

with the different years.<sup>15</sup> Particularly unjustifiable is the attempt of Zimmer to see in the two-year series a series of two years of 354 days each, with an intercalary month in the second; for the year of 354 days, as such, is not known to have existed before the Sūtra period.

Zimmer<sup>16</sup> also finds an attempt at intercalation in the famous 12 days in which the Ṛbhus are said to have slept in the house of Agohya.<sup>17</sup> He thinks that they represent twelve days added at the winter solstice to equate the lunar year of 354 days and the solar year of 366 days; and from the reverence paid in German antiquity to the '12 nights,' he infers that this mode of intercalation is Indo-Germanic.<sup>18</sup> There can be little doubt that this view is wrong, and that the 12 days are merely the 'reflexion of the year' (*saṃvatsarasya pratimā*)<sup>19</sup> in the sense that they represent the twelve months, and have no relation to chronology at all.

A reference to the use of Saṃvatsara alone as the fifth year of the cycle is seen by Shamastry<sup>20</sup> in the peculiar dating of certain notices in the Baudhāyana Śrauta Sūtra,<sup>21</sup> but this view is improbable.<sup>22</sup>

<sup>15</sup> Cf. Weber, *Indische Streifen*, 1, 91; Thibaut, *Astronomie, Astrologie und Mathematik*, 12; Hopkins, *Journal of the American Oriental Society*, 24, 42.

<sup>16</sup> *Op. cit.*, 366, 367; Tilak, *Orion*, 16 *et seq.*; Hillebrandt, *Vedische Mythologie*, 3, 145.

<sup>17</sup> Rv. iv. 33, 7. Cf. i. 110, 2; 161, 13. See on this legend, Macdonell, *Vedic Mythology*, p. 133; Oldenberg, *Religion des Veda*, 236.

<sup>18</sup> See Weber, *Indische Studien*, 10, 242 *et seq.*; 17, 223, 224; 18, 45, 46; *Proceedings of the Berlin Academy*, 1894, 809; Thibaut, *op. cit.*, 10; Schrader,

*Prehistoric Antiquities*, 308, 310; Whitney, *Journal of the American Oriental Society*, 16, xciv.

<sup>19</sup> Kāthaka Samhitā, vii. 15; Taittiriya Brāhmaṇa, i. 1, 9, 10; Kauṣītaki Brāhmaṇa, xxv. 15. See also Atharvaveda, iv. 11, 11; Weber, *Omina und Portenta*, 388.

<sup>20</sup> *Gavām Ayana*, 137, 138.

<sup>21</sup> ii. 12; iii. 1; xxvi. 18; xxx. 3. See also Kauṣītaki Brāhmaṇa, i. 3; Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa, xi. 1, 1, 7.

<sup>22</sup> Caland, *Über das rituelle Sūtra des Baudhāyana*, 36, 37, gives a much more reasonable explanation of the anomaly.

**Samvarāṇa** is the name of a Ṛṣi mentioned in one passage of the Rīgveda.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> v. 33, 10. Cf. Oldenberg, *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft*, 42, 215.