



3-31-2022

Time, the Calendar, and Centralized Power in Japan: Relying on the Research of Yoshiro Okada

Hiroshi Saito

Faculty of Law, Toyo University

Follow this and additional works at: <https://gensoken.toyo.ac.jp/japanese-society-and-culture>



Part of the [Jurisprudence Commons](#), [Legal History Commons](#), and the [Legal Theory Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Saito, Hiroshi (2022) "Time, the Calendar, and Centralized Power in Japan: Relying on the Research of Yoshiro Okada," *Japanese Society and Culture: Vol. 4, Article 4*.

DOI: 10.52882/2434-1738-04-04

Available at: <https://gensoken.toyo.ac.jp/japanese-society-and-culture/vol4/iss1/4>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by Institute of Social Sciences. It has been accepted for inclusion in Japanese Society and Culture by an authorized editor of Institute of Social Sciences.

[Received 24 May 2021 / Revised 7 June 2021 / Accepted 20 June 2021]

Time, the Calendar, and Centralized Power in Japan: Relying on the Research of Yoshiro Okada

Hiroshi Saito*

Abstract

When, why, how, and by whom was “time” combined with “law” in Japan? This paper scrutinizes the issue based on Yoshiro Okada’s research, especially his most important works: *Nihon no Koyomi* and his thesis “Meiji no Kaireki: ‘Toki’ no chuo shuken-ka.” It is thus possible to understand how the political authorities used the unification of the calendar system to demonstrate their power and to govern the lives of the nation. Thereafter, “time” was used as a fundamental and important standard for judgment in the science of law, legalism, and the rule of law. In this process, “calendar (time) and law” became social capital as a public good in society.

Keywords: Time, Calendar, Law, Power, Japan

Preface

Research on “time and law” has focused thus far on the perspectives of philosophy of law, sociological jurisprudence, and history of law in Japan. This is a consequence of concentrating on “law” when investigating relevant works in the social sciences.¹ In the process, however, it has become clear that the object we call “law” and the notion we call “time” are classifications and definitions that reflect a “modern” perspective. If, however, the conventional approach to this subject is replaced by a humanities-based approach, the scope of previous research on the “relationship between power and calendar” becomes clearer. Notably, these inquiries read “time” as “the calendar,” and “law” as “power.”

In this paper, I intend to summarize the relationship between “time and law,” or in other words “calendar and power,” relying on the work of Yoshiro Okada,² who has published many treatises on the Japanese calendar from the historical perspective of the humanities. Since Okada’s research pertains exclusively to Japan, the object of this paper will be limited to the “calendar and power in Japan.”

1. In Okada’s 1972 monograph,³ he comments on the issue of the “calendar and power” as follows: “Although the calendar would be the norm of social life, it has not been studied enough in Japan.

* Professor, Philosophy of Jurisprudence and Public International Law, Faculty of Law, Graduate School of Law, Toyo University, Tokyo.

1 Cf., Hiroshi Saito, “Jikan to Hou (1)” *Toyo Hogaku*, vol.57, no.2, (Toyo University, 2014), pp.1–18. <<http://id.nii.ac.jp/1060/00006464>>,...“Jikan to Hou (2)” *Toyo Hogaku*, vol.58, no.2, (Toyo University, 2014), pp.1–21, <<http://id.nii.ac.jp/1060/00006915>>,...“Jikan to Hou (3)”, *Toyo Hogaku*, vol.59, no.2, Toyo University, 2016), pp.1–14. <<http://id.nii.ac.jp/1060/00007681>>,...“Jikan to Ho (4/finis)”, *Toyo Hogaku*, vol. 63, no.1, (Toyo University, 2019), pp.63–85. <<http://id.nii.ac.jp/1060/00011008>> accessed May 7, 2021.

2 Yoshiro Okada: 1930–2014. Japanese Historian, Researcher of Koyomi (calendars), Emeritus professor of Joshi Bijutsu University, Tokyo, published many academic works on the Japanese calendar.

3 Yoshiro Okada, *Nihon no Koyomi*, Jimoku-sha, 1972. <Jimoku-sha No. 1330–07108–8402>

Although there are many excellent research books in the field of oriental history, we have gradually come to understand that there are few books that discuss the calendar from the standpoint of Japanese history.⁴ In fields other than Japanese history, “There are not many books on the calendar, but not a few. As above-mentioned, most of them are written from a natural science point of view. Some of them include excellent studies on the calendar and social life, but they also focus only on the study of calendars. A focus on this point is unavoidable.” In addition, “the calendar is a norm of social life, but in reality it is a product of society, so we think that the calendar plays the role of a mirror to understand the society that produced its own calendar.”⁵ Okada goes on to emphasize the idea that the calendar itself is a norm. From a legal standpoint, social norms are generally supposed to require either internal coercion, such as morality, or external coercion, such as law. What kind of norm should the calendar then be classified as? In Okada’s research, the calendar as a norm seems to be positioned between morality and law.⁶ Keeping this point in mind, we will look at Okada’s research.

2. Regarding the Japanese calendar, while referring to the so-called *Wei Zhi, Wo’ren Zhuan* (*Gishi-Wajinden* in Japanese), Okada suggests, “at least the yin-yang calendar and the zodiac signs that the Han people have used for a long time were not used in Japan at that time, but it’s possible to consider that the natural calendar, which can be called the agricultural calendar based on agricultural life as Norinaga Motoori urged, was used.”⁷ Okada surmises accordingly that a natural calendar based on agricultural life was used at first. At the same time, “according to Chinese history books, it is clear that the Chinese-style calendar was introduced to Japan between the 2nd or 3rd centuries and the first half of the 7th century.”⁸ Okada, however, doubts this and asks if there was a calendar system unique to Japan before the Chinese-style calendar arrived.

Okada addresses this question by referring to the archaeological exploration of a site dating to the period “before rice cultivation began in the Japanese archipelago in the second and third centuries BC.” Specifically, “the excavation survey of Oyu Stone Circles at Oyu, Kazuno-gun, Akita Prefecture is presumed to be a clock (*Gnomon*), the Jomon people around the 10th century BC knew the exact seasons from this sundial.”⁹ He thus concludes that “they (the Jomon people) were engaged in not only hunting and fishing but also (...) simple cultivation. In addition, the reason why this sundial technology was not passed on to posterity was that the era of different cultures was eventually reached by the Yayoi people, and this was not inherited.”¹⁰

In connection with rice cultivation, Okada notes that “annual events are customs that are repeated every year at a certain time, and are characterized by bearing a kind of restraint.”¹¹ In other words, “the beginning of paddy rice cultivation means the beginning of the Toshi (year), and the end of harvest means the end of the Toshi. Therefore, March to December constitutes one Toshi, and the harsh winter between January and February seems to be a time excluded from the Toshi. One year had about ten

⁴ *Ibid.*, p.1.

⁵ *Ibid.*, p.3.

⁶ *Ibid.*, p.3.

⁷ *Ibid.*, p.9. Cf., Hiroshi Hosoi, *Nihon-shi wo Manabu tameno “Kodai no Koyomi” Nyumon*, Yoshikawa-kobundo, 2014, pp. 554–55. <ISBN978–4–642–082556>

⁸ Yoshiro Okada, *op. cit.*, p.9.

⁹ *Ibid.*, p.12.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, p.13.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, p.16.

months. It was an example that the bonus of more than two months existed in temperate regions in ancient times.”¹² On this basis, Okada argues that the beginnings of a time classification or period occurred at that time. Thus, the introduction of the Chinese calendar separated the beginning of rice cultivation from the start of the year, which had long been the customary practice in Japan. In other words, “the New Year’s event was held around New Year’s Day after the Chinese calendar was adopted in Japanese society and gradually spread throughout the whole country by the central government. In Japanese history, it has been a long time since the complete calendar was used, but it was among the central and local aristocrats and intellectuals, and it was not until the Edo period that the common people could obtain the calendar, still it was quite difficult for them.”¹³

Okada describes the situation in the period after the introduction of the Chinese calendar in a little more detail. There are two questions: When did the Chinese calendar come to Japan, whether directly or via the Korean peninsula, and when was a reasonably authoritative calendar distributed in Japan? Regarding the former, Okada points out that “the history of the full-fledged calendar system in Japan might begin in the Suiko dynasty [AD 593–628],”¹⁴ and “in the Jito dynasty [AD 690–697], adopting the ‘Giho calendar’ (*Linde rili* in Chinese) of the Tang dynasty, the successor nation to the Sui dynasty (...) in China, has problems beyond technical superiority and inferiority.”¹⁵ During the Jito dynasty, the “Genka calendar was used until AD 691, and after that, the Giho calendar created in the Tang dynasty was used. This Giho calendar was used for 64 years from AD 665.”¹⁶ Regarding the Giho calendar, Okada says “it was the empress Jito who adopted it, and (...) it seems that the political aspect of this calendar reform will become clear.”¹⁷

Okada goes on to describe the calendar reform as follows: “According to the Ritsuryo system established after the Taika Reform [AD 645–650], matters related to the calendar system were under the jurisdiction of the Onmyo Ryo [public office] belonging to the Ministry of Nakatsukasa [a central ministry of public offices]. This Ministry was a joint or mixed government office with a meteorological observatory, an astronomical observatory, an office of fortune-telling and an office of prayer.”¹⁸ This ministry, and the Onmyo Ryo in particular, “administers augury and the astronomical calendar system, and as you can see from its name, the augury was prioritized. This situation ignored differences between the two and created the superstition in which Onmyodo [the Way of Yin and Yang] was the same as the astronomical calendar system. It became one of the causes that hindered the development of natural science in Japan.”¹⁹ At the same time, “in the early Nara dynasty [AD 710–794], which was not many years after the enactment of the Taiho Code [AD 701], it can be imagined that the Onmyo Ryo was already well established based on the Ryo Code [administrative law].”²⁰ Subsequently, after a weakening in the system of centralized government based on the Ritsuryo Code in the final years of Emperor

¹² *Ibid.*, p.19.

¹³ *Ibid.*, p.23.

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, p.55.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, p.56.

¹⁶ *Ibid.*, p.57. Cf., Hiroshi Yoshikawa, *op. cit.*, pp. 58–67.

¹⁷ Yoshiro Okada, *op. cit.*, pp.59–60.

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, p.63.

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, p.64. Cf., Teiji Yoshimura, *Nihon no Kodai-reki no Sho-meï*, Rokko-shuppan, 1981, pp.19–29. Yoshimura suggested that there was a great struggle between two groups: one that sought to accept the Chinese calendar and another that tried to continue the traditional Japanese calendar.

²⁰ Yoshiro Okada, *op. cit.*, p.65. Cf., Hiroshi Hosoi., *op. cit.*, pp.90–139.

Kanmu [AD 737–806], this system was enthusiastically reinvigorated through various reform policies early in Emperor Heizei’s reign.²¹

Regarding the name of an imperial era, “the system of era name was adopted not only by the Han race but also by the peoples in East Asia who were influenced by Chinese culture. Japan is one of them, and the last remaining era name country. (...) The era name thus functions to indicate the term of the monarch’s government, the authority to enact laws exists only for the monarch, and the era name was used by his/her own people and other dynasties who served as his/her subject.”²² Even in Silla [57 BC–AD 935] and Paekche [Baekje/18 BC–AD 660], “in the 6th century, the formation of a centralized nation progressed, and a unique era name was established at the time of claiming uniqueness or originality relative to neighboring countries, especially China. Paekche, however, was destroyed by the allied forces of Silla and Tang [China] in AD 660. In AD 650, after the Tang dynasty demanded a reason for keeping a unique era name in Silla, the King of Silla decided to abandon its unique era name and use the era name of Tang.”²³ In Japan, by contrast, “the era name system began with *Taika*, has been used continuously since the reign of Emperor Monmu, and continues to the present. (...) a change in era name was carried out to avoid mischief, famine, and plague or pray for auspicious signs. (...) the modern system of era name in Japan, the practice of assigning one era name to the reign of each emperor, was established in the first year of the Meiji era [AD 1868], and this practice continues in the present.”²⁴

3. Okada also makes general comments pertaining to the calendar. First, on the necessity of the calendar, “In order for human beings to form a group life, some kind of calendar is absolutely necessary. A calendar with some marks or guides that everyone could understand clearly would be created.”²⁵ On their origins in Europe, he states that “originally, the word ‘Calendar’ originated from the ancient Roman ‘Kalends’ (the first day of a month), and it refers originally to ‘screaming’ or ‘proclaiming’ by blowing a horn when the new moon was first seen above the western horizon.”²⁶ In East Asia, “in the Yin dynasty [17th century BC–1046 BC], one month consisted of thirty days, divided into three groups of days: upper, middle, and lower.”²⁷ In the Han era, the “*Taisho Reki* (*Tai chu li* in Chinese) was instituted in the first year of the Wu di dynasty (104 BC). (...) Since then, a new calendar system has been adopted every time when the dynasty changes.”²⁸ This is because “the emperor should serve as an astronomical observer, and grant an accurate calendar to his/her people, that is an important mission of the emperor. This is a common observable fact in the places where ancient civilizations of vast territory and mighty power arose. For that reason, the competence to legislate and distribute the calendar system was vested solely in the emperor. Therefore, obeying the calendar distributed by the emperor (...) represented an agreement to accept the emperor’s domination. Conversely, accepting a different calendar system meant treason against the emperor. When a new dynasty supplanted a former dynasty, the new one should consequently legislate its own calendar to declare the birth of a new government to the world.”²⁹

²¹ Yoshiro Okada, *op. cit.*, p.82.

²² *Ibid.*, p.87.

²³ *Ibid.*, p.89.

²⁴ *Ibid.*, pp.101–102.

²⁵ *Ibid.*, pp.113–114.

²⁶ *Ibid.*, p.115.

²⁷ *Ibid.*, p.121.

²⁸ *Ibid.*, p.122.

²⁹ *Ibid.*

Regarding Japan, “the reason for Emperor Tenji’s [AD 668–672] interest in a water clock was not merely personal, but was related to a pressing contemporary international situation with a country in the Korean peninsula. In Otsu kyo [a capital, AD 667–672], the water clock was needed for the conduct of bureaucrats under the Ritsuryo system. Based on *Nihon Shoki*, researching battle progress in the Jinshin War of AD 671, both armies made detailed strategies that were based not on the ‘day’ but on the ‘time.’ (...) We must understand that the idea of ‘time’ among the noble cast of that period was closer to the modern understanding than we might guess.”³⁰ Following his discussions of the water clock system and the bureaucracy, Okada proceeded to examine the matter of the ‘clock’.

“The so-called Japanese clock made in the Edo period [AD 1603–1868] is a mechanical clock that should have been used to describe fixed time through a process of ingenuity and improvement. Non-fixed time developed in a society where mechanical clocks didn’t exist and was based on natural changes in the day, whereas a mechanical clock couldn’t adjust to these natural changes; the so-called Japanese clock was a bequest of Tokugawa’s feudal age.”³¹ Okada then comments that “therefore, the non-fixed time system was abrogated with the reform of the calendar in the Meiji era (AD 1872). The period of the Japanese clock came to an end simultaneously with the import of foreign-made clocks that were low-priced.”³²

Returning to the calendar, Okada describes the following process, already noted by previous scholars. “The calendar reform of Jokyo [AD 1685] occurred, but it should not have been done based only on the ephemeris. The Tokugawa shogunate showed a positive attitude to this reform from the start, probably due to the confidence of the regime during the century after the Battle of Sekigahara [AD 1600], and the sense of political responsibility. It was supported by the development of the ephemeris and the Confucians. Hence, the Tokugawa shogunate became the first samurai-government able to achieve calendar reform in Japan. This obvious fact boosted its authority and encouraged the recognition of its power by groups from the Imperial Court to the common people. With the establishment of a new astronomical office, the real power of calendar reform passed to the shogunate. Moreover, since Tsuchimikado-ke [the family of a court noble], the head family of yin-yang diviners, was already protected and controlled by the authority of the shogunate in the first year of the Jokyo period, it can be said that the shogunate's control over both scientific and mythical spheres was established then.”³³ In particular, “An important point of the Jokyo calendar reform is that the shogunate's control over the family who traditional undertook calendar-making was established on this occasion. (...) Although the process of their establishment and development varied and various forms of local calendars existed in Japanese society, all of them had the same content.”³⁴

On the importance of the calendar in a feudal society, “since the settlement of accounts should be conducted at a regular time or day in a year, the calendar on which the common time was written was very important and useful for all people including samurai, merchants, townsmen, farmers and so on at that time.”³⁵ Therefore, the method of promulgating or distributing a written copy of the official

³⁰ *Ibid.*, p.135. Cf., Yoshiro Okada *et al.*, ed., *Koyomi no Dai-jiten*, Asakura-shoten, 2014, pp.410–416. <ISBN978-4-254-10237-6>

³¹ Yoshiro Okada, *op. cit.*, p.148.

³² *Ibid.*, p.149. Cf., Yoshiro Okada *et al.*, *op. cit.*, pp.418–426.

³³ Yoshiro Okada, *op. cit.*, pp.156–157.

³⁴ *Ibid.*, pp.157–158.

³⁵ *Ibid.*, pp.201–202.

calendar was important. During the Tokugawa shogunate, the authorities strictly prohibited the sale of calendars without permission to strengthen their control over the publication of calendars, but allowed them to be presented to acquaintances and customers.³⁶ Conversely, “the Tokugawa shogunate made a certified calendar family contribute an offertory [money] and protected them sufficiently. The shogunate exercised strict control over private calendars.”³⁷ This control continued even in the Meiji era. “After the Meiji Restoration, the new [Meiji] government strictly prohibited the publication of informal calendars, etc., other than by authorized persons who contributed offertories.”³⁸ This was especially true in Okinawa, where “the Chinese calendar had been used for a long time. When this was switched to the solar-based Japanese calendar in the Meiji period, there was great confusion and opposition. In 1945, when the US army occupation began, the use of the imperial era name ‘Showa’ was prohibited and the use of the Christian Era mandated. In 1972, administrative authority over Okinawa was restored to Japan, and the use of ‘Showa’ revived.”³⁹ Okada goes on to say that, “The biggest incident in the history of modern Okinawa was in 1372, when the Ming dynasty [China] made the relation of master to servant with the king of ‘Urasoe’ in central Okinawa. (...) and Okinawa as a whole accepted the Chinese calendar. (...) Later, the king of the central area unified Okinawa and established the Ryukyu Kingdom [AD 1429]. According to the history of the Ryukyu Kingdom, it had two positions before the Meiji era. One position was that of a tributary state to the Ming and Ching dynasties, and the other was as a part of the Tokugawa shogunate. Accordingly, in relations with China, the kingdom used the Chinese calendar, and in relations with Japan, it used the Japanese calendar until the Meiji era.”⁴⁰

Okada seems to have seen Ryukyu as a unique case from the perspective of the calendar. In his view, “[In Ryukyu] the Yamato calendar [Japanese calendar] had traditionally been used in documents related to Japan, and was not commonly used in relation to China or in the interior of Ryukyu. From January 1, 1873, however, the solar calendar was accepted in Japan, and its use changed the situation drastically. (...) To clarify the affiliation of Okinawa, the Japanese government conferred the status of peer on King Shoutai [the last king of Ryukyu], abolished the Ryukyu Kingdom, and established the Ryukyu han [fief] anew. (...) Ryukyu han was ordered to reform its internal affairs, accept the Japanese calendar system, and obey legal declarations of the Meiji [Japanese] government. (...) This action toward Okinawa caused an international dispute between Japan and the Ching dynasty [China], leading to the intervention of President Grant [18th US President] and an eventual settlement of the issue by a cession from China to Japan in AD 1881.”⁴¹ Returning to the calendar, “there were many types of local and private calendars in Ryukyu until the era of King Shokei [AD 1713–1751], but he asserted royal authority over the calendar. He installed a water clock and a sundial in Shuri Castle. Those clocks symbolized the authority of the king, they were not products for daily necessity. These actions were undertaken to centralize power over the calendar system.”⁴²

4. On November 9, 1872, an imperial declaration by which Japan would accept the solar calendar was announced suddenly, and December 3, 1872 became January 1, 1872.⁴³ Okada notes the following about

³⁶ *Ibid.*, p.207.

³⁷ *Ibid.*, p.215.

³⁸ *Ibid.*, p.240.

³⁹ *Ibid.*, p.295.

⁴⁰ *Ibid.*, p.296.

⁴¹ *Ibid.*, pp.299–300, p.304.

⁴² *Ibid.*, p.308.

⁴³ *Ibid.*, p.317.

this sudden calendar reform. This reform “can be understood in the context of the centralization of ‘Toki [time]’.”⁴⁴ In this case, “Toki” means “Koyomi [calendar],” control of the “calendar” is synonymous with the control of “Toki,” and the centralized government practices the integrated management of the “calendar” or “Toki.” The result is to establish the foundation of “time and law” in the present.

Based on Okada’s ideas, a key feature of the calendar reform was “the practice of assigning one era name to the reign of each emperor.” Thus, the Dajokan [Grand Council of State] declared that a “one imperial era name per one emperor” system would begin, and the year Keio 4 was amended to Meiji 1 in AD 1868. This system continues in the present Era Name Law.⁴⁵ “For a long time, a draft of the imperial era name was proposed by a group of professional writers, but gradually the membership of the screening committee and its selection processes were kept secret. As a result, the mysteriousness of the imperial era name and the dignity of the emperor who had the authority to decide it were increased.”⁴⁶ In China, which had already adopted “the practice of assigning one era name to the reign of each emperor,” this system was quite advanced in the Yuan Dynasty [AD 1271–1368], and was institutionalized in the following Ming and Ching dynasties. As a result, the names of the emperors and their era names became identical, and the idea that the emperor could control ‘time’ was further clarified.⁴⁷ “In other words, the Meiji government sought similarly, through trial and error, to find out what would be effective in showing who is the ruler of ‘time’ internally and externally.”⁴⁸ It can be said that this led to the calendar reform described above.⁴⁹

This “new time system was put into practical use in the treaty ports and government offices, military academies, schools, etc., where foreigners were employed, but legally it was adopted in the declaration of the Grand Council of State at the same time as the adoption of the solar calendar on November 9, 1897.”⁵⁰ In addition, “Initially, the 24-hour fixed time system used the local time in each regions, which measures the culmination of the sun and determines solar noon, but with the development of trains and railways, the local time in Tokyo has come to play the role of standard time. Thereafter, based on international treaty, the standard time [GMT +9] based on the meridian of 135 degrees east longitude was adopted from January 1, 1887 (central standard time from 1896), and the time system was finally unified and completed in Japan. In modern nations, the standardization of the time system was accelerated by the development of railways and telegraphs. Simultaneously, an accurate and precise time signal system made it possible for everyone to share the time very accurately. In this process, national, international, and global controls and regulations are always interrelated.”⁵¹ During this time, Okada suggests, the Meiji government would “make efforts to revise and rescind the unequal treaty concluded by the shogunate and regain tariff autonomy, at which time it became clear that the lunisolar calendar system had become a hindrance in various aspects. (...) It was also necessary to eliminate the discriminatory view of Westerners who regarded the lunisolar calendar as a premodern relic.”⁵² In addition, “The

⁴⁴ Yoshiro Okada, “Meiji no Kaireki: ‘Toki’ no chuo shuken-ka”, Yoshio Fujiwara, ed., *Kan: History, Environment and Civilization*, vol. 13, Fujiwara-shoten, 2003, p.278. <ISBN4-89434-336-3>

⁴⁵ *Ibid.*, pp.278–279.

⁴⁶ *Ibid.*, p.279.

⁴⁷ *Ibid.*

⁴⁸ *Ibid.*, p.280.

⁴⁹ *Cf.*, Yoshiro Okada, *Meiji no Kai-reki*, Taishukan-shoten, 1994. This book focused on calendar reform in the Meiji era.

⁵⁰ Yoshiro Okada, *op. cit.*, p.282.

⁵¹ *Ibid.*, p.282.

⁵² *Ibid.*, p.283.

companies wishing to distribute a calendar should pay the government a special tax [Myoga-kin] of 10,000 yen every year [2.5–3 million yen as of today],⁵³ in return for which the calendar manuscript for the following year was handed over and a monopoly on the sale of the calendar nationwide was permitted by the government. This situation meant that a system of control over the distribution of the calendar was established completely.”⁵⁴

It was a challenging situation for government officials that the 6th year of the Meiji era consisted of 13 months, because “the salary system of officials was changed from an annual to a monthly salary system in the 4th year of the Meiji era. Although there were bissextile months [13th month] in the 1st and 3rd years of the Meiji era, they were not a problem under the annual salary system. Nevertheless, this was the first experience with the monthly salary system, so Shigenobu Okuma [a vice-minister in the early Meiji era], who was plagued by the financial trouble, got a shock [because he was required to pay an additional month’s salary to the officials]. He decided to delete the bissextile month by adopting the solar calendar. (...) As a result, on November 9th, the imperial message on the revision of the calendar was promulgated, and the declaration of the revision by Dajokan was published. Therefore, to reconcile the enforcement of the revision with January 1, 1873, the December of Meiji 5 ended after only two days, and the next day was set to January 1, 1873.”⁵⁵ “The government, fearing that the lunar calendar symbolized the former system, focused on the spread of the solar calendar system as much as possible. With the implementation of the system of a weekly day off in public institutions from April 1867, working half a day on Saturday and having all of Sunday off, the unification of ‘time’ by the central authority was completed perfectly.”⁵⁶

Conclusion

The calendar has played a very important role in the lives of human beings since the birth of civilization,⁵⁷ and it can be said that power and politics have exploited its importance. In other words, the rule and control of the calendar (time) became a symbol of political authority. Based on Okada's research, a similar pattern can be observed in the histories of both China and Japan. Power and the calendar did not unite naturally, but the calendar (time) was the most important factor in the establishment of a political authority that asserted control over the most important elements of people's lives. Meanwhile, the details of the calendar system, i.e., “time (hours, minutes, seconds, etc.),” developed⁵⁸ and functioned as a fundamental and important standard for judgment in the science of law, legalism, and the rule of law. As a result, it may be understood that “time” was incorporated in law through legislation by the legislative power. As this situation was maintained, the unification of time and law came to be positioned as “social capital” or “public goods” in human society⁵⁹ and the relationship of “law and time” was independent of changes in authority. As mentioned above, it may be understood that “law and time” has come to be a public good in our society, and that political necessity created the unification of “law and time.”

⁵³ The contributor independently made an approximate calculation based on data from the Bank of Japan <<https://boj.or.jp/announcements/education/oshiete/history/j12.htm/>> accessed May 7, 2021.

⁵⁴ Cf., Yoshiro Okada *et al.*, *op. cit.*, pp.335–341. Okada, *op. cit.*, p.284.

⁵⁵ *Ibid.*, pp.284–285.

⁵⁶ *Ibid.*, p.285.

⁵⁷ Cf., Yoshiro Okada *et al.*, *op. cit.*, pp.30–82.

⁵⁸ Cf., G.J.Whitrow, *Jikan: sono Seisitu*, translated by Mutsuo Yanase and Koji Mumakura, Hosei Univ. Press, 1995, pp.89–123. <ISBN4-588-02145-1>

⁵⁹ This idea is written in the light of, especially “Social Capital Theory”, the following. Akie Iriyama, *Sekai-hyojun no Keiei-ron (Management Theories of the Global Standard)*, Diamond-sha, 2020, pp.499–517.