IDENTIFICATION OF DARIUS THE MEDE

George R. Law

Ready Scribe Press
Pfafftown, NC

IDENTIFICATION OF DARIUS THE MEDE

This book is the published version of the 2010 dissertation written by George R. Law in order to complete his Ph.D. in O.T. Studies at Piedmont Baptist College and Graduate School.

Cover Illustration / by Elizabeth J. Law (© Elizabeth J. Law). The scene suggests a well-known practice among Mesopotamian kings: here a Medo-Persian king is engaged in physical combat with a mature male lion in order to prove his divinely-ordained status and favor.

Law, George R.
Identification of Darius the Mede / by George R. Law.
ISBN 978-0-9827-6310-0 (paper binding)

Printed in the United Stated of America

CHAPTER 3

DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY OF RESEARCH

In previous investigations concerning Darius the Mede,[1] even though careful research might have been done, a scientific method does not seem to have been employed. Even though each investigator answered specific questions, the questions might have been asked inconsistently concerning the possible candidates, and the results were apparently not tracked by a scientific method or charted for comparison before they were analyzed. A scientific method of identification will now be proposed for this present investigation of the identity of Darius the Mede. The proposed method of identification will include the science already discovered and practiced by criminal investigators, the health industry, and those scholars who investigate identifications in ancient documents.

---

[1] Four recent extensive investigations of the identity of Darius the Mede have been conducted: 1) by Robert D. Wilson "Royal Titles in Antiquity: An Essay in Criticism, *The Princeton Theological Review*, 2.2 (April 1904) 257-282; 2.3 (July 1904) 465-497; 2.4 (October 1904) 618-664; "Royal Titles in Antiquity: An Essay in Criticism, *The Princeton Theological Review*, 3.1 (January 1905) 55-80; 3.2 (April 1905) 238-267; 3.3 (July 1905) 422-440; 3.4 (October 1905) 558-572; *Studies in the Book of Daniel; a Discussion of the Historical Questions*. New York: G. P Putnam's Sons, 1917; "The Title 'King of Persia' in the Scriptures," *The Princeton Theological Review*, 15.1 (January 1917): 90-145; "Darius the Mede," *The Princeton Theological Review*, 20.2 (April 1922): 177-211; 2) by Harold Rowley *Darius the Mede and the Four World Empires in the Book of Daniel: A Historical Study of Contemporary Theories*. 1935. Reprint, Cardiff: University of Wales Press Board, 1964; 3) by John Whitcomb *Darius the Mede: A Study in Historical Identification*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1959; and 4) by William Shea "An Unrecognized Vassal King of Babylon in the Early Achaemenid Period," I-IV, *Andrews University Seminary Studies* 9, 10 (1971-72), 9:51–57, 99–128; 10: 88–117, 147–78; "Darius the Mede: An Update." *Andrews University Seminary Studies* 20 (Aut 1982): 229-47; "*Darius the Mede* in His Persian-Babylonian Setting," *Andrews University Seminary Studies* 29 (*1991*):235-257; "The Search for Darius the Mede (concluded), or, The Time of the Answer to Daniel's Prayer and the Date of the Death of Darius the Mede." *Journal of the Adventist Theological Society* 12 (2001): 97-105.

Current Methods of Personal Identification

Unfortunately we do not have the fingerprint of Darius the Mede in a cuneiform clay text in order to help identify him.[2] Identification methods are not just limited to criminal investigations; they are also important to the health industry, and of course, to research like this present investigation, examining the possible identifications of individuals in ancient writings. The relevant features from the methods used in each of these three fields have been employed in the creation of a method of identification for investigating the identity of Darius the Mede.

Personal Identification in Criminal Investigations

Modern criminal identification is based on various scientific methods. The scientific methods employed in criminal identification are mostly used for collecting evidence, but they can also help to make an identification of a criminal. Line-ups, anthropometry,[3] fingerprinting, and DNA testing are all used in criminal investigation as methods of identification.

Evidence in criminal investigations can be classified into two basic categories: physical evidence and informational evidence. Physical evidence, such as hair and fingerprints, can be gathered at the scene of the crime. Sometimes, only one piece of certain types of physical evidence, such as DNA, is enough to make a positive identification. Informational evidence in a criminal investigation can be gathered by observation of the scene of the crime and also by questioning the witnesses of a crime, the victims, and even the criminal himself. But both types of evidence, material and informational, must be matched to the individual being investigated in order to make an identification.

The relevant features of the criminal investigation method will be used in the method of identification proposed for this study. From this method only the science concerning informational evidence is relevant and useful (since only ancient artifacts remain, all other personal physical evidence is no longer available). In the case of Darius the Mede, the surviving contemporary witnesses from the sixth and fifth centuries BC are in the biblical and ancient cuneiform texts. Personal data can be mined by "questioning" these ancient texts. The information in the classical histories can be valuable, but the further these classical witnesses are from the time of the fall of Babylon, the less will be their value. Modern works may be valuable for their translations and analyses of the texts, but not as direct witnesses.

---

[2] "The Babylonians pressed fingerprints into clay to identify the author of cuneiform writings and to protect against forgery"; see "Police Technology," (2009), in *Encyclopædia Britannica*. (Encyclopædia Britannica Online) available on the internet at http://www.britannica.com/EBchecked/topic/467289/police/260945/Criminal-identification (accessed Sep 30, 2009).

[3] Anthropometry is the science of human individual measurements in order to understand variables of human physiques. The individual characteristics of a known criminal can be recorded through photography or anthropometry so that the criminal can be re-apprehended in the event of the commission of a similar crime.

Personal Identification in the Health Industry

The health industry also uses methods of personal identification. Across the industry health workers are very concerned with protecting the privacy of the patient's personal information. The privacy problem is magnified when information is shared between health organizations for clinical research and the improvement of prevention, diagnosis, and health treatments. Therefore, information from individual patients must be "de-identified" to a point which will protect the privacy rights of the individual, yet maintain enough specificity to still be useful for research and analysis.

In an address to the United States Department of Health and Human Services, Latanya Sweeney, the director of the Laboratory for International Data Privacy communicated her observations concerning "Standards of Privacy of Individually Identifiable Health Information."[4] "Safe harbor" is the industry name for the government mandate to remove personal identifiers from the health records.[5] Sweeney described this government mandate and suggested a minimum level (number of identifiers) needed for specificity:

> The safe harbor currently requires removal of all 18 enumerated identifiers, including direct identifiers such as name, street address and Social Security number, as well as other identifiers, such as birth date, admission date and discharge date, and 5-digit ZIP code. . . .
>
> As noted earlier, {date of birth, gender, 5-digit ZIP} combine to uniquely identify about 87% (216 million of 248 million) of the population in the United States.[6]

In her remarks, Sweeney described the different levels of identification which can be achieved by using varying numbers of personal identifiers. She also noted the great difference in the level of specificity when a geographic area is refined from a country to a city or from a city to a zip code.

In this present investigation the practices of the health industry, normally intended to protect the privacy of individuals, will be useful in determining the amount of information and type of identifiers required to make a positive identification of a specific individual. Even though Darius the Mede did not have a social security number or even a zip code, principles of identification developed by the health industry can be applied to this investigation and help in his identification. The health industry has documented at least eighteen identifiers (types of personal information) which can help to make an identification, or, if the opposite result is

---

[4] "Comments of Latanya Sweeney, Ph.D., Director, Laboratory for International Data Privacy Assistant Professor of Computer Science and of Public Policy Carnegie Mellon University To the Department of Health and Human Services On 'Standards of Privacy of Individually Identifiable Health Information'" (Carnegie Mellon University) available on the internet at http://privacy.cs.cmu.edu/dataprivacy/HIPAA/HIPAAcomments.html (accessed Sep 30, 2009).

[5] The term "safe harbor" is commonly used to describe this government mandate in the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act of 1996 (HIPAA). (Compare with the European Union Directive 95/46/EC). According to a bulletin published by the research department at the University of Utah, "HIPAA 'Safe Harbor' De-Identification of Medical Record Information requires that each of the following identifiers of the individual or of relatives, employers, or household members of the individual must be removed from medical record information in order for the records to be considered de-identified:" See this bulletin at the University of Utah website: http://www.research.utah.edu/irb/board/pdf/checklist/hipaa_safehrbr_identifiers.pdf (accessed Sep 30, 2009).

[6] "Comments of Latanya Sweeney."

necessary, which can help to de-identify an individual. The identifiers used in the health industry can be generalized and applied in this study's proposed method.

Personal Identification in Ancient Inscriptions

The quest of this present study has some similarities to the ongoing quest of archeologists who endeavor to identify names written in ancient inscriptions. In his book, *Identifying Biblical Persons in Northwest Semitic Inscriptions of 1200-539 B.C.E.,* Mykytiuk lays out a "*comprehensive system* for evaluating potential identifications in Northwest Semitic inscriptions."[7]

In the first chapter of his book, Mykytiuk defines the terms and qualifying factors necessary for an identification system and reviews the criterion already suggested by other researchers. After dealing with the question of the inscription's reliability, Mykytiuk lists seven categories to be considered in making an identification from an inscription.[8] In the second chapter he assigns grades of certainty of identification, from "singularity" to "disqualified."[9] In the rest of his book he uses some example inscriptions to show how one would employ his system.

The method of personal identification in ancient Semitic inscriptions proposed by Mykytiuk is very valuable to this present investigation because it deals with the same general topic: ancient persons in ancient documents (inscriptions). The difference is that Mykytiuk's method begins with the inscriptional name of the ancient person with the purpose of matching it to the appropriate biblical character; whereas this present investigation will try the reverse of his method and so begins with the name[10] of a biblical character, Darius the Mede, with the purpose of matching it to an ancient king of Babylon. The identifying marks employed in Mykytiuk's method will be helpful in the same way as the identifiers used in the health industry.

Proposed Method of Personal Identification

Seven steps will be involved in the design of this study's proposed method for identifying Darius the Mede.

First of all, a determination should be made concerning which categories of information from Sweeney's list of personal identifiers and from Mykytiuk's method are to be employed in this study's proposed method. These initial categories should be organized according to their potential value for increasing the reliability of a possible identification.

---

[7] Lawrence J. Mykytiuk, *Identifying Biblical Persons in Northwest Semitic Inscriptions of 1200-539 B.C.E.* (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2004), xii.

[8] Mykytiuk's list includes 1) date, 2) language, 3) socio-political classification, 4) name, 5) relations, 6) titles, 7) other (identifying marks); see Mykytiuk, 43-54. He also addresses the issue of the absence of evidence; see Mykytiuk, 54.

[9] Mykytiuk, 57-80.

[10] That "Darius" in "Darius the Mede" is a personal name is an unproven assumption. The reference to it as a "name" at this point in the study is not to be taken as an assumption or a conclusion. By definition, a "name" has many meanings and can be personal, or an appellation, or can be associated with one's occupation, or can even be an honorary or infamous title. (See definition given above, p. 22.)

Second, a list of potential candidates should be assembled for all who have potential to be identified as "Darius the Mede."

Third, a first phase of data collection should be done for first tier questions from all the ancient texts contemporary with the lifetimes of all the potential candidates. The data should be organized into categories on Personal Data Sheets. The focus of the data search will be information from historical works written within a hundred years of the candidate's death.

Fourth, the mined information should be charted to allow two actions: 1) the qualification or disqualification of potential candidates; and 2) a comparison of the data for potential candidates.

Steps for Proposed Method

Step 1. Determine which categories of informational data are important for making an identification.

Step 2. Assemble list of potential candidate to be investigated.

First Phase:

Step 3. Collect and organize data for qualifying questions (# 1-3) concerning the candidates.

Step 4. Chart the data for qualifying questions (# 1-3) to qualify and compare the candidates.

Second Phase:

Step 5. Collect and organize data for distinguishing questions (# 4-6) concerning the qualified candidates.

Step 6. Chart the data for distinguishing questions (# 4-6) for each candidate and assess the value of the evidence for each question

Step 7. Based on the value of the evidence, compute a Grade of Identification for the candidate's identification as Darius the Mede.

Table 3.1 Steps in Proposed Identification Method

Fifth, a second phase of data collection should be done for second tier questions which would increase the reliability of the candidate's identification.

Sixth, the data should once again be charted to aid the comparison of the data for qualified candidates.

Finally, a Grade of Identification for the proposed identification should be computed and awarded to each qualified candidate based on the quality of their evidence.

Step One: Categories of Information

Step One is concerned with determining the appropriate categories of information to be collected. Whether in a criminal investigation, or in the health industry, or in researching ancient people, determining the right categories of information can be as important as the collection of all the fragments of evidence for increasing the likelihood of making a reliable identification. For this study, some of the categories from the previously described methods will be combined and organized to create a proposed method for this present study concerning the identity of Darius the Mede.

Sweeney's report for the health industry explained how a high level of specificity can be garnered from a minimal number of identifying categories (even with as few as just 3) by choosing the right categories. But her report also confirmed the logical assumption that the more information (identifiers) one possesses, the more reliable one's conclusion. The list of three categories which Sweeney stated to be her minimum includes 1) date of birth, 2) gender, and 3) 5-digit ZIP code. In order for these three categories to be applicable to this study they will be generalized to 1) age at the time of a particular event, 2) gender, and 3) geographic location. Other identifiers from the health industry are unnecessary at this point because, either they are irrelevant to this investigation, or they will be adequately covered by Mykytiuk's categories. What is important concerning Sweeney's three identifiers is that they provide a minimum baseline of matching identifiers which will be necessary to qualify which candidates may continue in this investigation.

Mykytiuk's book concerning the identification of ancient people includes his list of identifying marks. Mykytiuk's list includes 1) date, 2) language, 3) socio-political classification, 4) name, 5) relations, 6) titles, and 7) other (identifying marks).[11] According to Mykytiuk, the first three categories answer the question of whether or not the identification is permitted,[12] and the remaining categories indicate the strength or weakness of the possible identification.[13]

The method proposed for this study will be structured similar to Mykytiuk's method. After qualifying the candidate with initial questions, the remaining categories and their relevant questions are intended to determine how well the candidate matches the proposed identification. Only four of Mykytiuk's seven categories are relevant to this study: date, socio-political status, relations, and titles. His other three categories (language, name, and other) will not be used in this study's proposed method. The category "language" will not be necessary because, in the case of Darius the Mede, the book of Daniel has already made this connection. The fourth category "name" is not used because it is the term under investigation: "To whom does 'Darius the Mede' refer?" His seventh category, "other," is not specific enough to be of value to the proposed method.

---

[11] Mykytiuk, 43-54.
[12] Mykytiuk, 43.
[13] Mykytiuk, 49.

Qualifying Categories

The following categories from these above-described methods will be organized to create a proposed method for this present study. The first three categories will become qualifying questions used to qualify the candidates in the first phase of informational data collection (Steps Three and Four). Even though some categories might seem obvious, their inclusion is required to ensure a complete methodology and a thorough investigation. Later, another group of categories, the final three, will become distinguishing questions and be used in a second phase of informational data collection (Steps Five and Six).

The first category of this proposed method reflects Sweeney's category of gender. The book of Daniel indicates that Darius the Mede was male (Dan 6:14). The qualifying question for this category will be (1.): "Was the person male?" This category might at first seem superfluous, but is the most logical first question since it disqualifies half of the pool of possible candidates.

The second category of this proposed method is the candidate's socio-political classification. This category places the candidate at the scene of the event. The book of Daniel indicates that Darius the Mede was in Babylon after its fall to the Medo-Persians (Dan 5:31-6:27). The qualifying question for this category will be (2.): "Was this person involved with the fall of Babylon in 539 BC?" This question combines Sweeney's concept of geographic location[14] and Mykytiuk's concept of socio-political classification.[15] Because the socio-political classification of a person is intended to be a broader term than his "ethnicity" and "nationality," it should not mistakenly exclude potential candidates because the initial scope of investigation was too narrow. As Mykytiuk has pointed out, "[these] persons could be named in inscriptions of states and societies other than their own."[16] This is the case with the individual whom Daniel described as Darius the Mede; he was not originally a citizen of Babylon. This question is meant to determine if the candidate was in the right geographical area at the time of Babylon's fall in 539 BC.

The third category of this proposed method is the candidate's age at the time of the fall of Babylon (539 BC). The book of Daniel indicates that Darius the Mede was approximately sixty-two years old when the Medo-Persians conquered Babylon in 539 BC (Dan 5:31). The qualifying question for this category will be (3.): "Was this person approximately sixty-two years of age when Babylon fell in 539 BC?" This category reflects the combination of Mykytiuk's category of "date" and Sweeney's category of "date of birth."[17]

These first three categories will establish the minimum standard—the test of qualification determining whether or not a potential candidate will undergo further consideration.

---

[14] The concept of geographic origin refers to the location (usually current place residence) of an individual.

[15] Mykytiuk's concept of social-political classification refers to the then current location of an ancient person even though their name or ethnic epithet might indicate that they are "out of place"; see Mykytiuk, 47.

[16] Mykytiuk, 47. Mykytiuk's point is confirmed by Kent: "apparently not unusual for a person among the Persians to have a name which did not fit his geographical origin." See R. G. Kent, *Old Persian, AOS* 33 (New Haven, CT: American Oriental Society, 1953), 8, n. 1.

[17] An understanding of variations in dating systems will not be necessary as long as the approximate age can be established.

Distinguishing Categories

The second set of categories concerning the candidate's identity will include questions which will further distinguish one candidate from another. These final three questions will be called "distinguishing questions." For the candidates who have met the initial test of qualification, the final three distinguishing questions will help to determine the strength or weakness of the candidate's identification as Darius the Mede. If good evidence is found for these distinguishing questions, the reliability of the identification will increase; however, if there is a lack of evidence for these questions, the reliability of the identification will remain weak.[18] Negative evidence for these questions might require an explanation; furthermore, if there is no adequate explanation for the negative evidence, the candidate could eventually be disqualified.

The fourth category of this proposed method will concern the candidate's "heritage." The book of Daniel indicates that Darius the Mede was a Mede (Dan 5:31; 9:1; 11:1). The distinguishing question for this category will be (4.): "Could this person be described as a Mede?" The normal understanding of a person's heritage concerns one's nationality and ethnicity. The terms which describe one's heritage can overlap and may even seem to be contradictory (such as a Hebrew man also being a Babylonian), and so, they might require some discussion.

The fifth category of this proposed method will concern the candidate's kin relations. The book of Daniel indicates that Darius the Mede was the son of Ahasuerus (Dan 9:1). The distinguishing question for this category will be (5.): "Was this person a descendant of Ahasuerus?" As in Mykytiuk's method, the category of "relations" includes any "family and other interpersonal relations"[19] Therefore, the description of one's relationship to a father, wife, or son would be extremely helpful in establishing the strength and reliability of the candidate's identification.

The sixth category of this proposed method will concern the candidate's titles. The book of Daniel indicates that Darius the Mede was king of the Chaldeans (Dan 5:30-31; 9:1). The distinguishing question for this category will be (6): "Did this person rule as king of the Chaldeans?" The category of "titles" reflects the occupation or position of someone as they function in their society.[20]

This proposed method and its proposed categories of information might be useful in future investigations of other unrecognized persons in ancient history. The categories of this proposed method could be tailored to suit other investigations. Some categories might also be divided into subcategories which could include more details to fortify the reliability of the identification. The more specific the information, the greater the weight it can carry as evidence; and the greater the weight of the evidence, the more reliable will be the identification.

---

[18] The lack of informational data does not count against a proposed identification, because data may be found in the future which might strengthen the reliability of the proposed identification.

[19] Mykytiuk, 50.

[20] An example given by Mykytiuk: "the title *'ebed* implies that the master of the *'ebed* was a *melek*" [an *'ebed* is a servant, and a *melek* is a king]; see Mykytiuk, 52.

Step Two: List of Potential Candidates

Step Two involves the assembly of appropriate potential candidates who might possibly be identified as Darius the Mede. The initial list of candidates will be compiled by assembling all possible candidates of whom writers have theorized during the last century or so. Even though many will be disqualified by the first tier of category questions, at least they will show how this proposed method works.

Personal Data Sheet:

Subject (common name):

Categories of Qualifying Questions:

1. Gender:
   -Was this person male?
2. Socio-political classification:
   -Was this person involved in the taking of Babylon in 539 BC?
3. Age at fall of Babylon:
   -Was this person approximately 62 years old when Babylon fell in 539 BC?

Categories of Distinguishing Questions:

4. Heritage:
   -Could this person be described as a Mede?
5. Relations:
   -Was this person a descendant of Ahasuerus?
6. Titles:
   -Did this person rule as king of the Chaldeans?

Table 3.2 Example of Personal Data Sheet

Step Three: Collection of Qualifying Data

Informational data on potential candidates should be collected in two phases. Step Three is the first phase of data collection. Step Three should focus on the qualifying categories (# 1-3) and collect all available data for all the candidates in these three categories. The second phase of data collection will be restricted to those candidates who have been qualified by these questions. Data collection must be thoroughly done, since neglecting any information about a candidate might skew the results. After the data are collected, they should be recorded in the appropriate categories and used to answer the qualifying questions on individual Personal Data Sheets. Table 3.2 (above) provides an example of the Personal Data Sheet which should be compiled for each candidate.

Step Four: Charting of Qualifying Data

During Step Four the informational data should be arranged on a chart. The chart will help in analysis of the data and comparison of potential candidates. The heading at the top of each column of the chart should identify the potential candidate, and each row should be labeled with the categories of data. The information associated with that candidate should be placed underneath each candidate, in the column labeled for the candidate and in the appropriate category row.

After the information concerning each candidate has been placed in the appropriate columns and category rows (#1-3), the question of the candidate's qualification should then be assessed. An example of the Personal Data Chart is in Table 3.3 (below).

Personal Data Chart:

Subject:	Astyages	Cambyses	Cyaxares
Category:			
1. Gender (male?)	yes	yes	yes
2. Socio-political	no		
3. ~62 (age in 539 BC)	no		
Qualified? No=0; Yes =1	0		
4. Heritage			
5. Relations			
6. Titles			
Total Points:			

Table 3.3

Example of Personal Data Chart

Any candidate who has a negative answer in one or more of the three qualifying questions will not be qualified for further investigation. A zero (0) will be placed in the row labeled "Qualified?" under the column labeled for that candidate. In this sample chart (Table 3.3 above) some sample answers for questions concerning Astyages have already been entered. Since according to the sample chart Astyages has a negative response in one or more of the categories, he will be disqualified from continuing in this investigation. Because Astyages is disqualified, he will earn no points. A zero (0) has been placed under his name in the appropriate column and row. In this example, Astyages has been eliminated from further consideration (and therefore cannot increase his reliability score). In the final analysis, when his Grade of Identification is assessed, Astyages would receive a grade of "F" because his total score is zero (0). (See Table 3.5 on page 54.)

If there are no negative responses to the three qualifying questions, then that candidate will be considered to be "qualified," and he will earn one (1) point. One (1) point will be placed

on the Personal Data Chart in the candidate's column in the row labeled "Qualified?" After it has been determined which candidates are qualified, the second phase can begin.

Step Five: Collection of Distinguishing Data

Step Five begins the second phase of data collection and will be restricted to those candidates who have been qualified by the first tier categories. As previously mentioned, the second phase of the data collection process focuses on the distinguishing categories (# 4-6). The data collection should be as thorough as possible, since every piece of information will affect the assessment of the reliability of the candidate's identification. Once again, the informational data should be recorded in the appropriate categories (# 4-6) on the Personal Data Sheet for each candidate.

Step Six: Charting of Distinguishing Data

In Step Six (similar to Step Four) the information from the distinguishing questions which was recorded on the Personal Data Sheets should be arranged on the Personal Data Chart. The purpose of this chart is to help in analysis of the data and also the comparison and final assessment of the candidates' possible identification as Darius the Mede. The information associated with a particular candidate should be placed in the appropriate category row where it intersects the column labeled for that candidate.

This information in the second phase is handled differently from the information in the first phase. Instead of qualifying the candidate, as was the purpose of the first phase, the purpose of the second phase is to determine the strength or weakness of the candidate's proposed identification as Darius the Mede. The quality of the evidence gathered for each distinguishing category must be appraised and awarded a point value. Each category will have a maximum value of one point. For evidence which is less than excellent, partial points will be awarded (according to Table 3.4).

Point Value	Quality of evidence:
1.00 (100%)	Excellent
0.75 (75%)	Good
0.50 (50%)	Satisfactory
0.25 (25%)	Poor
0.00 (0%)	None

Table 3.4 Point Values for Quality of Evidence

Step Seven: Assessment of Grade of Identification

Finally, Step Seven is computing a Grade of Identification based on the value of the evidence for a candidate's identification as Darius the Mede.

In this method the candidates who were qualified by the qualifying questions earned a point value of one (1) point which was marked in the row labeled "Qualified?" (see Step Four). The three distinguishing questions (#4-6) have each been assigned a maximum point value of one (1) point. In Step Six, the quality of the evidence for each distinguishing question was appraised and points (or partial points) were awarded and placed into the appropriate rows and columns for each candidate. Now, in Step Seven the total of all the point values should be summed. The total point score will reflect a Grade of Identification for that particular candidate's identification as Darius the Mede.

The Grade of Identification is determined by the candidate's total points and its correspondence to a grade as indicated in Table 3.5 (below). Those candidates who were qualified by the qualifying questions have already earned "one (1) point" which was marked in the row labeled "Qualified?" If a candidate were to receive full credit in each of the three distinguishing categories, he would receive three (3) more points and his total points would be "4.0" and his Grade of Identification according to Table 3.5 would be an "A". A candidate who is qualified but does not earn any other points from the distinguishing categories would remain with a total of "1.0" point, and his Grade of Identification would be a "D". The correspondence of a candidate's total points to the Grades of Identification can be found in Table 3.5 (below).

Grades:	Total Points:
A	4.0
B	3.0
C	2.0
D	1.0
F	0.0

Table 3.5 Grades of Identification