazaki's *History of Japan's National Literature* is quite remarkable in that it offers no definition of the very subject it sets out to deal with, as if the question of the nature of literature was a settled one. As Suzuki Sadami and Emmanuel Lozerand – among many others – have shown, though, in Meiji Japan, the question of the nature of literature is very much a pressing one, one that is being thoroughly discussed and sometimes fiercely

---

<sup>47</sup> BABA 2020: 127.

debated. Accordingly, Mikami Sanji's and Takatsu Kuwasaburō's *History of Japanese Literature* devotes a great number of pages to the elucidation of this particular question.<sup>48</sup> We should keep in mind that their definition is confined to what they call "pure literature" (*junbungaku* 純文学):

文學とは或る文体を以て、巧みに人の思想、感情、想像を表はしたる者にして、実用と快楽とを兼ねるを目的とし、大多数の人に大体の智識を傳ふる者を云ふ

'Literature' is that which expresses skillfully and in a certain style the thoughts, the feelings and the imagination of man. It refers to that whose purpose is at the same time utility and pleasure and which conveys general knowledge to the majority.<sup>49</sup>

One can see clearly that the concept of "utility" (*jitsuyō* 実用) employed here entails some compromises with a more general perception of literature, which would not be limited to the *belles-lettres*, but also encompass scientific, journalistic writings and knowledge in general.<sup>50</sup>

The earlier *Collection of Japanese Literature* 日本文学集覧, co-authored with Yamazaki Kōgorō 山崎庚午郎 in 1892, was in fact built upon such a comprehensive conception of literature. This goes to show how the exact extension of the field was a matter of contention at the time, as is evidenced by the collection's table of contents:<sup>51</sup>

1. Japanese prose 和文
  1. History of Japanese prose 和文史
  2. Study material in Japanese prose 和文教草
2. Japanese poetry 和歌
  1. History of Japanese poetry 和歌史
  2. Study material of Japanese poetry 和歌教草
3. National history 国史
  1. Summary of our national history 国史要略
  2. Study material of national history 国史教草
4. Law 法制
  1. Law history - general remarks 法制史・総論
  2. Study material of law 法制教草

<sup>48</sup> SUZUKI 2006; LOZERAND 2005.

<sup>49</sup> MIKAMI/TAKATSU 1890: 13.

<sup>50</sup> See BROWNSTEIN (1987: 447–452) on the delineation of literature within the field of knowledge (*gakumon* 学問) in Mikami and Takatsu's *History of Japanese literature*.

<sup>51</sup> YAMAZAKI/OKAZAKI 1892: 13–24.



It should be noted that this table of contents makes no allusion to the existence of a Sino-Japanese literature, which is made up of texts composed in Sinitic – *kanbun* 漢文 – and of Sino-Japanese poetry – *kanshi* 漢詩, without completely excluding from the field of “Japanese literature” 日本文学 texts that were written down in Sinitic, such as the “study materials” of history and law. In this respect, Okazaki construes “Japanese” literature markedly less narrowly than his forerunners Ueda Kazutoshi (*National Literature* 国文学, 1890) or Haga Yaichi and Tachibana Senzaburō (*National Literature Reader* 国文学読本, 1890), from whose books Sino-Japanese literature is altogether left out,<sup>52</sup> while it is not entirely the case with Mikami and Takatsu’s *History of Japanese Literature* or with Okazaki’s *Geschichte der japanischen Nationallitteratur*.

That Okazaki omitted to define “literature” in his 1899 *Geschichte der japanischen Nationallitteratur* does not indicate that he was contented by a vague and comprehensive vision of literature. Rather, he was very conscious of the necessity of this definition, as becomes clear from the following characterization of literature, found in his 1893 *History of Women’s Literature*, which is worded in terms that strikingly resemble those of Mikami and Takatsu (which would hint that Okazaki had very probably read it):

文学の定義は如何にといふに、才学ある男、或は女が一定の方法によりて、読者に快樂を與へんが為に、想像、感情及推理等を書き現はしたるもの、即ち是なり。或は、文字を以て書かれたるものは、總て文学なりとの説もあれど、著者は美文学と名くべきもののみ、文学といふ。

What is the definition of literature? It is nothing else than the imagination, the feelings and the reasoning put down in writing by men and women of talent according to a certain method, in order to give pleasure to the readers. There is also the opinion that everything that is committed to writing is literature, but the author of these lines only calls “literature” the things that can be dubbed “belles-lettres”.<sup>53</sup>

This one definition forms the basis of all the ensuing ones and Okazaki will elaborate very little on it. Nor will he attempt to adapt it to the particular cases he is dealing with: “women’s literature” is solely the literature written by women rather than by men,<sup>54</sup> while “national literature” is but the body of literature written in a given country,<sup>55</sup> the idea of

<sup>52</sup> On these works, see LOZERAND 2005: 251–272 and 272–282.

<sup>53</sup> OKAZAKI 1893: 2.

<sup>54</sup> OKAZAKI (1893: 8): “When I speak of the history of women’s literature, I speak of the evolution of what is written in either verse or prose, in which only the thoughts, emotions and reflections of the women of this country manifest themselves in the writing or the style.” (予の女學史といふは、国民中の女性のみ思想、感情、及推理等が文字上、或は文字様のものに現れて、韻文、又は散文となりたるもの沿革をいふなり)。

<sup>55</sup> OKAZAKI (1893: 6): “When I speak of the literary history of a country, I speak of the evolution of this country’s own literature, written in either verse or prose, in which its people’s thoughts,

“nation” being left undefined. Rather than postulate a complete disinterest for these theoretical matters on Okazaki’s side, it is probably wiser to argue that he did not see the necessity to define both, since both concepts had already begun to carry some weight. Whereas Mikami and Takatsu had to appeal to Taine’s theory of the three causal factors determining the character of a nation (which is in turn reflected in its literature)<sup>56</sup> to lay out the conceptual groundwork of their *History of Japanese literature*, Okazaki seems to regard the idea of the uniqueness of the Japanese people as self-evident, the intellectual foundation of which seems to be provided by older ideas on the distinctiveness of Japanese culture, most notably *vis-à-vis* China.<sup>57</sup> The fact that he was writing in German, for a Western readership, could also account for the lack of definition. When writing for Japanese readers, as in the *History of Women’s Literature*, Okazaki would feel compelled to follow in the footsteps of Mikami and Takatsu and provide a working definition of literature, but it is likely that he did not feel the same necessity to do so as he was sketching his account of Japanese literature for Westerners, since he probably estimated that it was the Japanese element rather than the idea of literature they needed to be introduced to.

That Okazaki should elect to write his doctoral thesis on the *Man'yōshū* is also very significant with respect to the definition of a Japanese “national literature”. As Shinada Yoshikazu has eloquently shown, in the Meiji era, the vast anthology from the Nara period came to crystallise a great number of issues pertaining to the debate on “national literature”, just as Japan looks to the past for quintessentially Japanese models of the “national poetry” (*kokushi* 国詩) to come. A particular vision of the *Man'yōshū* takes shape from the third decade of Meiji onwards, a vision which Shinada dubbed the “vision of *Man'yōshū* as national anthology” 万葉集国民歌集観. This vision manifests itself under two forms, of which the latter will eventually supersede the former: the *Man'yōshū* is first viewed as an anthology of poems written by the entirety of the people – and as such, it

---

emotions and reflections manifest themselves in the writing or the style.” (一国の文學史といふは、其国人民の思想、感情、及推理等が文字、或は文字様のものに現れて、韻文、又は散文となりたる、一国固有の文学の沿革をいふなり). Here again, the definition given by Okazaki borders on plagiarism from MIKAMI/TAKATSU (1890: 29): “What we call the literature of a country should be defined as what its people express in the national language of its peculiar thoughts, feelings and of its imagination” (一国の文学といふものは、一国民が其国語によりて、その特有の思想、感情、想像を書きあらはしたる者なりといふべきなり).

<sup>56</sup> See TAINE 1866: XXIII and MIKAMI/TAKATSU 1890 :25–29. The three factors are the “national characteristics” (国民固有の特性), the external phenomena (*i.e.* geography and climate 身外の現像) and the current of the time (時運).

<sup>57</sup> OKAZAKI (1893: 7): “Our Japanese literature is rich with thinking and it possesses a great artistic beauty” (我日本人は文学の思想豊に、且つ美術の妙を獲たり). He acknowledges “elegance” 優美 as a quality unique to Japanese literature, a quality which is also alluded to in MIKAMI/TAKATSU (1890: 26): “Japanese literature is elegant, Chinese literature is majestic, Western literature is elaborate” (日本文学を優美といひ、支那文學を雄壯といひ、西洋文学を精緻といふ). The same qualification is also applied to Japanese literature by Haga Yaichi in his *Ten Lessons* (HAGA 1899: 13).

gives a unity and coherence to the nation as a whole (*kokumin* 国民); the *Man'yōshū* is then perceived as a work where a properly national and uniquely Japanese character finds its expression (*minzokuteki* 民族的).<sup>58</sup> Both aspects of this vision play out in Okazaki's work on the *Man'yōshū*. The first one is very clearly put in the following pronouncement, highly reminiscent of Mikami and Takatsu:

Da die Dichter und Dichterinnen im *Man'yōshū* den verschiedensten Klassen, vom Kaiser bis zum Arbeiter angehörten, so ist auch der Inhalt, die Form und der Stoff sehr verschieden.

As the poets of the *Manyōshū*, male as well as female, belonged to very diverse social classes – from the emperor to the worker, the content, the form and the subjects [of the poems] are very diverse.<sup>59</sup>

The idea of an essentially national character unmarred by Indian or Chinese influence is also present. Okazaki repeatedly alludes to a “fundamental character of the Japanese people” („Grundcharakter des japanischen Volkes“),<sup>60</sup> of which Japanese literature offers a reflection (as “a mirror of national characteristics”, „ein Spiegel der nationalen Eigentümlichkeiten“).<sup>61</sup> As was often the case at the end of the 19th century, this national character is presented here as a force capable of absorbing the external elements it needs without risking adulteration:

Doch muss angenommen werden, dass sich ein guter Teil [der japanischen Ideen] unverfälscht daneben erhalten hat, denn die ungesunden oder schwachen Denker bald ganz in chinesischen und indischen Anschauungen aufgingen, während die stärkeren japanischen Elemente aus letzteren nur ihre Nutzenwendungen zogen und sie somit völlig japanisierten und sich zu eigen machten. Wir finden infolgedessen noch heute im japanischen Volke eine Menge Grundideen aus jener Zeit, die sich als kostbarer Schatz von Generation zu Generation geerbt haben.

One must however admit that a large part [of the Japanese ideas] have maintained themselves unaltered because the unsound or weak thinkers soon lost themselves completely in Chinese and Indian conceptions, while the stronger Japanese elements among them only drew the use values of those conceptions, which they completely japanized and appropriated. Thus we still find in the Japanese people of

<sup>58</sup> See SHINADA (2001). The main points of the book are summed up in English in SHINADA (2002), they are further developed in SHINADA (2018).

<sup>59</sup> OKAZAKI 1898: 36. MIKAMI/TAKATSU (1890: 137): “Nara court was the age of waka. From the [emperor] to the man of the people, every one composed poetry.” (奈良の朝は和歌の時代なり。上は万乗の貴きより、下匹夫に至るまで、皆歌を詠まざるなし).

<sup>60</sup> OKAZAKI 1898: 61.

<sup>61</sup> OKAZAKI 1898: 65.

the present day a host of fundamental ideas from this time, which have been passed on like a precious treasure from generation to generation.<sup>62</sup>

It thus appears clearly that Okazaki writes on the *Man'yōshū* within the framework of the debate on Japan's national literature. This particular Japaneseness, nevertheless, is not so much embodied by the literary content of the anthology, but by the philosophical, religious and ethical notions that it comprises, which, according to Okazaki, have been undeservedly neglected by his predecessors. Even Sengaku 仙覚 (1203–1273) and Kamo no Mabuchi 賀茂真淵 (1697–1769), whom Okazaki speaks very highly of, have allegedly disregarded it, an oversight which Okazaki sets out to correct:

Doch wer hat bis jetzt die darin enthaltenen philosophischen, religiösen und ethischen Gesichtspunkte genau und richtig aufgesucht und kritisiert?

However, who, as of today, has accurately and justly examined and critiqued the philosophical, religious and ethical views [the *Man'yōshū*] contains?<sup>63</sup>

The value of the *Man'yōshū* as national literature is thus clearly predicated upon its conceptual value and Okazaki levels unsparing criticism at those among his predecessors who got carried away by what he views as aesthetic musings.<sup>64</sup> His definition of the national literature is therefore a rather ambiguous one: it is more or less coterminous with an aesthetic field, which it constantly threatens to leave for the sake of other non-aesthetic values.

<sup>62</sup> OKAZAKI 1898: 59. This brand of assimilationist nationalism was especially conspicuous in the pages of the journal *Imperial Literature* 帝国文学 (see chapter II.3 in SHINADA 2001). One will find a very telling example in the following pronouncement featured in an article written by Inoue Tetsujirō in 1895 ("The Past and Future of Japanese Literature" 日本文学の過去及び将来): "it is through the melting and appropriating of various forms of thoughts that we shall nurture the characteristics of our own national literature" (各種の思想を鎔鑄して以て我が者とすれば、自ら国民文学の特質を養成する; cited in SHINADA 2001: 68). See also OKAZAKI 1899b: 51.

<sup>63</sup> OKAZAKI 1898: 9. The thesis mainly revolves around the elucidation of the various "contents" of the *Man'yōshū* (see the "Table of contents" translated in the appendix).

<sup>64</sup> OKAZAKI (1898: 9): "Now I dare say it: the former critics and commentators, who still had not been trained in the modern thinking, allowed themselves to be carried away on the wings of their poetic fantasies and feelings more often than is permitted. Therefore, they could not analyse or synthesise well, so that they could not exercise good critique. They had acknowledged beauty as such but had barely any knowledge of how, where and whence it came to be, in short, they read less into the work than was actually there." („Ich wage jetzt zu behaupten, dass sich die früheren Kritiker oder Kommentatoren, welche die Schulung des modernen Denkens noch nicht besaßen, öfters dem Fluge ihrer dichterischen Phantasie und Empfindungen mehr hingaben, als es gestattet werden kann. Deshalb konnten sie nicht gut analysieren oder synthetisieren und somit auch nicht richtig kritisieren. Sie hatten das Schöne als das Schöne gut beurteilt, doch wussten sie kaum "wie", "worin" und "woher", kurz, sie lasen weniger in dem Werke, als darin steht“).

## The position of Japanese literature vis-à-vis Western literature

The issue of the rightful position of Japanese literature in relation to other (Western) literatures is never taken up in Okazaki's Japanese works. On the other hand, the very last chapter in his doctoral thesis, entitled "The trends of the time in *Man'yōshū* compared to those of our time" („Die Zeitströmungen im *Man'yōshū* im Vergleich zur Neuzeit“) grapples with it constantly. Okazaki draws a parallel between the introduction of Indian and Chinese cultures in the 7th and 8th centuries and that of Western cultures into Meiji Japan.<sup>65</sup> The first moments in this opening-up of Japan were, according to him, a period of indiscriminate cultural importation, which he judges severely.<sup>66</sup> Against this, he defends the notion that the Japanese national character is capable of adapting what must be adopted and rejecting what cannot be adapted. Thus, he favours what he calls a "sound eclecticism" („gesunde[r] Eklektizismus“), which he contrasts with the thoughtless adoption of foreign thinking, which he calls "syncretism" („Synkretismus“).<sup>67</sup> In his opinion, Germany provides an excellent example of this eclecticism, so much so that Japan should take it as its model:

So oft ich die Geschichte der modernen Philosophie studiert habe, habe ich mich stets darüber gewundert, wie die Deutschen es verstanden, das enthusiastische, phantasievolle Denken der Franzosen mit dem besonnenen, vorsichtigen Kritizismus der Engländer zu vereinigen und völlig in ihr eigenes Wesen aufzunehmen. Dieselbe Gabe muss ich auch den heutigen Japanern zugestehen, wie es sich denn überhaupt mehr und mehr herausstellen dürfte, dass die Japaner ihrer ganzen Charakter- und Geistesanlage nach berufen sein werden, dereinst im fernen Osten eine ähnliche Stellung in wissenschaftlicher Beziehung ausfüllen, wie die Deutschen im Westen.

---

<sup>65</sup> OKAZAKI (1898: 60): "To a larger degree, in the same way that India and China made themselves noticed with their cultural influence, in the modern times, Europe and America, with their advanced cultures, have penetrated Japan like a strong current breaking a dam, which is prominently visible in science and society" („In noch höherem Masse, wie sich schon zu jener Zeit Indien und China mit ihren Kultureinflüssen in Japan bemerkbar machten, sind in der neueren Zeit Europa und Amerika mit einer vorgeschrittenen Civilisation, wie ein gewaltiger Strom den Damm durchbrechend, eingedrungen. Das tritt hauptsächlich auf wissenschaftlichem und sozialem Gebiete hervor.“).

<sup>66</sup> OKAZAKI 1898: 65. He evokes a vogue of English authors that allegedly overshadowed Japanese literature completely (mentions are made of Chaucer, Shakespeare, Milton, Addison, Raleigh, Swift, Hume, Gray, Macaulay and Herbert Spencer).

<sup>67</sup> OKAZAKI 1898: 63. "Syncretism" is characterized as the "collation of heterogeneous thoughts without criticism or method" („ei[n] Zusammentragen heterogener Gedanken ohne Kritik und Methode“).

Whenever I studied the history of modern philosophy, I would constantly wonder how the Germans had understood how to combine the enthusiastic and imaginative thinking of the French with the prudent and cautious critical philosophy of the English and how to adopt them as an integral part of themselves. I must concede that the Japanese of today are endowed with the same gift, as it should become clear that the Japanese, for the entirety of their characters and mental dispositions, will be destined to occupy a similar position in the Far East in relation to science as the Germans in the West.<sup>68</sup>

Here is probably one of the key motivations for Okazaki to write his works in the German language. It is common knowledge in the Meiji era, that Germany is a literary latecomer compared to the two nations that boast uninterrupted literary traditions, namely England and France.<sup>69</sup> Germany, nevertheless, managed to overturn the *status quo* in order to build a literary tradition worthy of respect, as Mikami and Takatsu imply:

今の日耳曼の如きも、近代こそは其文學燦然として、觀るべきもの多けれども、耶蘇紀元千五百五十年頃より全千七百五十年ごろまで、大約二百年の間は殆ど文學無かりき。

As for contemporary Germany, its literature has only started to shine brightly in the modern era, and although there are many things worthy of note, it has been almost deprived of literature for a period of two hundred years, from around 1550 to 1750.<sup>70</sup>

In the 1890s, the opinion that Germany arrived at this through its positive valuation of folk literature becomes a prevailing one. The Japanese have by then progressively adopted Johannes Gottfried Herder's idea that folk literature, and especially folk songs, are a reflection of the profound *Volksgeist* of every nation and Germany is painted as the one country which succeeded in acting upon this conception to give rise to a truly national literature that is at the same time worthy of consideration. Such a conception, based upon the terrain of German romantic philosophy, will exert a great deal of influence on the second period of the vision of *Man'yōshū* as national anthology.<sup>71</sup> Okazaki, rather

<sup>68</sup> OKAZAKI 1898: 62.

<sup>69</sup> OKAZAKI 1898: 62. The notion of English and French literature as being the only two continuous literary traditions is of course a European idea (see for example the preface to TAINE 1866). The perceived continuity of a literary tradition is a central focus of debate in Japan and MIKAMI/TAKATSU (1890: 4) show a tremendous ingenuity to prove that, despite appearances, Japanese literature has never experienced an interruption (断絶せし事なし).

<sup>70</sup> MIKAMI/TAKATSU 1890: 3.

<sup>71</sup> See SHINADA (2001: 188ff.) for an overview of the Japanese understanding of "folk songs" and on the context of the translation of the German term *Volkslied* as *min'yō* 民謡.



unsurprisingly, will come to express his fondness for Japanese folk songs in later writings, but it is not yet the case in the works that we are dealing with.<sup>72</sup>

For Okazaki, Japan's situation is relatively close to that of Germany, save for one crucial element: contrary to Germany, Japan doesn't lack literature, it is just that the literature it possesses is not admitted into "world literature" („Weltliteratur“), as an anonymous German – whose words Okazaki conjures up in his discussion – rightly points out:

Jetzt hat sich Japan zwar zu einer ansehnlichen Stellung unter den Kulturländern emporgehoben, aber seine Literatur ist zurückgeblieben. Sie ist zwar schon sehr alt und die Stoffe sind sehr reich, aber in der Weltliteratur nimmt sie nur eine untergeordnete Stellung ein.

There is no doubt that Japan has raised itself to a respectable position among the cultured nations, but its literature is lagging behind. It is very ancient and its subjects are very rich, but it only takes up a subordinate position within world literature.<sup>73</sup>

Okazaki goes on to explain why this perception presumably originates in the fact that Europeans and Americans only apprehend Japanese literature through Western works that do not do it justice, hence the necessity to write on Japanese literature in a Western language. Okazaki has therefore a very keen sense of the existence of a world literature, of a literary world order. Yet, literary production alone does not guarantee a place within this order and the ability to produce a critical and historical discourse on literature seems to play an equally significant role. In this respect, Okazaki's production and especially his *History of Japan's National Literature* are to be viewed in the continuity of this reflection and it aims at raising Japan's literature to its rightful place in the concert of literary nations. Paradoxically, though, for this participation of the Japanese in world literature to materialise, Okazaki has to admit to the existence of a form of universality of literature that goes beyond the national characteristics that he expended so much effort on seeking out in the *Man'yōshū*.<sup>74</sup> The place of Japan among the cultured nations is indeed

<sup>72</sup> See for example OKAZAKI 1899b: 174. By contrast the only mention of "popular songs" (*rika*, *zokuyō*) to be found in the *History of Japan's National Literature* (OKAZAKI 1898: 103) is a rather negative one: OKAZAKI (1898: 103) indeed calls them "popular songs of low value, that are sung in every street" („Volkslieder von geringem Wert, die auf allen Strassen gesungen werden“). In all fairness, those "songs" are the one composed by *jōruri* 浄瑠璃 authors, which might account for our author's reservations. It must also be added that songs composed in cities – as opposed to those of the countryside – are not always admitted into this category of "folk songs" (see for example the case of Ueda Bin 上田敏 in SHINADA 2001: 208).

<sup>73</sup> OKAZAKI 1898: 63.

<sup>74</sup> OKAZAKI (1898: 65): "One must see the belles-lettres as the outpouring of human feelings and impressions. As they rely on the same foundations in all civilised peoples, one will have to admit

predicated on this admission to there being a common denominator, which in turn entails a universal character of literature.

### The determining factors of literary history

It is a fact worthy of note that Okazaki's *History of Japan's National Literature* makes no explicit references to literary histories, neither in Japanese nor in German. This absence of German models is all the more remarkable as Okazaki has chosen a title, *Geschichte der japanischen Nationallitteratur*, that is highly reminiscent of that of the widely read sum written by Georg Gottfried Gervinius, the *History of the Poetic National Literature of the Germans* (*Geschichte der poetischen Nationalliteratur der Deutschen*, 1835–1842), which had by then established itself as a reference. As we touched upon earlier, it is also very similar to the title of a lesser-known work, Hermann Kluge's *Geschichte der deutschen National-Literatur* (1869), which Karl Florenz purportedly used in his German classes at Tōdai. Yet, Kluge's text is not cited as a reference. Neither do we find any mention of Wilhelm Scherer's *History of German Literature* (*Geschichte der deutschen Literatur*, 1883), which would later play a decisive role in the shaping of the narrative of Karl Florenz' literary history.<sup>75</sup> The *History of Women's Literature*, on the other hand, alludes briefly to the works of a certain "Spalding" (presumably William Spalding, author of a *History of English literature*, published in 1853) to touch upon the correlation between literature and political history, without however giving any details regarding this work.<sup>76</sup> Finally, Okazaki does not even mention any preparatory stage of reading of Western literary histories. This could have been expected, since the mention of such preparations is found in the introduction to Mikami and Takatsu's *magnum opus*.<sup>77</sup>

In these circumstances, one can wonder what theoretical foundation Okazaki's retracing of Japan's literary history might be based upon. Indeed, no counterpart to Taine's theory of the three causal factors is to be found, as was the case with Mikami et Takatsu, nor do we see any quotation from the works of a critic or a thinker in the *History of Japan's*

---

that every people understands more or less and is able to appreciate the belles-lettres of another." („Man muss die schöne Litteratur als Ausfluss der menschlichen Empfindungen und Gefühle betrachten. Da diese nur bei allen zivilisierten Völkern auf derselben Grundlage ruhen, so wird man auch zugeben müssen, dass jedes Volk mehr oder weniger die schöne Litteratur eines anderen versteht und würdigen kann.“).

<sup>75</sup> See BABA 2020. Baba argues that Florenz, far from imposing an external narrative on Japan's literary history, borrowed from both Scherer and Kamo no Mabuchi (via Haga Yaichi) to construct a hybrid narrative of literary history, that owes to both the German and the Japanese intellectual tradition.

<sup>76</sup> OKAZAKI 1893: 8.

<sup>77</sup> LOZERAND 2005: 76ff.

*National Literature*,<sup>78</sup> even if the prominent role played by the proponents of National Learning in advancing the research on national literature is acknowledged in a passage on the literary production of the Edo period.<sup>79</sup> Okazaki's work on the *Man'yōshū*, on the other hand, alludes repeatedly to the works of thinkers of the National Learning conviction and to those of German philosophers, notably to the German treatises on aesthetics, which have found considerable favour among the intellectual elite of the 1880s and 1890s.<sup>80</sup> In a rather characteristic fashion, one finds an indiscriminate amalgamation of National Learning thinkers who originally belong to opposite trends within the movement, like Kamo no Mabuchi and Kagawa Kageki.<sup>81</sup> Such a coexistence of various tendencies no doubt reflects the synthesis that was operated in the crucible of the philosophy classes at Tōkyō University. Many professors there had indeed a National Learning background and viewed themselves as heirs to this intellectual tradition, against which Haga Yaichi will eventually voice a full-throated criticism in his 1900 *Outline History of National Learning* 国学史概論.<sup>82</sup> This purported continuity also explains why, in Okazaki's text, some professors at Tōkyō University (such as Toyama Masakazu 外山正一) are cited after and in the same train of thought as National Learning thinkers. Regarding German philosophy, one must admit that most references are second-hand ones, that owe a great deal to Richard Falckenberg's *History of modern philosophy* (*Geschichte der neueren Philosophie*, 1885), which Okazaki

<sup>78</sup> That is, if we except a first judgement passed by Kamo no Mabuchi on the love poems of the *Man'yōshū* and a second one on the poet Yamabe no Akahito (OKAZAKI 1899a: 22; 26).

<sup>79</sup> Of the Mito School, OKAZAKI (1899a: 90) writes that it was its wistful desire for locating a Japanese national character („Nationalität“) that spurred its interest in literature (see below, III.1). Of Motoori Norinaga, he states that he was “the greatest national literatus, the true Messiah of Japanese national literature” („der grösste Nationallitterat, der eigentliche Messias der japanischen Nationallitteratur“, OKAZAKI 1899a: 98).

<sup>80</sup> On this aspect, see LEWIN 2001, especially regarding the introduction into Japan of the philosophy of Eduard von Hartmann, an exponent of Hegelian idealism credited with writing a *Philosophy of Beauty* (*Philosophie des Schönen*, 1888) which will be of great influence on Mori Ōgai.

<sup>81</sup> On these two figureheads of the National Learning movement, especially Kagawa, see ÁROKAY 2014. Kamo no Mabuchi (1697–1769) is cited time and again, mostly through his *New Learning* 新学 (OKAZAKI 1898: 22; 27; 35; 36; 39; 42). The *Objection to the New Learning* 新学異見 (written in response to Mabuchi) by Kagawa Kageki 香川景樹 (1770–1843) is also cited several times (pp. 36, 38, 39). Kamo no Mabuchi had formed a poetic group, Agatai-ha 泉居派, which the Keien-ha 桂園派 came to oppose. The Agatai-ha and Mabuchi's successors viewed the *Man'yōshū* as the unsurpassed model of poetry, while the Keien-ha was led by some of Kagawa's disciples and it proclaimed the superiority of the *Kokinshū* (which was not what Kagawa intended). Mabuchi's belief in the superiority of *Man'yōshū* would be passed on by his disciples such as Tachibana no Chikage 橘千蔭 (1735–1808; author of a very popular *Abbreviated Commentary on the Man'yōshū* 万葉集略解 [1796–1812]) and Murata Harumi 村田春海 (1746–1812).

<sup>82</sup> On this text, see LOZERAND (2005: 132). More than the department of literature, the Classics training course 古典講習科, which only graduated two classes of students between 1882 and 1886, was steeped in the spirit of National Learning: 13 out of 17 professors had indeed a National Learning background. On this course, see LOZERAND (2005: 105) and SHINADA & SAITŌ (2012).

unambiguously cites several times.<sup>83</sup> The reference to German philosophy doesn't provide the basis for Okazaki's aesthetic reflection, rather, it is merely used to back up already formed conceptions, that are grounded in National Learning. Page 37 of Okazaki's work on the *Man'yōshū* presents us with a very telling example of this. Okazaki gives two characterizations of the *Man'yōshū*'s poetry, namely what he perceives as its naïveté<sup>84</sup> and the genuineness of the feelings that are expressed. In both cases, one finds a list of quotations meant to serve as basis for those claims, in which quotations from books by National Learning scholars are followed by similar pronouncements by Tōkyō University professors, which are then followed by concepts taken from the German philosophical tradition. Here are, for example, the quotations used to justify this characterization of the *Man'yōshū* as a poetry expressing genuine feelings:

[Kamo no Mabuchi, *New Learning*]:<sup>85</sup> Die Leser werden nie sexuell erregt, wenn sie die Liebeslieder im *Man'yōshū* lesen, sondern nur Bewunderung erfüllt sie, weil sie durch die Lauterkeit und Innigkeit der Gedichte ergriffen werden.

The readers are never sexually aroused when they read the love poems in the *Man'yōshū*, they are rather filled with amazement, because they are captivated by the sincerity and the depth of the poems.

[Fujitani Mitsue 富士谷御杖 (1768–1823),<sup>86</sup> *Sack of Poems* 歌袋]:<sup>87</sup> Es entspricht nicht der alten Dichtungsmethode, dass die in den Gedichten ausgedrückten Gedanken oder Gefühle andere sind, als die wirklichen der Verfasser.

The fact that the feelings and thoughts expressed in the poems should be other than the actual ones harboured by the writer does not conform to the ancient compositional method.

<sup>83</sup> The work is cited in OKAZAKI (1898:14).

<sup>84</sup> OKAZAKI (1898: 36) cites Murata Harumi's *Utogatari* to this effect: "the poems resemble those flowers that bloom in plains and mountains and that gleam in the mist and are wet with dew. They give themselves in an unaffected manner. In this, they resemble the blameless children who play there innocently" („Die Gedichte gleichen den Blumen, welche im Felde oder auf Bergen durch Thau glänzend gemacht wurden; sie geben sich ungekünstelt wie die Natur. Sie gleichen darin harmlos spielenden, unschuldigen Kindern“). Original text : 時にふれて心よりよみいでたる歌は野山にさき出でたる花の、霞にほひ露に潤へるが如し。[...] 古の歌はあるがままをいひ出でて、幼くはかなきが如くにして心深し(SASAKI 1972 : 152).

<sup>85</sup> We did not find this exact passage in the *New Learning*.

<sup>86</sup> It should be noted that Mitsue authored a commentary on the *Man'yōshū* entitled the *Man'yōshū's Lamp* 万葉集灯, cited by OKAZAKI (1898: 9). On this character and his aesthetics, see MARRA (2010: 398–415).

<sup>87</sup> We did not find this particular citation in Fujitani Mitsue's text.

[Toyama Masakazu]: Die Gedichte enthalten nur Wahrheit, nur die innersten Empfindungen der Dichter. Er [Toyama] wählt das Gleichnis: „kein Wasser, sondern Alkohol, also Heißblut“. Deshalb wirken sie auf den Leser so majestätisch und tragisch, dass er sich gepackt und hingezogen fühlt zu hoher Bewunderung.<sup>88</sup>

The poems contain only truth, only the most intimate feelings of the poets. Toyama chooses the following simile: “no water, only alcohol and hot blood”. This is why they make such a majestic and tragic impression upon the reader, to a point where he feels gripped and attracted to a higher level of amazement.

This sequence is finally tied – with no obvious relevance – to the concept of the “morally beautiful” („das sittliche Schöne“) developed by the philosopher Johann Friedrich Herbart (1776–1841), whose pedagogical works are introduced by the Meiji government in the 1890s.<sup>89</sup> Herbart borrows from Kant the idea of a disinterested and purely formal aesthetic judgement, which he connects to the – Kantian – idea of an *a priori* moral judgement. Upon this basis, he attempts to detail the characteristics that shape this formal moral judgement, this “morally beautiful”.<sup>90</sup> Therefore, it seems that the only common trait between Okazaki’s demonstration and Herbart’s aesthetic thinking is the rather vague idea

---

<sup>88</sup> Okazaki doesn’t indicate the origin of the citation, which we nevertheless managed to retrieve in an 1896 article published in *Imperial Literature* and entitled “Poems in the New Style and the Methods for Reading Poetry Aloud” 新體詩及び朗讀法. The original passage reads: 万葉集の歌には、作者の実意が表はれて居ります、作者の赤心が表はれて居ります、水は一滴も雑て居りませぬ、全くアルコールであります、全く熱血であります、其れ故に、万葉集の歌は莊嚴であります、非常であります。其れ故に、読む者をして実に感動せしむるのであります (TOYAMA 1909: 30–31).

<sup>89</sup> Herbart has theorized the fostering of civic virtues in children through education. His works and those of his disciples (G.A. Lindner, T. Ziller, W. Rein) will be introduced into Japan by Emil Hausknecht (1853–1927), who taught at Tōkyō University, and later by the pedagogue Tanimoto Tomeri 谷本富 (1867–1946), who will pen an *Applied Pedagogy and Teaching* 実用教育学及教授法 (1894) and a *Course on Scientific Pedagogy* 科学的教育学講義 (1895) both inspired by Herbart (KAIGO *et al.* 1999: 85–88).

<sup>90</sup> In this matter, we shall refer to FALCKENBERG (1898 [1885]: 439): “the most important among these [doctrines of art], which deals with moral beauty, moral philosophy that is, must also ask what the most simple relations between the wills [of subjects] are, relations which call for a positive or negative moral evaluation (which is independent from the beholder’s interest) and which ask what the practical ideas and conceptual models are, from which the moral taste judges – without will and with absolute clarity – the values or lack thereof in the will (be it actual or presumed). Herbart enumerates five such primitive ideas and ground judgements of consciousness” („Die wichtigste derselben [*i.e.* ‘der Kunstlehren’], welche das sittlich Schöne behandelt, die Moralphilosophie, hat also zu fragen nach den einfachsten Willensverhältnissen, welche eine (vom Interesse des Beobachters unabhängige) moralische Billigung oder Missbilligung hervorrufen, nach den praktischen Ideen oder Musterbegriffen, nach denen der sittliche Geschmack über Wert und Unwert des (wirklich geschehenden oder nur vorgestellten) Wollens willenlos und mit unbedingter Evidenz urteilt. Herbart zählt fünf solcher primitiven Ideen oder Grundurteile des Gewissens auf“).

of an unmediated aesthetic emotion. This disjunction between National Learning thought and German aesthetics also probably accounts for the relatively modest number of references to the latter, which remain punctual and are mostly not elaborated upon.<sup>91</sup> In this respect, it should also be noted that in every instance of juxtaposition of these Japanese and German references, it is the National Learning understanding of the concept that prevails.

One can already discern, in Okazaki's utilisation of National Learning references, the principles that will drive his *History of Japan's National Literature*. Like Toyama, Okazaki builds on the National Learning nationalist thought, most notably on their conception of a purely Japanese character. This idea is itself founded upon an idealisation of a purported simplicity and purity of Antiquity, which our scholars view as being under the threat of foreign culture and influence. This corresponds exactly with the conception of Kamo no Mabuchi, as can be seen at the opening of his *New Learning* にひまなび (1765), which Okazaki cites at the end of his *History*:<sup>92</sup>

古の歌は調を専らとせり。うたふ物なればなり。その調の大よそは、のどにも、あきらにも、さやにも、遠をくらにも、己がじし得たるまにまになる物の、貫くに、高く直き心をもてす。且つその高き中に雅びあり。直き中に雄々しき心はあるなり。[...] 然れば古の事を知る上に、今その調の状をも見るに、大和國は丈夫國にして、古は女も丈夫に習へり。故、萬葉集の歌は、凡そ丈夫の手振なり。山背國は手弱女國にして、丈夫も手弱女を習ひぬ。[...] それが上に唐の國ぶり行はれて、民、上を畏まず、よこす心の出で來こし故ぞ。

Ancient poetry is mainly concerned with melody. This is because ancient poetry was originally sung vocally. Generally speaking, the melody of poetry was tranquil, clear, pure and slightly melancholy; a variety of human emotions produced numerous melodies, but the common factor among all these was that the poetry was lofty and straightforward. A sense of elegance exists within this loftiness, while a feeling of

<sup>91</sup> In a similar fashion, OKAZAKI (1898: 15) cites a *Critique of the philosophical pessimism of the modern era* (*Kritik des philosophischen Pessimismus der neueren Zeit*) by a certain Weygoldt, which he uses to level criticism at Schopenhauer and, through Schopenhauer, at Buddhism, in terms that are reminiscent of the attacks directed against Buddhism by National Learning proponents, such as Hirata Atsutane 平田篤胤 (in his *Shitsujō-shōgo* 出定笑語). He also makes use of the Leibnizian idea of the "best of all possible worlds" to preclude the any notion that the world as it is is deficient (OKAZAKI 1898: 13). In this understanding, evil is not a part of creation, but it is rather caused by a "god of evil" („Gott des Bösen“), Makatsuhi, which Motoori Norinaga evokes in his *Naobi no mitama* 直毘靈 (1771).

<sup>92</sup> OKAZAKI (1899a: 117): "In his *New Learning*, which was released in 1765, he has put his vision of Japanese poetry into writing and he criticises the other ancient poetry collections. In his view, Japanese poetry must preach the sublime and the natural, as the *Man'yōshū* does. The sublime comprises beauty, the natural comprises strength and the poem must not become too effeminate" („In seinem *Nihimanabi*, das im Jahre 1765 erschien, hat er seine Ansicht über das Uta niedergelegt und die alten Gedichtsammlungen kritisiert. Nach ihm soll das Uta Erhabenes und Natürliches predigen, wie es das *Man'yōshū* thut. Das Erhabene wird das Schöne, das Natürliche die Kraft in sich einschließen, und das Uta darf nie zu weibisch werden“).



masculinity underlies its straightforwardness. [...] Therefore, to come to an understanding of the ancient state of life, when one experiences the structure of ancient poetry, we come to see that the ancient capital in the province of Yamato was masculine in nature, and women followed the style of men. Thus, the poetry in *Man'yōshū* is for the most part masculine in nature. The next era, when the capital was in the province of Yamashiro, was feminine in nature, and men followed the style of women. [...] Add to this the popularity of Chinese learning, and the common people lost their respect for their rulers, and an increasingly wicked disposition only worsened.<sup>93</sup>

It is worthy of note for our later developments on the *History of Japan's National Literature* that this idea of a loss of poetic authenticity is framed in gendered terms: the *Man'yōshū* is the reflection of an authentic and masculine temper which is then “corroded” by the advent of feminine affectation. This gendered opposition is in turn founded on a geographic one, that contrasts the perceived masculinity of Yamato with the effeminacy of the Yamashiro region, a geographic divide that is also relevant – although not in the same form – for the comprehension of Okazaki's writings. It should be remarked that such criticism of Heian poetic effeminacy becomes quite common in the years 1880–1890, notably in the poetic milieu. Robert Tuck has eloquently shown how in this decade poets such as Hagino Yoshiyuki 萩野由之 (*On Reforming National Learning and Waka* 国学和歌改良論, 1887) or Yosano Tekkan 与謝野鉄幹 (“Women and National Literature” 女子と国文, 1893 ; “Sounds of the Nation's Ruin” 亡国の音, 1894) took it upon themselves to sound a note of caution against what they perceived as the *waka's* femininity, which, they argued, was debilitating for the nation as a whole.<sup>94</sup>

In the *Man'yōshū*, Okazaki praises more or less the same qualities as Mabuchi. In a section aptly titled “Where does the value of the *Man'yōshū* lie?” („Worin besteht nun der Wert des *Man'yōshū*?”) he avers that it resides first and foremost in the collection's “simplicity” („Einfachheit”) and in the “primitiveness of [its] conceptual world” („Ursprünglichkeit der Gedankenwelt”).<sup>95</sup> Other positive attributes include the *Man'yōshū's* “sublimity and beauty” („Erhabenheit und Schönheit”) and its (presumably thematic) “richness” („Reichhaltigkeit”). However, as in Mabuchi's text, the qualities of spontaneity and purity seem to be perceived as residual, as remnants of an earlier state of greater, unadulterated primitiveness. The *Man'yōshū* era is indeed viewed as already contaminated by Chinese influence. This does not appear as clearly in Okazaki's thesis as in his later *History of Japan's National Literature*, but it can be perceived in statements such as the

<sup>93</sup> KAMO 1975: 585–586. Translation in BENTLEY 2019: 250–251.

<sup>94</sup> See the fifth chapter of TUCK (2018).

<sup>95</sup> OKAZAKI 1898: 10.

following, which describes the era as a time of “language reform” („Reformation der Sprache”) where Chinese influence comes to pervade the Japanese language :

Vor der *Man'yōshū*-Zeit sprach man die ursprüngliche, reine japanische Sprache. Nach dieser Zeit war sie sehr mit der chinesischen vermischt.

Before the *Man'yōshū* era, the primitive, pure Japanese language was spoken. After this era, it was very much blended with Chinese.<sup>96</sup>

As in Mabuchi's *New Learning*, there is a geographic element to such an idea of cultural contamination. There are indeed areas of Japan where the original culture maintained itself. Those are the regions where Chinese influence has not penetrated too deeply and where something of the pre-Chinese culture can be retrieved. In Okazaki's case, this untouched area is the North-East, where the “Poems of the East” (*Azuma-uta* 東歌) originate from:

Da die Bewohner des nördlichen Teiles sehr wenig mit den anderen Nationen in Berührung kamen, so findet man dort ohne Zweifel die alte japanische Sprache, welche vor der *Man'yōshū*-Zeit gesprochen wurde.

Since the inhabitants of the northern part [of Japan] came very seldom in contact with other nations, one doubtless finds there the old Japanese language, which was spoken before the *Man'yōshū* era.<sup>97</sup>

Okazaki goes on to elaborate on this particularity of the language of Eastern Japan (of which he gives several instances, contrasted with words taken from the *Kokinshū*) and of the singularity of its customs and of its people's mentality, as reflected in the *azuma-uta*.<sup>98</sup> In his description, one already finds the characterization of the *Azuma* people as warriors, but it is by no means their dominant characteristics, as will be the case in the *History of Japan's National Literature*.<sup>99</sup> The parallel drawn by Okazaki between East Japan's culture and mentality and that of Ancient Japan is a very self-serving one, as he explicitly depicts

<sup>96</sup> OKAZAKI 1898: 23.

<sup>97</sup> OKAZAKI 1898: 24. The *azuma-uta* are poems attributed (not without reservations) to people from the North-East of Japan, written in a distinct variety of Old Japanese (called “Eastern Old Japanese” by the linguists, as opposed to “Western Old Japanese”, the language of the *Man'yōshū*). The small corpus is made up of 238 poems featured in Book XIV, to which should be added the 93 *sakimori-uta* 防人歌 (“poems of the frontier guards”) in Book XX, which are allegedly the works of Eastern Japanese soldiers stationed in Kyūshū. A short linguistic description of the language they use can be found in VOVIN (2012: 6–11) and VOVIN (2013: 6–13). A short English summary of the reservations harboured by some researchers regarding the attribution can be found in DUTHIE 2014: 213–214.

<sup>98</sup> OKAZAKI (1898: 23–25; 53–58).

<sup>99</sup> OKAZAKI (1898: 55).

himself as their descendant and as the potential heir to the ancient virtues they have passed on to the present.<sup>100</sup>

It is therefore evident that Okazaki borrows heavily from the particular synthesis of National Learning that gained currency under the Meiji regime. He cites the main figures of this current and give a nationalist spin to their pre-national ideas. In this, he finds himself at the pivotal point between the first and the second vision of the *Man'yōshū*, as put forward by Shinada: he sees it as a work that embodies the nation as a whole (with poets coming from all walks of life), but also as the locus where a properly national character is enshrined. In this respect, he resembles very much a nationalist such as Haga Yaichi, even if he will not progress as far as him in his investigation into the Japanese national character. Haga had indeed directed his attention to the popular aspect of the *Man'yōshū*'s poetry in his 1902 class on "Japanese Poetics" 日本詩歌学 at Tōkyō University, in which he praised *Volkspoesie* as more fundamental than *Kunstpoesie*.<sup>101</sup> Many of Haga's students at Tōkyō University will go on to become folklorists and one of them, Shida Gishū 志田義秀 (1876–1946), will theorise the idea of the *Man'yōshū* as a collection of *Volkslieder* 民謡.<sup>102</sup>

### Periodisation

We shall close this second part by noting that the *History of Japan's National Literature* adopts a division of literary history into eras, which is the result of a rather long reflection on the periodisation of Japanese history, especially of Antiquity (called in Japanese *jōko* 上古 or *jōdai* 上代). The *History* distinguishes a pre-Nara period, that spans the beginnings of Japanese history to the year 600 (Chapter I), an extended Nara period (600–800, Chapter II) and a period that stretches from the 9th to the 11th century, which corresponds roughly to the Heian period (Chapter III).<sup>103</sup> Such a division is nevertheless far from being self-evident. The *History of Women's Literature*, for example, adopted a wholly different approach to chronology: it divided the Ancient History into High Antiquity (*jōko* 上古), a period which

<sup>100</sup> OKAZAKI (1898: 58): "How could the *Azuma* people have ever imagined so many upheavals or that one of their descendants might critique their poems and translate them into German! May our excellent ancestors rest sheltered in their cold graves for many thousand years! For they have bequeathed to us their strength of character, their bravery and perseverance as their valuable inheritance!" („Wie hätte das alte Azumavolk je an solche Umwälzungen gedacht, oder gar daran, dass einer ihrer Nachkommen ihre Gedichte kritisieren und ins Deutsche übertragen würde! So mögen unsere ausgezeichneten Vorfahren noch viele Jahrtausende wohlgebetet im kühlen Grabe ruhen! Haben sie uns doch ihre Charakterfestigkeit, Tapferkeit und Ausdauer als wertvolles Erbe hinterlassen.“).

<sup>101</sup> SHINADA (2001: 210).

<sup>102</sup> In his *Introduction to Japanese Folk Songs* 日本民謡概論 (1906).

<sup>103</sup> They are then followed by a fourth chapter that spans Kamakura and Muromachi periods (13th–16th centuries) and a fifth one that starts with the establishment of the Edo shogunate and runs to the first half of the 19th century.

went from the “age of the gods” to the reign of empress Suiko 推古 (r. 592–628) and Middle Antiquity (*chūko* 中古), which followed on to the reign of emperor Horikawa 堀河 (r. 1087–1107).<sup>104</sup> We can therefore see that, at this point, the Nara period was not characterized as the period of the “*Man'yōshū* compilation” and that it was not viewed as particularly distinct from the Heian period.

A similar division was already playing out in an earlier work by Taguchi Ukichi 田口卯吉 (1855–1905), the *Short History of Japanese Civilisation* 日本開化小史 (1877), which, in its own way, foreshadowed the flurry of literary histories of the 1890s.<sup>105</sup> Taguchi opposes two periods, which more or less overlap with the *History of Women's Literature's* distinction between a primitive period unmarred by foreign influence and the period where this influence makes itself felt. The first chapter tells of the span of time between “the birth of the Way of the Gods until the spread of Buddhism” 神道の濫觴より佛法の弘まりしまで, while the second one covers the period that extends “from the arrival of Chinese learning to the decline of Kyōto” 漢學の渡りしより京都の衰へしまで. The first period is one of purity, which the absence of writing *de facto* excludes from civilisation, whereas the second one is characterized by an imitation of China.<sup>106</sup> The same goes for Haga Yaichi and Tachibana Senzaburō's *National Literature Reader* 国文学読本 (1890), but a discernible shift in Haga's perception of Ancient History takes place with the passage of time, as is evidenced by the chronology of his 1899 *Ten Lessons on the History of National Literature* 國文學史十講. Indeed, whereas the 1890 Reader construed “High Antiquity” 上古 as the period of time running until the Taika Reforms 大化 (645), the *Ten Lessons* published almost ten years later draw a clear line between Nara and Heian poetry. As in Okazaki's thesis, the Nara period is defined as an era of preservation of national language and national culture, even if it has admittedly already lost the simplicity of the “ancient times” 太古 (*taiko*).<sup>107</sup> It should be noted here that Mikami and Takatsu's *History of Japanese*

<sup>104</sup> OKAZAKI 1893: 1–3.

<sup>105</sup> LOZERAND (2005: 153–154) notes that the short work comprised a chapter on the history of Japanese literature. The work draws heavily from Nagamine Hideki's 永峰秀樹 translation of François Guizot's *Histoire de la civilisation en Europe* (“History of Civilisation in Europe”, 1828), published in 1874.

<sup>106</sup> Regarding the use of the concept of “civilization” in the context of Japanese literary history, see SHINADA 2012.

<sup>107</sup> Nara, as HAGA (1899: 19–20) asserts it, represents the “infancy of [Japanese] civilisation, where foreign influence has not yet penetrated too much” (我国文明の揺籃時代、外国の影響が余り這入って居らぬ時代). Yet, this period of infancy differs markedly from an even earlier period: “in the Nara period, Chinese cultural influence gains currency, to a point where it differs greatly from the simplicity of ancient times.” (奈良の朝では、支那の文物の影響も盛んに現はれて來まして、太古の簡単な有様とは余程の相違になりました). Nevertheless, the thought and the language have partially maintained their purity: “on the whole, the thought from the age of the gods is expressed in writing in pure *yamato-kotoba*.” (大体においては神代以来の思想を純粋な大和詞で書現したるものであります).

*Literature* (1890) had already singled out Nara as the *Man'yōshū* era and devoted a great number of pages to the anthology.<sup>108</sup>

Such a chronology is only possible within the framework of the 1880s and 1890s debates on the *Man'yōshū* and on its position within Japanese literature. It is clear that the anthology occupies a central position in the new vision of Japanese literary history, as the embodiment of the perceived national characteristics of the Japanese people. In this respect, Okazaki's *History of Japan's National Literature* is rendered possible by these debates that attach a high value to the *Man'yōshū* within Japanese literature.

### 3 The *History of Japan's National Literature*: literary history through the lenses of the *Man'yōshū*

Having laid out the intellectual foundations of Okazaki's reflection on literature, we can now dive into the short *History of Japan's National Literature*, written in 1899 in German by Okazaki himself. We will show how Okazaki attempted to write an entire history of literature from the perspective of the values he sees embodied by the *Man'yōshū*. His vision of the *Man'yōshū*, however, is fraught with ambiguities, as the vast anthology represents the last monument of a now lost past and, at the same time, the first moment in the history of Japanese literature under Chinese influence. Okazaki's perception of the *Man'yōshū* owes a great debt to the school of National Learning, as will become apparent, but at the same time, our author cannot completely reshape the literary canon that is being given its fixed form in the same period. We will therefore see how Okazaki distorts his own vision to allow authors already sanctioned by tradition (Murasaki Shikibu, Saigyō, Bashō, among others) into his *Man'yōshū*-centered narrative.

#### Okazaki's project and its structure

As was hinted at in his book on the *Man'yōshū*, Okazaki is keenly aware of the fact that Japanese historians of literature have a critical role to play in order for Japanese literature to earn its place within "world literature" („Weltliteratur"). Only a Japanese national, in his view, might give a fair account, that would not misrepresent Japanese literature to the general public. The declaration at the opening of the *History of Japan's National Literature* is to be interpreted in this sense:

Die Kenntnis der reichen japanischen Litteratur, die mit ihren Anfängen noch weit über das ehrwürdige Alter der griechischen klassischen Litteratur hinausreicht, ist

<sup>108</sup> MIKAMI/TAKATSU 1890: 137–197.

im Abendlande noch so gering, dass es fremden Gelehrten bisher nicht möglich war, sich ein Urteil über sie zu bilden. Aus diesem Grunde fasste ich seit langem schon den Plan, in einer europäischen Sprache eine umfassende Geschichte der japanischen Litteratur zu schreiben, ohne dass ich bisher dazu die Zeit gefunden hätte. So will ich denn, ehe ich das mir durch einen dreijährigen Aufenthalt lieb und teuer gewordene Deutschland verlasse, wenigstens einen kurzen Abriss der Geschichte unserer Nationallitteratur veröffentlichen, in der Hoffnung, damit wenigstens in Deutschland, dessen Interesse und Achtung zu gewinnen und zu erhalten uns Japanern von ganz besonderer Wichtigkeit ist, etwas mehr Licht über die geistige Arbeit meines Volkes und die Entwicklung seiner Ideen im Strome der Zeit zu verbreiten.

The knowledge of the rich Japanese literature, whose origins reach back to a time long before the venerable age of classical Greek literature, is still so limited in the West, that until now it was impossible for foreign scholars to form a judgement about it. For this reason, I have had the long-standing plan to write a comprehensive history of Japanese literature in a European language, without ever finding time to do it. Therefore, before leaving Germany, a country that my three-year stay has rendered dear to my heart, I want at least to publish a short summary of the history of our national literature, in the hope to throw some more light onto the spiritual workings of my people and the development of its ideas in the course of time, at least in Germany, whose interest and respect the Japanese care particularly to attract and to retain.<sup>109</sup>

Okazaki, however, is not only driven by outward motivations, but also by an inner necessity, which he touches upon when dealing with the Mito school and with Tokugawa Mitsukuni 徳川光圀 (1626–1701), who ordered Shimokōbe Chōryū 下河辺長流 (1627–1686) and Keichū 契沖 (1640–1701) to compile a commentary on the *Man'yōshū* (the *Man'yō-daishō-ki* 万葉集代匠記, “Hatchet-Job Writing on the *Man'yōshū*”). Okazaki highlights the fact that it was the interest for the “national character” („Nationalität”) that spurred the interest for national literature:

Wer aber so viel Liebe zu seiner Nationalität und der Majestät seines Kaisers [wie Mitsukuni] hat, der hat auch das geistige Bedürfnis, einzudringen in die Tiefen der Nationallitteratur.

Those who bear so much love for their national character and the majesty of their emperor[, as Mitsukuni did,] also have the spiritual need to dive into the depths of national literature.<sup>110</sup>

<sup>109</sup> OKAZAKI 1899a: ix.

<sup>110</sup> OKAZAKI 1899a: 90.



The idea of literature as reflection of national character is very wide-spread in the Meiji era, as we have already touched upon, but this short passage also gives us an insight into Okazaki's reasoning and his decision to write a literary history to showcase the production of the Japanese spirit. In this respect, Okazaki is very close to the ideology of national character described by Shinada, according to which literature is above all the vehicle of this character (which is a completely new notion in Japan at this time).

Okazaki intends to sketch out a short outline of the history of Japanese literature from its inception to the present era (as the subtitle indicates: „von den ältesten Zeiten bis zur Gegenwart“). He divides his text into five chapters, whose titles are strictly chronological:

1. From the oldest times to the year 600
2. From 600 to 800
3. From the 9th to the 12th century
4. From the 13th to the 16th century
5. From the 16th century to the first half of the 19th century

We have already seen how Okazaki has come to adopt a new vision of periodisation for ancient history, which made him distinguish Nara and Heian periods. As for the rest, one finds a high degree of resemblance with other literary histories of the time, such as that of Mikami and Takatsu. The two Tōdai graduates divide Japanese history into: the age of origins, the Nara period, the Heian period, the Kamakura period, the Northern and Southern Courts period grouped together with that of Muromachi and the Edo period. Haga Yaichi also adopts a similar division, except for the fact that he ties together the age of origins and that of Nara and distinguishes the contemporary period (*gendai* 現代) from Edo, which Okazaki doesn't.<sup>111</sup> Okazaki is nevertheless very close to Haga in his characterization of each period:

	Haga Yaichi		Okazaki Tōmitsu
Antiquity (including Nara) 上古	Period of purity 純粹 and simplicity 簡單 of the national style, which still remains to some extent in the <i>Man'yōshū</i> . <sup>112</sup>	From the oldest times to the year 600 600–800	Age characterized by naturalness („natürlich“) and unaffected simplicity („ungeschminkt“). <sup>113</sup> Complete moral transformation caused by the introduction of Chinese culture (with the

<sup>111</sup> HAGA (1899: 17–25) distinguishes Antiquity 上古 (from the origins to Nara), an Ancient Period 中古 (from Heian to the founding of the Kamakura *bakufu*), a Late Ancient Period 近古, which encompasses the Kamakura and Muromachi periods, the modern period 近世 (Edo) and the contemporary period 現代 (starting from Meiji).

<sup>112</sup> HAGA 1899: 20.

<sup>113</sup> OKAZAKI 1899: 11.

	Haga Yaichi		Okazaki Tōmitsu
			<i>Man'yōshū</i> remaining almost unaffected) : the people becomes “enlightened” („aufgeklärt”), “with delicate manners” („fein gesittet”), “literary” („literarisch”), “weak” („schwach”), “patient” („geduldig”), “pessimistic” („pessimistisch”), “unnatural” („unnatürlich”). <sup>114</sup>
Heian 中古	Period of elegance 閑雅優美 and delicacy 繊麗艶美, whose general atmosphere is decried as weak (弱弱しい) and effeminate (女らしい). <sup>115</sup>	9th–12th c.	High point of women’s literature („Glanzpunkt der Frauenlitteratur”), golden age of Sinitic literature, then of the vernacular literature, which is however plagued by an excessive sensuousness („Sinnlichkeit”). <sup>116</sup>
Kamakura-Muromachi 近古	Period of melancholy 幽鬱 and sobriety 質素儉約. <sup>117</sup>	13th–16th c.	Spread of the “Buddhist, pessimistic worldview” („buddhistisch-pessimistische Weltanschauung”). <sup>118</sup>
Edo 近世	Period where “the spirit of literature is to be found in Confucianism” (文学の精神は儒教にあり). An “obscene and frivolous literature” 猥褻な軽文學 also exists as a reflection of the general atmosphere of frivolousness. <sup>119</sup>	16th–19 <sup>th</sup> c.	Age of literature under the influence of Confucianism, along with the development of studies on vernacular literature. <sup>120</sup>
Meiji 現代	Age of national literature 国民文学, that takes its rise after the abolishing of social strata. <sup>121</sup>		

<sup>114</sup> OKAZAKI 1899: 15.

<sup>115</sup> HAGA 1899: 20.

<sup>116</sup> OKAZAKI 1899: 45; 55.

<sup>117</sup> HAGA 1899: 21.

<sup>118</sup> OKAZAKI 1899: 63.

<sup>119</sup> HAGA 1899: 23.

<sup>120</sup> OKAZAKI (1899: 83) quotes the words of Fujiwara Seika 藤原惺窩 (1561–1619) to Tokugawa Ieyasu 徳川家康 regarding the centrality of the *Great Learning* 大学 for government and for the customs.

<sup>121</sup> HAGA 1899: 24.

We shall conclude this section with one of the very rare comments on Okazaki's work, that of Edwin Reischauer. In his English translation of the *Izayoi Nikki* (十六夜日記), Reischauer observes that Okazaki "follows the traditional Japanese approach to literature by putting primary emphasis on poetry".<sup>122</sup> It is certainly true to some extent, as Okazaki places the *Man'yōshū* at the center of his reflection on literature, as will become clear in the next section. Prose, however, is not completely neglected, be it only because Okazaki has to include some already canonical prose texts (such as the *Tale of Genji*) into his recounting of Japan's literary history. As will be seen in the last section, Okazaki finds himself obliged to make certain compromises with the already existing canon and with some of the new insights born in the Meiji era. It must be pointed out that the *History of Japan's National Literature* is concluded by a short section where writers from the last period are sorted by scriptural style and genre. Okazaki distinguishes authors using the "mixed Japanese-Chinese style" (*wakan-konkō-bun* 和漢混交文) from those using the "vernacular style" (*wabun* 和文) and composing Japanese *uta*. He further adds "playwrights and novelists" („Dramatiker und Novellisten"; *gikyoku* 戯曲, *shōsetsu* 小説), who form a single category, and "haikai poets" („Haikai Dichter"), with whom he ends his book.<sup>123</sup> This short section reads like an appendix added in afterthought to the general structure of the book and which maintains a certain degree of independence. The emphasis laid on form rather than on the values embodied by the various works makes it stand out from the general flow of Okazaki's narrative.

### Literary history seen from the *Man'yōshū*

We have already seen that Okazaki's vision of literary history owed a great deal to the reevaluation of the *Man'yōshū* performed by National Learning scholars and inherited by Meiji intellectuals. This becomes evident in his *History of Japan's National Literature*, which puts forward a conception of Japanese literary history that is conspicuously influenced by Kamo no Mabuchi and his companions. Such a general orientation is not developed upon in the *History's* preface, however, the long paragraph that serves as an introduction to the fourth chapter could as well have functioned as a paratext for the entire work, for it makes Okazaki's understanding of literary history very clear, even if it somewhat distorts the general framing of the argument:

Die Litteratur ist ein Spiegel des Zeitgeistes. Im *Man'yōshū* kann man die damaligen Zeitströmungen verfolgen und nicht bloß das Leben, sondern auch das Denken, Wollen, Empfinden des Volkes kennen lernen. Jedes Gedicht im *Man'yōshū* erzählt eine wahre Begebenheit, die Phantasie quillt aus dem innersten, heißen Herzen,

<sup>122</sup> REISCHAUER 1947: 377.

<sup>123</sup> OKAZAKI 1899: 112; 116; 124; 134.

und die Form und Klangweise ist natürlich, nicht gesucht. Die Dichter folgten den Eingebungen und Empfindungen des Augenblicks; sie sprachen ihres Herzens Leid und Freud' in ihren Gedichten aus; nie schrieben sie andere Gefühle nieder, als ihre eigenen, im Gegensatz zu den Dichtern späterer Zeiten. Die Dichter der *Man'yōshū*-Zeit waren niemals Poeten von Profession, und sie schrieben nicht, um sich ihr Brot zu verdienen, sondern nur, wenn sie ihr Inneres dazu antrieb. Im 9. Jahrhundert wurde es anders. Die fremdländischen Ideen und Gewohnheiten verdrängten in Japan die alte Einfachheit, Männlichkeit und Reinheit. Durch die Eitelkeit, Weichlichkeit und Äußerlichkeit, die jetzt zu herrschen begannen, wurde das Volk und das Leben verändert; an die Stelle des Majestätischen und Erhabenen trat das Schöne und Zierliche. Im 10. und 11. Jahrhundert wurden infolgedessen die Litteraturerzeugnisse im allgemeinen schon weniger wertvoll. Äußerlich zwar verfeinert, waren sie doch in der Form wie im Inhalt beschränkter. Der litterarische Himmel Japans wurde von Nebel verhüllt, durch den nur gedämpft noch die Strahlen der Sonne drangen. Je weiter die Zeit fortschritt, desto mehr wurde die Dichtkunst herabzogen und die eigene Art vergessen. Die Ruhmgier, die Prahlerei, der Pomp und die Heuchelei des 12. Jahrhunderts ließen die Litteratur zur Affektion und Ostentation hinneigen.

Literature is a mirror of the spirit of the times. In the *Man'yōshū*, one can retrace the trends of this past era, not only the people's life, but also their thinking, their will and their feelings. Each poem in the *Man'yōshū* tells of a true event, imagination wells up from the warm, innermost heart and both the form and sound of poems are natural, rather than polished. The poets followed their inspirations and their emotion of the moment. They expressed their sufferings and their joy in their poems and they never committed to writing emotions that were not theirs, contrary to poets of the later ages. The poets of the *Man'yōshū* era were never professional poets and they did not write to fulfill a commission, but only because they were compelled to by an inner necessity. In the 9th century, this changed. Foreign ideas and habits coming into Japan pushed back the old simplicity, the masculinity and the purity. The people and life in general were transformed by the vanity, the weakness and the shallowness that began to prevail. The beautiful and the delicate took the place of the majestic and the sublime. Consequently, in the 10th and 11th centuries, literary production became of lesser value on the whole. Refined as they might outwardly seem, they were more limited in both form and content. The skies of Japan's literature were overcast by clouds with only dim sunrays shining through. As time went by, the art of poetry decayed more and more and the original style was forgotten. The lust for glory, the conceit, the pompousness and the hypocrisy of the 12th century made literature prone to affectation and ostentation.<sup>124</sup>

---

<sup>124</sup> OKAZAKI 1899a: 60.

It must first be pointed out that the above description seems to contradict the general economy of the *History*. As mentioned above, the great cultural shift experienced by the Japanese people is supposed to have taken place with the introduction of foreign (mostly Indian and Chinese) culture into Japan in the 7th century. Here, however, the *Man'yōshū* era is still presented as a period of unmarred purity, which the 9th century proclivity for things foreign perverted. This disjunction between the overall structure and the tenor of the above paragraph might indicate that the latter corresponds to an earlier stage of Okazaki's reflection.

Contrary to the views expressed in Okazaki's thesis, the *Man'yōshū* era is not depicted as a period of pristine purity in this *History*. Rather, it is already described as having shifted away from the primitive manner of ancient poetry, which is reflected in the poems from the *Kojiki* and the *Nihon-Shoki* (what the specialists now call *kiki-kayō* 記紀歌謡, "the poems of the records and chronicles").<sup>125</sup> Yet, the Japanese poems seem to have retained parts of their original form amidst the era of cultural upheavals ushered in by the missions to the Tang, for reasons that Okazaki omits to clarify.<sup>126</sup> As a result, the poems have been tainted by the foreign creeds of Buddhism and Confucianism and thus lost their "innate naiveté" („angeborene Naivität“).<sup>127</sup>

Was die Verschmelzung dieser Elemente an schönen litterarischen Erzeugnissen hervorgebracht hat, sehen wir im *Man'yōshū*.

What the fusion of these elements has yielded of beautiful literary productions can be seen in the *Man'yōshū*.<sup>128</sup>

Seen in this light, the *Man'yōshū* already represents an intermediary stage in the history of Japanese poetry, remotely reminiscent of a now lost authenticity. It has however succeeded in preserving the "fresh, uncontrived and yet fitting expression of natural and purely human feelings" („der frische und ungekünstelte, aber entsprechende Ausdruck des

<sup>125</sup> OKAZAKI (1899a: 11): "The songs from this period are all as natural and unadorned as the people was and they are as upright and true as their feelings and thoughts were. Yet, for a long period, there were no classical poems. Foreign ideas had also not yet penetrated into literature" („Die Lieder dieser Zeit sind alle so natürlich und ungeschminkt wie die Menschen, und diese sind gerade und treu wie ihr Gefühl und ihre Gedanken. Es gab jedoch noch lange Zeit kein klassisches Gedicht. Auch fremde Ideen waren in die Litteratur noch nicht eingedrungen.“).

<sup>126</sup> OKAZAKI (1899a: 20): "As the Chinese and Indian beliefs arrived into Japan and, raging like typhoons, shattered the old rotten constructions, the Japanese saved for themselves a valued treasury from this chaos: the gem of their poetry, the Japanese poem!" („Während die chinesischen und indischen Anschauungen in Japan einzogen und, wie Taifune wütend, die alten morschen Gebäude zertrümmerten, retteten sich die alten Japaner einen kostbaren Schatz aus diesem Chaos: das Kleinod ihres Uta, das japanische Lied!“).

<sup>127</sup> OKAZAKI 1899a: 21.

<sup>128</sup> OKAZAKI 1899a: 21.

natürlichen und rein menschlichen Gefühls").<sup>129</sup> This ideal, as we touched upon earlier, is framed in gendered terms and Okazaki praises the *Man'yōshū* for the "manly and forceful wind" („den männlichen und kraftvollen Zug") that blows throughout its pages.<sup>130</sup>

By comparison, on a relative scale, all further developments of literature are made out to be consecutive shifts away from this epitome of perfection that the *Man'yōshū* incarnates. Everything thereafter is but a debased form of authenticity, that inclines towards the cult of pure form and mannerism.<sup>131</sup> Furthermore, for Okazaki, not only is the ancient purity irretrievably lost, but there are also numerous other causes of decline still at play, whose effects are equally inimical to the development of "true" Japanese literature. These factors of spiritual decadence are first and foremost cultural ones, such as the encroachment of foreign modes of thought, such as Confucianism and above all of Buddhism – depicted as a pessimistic („pessimistisch"),<sup>132</sup> "idealist and speculative" („spekulativ und idealistisch")<sup>133</sup> mode of thinking, altogether alien to the Japanese national temperament. Accordingly, certain authors, eras and even entire genres are depicted negatively on account of perceived Buddhist undertones or of a purported espousal of Buddhist values. This point is exemplified by the disqualification of the works of Kamo no Chōmei 鴨長明<sup>134</sup> (1155–1216), of the entire literature of the 9th century<sup>135</sup> and of genres such as *nō* 能 or *renga* 連歌.<sup>136</sup> The other determining factors of literary decadence are moral, geographical and sociological and they are more or less the necessary corollaries of foreign influence. For this reason, all three causes are very much linked to one another. Immorality derives from the introduction of foreign culture, as we saw in the last section, since it is this foreign culture that alters the original naïveté for the worse. One social class in particular strikingly embodies this cultural shift and the era of immorality it brings about: the nobility, whose licentiousness and dissipation Okazaki chastises repeatedly.<sup>137</sup> There is of course a political sense to this indictment of the nobility,

<sup>129</sup> OKAZAKI 1899a: 21.

<sup>130</sup> OKAZAKI 1899a: 22.

<sup>131</sup> OKAZAKI 1899a: 69. See the above translation of that paragraph.

<sup>132</sup> OKAZAKI (1899a: 63) speaks of a "Buddhist, pessimistic worldview" („buddhistisch-pessimistische Weltanschauung") prevailing in the 12th century.

<sup>133</sup> OKAZAKI 1899a: 16.

<sup>134</sup> OKAZAKI 1899a: 76.

<sup>135</sup> Which is depicted as the "flowering period of Chinese literature and philosophy and of Buddhist idealists" („Blütezeit chinesischer Litteratur und Philosophie und zugleich buddhistischer Idealisten"; OKAZAKI 1899a: 34).

<sup>136</sup> OKAZAKI 1899a: 64; 81.

<sup>137</sup> Speaking of the Heian era, OKAZAKI (1899a: 47) states that "the salons were marketplaces of sensuality, the noble's estates were the stages of a drunken love frenzy. Unfettered by any moral, people viewed sensuous pleasures as the greatest good" („Die Gesellschaften waren die Märkte der Sinnlichkeit, die Edelsitze die Stätten trunkener Rasereien der Liebe; ohne innern moralischen Halt, betrachtete man schließlich den sinnlichen Genuss als das Höchste"). The work that most



as they are also criticized for the Fujiwara clan's confiscation of the imperial household's power.<sup>138</sup> As in Mabuchi's writings, this foreign culture heralded by nobility is associated with a particular area in Japan, the south-western part of the country,<sup>139</sup> which Okazaki contrasts with the north-eastern region, viewed much more positively. The North-East, as was the case in Okazaki's thesis, is described as more primitive and as untouched by foreign influence and overall more representative of Japan's ancient values of simplicity and sincerity.<sup>140</sup> The area is also clearly associated with the warrior class, which is therefore implicitly opposed to the nobility.

In this history of decline, the only works of literature to find favour should be those reminiscent of the *Man'yōshū* and of the positives qualities it epitomises. It is the case to a large extent and one finds for instance the expected praise of Minamoto no Sanetomo's 源実朝 (1192–1219) "primitiveness, strength of will and bravery" („Urwüchsigkeit“, „Willenstärke“, „Tapferkeit“), inherited from Mabuchi's *New Learning*. Okazaki also lavishes praise on the Mito school and the National Learning school, credited with initiating research into national literature, especially into the *Man'yōshū*.<sup>141</sup> Yet he reserves his highest praise not for Keichū or Mabuchi, but for Motoori Norinaga, the "true Messiah of Japanese national literature" („eigentliche Messias der japanischen Nationallitteratur").<sup>142</sup> However, the literary perfection exemplified by the *Man'yōshū* is represented as unattainable, be it only because foreign culture and its tendency for unnaturalness have irremediably percolated into Japanese culture. As a result, even attempts by the warrior class to replicate the ancient glory in the form of temples such as the Kinkakuji 金閣寺 and the Ginkakuji 銀閣寺 are deemed to "lack the grandeur and majesty, that characterized those of the *Man'yōshū* era" („es fehlte [...] das Grosse und Majestätische, das denen der *Man'yōshū*-Zeit eigen ist").<sup>143</sup> Again, such failures can be ascribed to the fact that the warriors of the Ashikaga period lost their "simplicity" and their "roughness" („Einfachheit und Rauheit")<sup>144</sup> as they adopted aristocratic tastes and devoted their energy to the practice of *renga* or tea ceremony.

---

eloquently depicts this atmosphere of immorality and licentiousness, in Okazaki's view, is the *Tales of Yamato* (OKAZAKI 1899a: 44).

<sup>138</sup> OKAZAKI 1899a:48.

<sup>139</sup> He repeatedly alludes to the high degree of penetration of Tang culture in the South-West, especially in the capital of Heian (OKAZAKI 1899a: 70). Towards the end of the work, as Okazaki discusses Edo culture, he writes of the corrosive influence of south-western culture on the development of *jōruri* and of the nefarious influence exerted on *ukiyo-e* by the "frivolous air from Kyōto and Ōsaka" („frivole Luft von Kyōto und Ōsaka"; OKAZAKI 1899a: 103–105; 107).

<sup>140</sup> Which is evidenced by the *azuma-uta*'s closeness with "colloquial language" („Umgangssprache"), viewed as a proof of their sincerity and unadorned character (OKAZAKI 1899a: 22).

<sup>141</sup> OKAZAKI 1899a: 90. See above III.1.

<sup>142</sup> OKAZAKI 1899a: 98.

<sup>143</sup> OKAZAKI 1899a: 74.

<sup>144</sup> OKAZAKI 1899a: 73.

### Negotiating with the canon

In some respects, Okazaki's wide-ranging argument for the *Man'yōshū* as embodiment of all Japaneseness precludes any admission into the rightful canon of works that stray from this unparalleled model or even of any other work at all. Indeed, there does not seem to be anything to expect from further developments in literature, in so far as, in the best of cases, later works will only bear some degree of resemblance to the source-model and, in every case, they are not likely to usher in a new flourishing period of "primitive literature". In this sense, Okazaki's *History* differs markedly from that of Mikami and Takatsu in its almost complete identification of Japaneseness with a single work and a single period. Whereas, as Michael Brownstein points out, the narrative of Mikami and Takatsu's *History* unfolds like a "romance of *kokuta*" ("national essence"), where after many twists and turns a rebirth of this essence can be expected, in Okazaki's work, this essence is too exclusively tied to the Nara period and its literature for anything of the sort to happen.<sup>145</sup> This way, even if the Edo period is presented positively by Okazaki, who apprehends it as a time of Confucian learning and as the inception of Japanese learning, it cannot be viewed as a period of literary revival of great magnitude. Mikami and Takatsu, on the other hand, describe Edo as period where native creativity asserts itself after a Confucian revival, most notably in the works of Edo prose writers and novelists.<sup>146</sup> In this respect, Okazaki leans more towards the conception of literature of National Learning school than to the one rearranged around the national essence in a modern sense. His perception of the *Man'yōshū* is also quite traditional in the sense that, although he locates a distinctly Japanese character in the anthology – which aligns with the second aspect of the vision of *Man'yōshū* in the Meiji era according to Shinada, he doesn't move beyond that point to look for contemporary manifestations of this character, as later generations of folklorists inspired by Haga will.

Yet, Okazaki manages to salvage works of literature that stand outside his grand narrative of decline. He presumably does so for two reasons: the necessity to justify the inclusion of some already canonical works into the corpus and the need to justify new linguistic practices that emerged in Meiji. Among those already canonical works are for example the *Kokinshū* 古今集 (905), the *Tale of Genji* 源氏物語 (11th century), the poems of Saigyō 西行 (1118–1190), Fujiwara no Teika 藤原定家 (1162–1241), the *Shin kokin wakashū* 新古今和歌集 (1205) and Bashō 芭蕉 (1644–1694). In some cases, their place in the canon is justified by Okazaki with relative ease and mostly based on their perceived closeness to the characteristics of the *Man'yōshū*: that is the case of the *Kokinshū*, which Okazaki describes as a manifestation of "sound national sentiment" („gesundes Nationalgefühl"),<sup>147</sup> but also,

<sup>145</sup> BROWNSTEIN 1987: 452.

<sup>146</sup> BROWNSTEIN 1987: 455.

<sup>147</sup> OKAZAKI 1899a: 39.

in a more subtle way, of Bashō's *haiku* 俳句. Bashō, whom Okazaki calls a “king or god of *haikai*” („König oder Gott der Haikai”),<sup>148</sup> is already a canonical figure and he is praised here for his emphasis on the observation of nature as compositional principle. The sincerity of feelings of his poetry is furthermore described as a common poetic good that can be shared by all in society, which is also a characteristic of the *Man'yōshū*.<sup>149</sup> This characterization of *haiku* goes hand in hand with a more general depiction of it as a total genre, that unites all social strata and is unlimited in its creative resources, even if, at the very end of his *History*, Okazaki laments that the genre has devolved into a superficial (and commercialised) pursuit.<sup>150</sup> Such a view of *haikai* as a genre that spans all walks of life is widely held in the 1890s amidst the group of Tōkyō University students who will participate in the reshaping of the *Man'yōshū* as popular anthology during this decade.<sup>151</sup> Others, such as Saigyō and Teika, are spared for their own merits, which only remotely overlap with the characterization of the *Man'yōshū*: Saigyō, who represents the 12th century Buddhist pessimism („Vertreter der buddhistischen, pessimistischen Litteratur im 12. Jahrhundert”) is still celebrated for the “moving truthfulness” („rührende Wahrheit”) of his poems and for the “simple popular language” („einfach[e] Volkssprache”) of his poetic diction;<sup>152</sup> Teika is redeemed by his being “well-versed in the ways of the world” („weltklug”),<sup>153</sup> as opposed to the pessimist Chōmei who remains aloof from it, which earns him the comparison with Kakinomoto no Hitomaro, for reasons difficult to fathom.<sup>154</sup> The case of Heian female literature is slightly more complex. Okazaki is forced

<sup>148</sup> OKAZAKI 1899a: 93.

<sup>149</sup> OKAZAKI (1899a: 135–136): “The ever so wonderful nature was his ideal and his motto was: ‘Follow nature!’. His heart was able to feel the warmth of its wonders and he was certainly more imbued than others with the notion that the enjoyment of the beauty of creation was the shared feeling of all humanity, through which we all become siblings, by which all of us are linked, from the emperor down to the beggar.” („Die ewig wunderbare Natur war sein Ideal, und sein Wahlspruch hiess: ‚Folge der Natur!‘ Sein Herz konnte ihre Wunder warm nachempfinden, und er war gewiss mehr als andere davon durchdrungen, dass der Genuss der schönen Schöpfung das gemeinschaftliche Gefühl der ganzen Menschheit ist, durch das wir verbrüdet werden, ja, durch das wir alle, vom Kaiser bis zum Bettler, unaufhörlich zusammengekettet sind“).

<sup>150</sup> OKAZAKI (1899a: 138): “*Haikai* really was a poetic genre that contained all aesthetic elements. Unfortunately, because of greed, other genres branched off, like *senryū*, *mikasazuke* and other worthless frivolities and *haikai* collapsed.” („Haikai war wirklich eine Dichtungsart, die alle ästhetischen Elemente enthielt. Aber leider zweigten sich verschiedene Arten, wie *Senryū*, *Mikasatsuke* und andere wertlose Spielereien, um des Geldes willen davon ab, und das Haikai sank in sich selbst zusammen“).

<sup>151</sup> See the fourth chapter in TUCK (2018).

<sup>152</sup> OKAZAKI 1899a: 57–58.

<sup>153</sup> OKAZAKI 1899a: 76.

<sup>154</sup> Could this be a reminiscence of the fact that retired emperor Reigen 靈元 (1654–1732) had ordered that Fujiwara no Teika's portrait be substituted for that of Hitomaro in *Hitomaro eigū* 人麻呂影供 ceremonies? On this, see COMMONS 2009: 194–196.

to admit that the Heian period, which he decried for having slid into effeminacy and immorality, is “the most beautiful period of ancient Japanese literature” („die schönste Periode der älteren japanischen Litteratur”).<sup>155</sup> In this context, the only way to clear the name of such a commanding figure as Murasaki Shikibu is to sever all ties between her and the general atmosphere of the period. Murasaki is therefore recast as an “image of pure Japanese morality, of complete innocence, restraint and piety, full of natural charm” („Bild reiner japanischer Sitte, ganz Unschuld, Zucht und Frömmigkeit, voll natürlicher Anmut”).<sup>156</sup> Lady Murasaki, however, is the only one to be so diligently rescued and, surprisingly for the author of a book on women’s literature, no attempt is made by Okazaki to connect her being a woman with a sense of Japaneseness, as was clearly the case in the *History of Women’s Literature*<sup>157</sup> and will be the case in the writings of later *kokubungaku* scholars.<sup>158</sup> Murasaki does incarnate Japanese virtues, but it is not by virtue of being a woman. The last topic of negotiation with the canon is the “mixed Japanese-Chinese style” (*wakan-konkō-bun* 和漢混交文), which forces Okazaki to reconsider many aspects of his discourse on literature. The term “mixed Chinese-Japanese style” is an invention of the early years of the Meiji era and it is used to describe the written style, heavy with Chinese borrowings, exhibited by such works as *Konjaku-monogatari-shū* 今昔物語集, *Heike-monogatari* 平家物語 and the works of many Edo prose writers (e.g., Arai Hakuseki 新井白石, Kaibara Ekiken 貝原益軒).<sup>159</sup> It is very unlikely that these writers had any notion that they were using a distinct mixed style (as there was more of a continuum of different mixed styles), but the *wakan-konkō-bun* is nevertheless promoted, from the second decade of Meiji onwards, as a retroactive ancestor to the officially sponsored “universal style” (*futsū-bun* 普通文), i.e. the “Sinitic register” (*kanbun-chōshi* 漢文調子) in its standardized and simplified form.<sup>160</sup> Okazaki’s take on this style is ambiguous: he views it as an expression of

<sup>155</sup> OKAZAKI 1899a: 45.

<sup>156</sup> OKAZAKI 1899a: 48.

<sup>157</sup> See for example the preface to OKAZAKI (1893: i) by Inoue Tetsujirō : “If we look into the past and present times, if we inquire about East and West, [it becomes clear that] no country has seen women achieve such glory as Japan has. The fact that the excellent works of our national literature are of pure beauty and profound elegance and possess a distinct style originates in the Heian court and women are the true source of it. [...] All these have come down to us and are still viewed as literary models. How would Japan not be the country of women?” (考之古今、徴之東西。女子之盛。未有如日本者也。蓋國文之佳者、清麗幽雅。有一種氣韻。是起于平安朝。而女子實爲其本源。[...] 皆傳于今日。屹爲國文模範。日本豈非女子之國耶)。

<sup>158</sup> Like Fujioka Sakutarō 藤岡朔太郎 or Tsuda Sōkichi 津田左右吉 dealt with in detail by SUZUKI 2000.

<sup>159</sup> The term was arguably coined by Konakamura Kiyonori 小中村清矩 (professor of Japanese literature at the University of Tōkyō and initiator of the classics training course in 1882) in a 1878 article (“The nature and history of national literature” 国文の性質並沿革). See NISHIDA 1982: 191.

<sup>160</sup> The “universal style” borrows heavily from Sinitic vocabulary and syntax, to a degree where, theoretically at least, a sentence in “universal style” can be directly “reverted” to Sinitic. The highly demanding nature of this style, which requires a training in Sinitic from readers and writers, will

the simplicity of taste of North-East Japan's warrior class, but towards the end of his book, he redefines it as a blend of the linguistic virtues of both Chinese and Japanese, in complete contrast to his narrative of literary decline caused by Chinese influence. Early in the book, the mixed style was depicted as that of the warrior tales (*gunki* 軍記) and was viewed positively due to its perceived ties with the poetry of Minamoto no Sanetomo (1192–1219), infused with the poetic diction of the *Man'yōshū*.<sup>161</sup> On the other hand, in Okazaki's own words, this style embodies the "beauty and brevity of the Chinese and the delicacy and charm of Japanese scripts and languages" („Schönheit und Knappheit der chinesischen und Zierlichkeit und Anmut der japanischen Schrift und Sprache").<sup>162</sup> In this depiction, the negative foreignness of Sinitic seems to fade from view, to leave room for its positive stylistical characteristics, while the "delicacy" („Zierlichkeit") of Japanese, rather than being singled out for criticism, is depicted as a positive attribute of the language. Miscegenation, which seemed to draw strong criticism, is now celebrated as a precondition for a balanced style, in terms that seem very far remote from the "sound eclecticism" advocated by Okazaki in his thesis on the *Man'yōshū*. It is quite remarkable that a great deal of Okazaki's negotiation with the canon is relegated to the final pages,<sup>163</sup> which, as has already been hinted at, classifies late Edo period works into scriptural styles and genres. This last part reads like an admission of the limits inherent to Okazaki's narrative, especially because it adopts a descriptive rather than ideologically informed approach. Authors are succinctly presented rather than judged on the ground of their relative position to the spirit of the *Man'yōshū*. This allows for a much more wide-ranging discussion of different genres and for the inclusion of female poets and of comical literature into the scope of worthy literature.<sup>164</sup> In this way, even if Okazaki concludes his book on the decline of *haiku*, he does so after having escaped for a minute the

---

spur Meiji officials to simplify it, under a form that will be definitively fixed in the 1890s (OKAMOTO 1982: 60–70).

<sup>161</sup> OKAZAKI (1899a: 112): "Later on [...] Shōgun Sanetomo, the champion of the North, sought to imitate the strength and grandeur of the *Man'yō* era in his poetic diction. In a time when Sanetomo's poetry was acclaimed, it was but natural that a similar prose should develop, in order to meet the people's tastes. In this sense, famous works appeared soon, such as the *Heike-monogatari*, the *Genpei-jōsui-ki* etc..." („Späterhin suchte [...] der Vertreter des Nordens, Shōgun Sanetomo, die Kraft und Grösse der *Man'yō*-Zeit in seinen Dichtungen nachzuahmen. In der Zeit, als man den Poesien Sanetomo's Beifall spendete, musste sich natürlicherweise auch eine gleichartige Prosa entwickeln, um den Geschmack des Volkes zu befriedigen. Bald erschienen denn auch in diesem Sinne berühmte Werke, z. B. das *Heike-Monogatari*, das *Genpei-Seisui-Ki* u. a.(").

<sup>162</sup> OKAZAKI 1899a: 112.

<sup>163</sup> OKAZAKI 1899a: 112–135. They comprise the section on mixed style and that on *haikai*.

<sup>164</sup> OKAZAKI (1899a: 123–124) mentions the female poets [Yuya] Shizuko 油谷倭文子 (1733–1752), [Kada no] Tamiko 荷田民子 (1722–1786), Koran-joshi (Yanagawa Kōran 梁川紅蘭 [1804–1879]) and Arakida Rei[jo] 荒木田麗女 (1732–1806), whom he speaks highly of. Among comical writers, Okazaki speaks particularly fondly of Kyokutei Bakin 曲亭馬琴 (1767–1848).

characterization of the period as an age of decline. In this sense, this final twenty pages exemplify the fact that Okazaki was aware, to a degree, of the imperfection of the narrative he had developed and of the disjunction it exhibited with his experience as a reader of late Edo works.

## Conclusion

We have attempted to paint a portrait of Okazaki Tōmitsu, an almost completely unknown figure, who was nevertheless very representative of his time and of its reflection on national literature. Okazaki found himself in contact with many of the young intellectuals who participated in the construction of the Japanese discourse on literary history, such as Takatsu Kuwasaburō or Inoue Tetsujirō. Being a student at Tōkyō University, he was steeped in this particular atmosphere of National Learning and Western ideas that shaped the first generation of literary historians. Under their influence, Okazaki set out to write his first works on Japan's literary tradition, in which he progressively elaborates his conception of literature as a distinct field of knowledge. His first publication on literary history, the *History of Japanese Women's Literature* bears witness to his first attempt at characterising Japanese literature *vis-à-vis* other literary traditions, but it is his thesis on the *Man'yōshū*, written while in Germany, that will set the course for his further writings on literature. Influenced by the school of National Learning and its emphasis on Nara period as the source of Japanese culture, Okazaki will go on to develop a vision of literature centered on the *Man'yōshū*, which parallels in many respects the conception of *Man'yōshū* as a national anthology that emerges towards the end of the 19th century. Thus, Okazaki comes to construe the *Man'yōshū* as an emanation of the entire body of the nation and as an embodiment of its unique Japaneseness. In this perspective, the whole history of Japanese literature is viewed through the lens of the *Man'yōshū*, which represents its highlight, but also an unparalleled model, which any later literature can only hope to replicate. It is on this basis that Okazaki structures his *History of Japan's National Literature*. In this respect, his conception of Japanese literature embodies the inherent contradiction of *Man'yōshū*-centric visions of literature: the search for an essence of ancient and a model for future literature precludes the possibility of further developments in literature. Such an obsession for a hypothetical essence of Japanese literature is in no way unusual among Japanese intellectuals of the time. Nevertheless, while Okazaki negotiates with the preexisting literary canon to include the works his system has *de facto* excluded, other literary historians work on a more fundamental level in order to find a way around the aporia encountered by Okazaki. For example, Mikami and Takatsu chose not to locate Japaneseness in a single piece of literature, thus allowing other works to embody a Japaneseness of their own. Similarly, former students of Haga such as Fujii Otoo 藤井乙男 (1868–1946) and Takagi Toshio 高木敏雄 (1876–1922) will locate new forms of this essence



in folk culture. The very last section of the *History*, which shifts away from the general *Man'yōshū*-centric framework to offer a list of works simply categorized in terms of scriptural style and genre reads like an admission of the book's own theoretical limitations as literary history.

In this sense, it would seem that Okazaki's attempt to position Japanese literature within "world literature" was unsuccessful. His *History* seems to have attracted very few readers, although he had ties to the very same literary and academic milieu as Karl Florenz,<sup>165</sup> the author of the first authoritative history of Japanese literature in the German language. Reading Florenz' work, whose perspective is quite different to that of Okazaki, one still finds that his characterization of Kakinomoto no Hitomaro as a "patriot" and defender of the "national character" is far from alien to Okazaki's perception of the *Man'yōshū*.<sup>166</sup> It is also well-known that Florenz used Japanese literary histories for the compilation of his own work, so that it is in a way remarkable that he should not even mention Okazaki's books on the *Man'yōshū* and on literary history.<sup>167</sup> If the two men had been acquainted and worked hand in hand, surely Okazaki's ambition of representing Japanese literature for the Western public might have been fulfilled. One could argue that Okazaki's project didn't succeed because it lacked the support of an institution, as in the case of the officially sponsored *Histoire de l'art du Japon* (1900), or of an influential foreign intellectual, such as Sylvain Lévi who penned a preface for Fujishima Ryōon's 1889 *Les Douze sectes bouddhiques du Japon*. But on the other hand, the simple fact that a history of Japanese literature could be written in a foreign language amounts to a success of some kind. The fact that it could be written shows that Japanese literature can be articulated in terms similar to other literary traditions. In this light, we might want to reconsider the fact that Okazaki's *History of Japan's National Literature* was solely written for a foreign audience. It might well be that the existence of such a book was more important for Japanese people such as Haga – who mentions it in the closing of his outline on the flourishing of Japanese literary history – and that this possibility, in and of itself, positioned Japan within the field of world literature, even if the actual work was not to be widely read.

---

<sup>165</sup> SATŌ 1995: 12.

<sup>166</sup> FLORENZ (1906: 93–94): "[Hitomaro] is the one who maintains the national character the most visibly, he is a fervent patriot, a worshipper of the gods, a pure shintoist and royalist" („[Hitomaro] bewahrt überhaupt die nationale Eigenart am deutlichsten, ist ein glühender Patriot und Verehrer der alten Götter, ein Schintoist und Royalist vom reinsten Wasser”).

<sup>167</sup> SATŌ (1995: 12) notes that Florenz made use of Haga's *Ten Lessons* (HAGA 1899), of Fujioka Sakutarō's *Manual of National Literature* 日本文学教科書 (1901) and of Wada Mankichi 和田万吉 and Nagai Hidenori's 永井一孝 *Short History of National Literature* 国文学小史 (1899).

## Appendix: Table of contents of *Das Man'yōshū: Eine kritisch-ästhetische Studie*, 1898

I. Einleitung [Introduction]

II. Der Zusammensteller des *Man'yōshū* [The *Man'yōshū*'s compiler]

III. Textgeschichte [Text history]

IV. Worin besteht nun der Wert des *Man'yōshū*? [Where does the *Man'yōshū*'s value lie?]

V. Die philologischen Erscheinungen im *Man'yōshū* [Philological phenomena that appear in the *Man'yōshū*]

VI. Die geschichtlichen Erscheinungen im *Man'yōshū* [Historical phenomena that appear in the *Man'yōshū*]

VII. Geographisches im *Man'yōshū* [Geography in the *Man'yōshū*]

VIII. Die Hinweise des *Man'yōshū* auf Mode und Sitten [Indications contained in the *Man'yōshū* regarding fashion and customs]

1. Die Form des Haares [Hairstyle]

2. Die Kleidung [Clothing]

3. Hausrat und Schmuck [Furnitures and jewelry]

4. Die gesellschaftlichen Beziehungen [Social relations]

5. Familie [Family]

IX. Überblick über die Gedichte [Overview of the poems]

X. Azumavolk und Azumagedichte [The Azuma people and the Azuma poems]

XI. Die Zeitströmungen im *Man'yōshū* im Vergleich zur Neuzeit [The trends of the time in *Man'yōshū* compared to those of our time]

XII. Schluss [Conclusion]

### Reference list

#### Primary sources

CHŌSEN DENKI JIGYŌ SHI HENSHŪ IINKAI 電気事業史編集委員会 (2005): *Chōsen denki jigyō shi 1* [History of Electricity in Korea 1] 電気事業史 1. “Kankoku chiri fūzokushi sōsho 韓国地理風俗誌叢書“, 351. Seoul: Kyōngin munhwasa.

FALCKENBERG, Richard (1898 [1885]): *Geschichte der neueren Philosophie von Nikolaus von Kues bis zur Gegenwart*. Leipzig: Verlag von Veit & Comp.

- FLORENZ, Karl (1915 [1894]): *Dichtergrüsse aus dem Osten: Japanische Dichtungen*. Leipzig: C.F. Amelangs Verlag.
- FLORENZ, Karl (1906): *Geschichte der japanischen Litteratur*. Leipzig: C.F. Amelangs Verlag.
- HAGA, Yaichi 芳賀矢一 (1899): *Kokubungaku-shi jikkō* [Ten Lessons on the History of National Literature] 國文學史十講. Tōkyō: Fuzanbō.
- INOUE, Tetsujirō 井上哲次郎 (1943): *Kaikyū-roku* [Remembrances of the Past] 懷旧録. Tōkyō: Shunjū-sha Sōhaku-kan.
- KAMO, Mabuchi 賀茂真淵 (1975 [1765]): *Niimanabi* [New Learning] にひまなび. In: HASHIMOTO, Fumio 橋本不美男 *et al.* (ed.): *Nihon koten bungaku zenshū Karonshū* 日本古典文学全集 歌論集. Tōkyō: Shōgakkan: 585–604.
- MIKAMI, Sanji 三上参次, TAKATSU Kuwasaburō 高津楯三郎 (1890): *Nihon bungaku shi* [History of Japanese Literature] 日本文学史, 2 vol. Tōkyō: Kinkōdō.
- OKAZAKI, Tōmitsu 岡崎遠光 (1898): *Das Manyōshū. Eine kritisch-ästhetische Studie*. Leipzig: Duncker & Humblot.
- OKAZAKI, Tōmitsu 岡崎遠光 [Shimotsuke Tōmitsu 下野遠光] (1893): *Nihon jogaku shi* [History of Japanese Women's Literature] 日本女學史. Tōkyō: Keigyōsha.
- OKAZAKI, Tōmitsu 岡崎遠光 [Shimotsuke Tōmitsu 下野遠光] (1895): *Nihon shōbunten* [A Short Japanese Grammar] 日本小文典. Tōkyō: Shōeidō.
- OKAZAKI, Tōmitsu 岡崎遠光 (1899a): *Geschichte der japanischen Nationallitteratur. Von den ältesten Zeiten bis zur Gegenwart*. Leipzig: Brockhaus.
- OKAZAKI, Tōmitsu 岡崎遠光 (1899b): *Keisei hyōron: Bungaku, Bijutsu, Keizai, Seiji no kansatsu* [Essays to Caution the Time: observations on literature, the arts, economy and politics] 警世評論: 文学・美術・経済・政治之觀察. Tōkyō: Hakubunkan.
- KEIJŌ DENKI KABUSHIKI-GAISHA 京城電気株式会社 (ed.) (1929): *Keijō denki kabushiki-gaisha Nijūnen enkaku-shi* [Twenty years of History of Keijō-Denki Kabushiki-gaisha] 京城電気株式会社二十年沿革史. Keijō [Seoul]: Keijō-denki.
- KEIJŌ DENKI KABUSHIKI-GAISHA SHOMU-KA 京城電気株式会社庶務課 (ed.) (1935): *Nobiyuku Keijō denki* [The Ever-Growing Keijō-Denki] 伸び行く京城電気. Keijō [Seoul]: Keijō-denki 京城電気.
- SASAKI, Nobutsuna 佐佐木信綱 (ed.) (1972): *Nihon kagaku taikei* 日本歌学大系 8. Tōkyō: Kazama Shobō.
- TAINE, Hippolyte (1866 [1863]): *Histoire de la littérature anglaise*. Vol. I. Paris: Hachette.
- TOYAMA, Masakazu 外山正一 (1909 [1896]): “Shintaishi, oyobi Rōdoku-hō” [Poems in the New Style and the Methods for Reading Poetry Aloud] 新體詩及び朗讀法. In: TOYAMA, Masakazu: *Sanzon-kō* 山存稿, 2. Tōkyō: Maruzen.
- YAMAZAKI, Kōgorō 山崎庚午郎, OKAZAKI Tōmitsu 岡崎遠光 [Shimotsuke Tōmitsu 下野遠光] (1892): *Nihon bungaku shūran* [Collection of Japanese Literature] 日本文学集覽. Tōkyō: Hakubunkan.

## Secondary sources

- ÁROKAY, Judit (2014): “Discourse on Poetic Language in Early Modern Japan and the Awareness of Linguistic Change”. In: ÁROKAY, Judit, Jadranka GVOZDANOVIĆ, Darja

- MIYAJIMA (ed.): *Divided Languages? Diglossia, Translation and the Rise of Modernity in Japan, China, and the Slavic World*. Berlin: Springer: 89–103.
- BABA, Daisuke (2020): “Analogisches Denken zur Hybridität: Karl Florenz’ *Geschichte der japanischen Litteratur* im Austausch der deutschen und der japanischen Literaturforschung“. In: *Neue Beiträge zur Germanistik* 19(161): 119–137.
- BENTLEY, John R. (2019): *An Anthology of Kokugaku Scholars: 1690–1868*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- BROWNSTEIN, Michael C. (1987): “From *Kokugaku* to *Kokubungaku*: Canon Formation in the Meiji Period“. In: *Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies* 67(2): 435–460.
- CHARRIER, Isabelle (1999): “La réaction nationaliste dans les milieux artistiques: Fenollosa et Okakura Tenshin“. In: TSCHUDIN, Jean-Jacques, Claude HAMON (eds.): *La Nation en marche: Etudes sur le Japon impérial de Meiji*. Arles: Picquier: 163–180.
- COBBING, Andrew (1998): *The Japanese Discovery of Victorian Britain: Early Travel Encounters in the Far West*. “Meiji Series”, 5. London: Routledge.
- COMMONS, Anne (2009): *Hitomaro: Poet As God*. Leiden: Brill.
- CONANT, Ellen P. (ed.) (2006a): *Challenging Past and Present. The Metamorphosis of Nineteenth-Century Japanese Art*. Honolulu: University of Hawai’i Press.
- CONANT, Ellen P. (2006b): “Japan ‘Abroad’ at the Chicago Exposition, 1893“. In: CONANT, Ellen P. (ed.): *Challenging Past and Present. The Metamorphosis of Nineteenth-Century Japanese Art*. Honolulu: University of Hawai’i Press: 254–280.
- DUTHIE, Torquil (2009): “The *Man’yōshū* as a Pre-classic“. In: SHIRANE, Haruo (ed.): *Ekkyō suru Nihon bungaku kenkyū* 越境する日本文学研究. Tōkyō: Benseisha: 20–23.
- DUTHIE, Torquil (2014): *Manyōshū and the Imperial Imagination in Early Japan*. Leiden: Brill.
- FRANK, Bernard (1983): “Postface“. In: FUJISHIMA, Ryōon 藤島了穩 (1983 [1889]): *Les Douze Sectes bouddhiques du Japon*. Paris: Éditions Trismégiste: 161–176.
- KAIGO, Tokiomi 海後宗臣, NAKA, Arata 仲新, TERASAKI, Masao 寺崎昌男 (1999): *Kyōkasho de miru kingendai Nihon no kyōiku* [Modern and Contemporary Japan through Textbooks] 教科書でみる近現代日本の教育. Tōkyō: Tōkyō Shoseki.
- LEIBFRIED, Christina (2003): *Sinologie an der Universität Leipzig: Entstehung und Wirken des Ostasiatischen Seminars 1878–1947*. “Beiträge Zur Leipziger Universitäts- Und Wissenschaftsgeschichte”, 1. Leipzig: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt.
- LEWIN, Bruno (2001): “Mori Ōgai and German Aesthetics“. In: MARRA, Michael F. (ed.): *A History of Modern Japanese Aesthetics*. Honolulu: University of Hawai’i Press: 68–92.
- LOZERAND, Emmanuel (2005): *Littérature et Génie national: Naissance d’une histoire littéraire dans le Japon du XIX<sup>e</sup> siècle*. “Collection Japon”. Paris: Belles Lettres.
- MARRA, Michael F. (2010): “Nativist Hermeneutics: The Interpretative Strategies of Motoori Norinaga and Fujitani Mitsue“. In: MARRA, Michael F.: *Essays on Japan: Between Aesthetics and Literature*. Leiden: Brill: 365–416.
- MARQUET, Christophe (1999): “Conscience patrimoniale et écriture de l’histoire de l’art national“. In: TSCHUDIN, Jean-Jacques, Claude HAMON (eds.): *La Nation en marche: Etudes sur le Japon impérial de Meiji*. Arles: Picquier: 143–162.
- MARTIN-LUTHER-UNIVERSITÄT HALLE-WITTENBERG: “Catalogus Professorum Halensis Philosophi (Catalogue of Professors at the University of Halle)”: <https://www.catalogus-professorum-halensis.de/> (accessed: 01.06.2021).

- MITTEAU, Arthur (2013): “L’universalisme de l’esthétique chez Okakura Kakuzō (dit Tenshin) et Ernest Fenollosa: critique et actualité”. In: *Ebisu* 50: 95–133.
- NAUMANN, Wolfram (1985): “Karl Florenz Als Literaturgeschichtsschreiber.” In: *Nachrichten der Gesellschaft für Natur- und Völkerkunde Ostasiens* 137: 49–57.
- NISHIDA, Naotoshi 西田直敏 (1982): “*Wakan-konkō-bun no buntai-shi* [Stylistic History of the Japanese-Chinese Mixed Style] 和漢混淆文の文体史”. In: MORIOKA, Kenji 森岡健二 *et al.* (eds.) (1982): *Kōza Nihongogaku 7 Buntai-shi 1* 講座日本語学 7 文体史 1. Tōkyō: Meiji-Shoin: 188–214.
- OKAMOTO, Isao 岡本勲 (1982): “*Genbun-itchi-tai to Meiji-futsū-buntai* [The *Genbun-itchi* Style and Meiji *Futsū-bun* Style] 言文一致体と明治普通文体”. In: MORIOKA, Kenji 森岡健二 *et al.* (eds.) (1982): *Kōza Nihongogaku 7 Buntai-shi 1* 講座日本語学 7 文体史 1. Tōkyō: Meiji-Shoin: 47–72.
- REISCHAUER, Edwin O. (1947): “The Izayoi Nikki (1277–1280)”. In: *Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies*, Vol. 10 (3–4): 255–387.
- RICHTER, Giles (1997): “Entrepreneurship and Culture: The Hakubunkan Publishing Empire in Meiji Japan”. In: HARDACRE, Helen, Adam L. KERN (eds.): *New Directions in the Study of Meiji Japan*. Brill: Leiden: 590–602.
- SATŌ, Masako (1995): *Karl Florenz in Japan: Auf den Spuren einer vergessenen Quelle der modernen japanischen Geistesgeschichte und Poetik*. Hamburg: Gesellschaft für Natur- und Völkerkunde Ostasiens e.V., MOAG, 124.
- SHIBUSAWA EIICHI MEMORIAL FOUNDATION: “Shibusawa Shashi Database”: <https://shashi.shibusawa.or.jp/> (accessed: 01.06.2021).
- SHINADA, Yoshikazu 品田悦一 (2001): *Man’yōshū no hatsumei: Kokumin kokka to bunka sōchi to shite no koten* [The Invention of *Man’yōshū*: the Nation-State and the Classics as Cultural Device] 万葉集の発明：国民国家と文化装置としての古典. Tōkyō: Shin’yōsha.
- SHINADA, Yoshikazu 品田悦一 (2002): “*Man’yōshū*: the Invention of a National Poetry Anthology”. In: SUZUKI, Tomi, SHIRANE Haruo (eds.): *Inventing the Classics: Modernity, National Identity, and Japanese Literature*. Stanford: Stanford University Press: 31–50.
- SHINADA, Yoshikazu 品田悦一 (2012): “Haijo to hōsetsu: kokugaku, kokubungaku, Haga Yaichi [Exclusion and Subsumption: National Learning, National Literature, Haga Yaichi] 排除と包摂：国学・国文学・芳賀矢一”. In: *Kokubun to kokubungaku* 国語と国文学 89(6): 3–20.
- SHINADA, Yoshikazu 品田悦一, SAITŌ, Mareshi 斎藤希史 (2012): *Kindai Nihon no Kokugaku to Kangaku: Tōkyō daigaku Kōten-kōshū-ka wo megutte* [National Learning and Sinology in the Modern Era: On the Classics Training Course] 近代日本の国学と漢学：東京大学古典講習科をめぐって. Tōkyō: UTCP.
- SHINADA, Yoshikazu 品田悦一 (2018): “*Man’yōshū* no kindai wo sōkatsu shite posuto-Heisei ni oyobu [Summing up of the situation of *Man’yōshū* in the modern era until Heisei] 万葉集の近代を総括してポスト平成に及ぶ”. *Nihon bungaku kenkyū Jānaru* 日本文学研究ジャーナル 5: 95–107.
- SHIVELY, Donald (1976): “The Japanisation of the Middle Meiji”. In: SHIVELY, Donald (ed.): *Tradition and Modernization in Japanese Culture*. Princeton University Press: Princeton: 77–119.

- SUZUKI, Tomi (2000): "Gender and Genre: Modern Literary Histories and Women's Diary Literature". In: SHIRANE, Haruo, Tomi SUZUKI (eds.): *Inventing the Classics*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- SUZUKI, Sadami 鈴木貞美 (2006 [1998]): *The Concept of "Literature" in Japan*. Transl. by Royall Tyler. Kyōto: International Research Center for Japanese Studies.
- TUCK, Robert (2018): *Idly Scribbling Rhymers. Poetry, Print, and Community in Nineteenth-Century Japan*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- UNIVERSITÄT LEIPZIG (2011): „Professorenkatalog der Universität Leipzig – Catalogus professorum lipsiensium“: <https://research.uni-leipzig.de/catalogus-professorum-lipsiensium/> (accessed: 01.06.2021).
- VOVIN, Alexander (2012): *Man'yōshū. Book 14. A New English Translation Containing the Original Text, Kana Transliteration, Romanization, Glossing, and Commentary*. Folkestone/Leiden: Global Oriental/Brill.
- VOVIN, Alexander (2013): *Man'yōshū. Book 20. A New English Translation Containing the Original Text, Kana Transliteration, Romanization, Glossing, and Commentary*. Folkestone/Leiden: Global Oriental/Brill.