the derivation of the Naksatra from the Chinese Sieou. The latter he did not regard as being in origin lunar mansions at all. He thought that they were equatorial stars used, as in modern astronomy, as a standard to which rlanets or other stars observed in the neighbourhood can be eferred; they were, as regards twenty-four of them, selecte about B.C. 2357 on account of their proximity to the equator, and of their having the same right ascension as certain circumpolar stars which had attracted the attention of Chinese observers. Four more were added in B.C. 1100 in order to mark the equinoxes and solstices of the period. He held that the list of stars commenced with Mao (= Krttikās), which was at the vernal equinox in B.C. 2357. Weber, 162 in an elaborate essay of 1860, disputed this theory, and endeavoured to show that the Chinese literary evidence for the Sieou was late, dating not even from before the third century B.C. The last point does not appear 163 to be correct, but his objections against the basis of Biot's theory were reinforced by Whitney, 164 who insisted that Biot's supposition of the Sieou's not having been ultimately derived from a system of lunar mansions, was untenable. This is admitted by the latest defender of the hypothesis of borrowing from China, Léopold de Saussure, 165, but his arguments in favour of a Chinese origin for the Indian lunar mansions have been refuted by Oldenberg. 166 who has also pointed out 167 that the series does not begin with Mao (= Krttikās).

There remains only the possibility that a common source for all the three sets—Nakṣatra, Manāzil, and Sieou—may be found in Babylonia. Hommel les has endeavoured to show that recent research has established in Babylonia the existence of a lunar zodiac of twenty-four members headed by the

<sup>162</sup> Naxatra, 1, 284 et seq. (1860).

<sup>163</sup> See Chavannes, cited by Oldenberg, Nachrichten der königl. Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen, 1909, 566, 567.

<sup>164</sup> Journal of the American Oriental Society, 8, 1 et seq.; Oriental and Linguistic Essays, 2, 385 et seq. For his controversy with Weber, see Weber,

Indische Studien, 9, 424 et seq.; 10, 213 et seq.; Whitney, Journal of the American Oriental Society, 8, 384 et seq.

<sup>165</sup> Toung Pao, 1909, 121 et seq.; 255 et seq.

<sup>166</sup> Nachrichten, 1909, 544-572.

<sup>167</sup> Ibid., 548, n. 9.

<sup>168</sup> Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft, 45, 592 et seq.