【Research Article】

A Boundary of National Identity Discourse: Karl Florenz's Strategy for the Historical Writing of Japanese Literature

Daisuke Baba

Abstract

This study represents an attempt to illuminate the intellectual influence of Japanese national literary studies (*koku-gaku*) on the German Japanologist Karl Florenz (1865–1939) and his representative work, *A History of Japanese Literature* (*Geschichte der japanischen Litteratur*, 1906).[1] From 1889 to 1914, this lecturer of German literature at the Tokyo Imperial University established close relationships with his Japanese students and colleagues, some of whom cooperated on his studies of Japanese literature. Their knowledge about Japanese literature was based on the *koku-gaku* tradition that manifested its policy as a modern discipline. After describing the development of the *koku-gaku* at the Tokyo Imperial University during the modernizing Meiji era (1868–1912), the present study assesses both the manifestation and the function of national literature studies. In these historical contexts, this brief study points out Karl Florenz's activity and limits of his study of Japanese literature in order to clarify his strategy of the historical writing of national literature as a German oriental philologist, especially in contrast to William G. Aston's (1841–1911) *A History of Japanese Literature* (1899). The following textual analysis of *Geschichte der japanischen Literatur* demonstrates how Florenz transformed his knowledge of Japanese literature from the *koku-gaku* into the German historical writing of national literature. The conclusion of this study discusses Florenz's philosophy of the national frames of German and Japanese literature and its boundary function in the context of national identity.

Keywords: *German, Japanese, nation, civilization, culture*

1. Introduction

Japan in the late 19th century marks its modernization as a nation state while rapidly adopting civilization and cultures of European and American powers. In this process, one of the most urgent problems that the Meiji-government had to deal with was the general education of the Japanese people. Japanese intellectuals were convinced of the need for establishing a national institution for education. During this period, the first university in Japan, the University of Tokyo (*Tokyo Daigaku*), was founded as the highest graded educational organization (Yamamoto 2014: 63-86).[2] This university represented a modern example of higher education based on European and American university models. Political leaders primarily required academic education for Japan's material enrichment. In slight contrast to this movement, which was incredibly single-minded in its focus upon material

1 I appreciate the assistance of Professor Dr. Michael Heitkemper-Yates (Rikkyo University) for kindly proofreading this paper. In this paper, the Japanese surname will be written first in all instances. The contents of sections 2 and 3 are partly included in a previous publication: Daisuke Baba. (2020). *A Hybrid Origin of Modern Historical Writing of Japanese Literature. Karl Florenz's "A History of Japanese Literature" and the German–Japanese Contact of Academic Cultures* (*Kindai Nihon Bungaku-shi Kijutsu no Haiburiddo na ichi Kigen. Kāru Flōrentsu "Nihon Bungaku-shi" ni okeru Nichi-doku no Gakujutsu Bunka Sesshoku*). Tokyo: Sangensha.

2 *Tokyo Daigaku* was renamed "Imperial University" (*Teikoku Daigaku*) after the Decree for the Imperial University (*Teikoku Daigaku-rei*) by the First Cabinet of Itō Hirofumi (1841-1909) in 1886. When, in 1897, another Imperial university was also founded in Kyōto, the name of "Imperial University" in Tokyo was changed to "Tokyo Imperial University" (*Tokyo Teikoku Daigaku*). This study will refer to *Tokyo Daigaku* in this period only as "Tokyo Imperial University."

advancement, Fukuzawa Yukichi (1835–1901) published *An Outline of Civilization Theory* (*Bun'mei-ron no Gairyaku*, 1875). Fukuzawa's work discusses how Japan should go with European and American civilization in order to obtain its own international independence, thereby explaining civilization from the perspective of not only material aspects but also with a recognition of the moral and intellectual aspects of the nation (Fukuzawa 1959: 19, 85). In the early phase of Japanese modernization, the key word "civilization" (*bun'mei*) already played an essential role in setting up the foundation of Japan's educational system and national identity.

At the Tokyo Imperial University, some intellectuals of Japanese language and literature studies were employed as officials and teachers. In the early Meiji era, from 1870s to 1880s, they had already developed the clear awareness that their *koku-gaku* tradition from the 17th and 18th centuries could not be maintained during the modernizing process without the financial and institutional support of the new government. One of these old-guard intellectuals, Konakamura Kiyonori (1822–1895), declared on the basis of Fukuzawa's theoretical treatise that the main purpose of Japanese studies as a modern discipline should be to support the moral and intellectual development of the nation state (Fujita 2007: 210). The official intellectuals regarded these aspects as the "national body" (*koku-tai*)—the unique national harmony between the Japanese political state under the emperor and the spiritual attitude of the Japanese people (Wachutka 2016: 65-82). In order to clarify these spiritual aspects of nationality, early modern researchers of Japanese language and literature had attempted philological approaches to ancient (and partly medieval) poetry and prose (Hisamatsu 1969: 139, 145). The accumulation of those findings up to the Meiji era allowed the next generation to describe a history of Japanese literature from the ancient to the early modern period. Indeed, Konakamura suggested during a meeting in 1891 that the writing of a well-summarized history of Japanese literature based on these philological findings aimed at presenting a panorama of the subjects of the modern *koku-gaku* (1898: 22).

In 1889, Karl Florenz started his career as a lecturer of German language and literature at the Tokyo Imperial University, while privately studying Japanese literature. From 1883 to 1886, he had specialized in Sanskrit philology at the University of Leipzig to become better acquainted with Japanese students. Inoue Tetsujirō (1856–1944), a member of the scholarly elite who spoke German well, not only regularly taught him Japanese language, literature, and history, before Florenz arrived in Japan in 1888 (Inoue 1943: 218-20) but also recommended him to the government as a German teacher for the new university (Kamimura 2001: 423). Florenz's study of Japanese literature from 1889 to 1914 was supported by his Japanese colleagues and students. Another colleague, Haga Yaichi (1867–1927), who specialized in Japanese literature from 1892 to 1895 under Konakamura's instruction, was interested in German theories and methods of language and literature study in order to justify the *koku-gaku* tradition as a modern discipline in the abruptly westernizing Japanese university system. In conceptualizing his history of Japanese literature, Haga made a close friendship with Florenz and privately lectured him on Japanese literature. Meanwhile, Florenz privately requested Fujishiro Teisuke (1868–1927), a student in the newly formed department of German literature, to assist in his own study of Japanese literature. After the graduation, Fujishiro attended lectures of a *koku-gaku* scholar on *Manyōshū*, the oldest collection of Japanese poetry from the 8th century, in order to regularly explain to Florenz the detailed contents of the lectures in German (Fujishiro 1927: 138-46). Furthermore, Fujishiro translated a large number of Japanese literary works into German for Florenz (Tobari 1970: 299-300). In his seminar for the German department, moreover, Florenz gave all his students a task to write a thesis about Japanese literature in German (Tokyo Daigaku 1986: 768) in order to gain more precise knowledge of Japanese literature. The

knowledge of the students about Japanese literature undoubtedly consisted of lectures of *koku-gaku* scholars at the university. From this situation, it is highly evident that Florenz's study of Japanese literature and one of his major works, *Geschichte der japanischen Litteratur*, were strongly influenced by the *koku-gaku* tradition through his collogues and students.

Previous studies of Karl Florenz have rarely focused on the process of academic exchange between Germany and Japan itself, but have typically revolved around the assessment of Florenz and his works in the present discourse concerning modern academic exchange.[3] In contrast to the previous studies, this study proposes that a hybrid process of German–Japanese academic contact occurred during this period. The case for this proposal shall proceed by means of the following questions: 1) what is the background of Florenz's description of his history of Japanese literature; 2) for what reason did he transform the *koku-gaku* tradition through German methods of historical writing; and as a result, 3) what kind of character did his history of Japanese literature obtain. These historical perspectives on the academic modernization of language, literature, and education enable this present study to contribute to a better understanding of contemporary Japanese language and education.

2. Historical writings of Japanese literature: Haga, Florenz, and Aston

Toward the end of the 19th century, Florenz began to draft his history of Japanese literature. The historical writing of Japanese literature itself had started with Mikami Sanji's (1865–1939) and Takatsu Kuwasaburō's (1864–1921) *A History of Japanese Literature* (*Nihon Bungaku-shi*, 1890) and *A Reading Book for Our National Literature* (*Koku-bungaku Toku-hon*, 1890), edited by Tachibana Senzaburō (1867–1901) and Haga Yaichi (Takatsu 1969: 10). Mikami's and Takatsu's representation had already referred to English writing methods on the basis of civilization theory (Mikami and Takatsu 1890). The civilization theory related to the historical writing of national literature represented the concept that the national mind develops its literature and culture nearly parallel to the material advancement. On this theoretical basis, a number of histories of Japanese literature were published during the 1890s. In this context, it should be questioned how Florenz, who was certainly not able to describe the history of Japanese literature by himself, adopted former representations. In the foreword of his literary history, Florenz remarks that among the literary approaches, only a few works were worthy of his reference:

> As priceworthy exceptions I would like to firstly give Professor Yaichi Haga's imaginative *Ten Lectures on a History of Our National Literature* (*Koku-bungaku-shi Jikkō*), then Dr. S. Fujioka's *A Textbook of a History of Japanese Literature* (*Nihon Bungaku-shi Kyōkasho*) along with supplement and Wada's and Nagai's *A Short History of Our National Literature* (*Koku-bungaku Shōshi*). These books are also a moderate size and give more hinting outlines than detailed descriptions rounded off in itself. But these books are often valuable tools and guides for my orientation in the chaotic amount of the stuff to be considered. Of course, I have also drawn

3 Representative works include the following: Satō Masako's first extent biographical study (1995) argues that this German philologist played an intermediate role in the modern development of Japanese literature studies as a result of his importation of German theories and methods. More recently, Kamimura Naoki (2001) published a research study concentrating on Florenz as the founder of German studies in Japan. Furthermore, Michael Wachutka's first monograph, published in the same year, investigates Florenz's translation of *The Chronicles of Japan* (*Nihon Shoki*, approx. 720) and his religious interpretation of Shintō. Additionally, Tsuji Tomoki's doctoral thesis (2010) pays critical attention to Florenz's "euro-centric" attitude as an orientalist who depicts Japan as a subject of the Western scientific system.

> instruction about quite many subjects thankfully from W. G. Aston's 1899 published *A History of Japanese Literature*, the first history of Japanese literature, which was described by a European and is worthy of its high commendation (Florenz 1906: IV-V).

In this way, Haga's and Aston's histories of Japanese literature belong to the main reference books for Florenz's historical description.[4] This section attempts to answer the question of how and for what reasons the German philologist included Haga's knowledge and Aston's English translation of literary works into *Geschichte der japanischen Litteratur*.

Undoubtedly, Florenz and Haga were constantly cooperating with each other on their study of Japanese literature. Florenz, who lectured at the department of German studies about the history of German literature (Tobari 1965: 35), had surely gained exact knowledge about historical writing methods widespread in the German speaking areas up to the end of the 19th century. Haga, to whom Florenz not only taught German but also allowed to use the German books of his collection, provided in his 1895 published essay a concept of a historical writing of Japanese literature, thereby summarizing the names of prominent historians of German literature such as Georg Gottfried Gervinus (1805–1871) (Kaikawa [Haga] 1895: 188-98). Meanwhile, in 1891, Haga composed a review of Florenz's translation and comments of *The Chronicles of Japan* that consisted of Fujishiro's translated original manuscripts (Haga 1992: 6). In his first lecture on national literature in the summer of 1898, Haga made a short comment that Florenz had already started writing down his history of Japanese literature (Haga 1983: 187), certainly with Haga's aid. The relationship between these relatively young intellectuals led to a content framework for Florenz's historical description of Japanese literature based on Haga's knowledge.

During the summer vacation time of 1898, Haga Yaichi delivered at the Education Association of Tokyo Imperial University (*Teikoku Daigaku Kyōiku-kai*) *Ten Lectures on a History of our National Literature* to students of Japanese studies and teachers of Japanese language (*koku-go*). In the following years, a supplemental book version of these lectures was put together with a short foreword and contained these 10 lectures in 267 pages as well as an index for the names of authors and works and terminologies (Haga 1903). It is Haga's detailed knowledge in regard to periodization, content constitution, and objects of description in these lectures that Florenz seems to have articulated in his historical writing, certainly not by reading this work directly, but by getting Haga's explanations.

As for periodization, Haga (1983: 194-8) categorizes his history of national literature into five blocks of time according to the changes of the political system. The oldest period (approx. the 6th century to 794), which Haga called "above-old" (*jō-ko*), extends from the ancient time respectively before the reception of Chinese culture and Buddhism up to the movement of the capital from Nara to Heian-kyō (contemporary Kyōto). The second "middle-old" (*chū-ko*) period (794–1192) marks the aristocratic institution and culture in Heian-kyō until the establishment of the feudal military government in Kamakura. Afterward, during the third "near-old" (*kin-ko*) period (1192–1601), the military regime moved its capital from Kamakura to Kyōto by the Muromachi (or Ashikaga) shogunate. In the next "near-world" (*kin-sei*) period (1601–1868), or the early modern Edo period of Japanese history (Shirane, Suzuki, and Lurie 2016: viii), the country was under the rule of the Tokugawa shogunate in Edo (contemporary Tokyo). The Meiji Restoration in 1868 marks the end of the feudal society, when Japan was isolated from other countries at the beginning of the 5th period.

4 Florenz seems to have referred to Fujioka's *A Textbook for a History of Our National Literature* (1901) and Wada's and Nagai's *A Short History of Our National Literature* (1899) only for the extract of a poetry in *Kojiki* or *Record of Ancient Matters* (Baba 2020: 67-8).

Haga designates this as "present time" (*gen-dai*) in which the political system under the emperor ruled the Japanese people with a distinctly Western influence. These periodizations of political history, as we will see below, constitute the contents of Florenz's historical writing. Aston's history of Japanese literature, meanwhile, is divided into seven periods: 1) Archaic period (before A.D. 700); 2) Nara period (8th century); 3) Heian or classical period (800-1186); 4) Kamakura period (1186–1332); 5) Nanboku-chō and Muromachi periods (1332–1603); 6) Yedo period (1603–1867); 7) Tokio period (1868–1900).

Haga's lectures also show parallels with Florenz's literary history in descriptive constitution. In the introduction to the first lecture, Haga restricts his use of the term "literature" (*bungaku*) on the basis of the European general definition of all pieces of writing determined to be "artworks such as poetry and prose" (Haga 1983: 188–9). In the beginning of the explanations about each period, he summarizes its major historical process including political events and its influences on Japanese culture. Furthermore, he sketches out the main development of literature as a characteristic product of Japanese collective mind in each period. After the general description of literary characters and genres, Haga explains representative authors and works along with the secondary literature of Japanese literary studies for self-study. In the same way, Florenz and Aston introduce—instead of comments on the secondary materials—their translation of passages from various literary works, adding to their summaries of the context. Meanwhile, the notion of Japanese people (*koku-min*) as the subjects of the emperors from the ancient to the current period, especially within the Imperial state during the Meiji era, obviously plays a central role in Haga's descriptive constitution. According to his understanding, Japanese literature is a mirror of the collective mind of the Japanese people whose literary development matches their process of civilization (*bun'mei*), especially in comparison with the ancient influence of China and during the late 19th century influence of Western powers (Haga 1983: 188-9). This triad of the Japanese people, literature, and civilization functions characteristically as a component of Haga's lectures on national literature.

Haga's and Florenz's writings of Japanese literature seem to be also nearly matching each other in literary genres, authors, works, and the main objects of historical description. Haga features literature in the ancient Nara period as writings of the oldest thoughts through purely Japanese words (Haga 1983: 195) including *Records of Ancient Matters* (*Kojiki*), *The Chronicle of Japan* (*Nihon Shoki*), and *Collection of Ten Thousand Leaves* (*Manyōshū*). As the foundation of Heian literature in the next period, Haga depicts the reception of Chinese literature and Buddhism and the invention of the Japanese *kana* syllabary. He calls this writing system "national letters" (*koku-ji*) and sentences written using the *kana* syllabary "national prose" (*koku-bun*) (ibid.: 196). In addition, he characterizes the Heian period as "an effeminate period" (ibid.: 222) and its literature as "extremely elegant in perspective of both form and content" (ibid.: 252). Haga situates Murasaki Shikibu's *The Tale of Genji* (*Genji Monogatari*) and Sei Shōnagon's *The Pillow Book* (*Makura no Sōshi*) at the top of Japanese national literature (ibid.: 246). He also evaluates the prose works of both female authors as "the origins of our national literature" or "classical literature" (*mohan bungaku*), to which Japanese authors in the following periods referred for their own prose writing (ibid.: 196). In the next Kamakura and Muromachi periods, studying and writing were no longer active through repeated wars (ibid.: 267). In contrast to court women, who were representative of Heian literature, Haga highlights male warriors and Buddhist monks, the major authors during the Kamakura period, whose works reflect the depressive feelings of Buddhist pessimism ruling at the time (ibid.: 252). In addition, he points out the development of the new Sino–Japanese writing style mixed with the Japanese *kana* syllabary (*wakan-konkō-bun*) and the emergence of the following genres: the military

chronicle (*gunki*) in the Kamakura period, the textual part of the traditional *Nō* theater (*yōkyoku*), comic theater (*kyōgen*) and the Muromachi tale (*otogi zōshi*), and linked verse (*renga*) in the next Muromachi period. In the Tokugawa period, and afterward, Japanese literature was no longer dependent on the authority of the Imperial court, Buddhist temples, or military lords. Because of the government promotion of education and the spread of print capitalism, especially urban townspeople accepted and created literary works. As most representative poets and authors of the "folk literature" (*heimin bungaku*) (ibid.: 197), Haga recognizes Matsuo Bashō (1644–1694) in popular linked verse (*haikai*), Chikamatsu Monzaemon (1653–1725) in the writing of puppet-theater plays (*jōruri*), and Ihara Saikaku (1642–1693) and Kyokutei Bakin (Takizawa, 1767–1848) in novels and book-length prose (*yomi-hon*) (ibid.: 287–310). According to Haga's last lecture, Japanese people who have created their own literature since the reception of Chinese culture and civilization in the ancient period will finally "harmonize the civilizations of East and West" in the Meiji period to give birth to new forms of literature (ibid.: 317).

While Haga sees the development of Japanese literature in the civilizing process of the Japanese people and their culture, Florenz describes the literary development from the perspective much less of civilization than of culture. Florenz's literary history is divided into five periods: 1) the oldest time (*älteste Zeit*, until 794); 2) Heian period (*Heian-Periode*, 794–1186); 3) Kamakura and Muromachi period (*Kamakura und Muromachi-Periode*, 1186–1601); 4) Tokugawa period (*Tokugawa-Periode*, 1602–1868); and 5) Meiji era (*Meiji-Ära*, since 1868) (Florenz 1906: VII-X). In this history, "the mind of the Japanese people" (*der japanische Volksgeist*, ibid.: III) fundamentally functions as a subject developing itself repeatedly with prosperity or decay. According to this theoretical framework, attitudes of the collective mind typical of the period are reflected in representative works of Japanese literature. The expression of "the people" (*Volk*) in the German historical context of the late 19th century meant not a nation belonging to a state, rather a large group of people with the same language and culture (Grimm and Grimm 1984a: 425). Furthermore, Florenz depicts the appropriate way the Japanese people have repeatedly attempted to adapt forms of Chinese literature since their reception of Buddhism and Chinese culture in the 7th century in order to refine their own literature. According to Florenz, the development of Japanese literature reached its highest point in the women's court literature during the 11th century—what Florenz commends as a literary harmony of "form" adapted from Chinese literature and "content" reflected in the minds of the Japanese people (Florenz 1906: 208). Florenz argues that in the 12th century, the collective mind experienced a declining process as a result of repeated wars, when male warriors and monks became the representative authors during the Kamakura period (ibid.: 255). In the 15th century, the reception of forms of the Chinese drama led to the development of the *Nō* theater as a type of Japanese drama (ibid.: 387). Up to the late 19th century, Japan remained peaceful under the rule of the Tokugawa centralist government. At the time, intellectuals were engaged not only in the research for ancient Chinese literature, but some of them also labored nationalistically for a new conception of Japanese literature in order to counter the authority of Chinese studies (ibid.: 416). Florenz indicates that in the "renaissance" of the Tokugawa period, a literary "reform" occurred as a result of Matsuo Bashō's Haikai-poetry and caused a small and short flourishing time of literature (ibid.: 446). Nevertheless, in his short report on Meiji literature, Florenz comes to the conclusion that the Japanese mind is confronted with the difficult situation of the decline because of its one-sided reception of European literature and culture, despite its tradition of Japanese literature (ibid.: 612). For that reason, Florenz constitutes his Japanese literary history based on the German scheme of the cultural development of the collective mind, which barely appears in Haga's lectures of national literature.

Considering Florenz's knowledge of German historical writing and the instruction in Japanese literature provided by his colleagues and students, it is assumed that he did not necessarily refer to William G. Aston's history of Japanese literature in order to better write his own literary history. In December 1900, however, Haga sent his comments on Aston's literary history to Florenz (Haga 1992: 173). The key point to understand in Florenz's reference to Aston's book seems to be the self-obvious fact that Florenz's book was written for German intellectual readers such as his colleagues of oriental studies in Germany. Most of those German readers who understood English well were likely to peruse the first history of Japanese literature by a European. As Florenz mentions in his text, Aston's English work had earned a high reputation until the German literary work was published. Therefore, it is clearly suspected that Florenz was urged to produce a better history of Japanese literature than that of his English colleague.

To compare Florenz's with Aston's work from this point of view, it is evident that Florenz intentionally not only translated almost the same passages from the Japanese original texts as Aston had done but also added context to his descriptions of these passages.[5] As we have seen above, Florenz's study of Japanese literature was dependent on his student's translations from the original texts into German. Taking these situations into account, it seems plausible that Florenz requested that Fujishiro translate the passages of representative works, which had been introduced in Aston's literary history in order to demonstrate to German readers that *Geschichte der japanischen Litteratur* details more translations and explanations of representative works than Aston's *A History of Japanese Literature*.

Almost all the historical writings of Japanese literature in the Meiji era took the framework of nation, state, and civilization for granted. From this perspective, literature was considered a product of the national mind in both the advancement of its civilization and the development of its culture. In fact, the historical writings based on the English understanding of literature as all written artwork of poetry and prose, as an excellent result of civilization and culture of the nation, describe a parallel development of civilization and culture (Shinada 2012: 11-2). Fukuzawa Yukichi's work had introduced this civilization theory for the first time in regard to François Guizot's (1787–1874) *Histoire de la Civilization en Europe* (1828) and Henry Thomas Buckle's (1821–1862) *History of Civilization in England* (1857) (Matsuzawa 1995: 368-9). In contrast to Aston, who seems to have been well aware of the English writing method for European readers, Haga, the heir of Konakamura's concept of *kokugaku*, certainly made use of the civilization theory for his lectures on national literature in order to invent the consciousness where all of the people in Japan might be seen as belonging to the Imperial state. According to Haga's historical writing, Japanese literature represents a cultural heritage of the nation state, which seems to have been constant from the ancient times to the Meiji era. This attitude also claims that the tradition of Japanese literary studies is worthy of Meiji Japan and a necessary modern discipline for the Tokyo Imperial University.

---

5 This includes the following: *Manyōshū* (Aston 1899: 36-48; Florenz 1906: 94-126), *Collection of Ancient and Modern Poems* (*Kokinshū*) (Aston: 60-2; Florenz: 138-53), *Tosa Diary* (*Tosa Nikki*) (Aston: 68-76; Flroenz: 192-7), *The Pillow Book* (*Makura no Sōshi*) (Aston: 106-16; Florenz: 224-8), *The Record of the Rise and Fall of the Genji and Heike* (*Genpei Jōsui-ki*) (Aston: 137-9; Florenz: 304-7), *The Tales of the Heike* (*Heike Monogatari*) (Aston: 141-2; Florenz: 304-7), *The Ten-Foot Square Hut* (*Hōjō-ki*) (Aston: 146-56; Florenz: 325-9), *Chronicle of Great Peace* (*Taihei-ki*) (Aston: 175-8; Florenz: 311-5), *Essays in Idleness* (*Tsurezure-gusa*) (Aston: 189-96; Florenz: 331-8), and *Battle of Coxinga* (*Kokusen'ya Kassen*) (Aston: 280-7; Florenz: 596-8). Especially, it is a striking feature of Florenz's strategy against Aston's literary history that Florenz translates just the same passages of the 2nd chapter "The Broom-Tree" (*Hahaki-gi*) and the 5th "Young Murasaki" (*Waka Murasaki*) of *The Tale of Genji*, one of the longest novels of Japanese literature (Aston: 98-103; Florenz: 215-8).

3. From the advancement of civilization into the development of culture

In the context of former literary histories, Karl Florenz reformulated Haga's knowledge of Japanese literature through German methods of literary history. In other words, it is necessary to discuss how Florenz wrote the civilization theory into the scheme of cultural development that had been fundamental to the historical thinking of national literature in the German speaking areas of the 19th century. One point that must be addressed is his foreword in which Florenz explains the aim of his literary history and distinguishes "civilization" (*Zivilisation*) from "culture" (*Kultur*). Another point worthy of attention is his evaluation of *The Tale of Genji* and *The Pillow Book* by female authors in Heian period, both of which can be, according to the civilization theory, assessed as an excellent result of civilization and culture of the Japanese people or their most sophisticated prose through the Japanese original *kana* syllabary.

The foreword of *Geschichte der japanischen Litteratur* begins with the claim that since the Meiji Restoration in 1868, Japan has increasingly accepted European and American civilization and cultures.[6] In this passage, Florenz emphasizes that Japan is the only advanced country equal to European powers among the non-European countries. He indeed contrasts the words "civilization" and "culture" without definition, but from the passage, it is clearly understood that the "advancement" (*Fortschritte*) of Japan means less of its cultural development of the collective mind than its progress toward material development. In addition, after remarking that more and more Europeans and Americans have become interested in Japanese culture, Florenz insists that even before the European influence, Japan already possessed a "highly developed" (*hochentwickelt*) culture (Florenz 1906: III). This passage, therefore, represents Florenz's clear distinction between the advancement of civilization and the development of culture.

In this contrast, Florenz, referring to the recent influence from Japanese on European culture—hinting at the Japonism in the late 19th century—addresses the notion of literature as follows:

> Very much less than the visual arts, we have been knowing of another expression of the collective mind of the Japanese people, literature, although in this literature, the fineness of Japanese taste expresses itself not less sharply than in the visual arts. (Florenz 1906: III)

Florenz sets up the collective "mind of the people" (*Volksgeist*) that functions as a subject developing itself in his historical writing of Japanese literature from the ancient to the latest period. In this framework, the historical subject has created a variety of literary works reflecting circumstances in each period. It is remarkable that Florenz distinguishes between people of European and American powers as a "nation" (*Nation*) and the Japanese people as a "people" (*Volk*), although he does not define these terms specifically. Both *Nation* and *Volk* were synonymous as "language communities" in the 19th century. *Nation* in German impressed an image of the entire people in the German speaking areas after the emergence of civil society as a single community (Grimm and Grimm 1984a: 425). The term *Volk*, meanwhile, also meant a group or cultural community in ancient times (Grimm

6 "It has not passed half a century yet since the Japanese people (*Volk*) have inclined to come out of their own closure from the other nations (*Nationen*) in the world and appropriate the material advantages of our modern civilization (*Zivilisation*) first of all with interest in their self-preservation. Then, the not less blessed result that was not intended at first is that Japan increasingly transformed itself in harmony with the mental and moral ideal of Western culture (*Kultur*). With lively participation, we have observed from all the points of view the surprising advancement (*Fortschritte*) of the East Asian people (*Volk*). They are the only people until now who have succeeded in owning an equal position of the European and American nations (*Nationen*)" (Florenz 1906: III).

and Grimm 1984b: 454). Considering the general meanings and Florenz's use of these terms, it is reasonable to think that he calls the group of European and American people (who would be more closely related to his German readers) as *Nation* and the group of non-European people as *Volk*.

It is through these synonyms in German, nation and people, that Florenz reconstituted Haga's civilization framework of national literature as an understandable type of a literary history for his German readers, focusing on the cultural development of the collective mind of the Japanese people. German literary historians in the 19th century, on the one hand, did not clearly distinguished between *Volk* and *Nation*. These terms were used mostly as synonyms in the meaning of one language community of the German speaking people. On the other hand, Haga Yaichi, as we have seen in section 2, regarded the Japanese "nation" (*koku-min*) as the one language unit of the subject belonging to the Imperial state. Taking these differences between the German and the Japanese understanding of language community into account, Florenz probably starts the foreword of his literary history with the perspective of the civilization theory and sets up the Japanese people only in the German meaning of one language community in contrast to the European and American nations related to their modern state. Florenz seems to restrict the aspect of his historical writing to the development of Japanese literature regardless of civilization. The contrasting use of nation and people, indeed, is limited to the brief passage in the foreword. In the main text, Florenz describes the historical process mostly from a cultural point of view.

As for Florenz's view of the literary history, it is remarkable that he once uses the term "cultural advance" (*kulturelle Fortschritte*) in order to explain Japan's reception of Chinese culture and its result. He emphasizes Buddhism and education coming from China in the 7th century as a main factor of cultural advance in Japan (Florenz 1906: 48). This expression includes the assumption of the "self-forming of the mind" (*geistige Bildung*), which argues that the Japanese people still in uncultivated conditions of life devoted themselves to learning the "highly developed" Chinese culture painstakingly in order to create their own literature (ibid.: 48-9). In other words, this perspective reveals that Florenz does not recognize Japan before the first reception of Chinese culture as a cultural at all. Without reasoning his viewpoint, Florenz additionally paraphrases in comparison with a foreign factor of Chinese culture an original factor of Japanese people as things "indigenously Japanese" (*einheimsch-japanisch*) (ibid.: 51). From this context, Florenz apparently assumes that the mixture of indigenously Japanese and Chinese factors through Japan's adoption of Chinese culture enabled the Japanese people to make dramatic progress and develop their own national literature. Over his literary history, furthermore, Florenz draws the reader's attention to Japanese people repeatedly receiving Chinese culture and improving their own culture such as the *Nō* drama in the Muromachi period and the style of novel in the Tokugawa period (ibid.: 287, 375, 517-8). For these reasons, Florenz's use of the expression "cultural advance" seems to be caused by his thinking of the first reception of Chinese culture as a crucial opportunity for Japanese people in uncultivated conditions to rapidly develop their own culture.

The description of culture in both aspects of advancement and development was unusual in the context of German historical writing in the 19th century. In German speaking areas, the historical process was described almost only from the perspective of the development of the national mind. As for the expressions of "advance" (*Fortschritt*) and "development" (*Entwicklung*), Leopold von Ranke (1795-1886) determined a comparative use in the context of Historicism. In the introduction of his *About the Epochs of Recent History* (*Über die Epochen der neueren Geschichte*, 1854), Ranke declares the historical idea that all of humankind has advanced constantly to be unproven. Instead of this idea (typical of the Enlightenment period), he insists on historical research to illuminate the force of the

national mind in a process of development, whereby his image of development represents a model of prosperity and decay (Ranke 1954: 5-7). This German standard historical view in the 19th century barely corresponds to Florenz's expression of cultural advance.

To sum up, Florenz seems to have used the notions of nation and people on the one side, and of advancement and self-development on the other side, in order to transform Haga's knowledge of Japanese literary history on the basis of civilization theory into a model of cultural development of the national mind through German historical writing methods. In the foreword, Florenz regards the European and American nations as communities of a modern confederated state or the resulting societies of high civilization. In contrast to this concept of national status, the Japanese people, according to the German general understanding of the literary history, means only a community of language and culture—regardless of modern national status. The notion of people matches better with the German theory of the development of the national mind than the notion of nation (as it was self-applied at the time). In the main text concerning the cultural development of the Japanese people, Florenz sets up the phases of both the advancement through the adoption of Chinese culture and the following self-formation. This notion of advancement, nevertheless, seems to be less familiar with the German historical model of prosperity and decay than with the civilization theory. The manipulation of cultural advancement and self-development is probably caused by the situation related to the historical writing of Japanese literature discussed in section 2. In this situation, Florenz had to describe Japan's relation to China to a certain extent from the perspective of civilization. As a result, he introduced his original use of the expressions of cultural advance and self-development or a hybrid point of view influenced by both Japanese and German discourses on national representation.

The theory of self-formation in literary development, especially in relation to a highly developed foreign culture, played a major role in the German speaking areas to define their cultural identification. Georg Gottfried Gervinus claims that within the European countries, only German people have appropriated classical literature and wisdom to such a high level as the ancient Greeks and Romans (Gervinus 1840: 11-2). The German philologist Wilhelm Scherer (1841–1886) insists in his assessment of the development of German literature that German people in the primitive conditions of their literature, repeatedly learned the literature of foreign countries to refine their own literature (Scherer 1883: 19, 21). In an earlier article about his concept of historical writing published in 1879, Scherer describes the cultural character of the German people as "the greatest possible increase in classical education" (*möglichste Steigerung der classischen Bildung*) (Scherer 1975: 397). Gervinus's and Scherer's works are recognized as the bestsellers of the history of German literature in the 19th century (Rosenberg 1989: 109), representing an academically approved self-image of German cultural features widespread in the civil society. Florenz, who studied in Leipzig and Berlin from 1883 to 1888, provided lectures on German literary history at the Tokyo Imperial University. Undoubtedly, he also shared the discursive type of German national self-understanding through the historical writings surrounding German literature—especially the German high receptivity of foreign cultures. This probably allowed his connection between German and Japanese cultural development to show German readers the self-forming process of the Japanese mind through Chinese literature and education.

In this view of cultural advancement and self-development, Florenz describes the Heian courtly literature of the 11th century, or the prose works by Murasaki Shikibu and Sei Shōnagon, not as a literary production of national civilization and culture, but as the most sophisticated harvest of Japan's reception of Chinese literature and the self-forming of its own literature. Florenz's following evaluation about both women's works that were, according to his comments, written nearly during

the same time round 1000 surely suggested to German readers an analogy with the development of German literature:

> To choose a round number, the year 1000 represents the highest point of literary production of the ancient Japan (Florenz 1906: 229).

Wilhelm Scherer's standard history of German literature sketches a regular development with prosperity around the years 600, 1200, and 1800, as well as with decay around the years 300, 900, and 1500 (Scherer 1883: 18). The second period of prosperity during the Medieval age is marked by the Chivalric romance or courtly poetry, particularly that of Gottfried von Strassburg and Wolfram von Eschenbach. Florenz, meanwhile, not only lists the Heian period as the "Medieval age" (*Mittelalter*) but also regards a characteristic point in the development of Japanese literature in comparison with European literatures as "early ripening" (*frühes Reifen*) (Florenz 1906: 229). His German readers who were familiar with Scherer's literary history were able to easily imagine that the courtly literature in the "Medieval age" in Japan reached the highest point of historical development 200 year earlier than in German speaking areas; not in poetry but in prose, and not written by men but by women. This type of analogous thinking functions as a discursive tie between German and Japanese literature in order for his intellectual readers to increase their interest in Japanese culture.

4. Conclusion

In this way of historical writing, Karl Florenz included Haga's knowledge of national literature from the *koku-gaku* tradition in the German context of the 19th century. Whereas Florenz, a specialist in ancient Japanese literature, had not been well aware of Heian courtly literature, his *Geschiche der japanischen Litteratur*, discussed above, evaluates both women's works, *The Tale of Genji* and *The Pillow Book*, as the classic prose of Japanese literature—differently from the previous histories of Japanese literature established by the civilization theory related to Japanese national identity discourse. In this reformulation of the literary knowledge, we can see the German Japanologist on a boundary between Japanese and German academic contexts in the late 19th century. On the Japanese side, intellectual leaders of the *koku-gaku* had set their academic policy on the basis of Fukuzawa Yukichi's civilization theory for the assimilation of the modern university system. On the German side, the growing interest in Japanese culture mainly within German people living in Japan (Schütte 2004: 62) and highly theorized historical methods for national literature enabled the German lecturer at the Tokyo Imperial University to describe his history of Japanese literature through the knowledge and assistance of his collogues and students.

The boundary on which Florenz stood while writing his literary history should be understood in the dynamic process between Japanese and German contexts. His historical writing was dependent on his situations as a German oriental philologist, an early German Japanologist, and a teacher within the department of German literary studies in a modernizing Japan. Under the influence from both academic contexts, Florenz's use of cultural advancement and self-development for historical writing led to his analogous thinking about the reception of highly developed foreign culture as a common similarity between German and Japanese national literature. With regard to this entire process, his understanding of Japanese literature distanced itself on the aspect of German historical writing to a certain extent from the Japanese discourse. At the same time, he had to follow the high evaluation of the Heian representative prose, which the previous literary historians had estimated very positively

on the basis of civilization theory and with which Florenz himself was probably not acquainted. The academic boundary about national identity included conflicts and comparability between German and Japanese literature studies in the modern period.

Bibliography

Aston, William George. (1899). *A History of Japanese Literature*. In *Collected Works of William George Aston. Vol. 5*, I-XI, 1-408. Edited by Tōru Haga. Bristol/Tokyo: Ganesha Publishing/Oxford University Press.

Baba, Daisuke. (2020). *Kindai Nihon Bungaku-shi Kijutsu no Haiburiddo na ichi Kigen. Kāru Flōrentsu "Nihon Bungaku-shi" ni okeru Nichi-doku no Gakujutsu Bunka Sesshoku* (*A Hybrid Origin of Modern Historical Writing of Japanese Literature. Karl Florenz's "A History of Japanese Literature" and the German–Japanese Contact of Academic Cultures*). Tokyo: Sangensha.

Florenz, Karl. (1906). *Geschichte der japanischen Litteratur*. Leipzig: C. F. Amelang.

Fujioka, Sakutarō. (1901). *Nihon Bungaku-shi Kyōkasho* (*A Textbook of a History of Japanese Literature*). Tokyo: Kaisei-kan.

Fujishiro, Sojin (Teisuke). (1927). F Sensei to Manyō no Soshaku (Chewing through Manyōshū with My Teacher F). In *Gahitsu Yoteki* (*Drops from My Quill*), 138-46. Tokyo: Kōbundō.

Fujita, Hiromasa. (2007). *Kindai Koku-gaku no Kenkyū* (*A Research on Japanese Literary Studies in the Modern Time*). Tokyo: Kōbundō.

Fukuzawa, Yukichi. (1959). *Bun'mei-ron no Gairyaku* (*An Outline of Civilization Theory*). In *Fukuzawa Yukichi Zenshū. Dai 4 kan* (*Complete Works of Fukuzawa Yukichi. Vol. 4*), 1-212. Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten.

Gervinus, Georg Gottfried. (1840). *Geschichte der poetischen National-Literatur der Deutschen. Bd. 1*. Leipzig: Wilhelm Engelmann.

Grimm, Jacob and Grimm, Wilhelm. (1984a). *Deutsches Wörterbuch. Bd. 13*. München: DTV.

Grimm, Jacob and Grimm, Wilhelm. (1984b). *Deutsches Wörterbuch. Bd. 26*. München: DTV.

Haga, Yaichi. (1903). *Koku-bungaku-shi Jikkō* (*Ten Lectures on a History of Our National Literature*). Tokyo: Fuzanbō.

Haga, Yaichi. (1983). *Koku-bungaku-shi Jikkō* (*Ten Lectures on a History of Our National Literature*). In *Haga Yaichi Senshū. Dai 2 kan* (*Selected Works of Haga Yaichi. Vol. 2*), 183-318. Tokyo: Kokugakuin Daigaku.

Haga, Yaichi. (1992). Shokan (Zen) (Letters (Complete)). In *Haga Yaichi Senshū. Dai 7 kan* (*Selected Works of Haga Yaichi. Vol. 7*), 1-144. Tokyo: Kokugakuin Daigaku.

Hisamatsu, Sen'ichi. (1969). *Nihon Bungaku Kenkyū-shi* (*A History of Japanese Literary Studies*). Tokyo: Shibundō.

Inoue, Tetsujirō. (1943). Furorentsu Hakase to Nihon-gaku (Dr. Florenz and Japanology). In *Kaisō-roku* (*Memoirs*), 215-31. Tokyo: Shunjūsha Kyōyō Sōsho.

Kaikawa [Haga, Yaichi]. (1895). Bungaku-shi Hensan Hōhō ni tsukite (About Compilation Methods for Historical Writing of Literature). In *Teikoku Bungaku. Dai 1 kan* (*Imperial Literature. Vol. 1*), 188-98. Unknown publisher.

Kamimura, Naoki. (2001). Doitsu Bungaku-ka Kyōshi toshite no K. Furōrentsu (K. Florenz as a Teacher of Department of German Literary Studies). In *Meij-ki Doitsu-go Gakusha no Kenkyū* (*Studies on Researchers of German Language and Literature in the Meiji Era*), 422-455. Tokyo: Taga Shuppan.

Konakamura, Kiyonori. (1898). *Yasumuro Zakkō* (*Konakamura's Various Considerations*). Tokyo: Yoshikawa Hanshichi.

Matsuzawa, Hiroaki. (1995). Kaisetsu (Commentary). In *Bun'mei-ron no Gairyaku* (*An Outline of Civilization Theory*), 363-91. Tokyo: Iwanami Bunko.

Mikami, Sanji and Takatsu, Kuwasaburō. (1890). *Nihon Bungaku-shi*. (*A History of Japanese Literature*.) Tokyo: Kinkōdō.

Nagai, Hidenori and Wada, Mankichi. (1899). *Koku-bungaku Shōshi* (*A Short History of Our National Literature*). Tokyo: Kyōiku Shobō.

Ranke, Leopord von. (1954). *Über die Epochen der neueren Geschichte*. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft.

Rosenberg, Rainer. (1989). *Literaturwissenschaftliche Germanistik. Zur Geschichte ihrer Probleme und Begriffe*. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag.

Satō, Masako. (1995). *Kāru Furōrentsu no Nihon Kenkyū* (*Karl Florenz's Japan-Study*). Tokyo: Shunjūsha.

Scherer, Wilhelm. (1883). *Geschichte der deutschen Litteratur*. Berlin: Weidmannsche Buchhandlung.

Scherer, Wilhelm. (1975). Die Epochen der deutschen Litteraturgeschichte. In *Über Literaturgeschichtsschreibung. Die historisierende Methode des 19. Jahrhunderts in Programm und Kritik*, 395-9. Edited by Edgar Marsch. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchhandlung.

Schütte, Hans-Wilm. (2004). *Die Asienwissenschaften in Deutschland. Geschichte, Stand und Perspektiven*. Hamburg: Institut für Asienkunde.

Shinada, Yoshikazu. (2012). Haijo to Hōsetsu. Koku-gaku, Koku-bungaku, Haga Yaichi. (Exclusion and Inclusion. Koku-gaku, Koku-bungaku, and Haga Yaichi.) In *Koku-go to Koku-bungaku. 6 Gatsu gō*. (*National Language and Literature. The June Issue*.) Tokyo: Meiji Shoin.

Shirane, Haruo, Suzuki, Tomi, and Lurie, David (ed.). (2016). *The Cambridge History of Japanese Literature*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Takatsu, Yoshihiko. (1969). *Nihon Bungaku-shi no Hōhō*. (*Methods of Histories of Japanese Literature*.) Tokyo: Ōfūsha.

Tobari, Chikufū. (1965). Doitsu-go Zange (*My Repentance for German Learning*). In *Tobari Chikufū Tsuisō Ikōshū* (*Collections of Memoirs and Posthumous Manuscripts of Tobari Chikufū*), 10-200. Tokyo: Ikubundō.

Tobari, Chikufū. (1970). Fujishiro Teisuke ni Atau (For Fujishiro Teisuke). In *Meiji Bungaku Zenshū. Dai 40 kan* (*Complete Works of Meiji Literature. Vol. 40*), 358-61. Tokyo: Chikuma Shobō.

Tokyo Daigaku (ed.). (1986). *Tokyo Daigaku Hyakunen-shi. Bukyoku-shi ichi* (*A 100 Year History of University of Tokyo. A History of the Departments 1*). Tokyo: Tokyo Daigaku Shuppan-kai.

Tsuji, Tomoki. (2010). *Doitsu ni okeru Nihon-gaku no Manazashi. Kāru Furōrentsu no Nihon "Shōsan" ni Hisomu "Besshi" no Kōzu* (*A Look of German Japanology. Construction of "Contempt" Hidden in Karl Florenz's "Praise" for Japan*). Not published: Doctoral thesis to University of Tsukuba.

Wachutka, Michael. (2001). *Historical Reality or Metaphoric Expression? Culturally Formed Contrasts in Karl Florenz' and Iida Takesato's Interpretations of Japanese Mythology*. Hamburg: Lit.

Wachutka, Michael. (2016). Der kokutai-Diskurs im Staatsverständnis des 19. und frühen 20. Jahrhunderts: Kerngedanken und Entwicklung der Idee von Japans einzigartigem Nationalwesen. In *Staatsverständnis in Japan. Ideen und Wirklichkeiten des japanischen Staates in der Moderne*, 65-88. Baden-Baden: Nomos.

Yamamoto, Masami. (2014). *Nihon Kyōiku-shi. Kyōiku no "Ima" wo Rekishi kara Kangaeru* (*A History of Education in Japan. "Today" of Education in historical perspective*). Tokyo: Keiōgijuku

Daigaku Shuppan-kai.