

full moon; but it is perhaps possible to account adequately for the importance of the *Ekāṣṭakā* as being the first *Aṣṭakā* after the beginning of the new year.

It is not certain exactly how the month was reckoned, whether from the day after new moon to new moon—the system known as *amānta*, or from the day after full moon to full moon—the *pūrṇimānta* system, which later, at any rate, was followed in North India, while the other system prevailed in the south. Jacobi¹¹ argues that the year began in the full moon of *Phālguna*, and that only by the full moon's conjunction with the *Nakṣatra* could the month be known. Oldenberg¹² points to the fact that the new moon is far more distinctively an epoch than the full moon; that the Greek, Roman, and Jewish years began with the new moon; and that the Vedic evidence is the division of the month into the former (*pūrva*) and latter (*aṇpara*) halves, the first being the bright (*śukla*), the second the dark (*kṛṣṇa*) period. Thibaut¹³ considers that to assume the existence of the *pūrṇimānta* system for the *Veda* is unnecessary, though possible. Weber¹⁰ assumes that it occurs in the *Kauṣītaki Brāhmaṇa* as held by the scholiasts. But it would probably be a mistake to press that passage, or to assume that the *amānta* system was rigidly accepted in the *Veda*: it seems at least as probable that the month was vaguely regarded as beginning with the new moon day, so that new moon preceded full moon, which was in the middle, not the end or the beginning of the month.

That a month regularly had 30 days is established by the conclusive evidence of numerous passages in which the year is given 12 months and 360 days. This month is known from the earliest records, being both referred to directly and alluded to¹⁴

¹¹ *Zeitschrift der Morgenländischen Gesellschaft*, 49, 229, n. 1; 50, 81. Cf. Hopkins, *Journal of the American Oriental Society*, 24, 20.

¹² *Ibid.*, 48, 633, n. 1; 49, 476, 477. This is the Epic rule, Hopkins, *loc. cit.*

¹³ *Indian Antiquary*, 24, 87. None of the evidence is absolutely con-

clusive one way or the other. It is perfectly possible that the usage of families or districts differed. Cf. Thibaut, *Astronomie, Astrologie und Mathematik*, 12.

¹⁴ *Rv.* i. 164, ii. 14, 48; x. 189, 3; 190, 2; *Av.* iv. 35, 4; x. 7, 6; 8, 23; xiii. 3, 8, etc.