

Pleiades (= Kṛttikās); but Thibaut's researches¹⁶⁹ are not favourable to this claim. On the other hand, Weber,¹⁷⁰ Whitney,¹⁷¹ Zimmer,¹⁷² and Oldenberg¹⁷³ all incline to the view that in Babylonia is to be found the origin of the system, and this must for the present be regarded as the most probable view, for there are other traces of Babylonian influence in Vedic literature, such as the legend of the flood, perhaps the Ādityas,¹⁷⁴ and possibly the word Manā.

¹⁶⁹ *Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal*, 63, 144-163. Cf. *Astronomie*, etc., 15; Oldenberg, *op. cit.*, 572.

¹⁷⁰ *Nakṣatra*, 1, 316 *et seq.*; *Indische Studien*, 10, 246, and elsewhere. Weber, *Nakṣatra*, 2, 362, 400, laid great stress on the fact that the Jyotiṣa, 8, referred to the difference of the longest and shortest day as being six *muhūrtas*, which makes the longest day fourteen hours twenty-four minutes; and he compared the Babylonian day of fourteen hours twenty-five minutes, and a Chinese day of fourteen hours twenty-four minutes. But Whitney, *Oriental and Linguistic Essays*, 2, 417, 418, shows that no stress can be laid on this argument, since the correspondence is only approximate, and the latitudes of the Babylonian and Chinese observations are approximately the same.

¹⁷¹ See *op. cit.*, 2, 418-420.

¹⁷² *Altindisches Leben*, 356, 357, where he is quite confident of the Semitic origin of the Nakṣatras.

¹⁷³ *Op. cit.*, 572.

¹⁷⁴ For the flood, see Zimmer, *op. cit.*, 101, 357, who is opposed to Weber's view (*Indische Studien*, 1, 160; *Indische Streifen*, 1, 11) that the story preserves an old Āryan tradition, and a reminiscence of the home of the Indians beyond the Himālaya (cf. Muir, *Sanskrit Texts*, 1², 190; 2², 323, n. 96; Lassen, *Indische Alterthumskunde*, 1², 638, and cf. Oldenberg, *Religion des Veda*, 276, n. 3). For the Ādityas, see Oldenberg, *Religion des Veda*, 185 *et seq.*; *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesell-*

schaft, 50, 43 *et seq.* His view is not accepted by Macdonell, *Vedic Mythology*, p. 44; Bloomfield, *Religion of the Veda*, 133. Still more doubtful is Zimmer's view (*Altindisches Leben*, 363, 364) of the division of day and night into thirty parts, which he sees in Rv. i. 123, 8, and which he thinks is based on the Babylonian division of the same period of time into sixtieths. Cf. also V. Smith, *Indian Antiquary*, 34, 230, who argues, but inconclusively, that the use of iron was introduced from Babylonia.

The facts about the Nakṣatras are (with the exception of the data from the Maitrāyaṇī Saṃhitā and the Baudhāyana Śrauta Sūtra) collected in Weber's second essay, *Die vedischen Nachrichten von den Nakṣatra*, 1861. The first essay, 1860, deals with the problem of origins. See also his discussions in *Indische Studien*, 9, 424 *et seq.*; 10, 213 *et seq.* Whitney's work lies partly in his scientific determination (in many places correcting Colebrooke's discoveries) of the later Nakṣatras in his edition and version of the Sūrya Siddhānta (*Journal of the American Oriental Society*, 6), and partly in his discussions of the question of origin (*Journal of the American Oriental Society*, 8), *Oriental and Linguistic Essays*, 2, 341-421 (with a stellar chart), and of the question of date as against Jacobi and Tilak's *Orion* (*Journal of the American Oriental Society*, 16, lxxxii *et seq.*). The views of Max Müller are found in his *Rigveda*, 4², xxxiv *et seq.* The modern discussion of the dates inferable from the Nakṣatra was in-