

## CHAPTER 4

### EVIDENCE CONCERNING THE CANDIDATES

The purpose of this chapter is to report the details of the evidence collected for each candidate who might be identified as Darius the Mede. In chapter three, the proposed method of identification specified six categories of informational data. In phase one of this method, the aim of the first three categories is to answer three qualifying questions (#1-3) in order to qualify candidates to continue in this process. In phase two, the aim of the last three categories is to answer three distinguishing questions (#4-6) in order to prove the strength of the candidate's proposed identification as Darius the Mede. Next, the candidate's evidence is appraised and a point value is awarded based on the value of the evidence. The point values are placed into the Personal Data Chart; and after they are totaled, the candidate's Grade of Identification can be determined from Table 4.13 (page 122).

#### **Phase One: Qualifying Categories**

For this identification method, the first phase includes three categories which investigate questions of qualification. The collection of informational data on potential candidates was focused on these three qualifying categories (#1–3). The data collected were then used to answer the qualifying question for each category on a Personal Data Sheet created for each candidate. The information from the Personal Data Sheet was placed into the Personal Data Chart to help to determine which candidates were qualified for further consideration. The candidates with negative evidence in one or more of these categories were disqualified and did not continue into the second phase of this investigation.

The first category investigated the question of the candidate's gender. The question for this category is (1.): "Was this person male?" Answering the question of gender is a logical first question since it disqualifies half of the pool of possible candidates.

The second category investigated the following question of the candidate's socio-political classification. The question for this second category is (2.): "Was this person involved in the taking of Babylon in 539 BC?" The intent of this question is to determine if the candidate was at the scene of the event. This is not a question of "ethnicity" or "nationality" because the

participants of this event (the fall of Babylon in 539 BC) included many people of diverse backgrounds. The term “social-political” was developed to reduce the probability that potential candidates might be mistakenly excluded because the initial scope of investigation was too narrow.<sup>1</sup>

The third category investigated the question of the candidate’s age at the time of the fall of Babylon. The question for this category is (3.): “Was this person approximately sixty-two years of age when Babylon fell in 539 BC?” An approximate age is all that needs to be established to answer this question.

These first three categories establish the minimum standard—the test of qualification determining whether or not a potential candidate would undergo further consideration. Data relevant to these three categories and collected for each candidate will now be presented.

The initial roster of candidates who have the potential of being identified as Darius the Mede was made by reviewing the theories presented by biblical scholars and written during the last century. The initial roster of six potential candidates includes the following: 1) Astyages, 2) Cambyses II, 3) Cyaxares (II), 4) Cyrus the Great, 5) Darius the Great, and 6) Gubaru. Most of these potential candidates will be disqualified by the qualifying questions. A Personal Data Sheet has been created to help collect the individual data for each of these candidates (see Table 3.2 and Appendix L). The names of the candidates populate the row of “subjects” at the top of the columns on the Personal Data Chart (see Table 3.3 and Appendix M).

### 1. Data Concerning Astyages (r. 585-550 BC)

Astyages was the last king of the Medes before Cyrus defeated him and took his royal authority from him. Because he was the last king of the Medes before Cyrus’ takeover, some scholars have suggested that Astyages might have been Darius the Mede.<sup>2</sup> In the past, scholars have assumed that the national heritage of Darius, being a Mede (Dan 5:31), must place him in the royal line of the Mede kings descending through Cyaxares I and Astyages. Thus, since Astyages was a royal Mede, he naturally should be considered as a possible candidate to be identified as Darius the Mede.

John Whitcomb explains that some scholars have thought that Astyages was Darius the Mede based on Herodotus’ information “that Astyages, [was] the last Median king, [and] had no son” of his own.<sup>3</sup> John Lightfoot’s argument that Astyages was Darius the Mede is as follows:

---

<sup>1</sup> Mykytiuk’s concept of social-political classification refers to the then current locations of an ancient person even though their name or ethnic epithet might indicate that he is “out of place”; see Lawrence J. Mykytiuk, *Identifying Biblical Persons in Northwest Semitic Inscriptions of 1200-539 B.C.E.* (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2004), 47.

<sup>2</sup> A recent scholar who has suggested that Astyages was Darius the Mede was Bern Alfrink in his article “Darius Medus,” in *Biblica*, viii, 1927: 330. H. H. Rowley in his book, *Darius the Mede* lists the following scholars as holding to the theory that Astyages was Darius the Mede: Syncellus, Cedrenus, John Lightfoot, J. Marsham, G. Winer, M. von Niebuhr, Westcott, G. Unger, and B. Alfrink. Harold H. 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), 30.

<sup>3</sup> John Whitcomb, *Darius the Mede: A Study in Historical Identification* (Grand Rapids, MI: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1959), 43.

The general consent of all the writers of the best repute among the heathen, [was] that there was no king of Media at the time, but only Astyages, Cyrus's grandfather; we may very well conclude, that this Darius, and their Astyages, were all one, —and that Darius, because of his grandfathership, did bear the name of the royalty, though Cyrus in this conquest had equal share with him.<sup>4</sup>

Harold Rowley noticed that the theory that Astyages was Darius the Mede, proposed by Bern Alfrink, capitalized on the lack of evidence, and he summarized Alfrink's argument: "We have no reason to know that they could not be identified than that we have definite indications pointing to their identification."<sup>5</sup> Here, Alfrink has made the common mistake of giving weight to the absence of evidence.

In the contemporary cuneiform contract tablets of that time there is no mention of Astyages as a king of Babylon, nor as a king of anything in 539 BC. Astyages is mentioned in two cuneiform documents which are proximate to the time of Cyrus' rise to power and Babylon's fall in 539 BC: the Nabonidus Chronicle<sup>6</sup> (ii.1-4), and the Nabonidus Cylinder<sup>7</sup> (¶ 4).

The Nabonidus Chronicle records the campaign of Astyages (Akkadian, *Is-tu-me-gu*) in 550 BC<sup>8</sup> against Cyrus (ii.1) and his army's rebellion against him resulting in his delivery into the hands of Cyrus (ii.2). Consequently, Cyrus marches to the royal capital of the Medes and carries off the treasure ("booty") of Astyages and his city to Cyrus' own royal city, Anshan (ii.3-4).

The Nabonidus Cylinder (¶ 4) reports that Astyages was "the king of the Medes." This cuneiform text records a dream of Nabonidus in which Marduk spoke to him. In the first column of the Nabonidus Cylinder, Marduk prophesied in Nabonidus' dream that the Medes<sup>9</sup> who had destroyed the temple of the god Sin in Harran would soon "be no more."<sup>10</sup> The following paragraph of the Nabonidus Cylinder then describes how "Cyrus, the king of Anshan, his second in rank. . . scattered the vast Median hordes with his small army. He captured Astyages, the king of the Medes, and took him to his country as captive."<sup>11</sup>

Much more is learned about Astyages through the classical historians. Herodotus reports that Astyages, the heir of Cyaxares to the Median throne, was present at the peace covenant made between the Lydians and the Medes on May 28, 585 BC.<sup>12</sup> Part of this peace covenant included the marriage of Astyages, the Crown Prince of the Medes, to Aryenis, the daughter of the Lydian king, Alyattes. By this marriage Astyages became brother-in-law to the

<sup>4</sup> John Lightfoot, *The Whole Works of the Reverend John Lightfoot*, vol. 2, ed. John Pitman (London: J. F. Dove, 1822), 309.

<sup>5</sup> Rowley, 32. Rowley directs the reader to Alfrink's work, "Darius Medus," in *Biblica*, viii, 1927: 330 (316-340). Alfrink supports his argument on the "fact" that the text has been corrupted, and the name for Astyages father, Cyaxares, might have been unknown by the scribe who switched the name to Ahasuerus.

<sup>6</sup> Nabonidus Chronicle. Translation and other information provided in Appendix B.

<sup>7</sup> Nabonidus Cylinder. Translation and other information provided in Appendix C.

<sup>8</sup> Robert Drews considers an earlier date, possibly as early as 554 BC, for the fall of Astyages; see Robert Drews, "The Fall of Astyages and Herodotus' Chronology of the Eastern Kingdoms" *Historia: Zeitschrift für Alte Geschichte*, Vol. 18, No. 1 (Jan., 1969): 1-11.

<sup>9</sup> Here *Umman-manda*, referring to the Medes, is used as a pejorative term generally meaning "barbarians."

<sup>10</sup> Nabonidus Cylinder ¶ 4.

<sup>11</sup> Nabonidus Cylinder ¶ 5.

<sup>12</sup> Herodotus I.75 (Many relevant passages from Herodotus are provided in Appendix G).

heir to the Lydian kingdom, Croesus.<sup>13</sup> Soon after this marriage, Astyages' father Cyaxares died, and Astyages began his reign as king of the Medes.<sup>14</sup> Astyages reign ended around 550 BC, during the sixth year of Nabonidus, when he was defeated and taken captive by Cyrus.<sup>15</sup> Astyages had no male issue,<sup>16</sup> but was the father of Mandane, whom he married to Cambyses, a Persian,<sup>17</sup> making Astyages the grandfather of Cyrus,<sup>18</sup> and making Cyrus the heir to the Median throne.<sup>19</sup>

The fact that Astyages had no male issue is further confirmed by the claims of the two Medes who rebelled against Darius the Great, and who tried to reestablish an independent Median kingdom in 522-521 BC. Since the only known lineage from Astyages was through his grandson, Cyrus, the rebels, Phraortes and Sitrantachmes, had to claim royal rights as descendants of Cyaxares, Astyages father.<sup>20</sup> T. Cuyler Young, Jr, an expert on the ancient Medes and Persians, confirmed the royal lineage of these Median kings:

The last two kings of the Medes in Herodotus' history are well documented in the cuneiform sources. Astyages is clearly the Ištuwigu of the Babylonian Chronicle's report on the conquest of the Medes by Cyrus II and the Persians. Since we can firmly date that event to 550 B.C., then, taking a risk and using Herodotus' chronology, we can say that Astyages came to the Median throne about 585 B.C. Cyaxares is the Umakištar of an earlier Babylonian Chronicle which tells the story of the collapse of Assyria and the fall of Nineveh. Cyaxares is reported to have led the Medes (often elsewhere in the Chronicle called the Umman-manda, an historical generalization for barbarians from the Zagros) in 614 B.C. against the Assyrian city of Arrapha and to have then gone on unsuccessfully to besiege Nineveh. In 612 B.C., however, he was back in Mesopotamia with his Median army and joined the Babylonians in the capture of the great Assyrian capital city on the banks of the Tigris River. These data are roughly compatible with the chronology of Herodotus, for, if Cyaxares ruled for forty years before Astyages came to his throne, his dates would be c. 625-585 B.C. Thus, two of the royal names in the Median line of Herodotus can be found in contemporary sources. [See also *ABC Chronicle* 7.11.1, 2; 3.29, 47.]<sup>21</sup>

Even though his work is now somewhat outdated, George Rawlinson gave an extremely generous estimate of the youngest possible age that Astyages could have been when he was deposed by Cyrus: "Old age was creeping upon the sonless king. If he was sixteen or seventeen

---

<sup>13</sup> Herodotus I.73-74.

<sup>14</sup> Herodotus I.107.

<sup>15</sup> Herodotus I.75, 130; *cf.* Nabonidus Chronicle ii.2.

<sup>16</sup> Herodotus I.109.

<sup>17</sup> Herodotus I.107.

<sup>18</sup> Herodotus I.75.

<sup>19</sup> Herodotus I.109. In Beaulieu's translation of the Nabonidus Cylinder ¶ 5 (Appendix C), Cyrus is called the "second in rank" to Astyages. This phrase might indicate that Nabonidus recognized Cyrus as the heir-apparent to the otherwise heirless Astyages.

<sup>20</sup> Behistun Inscription of Darius the Great, II, ¶ 5; and ¶ 14. Herodotus, George Rawlinson, Henry Creswicke Rawlinson, and John Gardner Wilkinson. *The History of Herodotus. A New English Version, Ed. with Copious Notes and Appendices* (New York: D. Appleton and Co., 1889), 497, 501.

<sup>21</sup> T. Cuyler Young, Jr., "The Early History of the Medes and the Persians and the Achaemenid Empire to the Death of Cambyses," in *The Cambridge Ancient History*. ed. John Boardman, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988), 17.

years old at the time of his contract of marriage with Aryênis, he must have been nearly seventy in B.C. 558, when the revolt occurred which terminated both his reign and his kingdom.”<sup>22</sup> Therefore, if the youngest that Astyages could have been in 558 BC was 70 years old; then nineteen years later in 539 BC, the year that Babylon was taken by Cyrus, the youngest that Astyages could have been was 89 years old.<sup>23</sup>

Personal Data Sheet:	
Subject: Astyages	
<u>Categories of Qualification:</u>	
1. Gender:	
-Was this person male?	<b>Yes</b>
2. Socio-political classification:	
-Was this person involved in the taking of Babylon in 539 BC?	<b>NA</b>
3. Age at fall of Babylon:	
-Was this person approximately 62 years old when Babylon fell in 539 BC?	<b>No</b> (was at least 89 years old)

Table 4.1 Astyages’ Personal Data Sheet (Phase One)

A better estimate of the true age of Astyages can be computed by the details reported by Berossus, the Babylonian historian (third century BC), concerning the joint campaign of the Medes and Babylonians against Nineveh in 614 BC. Berossus reports that in order to establish a long-term alliance between the Medes and the Babylonians, a daughter of Astyages (the crown prince<sup>24</sup> of the Medes) was married to Nebuchadnezzar (the crown prince of the Babylonians).<sup>25</sup> Gadd refers to these events, their participants, and the ancient evidence

<sup>22</sup> George Rawlinson, *The Seven Great Monarchies of the Ancient Eastern World* (New York: Burt, 1875), 110.

<sup>23</sup> Even John Lightfoot admits that Astyages “was far the older man, and because indeed he was Cyrus’s grandfather,” see Lightfoot, 309.

<sup>24</sup> It seems that the king’s sons were often associated with the kingship of their fathers. Maybe this also established the inheritance of the crown prince’s firstborn (being born during the crown prince’s co-regency instead of before).

<sup>25</sup> Berossus’ account is reported by Alexander Polyhistor and by Abydenus.

“Now after Samuges, Sardanapallus reigned over the Chaldaeans for 21 years. But he [Nabopolassar] sent an army to the aid of Ashdahak, the Chief and satrap of the Medes, in order to take Amuhean, one of the daughters of Ashdahak, as wife for his son Nabukodrossoros” (Alexander Polyhistor in Eusebius, *Chronicles I*, 29,14).

“After him, Sarakos reigned over the Assyrians. And, being informed that an army like locusts was coming up from the sea to attack him, he sent the general Busalossoros in haste to Babylon. But the latter, planning to revolt, first betrothed Amuhean, the daughter of Ashahek, prince of the Medes, to his son Nabukodrossoros. Departing straightway, he marched to attack Ninus, that is to say, the city of Nineveh. But king Sarakos, being

supporting them in his book published by the British Museum, *The Fall of Nineveh* (1923).<sup>26</sup> Thus Astyages was old enough in 614 BC to have a daughter of marriageable age (~15 years old). Therefore, Astyages was probably nearly a hundred years old when his kingdom fell to Cyrus (553-550 BC). The extremely old age of Astyages is supported by (and also helps to explain) the report in the Nabonidus Cylinder where Cyrus is compared to Astyages and according to some translations is called Astyages' "young servant."<sup>27</sup>

No documents have been found which confirm that Astyages was present at the fall of Babylon in 539 BC.

## 2. Data Concerning Cambyses II (r. 530-522 BC)

Cambyses II and his father Cyrus were the first Medo-Persian rulers to perform the New Year's ceremony and be granted the kingship of Babylon by the god Nabu. As the son of Cyrus, Cambyses acted as co-regent with his father who placed him on the throne of Babylon.<sup>28</sup> Because of Cambyses' reign on the throne of Babylon and the many contract tablets<sup>29</sup> which confirm his co-regency during Cyrus' first year (see Appendix J), some scholars have suggested that Cambyses might have been Darius the Mede.<sup>30</sup> The cuneiform records and the ancient historians provide ample information concerning the life and duration of Cambyses' reigns.

The evidence that Cambyses was in Babylon and reigned with his father, Cyrus, as King of Babylon, is firmly established. Many contemporary cuneiform contract tablets report that Cambyses, the son of Cyrus the Great, reigned as king of Babylon jointly with Cyrus during his first year (538 BC) in Babylon.<sup>31</sup> This first Cambyses' co-regency lasted for less than a year.<sup>32</sup>

informed of all these things, burnt himself and his royal palace, and Nabukodossoros received the rule over the kingdom and surrounded Babylon with a strong wall" (Abydenus in Eusebuis, *Chronicles I*, 35,28-37,13).

<sup>26</sup> Gadd identifies Ashahak to be the name Astyages (and also identities Nebuchadnezzar [Nabukodrossoros] and Amytis [Amuheha], the daughter of Astyages). C.J. Gadd, *The Fall of Nineveh: The Newly Discovered Babylonian Chronicle, No. 21901, in the British Museum*. (London: Trustees of the British Museum, 1923), 11.

<sup>27</sup> Nabonidus Cylinder i.28-33. Charles Ball translated this as "young servant" in an early translation of the Nabonidus Cylinder. Charles Ball, *Light from the East*, (London: Eyre and Spottiswoode, 1899), 209. Beaulieu's translation of this phrase can be found in Appendix C.

<sup>28</sup> Young, 47.

<sup>29</sup> Waldo H. Dubberstein, "The Chronology of Cyrus and Cambyses," *American Journal of Semitic Languages and Literature* 55, 1938: 417-418.

<sup>30</sup> H. H. Rowley offers the following scholars as holding to the theory that Cambyses II was Darius the Mede: H. Winkler, P. Riessler, and Charles Boufflower.

<sup>31</sup> Waldo H. Dubberstein was one of the first to note that nine documents during the first year of Cambyses' reign as "king of Babylon" include some variation of the formula referring to "at that time or in those days Cyrus his father was king of Lands... all dated to the first year, range from the second to the ninth month" See his article: Waldo H. Dubberstein, "The Chronology of Cyrus and Cambyses," *AJSLL* 55, 1938: 417-18. Others have shown that these documents confirm the co-regency of Cyrus and Cambyses during the nine months of Cyrus' first year. See Mariano San Nicolò, *Beiträge zu einer Prosopographie neubabylonischer Beamten der Zivil- und Tempelverwaltung*. (München. Bayerische Akademie der Wissenschaften. Sitzungsberichte. Philos.-hist, Abt. Jahrg.1941: Bd 2:H.2. 1941), 51-54; G. Frame, "Neo-Babylonian and Achaemenid Economic Texts from the Sippar Collection of the British Museum," *JAOS* 104, 1984: 747-48; and A. L. Oppenheim, "The Babylonian Evidence of Achaemenian Rule in Mesopotamia," *Cambridge History of Iran*, vol. 2, ed. Ilya Gershevitch (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985), 558-59.

In 530 BC Cambyses was once again installed as co-regent with his father Cyrus, right before his father's last and fatal expedition in the East. After Cyrus' death, Cambyses married his sisters, presumably to preclude any rival claim to the throne by way of marriage to one of Cyrus' daughters.<sup>33</sup> Most likely, Cambyses also secretly ordered the murder of his own brother named Smerdis (also known as Bardiya). Cambyses' fratricide opened the way later for the imposter "Pseudo-Smerdis" to usurp the Empire's throne.<sup>34</sup>

The ancient sources remove any doubt that Cambyses was the son and legitimate heir to Cyrus the Great. In the account on the Cyrus Cylinder, Cyrus and his son Cambyses are described as blessed by the Babylonian god, Marduk: "Marduk, the great lord, rejoiced over [my good] deeds. He sent gracious blessing upon me, Cyrus, the king who worships him, and upon Cambyses, the son who is [my] offspring."<sup>35</sup>

Personal Data Sheet:	
Subject: Cambyses	
<u>Categories of Qualification:</u>	
1. Gender:	
-Was this person male?	<b>Yes</b>
2. Socio-political classification:	
-Was this person involved in the taking of Babylon in 539 BC?	<b>Yes</b>
3. Age at fall of Babylon:	
-Was this person approximately 62 years old when Babylon fell in 539 BC?	<b>No</b> (he was a biological son of Cyrus, who was ~ 62 years old)

Table 4.2 Cambyses' Personal Data Sheet (Phase One)

Biology would dictate that if Cambyses is the natural son of Cyrus then the age of Cambyses must be less than that of his father, Cyrus. Although modern scholars might give varying estimates of Cyrus' age, the only ancient evidence available indicates that Cyrus was approximately 62 years old when Babylon fell in 539 BC (see Appendix H). If the age of Cyrus was approximately 62 years at time of the fall of Babylon in 539 BC, then it is impossible that

---

<sup>32</sup> Oppenheim discusses the possible cause of Cambyses' short nine-month co-regency in 538 BC. He suggests that Cyrus removed Cambyses because of his continuing conflict with Babylonian priests (which began on New Year 538 BC when he was installed as co-regent). See his chapter, "The Babylonian Evidence of Achaemenian Rule in Mesopotamia," in *The Cambridge History of Iran*, vol. 2, ed. Ilya Gershevitch (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985), 554-59.

<sup>33</sup> Herodotus, III.31, 32, 68.

<sup>34</sup> Albert Olmstead, *History of the Persian Empire*. (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1948), 109.

<sup>35</sup> Cyrus Cylinder, 26-27.

Cambyses could also be 62 years of age in 539 BC.<sup>36</sup> Based on the age of Cyrus, the age of Cambyses at the fall of Babylon would probably not be greater than 42, well short of the age of 62 which is specified for Darius the Mede.

### 3. Data Concerning Cyaxares (II) (r. ? - ? BC)

According to Xenophon, Cyaxares (II)<sup>37</sup> was the son of Astyages, the uncle of Cyrus, and the last Median king (following Astyages). Because these details seem fitting, the suggestion has been made that Cyaxares (II) might be Darius the Mede. Siegfried Horn wrote that “there is some evidence favoring the view that he [Darius the Mede] was Cyaxares II.”<sup>38</sup> Later Josephus followed Xenophon’s cue and provided for a possible harmony of Cyaxares (II) with Daniel’s report of Darius the Mede.<sup>39</sup> Since then other biblical scholars have followed Josephus’ suggestion and theorized that Cyaxares (II) might have been Darius the Mede.<sup>40</sup> The problem is that there is no sound evidence that Cyaxares (II) ever existed. Not until Xenophon’s historical romance did this person appear. Neither of the classic histories of Herodotus or Ctesias mentioned Cyaxares (II) or any other son of Astyages.

In the contemporary cuneiform contract tablets of that time, there is no mention of Cyaxares (II). In the historiographical texts only Cyaxares (I),<sup>41</sup> the father of Astyages, is mentioned in a portion of the Babylonian Chronicle which covered the tenth to the seventeenth years of Nabopolassar (Nebuchadnezzar’s father). No other Cyaxares is mentioned in any extant contemporary cuneiform documents.<sup>42</sup>

As mentioned above, Xenophon was the first to suggest the existence of Cyaxares (II). Xenophon makes Cyaxares (II) the son of Astyages and uncle of Cyrus. Xenophon’s assertion concerning the existence of Cyaxares (II) has no support in contemporary sources and

<sup>36</sup> As part of his theory that Cambyses is Darius the Mede, Charles Boufflower has suggested that Cambyses was only twelve years old when he was installed as king of Babylon in 538 BC. The idea that Cambyses was only twelve years old is based on a theory of textual corruption which involves the misunderstanding of numeric symbols. His theory is speculation at best. See Charles Boufflower, *In and Around the Book of Daniel* (London: Society for the Promotion of Christian Knowledge, 1923), 156-167.

<sup>37</sup> To differentiate the father of Astyages, Cyaxares [I] from the Cyaxares of Xenophon’s *Cyropaedia*, this Cyaxares is described as “the second” [“(II)”] even though there is no real evidence beyond Xenophon’s historical romance that this Cyaxares (II) existed.

<sup>38</sup> Siegfried Horn, “Babylon’s Fall and Persia’s Rise,” *Review and Herald* April 16, 1964: 11.

<sup>39</sup> Josephus states, “Darius was the son of Astyages, and had another name among the Greeks,” *Antiquities of the Jews*, X.xi.4.

<sup>40</sup> This is a list of some of the scholars who have suggested that Cyaxares (II) was Darius the Mede: Carl F. Keil, *The Book of Daniel*, Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1948, 194-200; Joseph Knabenbauer, *Commentarius in Danielem prophetam, Lamentationes et Baruch*. *Cursus scripturae sacrae*. *Commentariorum in U. T. : In libros propheticos*, 4. Paris: P. Lethielleux, 1891; W. S. Auchincloss, “Darius the Median,” *The Bibliotheca Sacra: A Religious and Sociological Quarterly*, ed G. Fredrick Wright, Oberlin, OH: Bibliotheca Sacra Company, 1909: 536-538 (who five years after publishing his commentary has changed his view from Darius to Cyaxares). Rowley also lists many supporters of the Cyaxares (II) view: Prideaux, Lowth, Hengstenberg, Rosenmuller, Havernick, Dereser, Kranfield and others. See Rowley, 37.

<sup>41</sup> Cyaxares is signified as “Cyaxares (I)” (“the first”) only to clearly differentiate him from Xenophon’s fictional son of Astyages, “Cyaxares (II).”

<sup>42</sup> Amelie Kuhrt suggests that in Xenophon and writers following him “the roles of Cyaxares and Astyages are reversed.” Amelie Kuhrt, *The Persian Empire a Corpus of Sources from the Achaemenid Period* (London: Routledge, 2007), 45.



contradicts Herodotus. According to Herodotus, Astyages had no male issue and his daughter Mandane was the only heir (even though a female) to the Median crown.<sup>43</sup> The fact that Astyages had no male issue is confirmed by the later claims of the two Medes who rebelled against Darius I and tried to reestablish an independent Median kingdom in 522-521 BC. Both rebels, Phraortes and Sitrantachmes, claimed to be descendants of Cyaxares (I), the father of Astyages.<sup>44</sup> Their tenuous claims through Cyaxares (I) were necessary, since the only lineage which descended from Astyages was through his grandson, Cyrus.

Another problem for the Cyaxares (II) theory is that the narrative of Xenophon does not place Cyaxares (II) in or about Babylon either before or after its fall to Cyrus. Instead, a fair reading of Xenophon describes the meeting of Cyrus with Cyaxares (II) and the army in the fields of newly-conquered Syria. After this meeting and before the Medo-Persian army conquers Lydia and Babylon, Cyaxares (II) and a third of the army immediately departed to go back home to protect Media while Cyrus and the army began their campaign against Babylon.<sup>45</sup> According to Xenophon's story, Cyrus again meets Cyaxares (II) after the fall of Babylon. Cyrus tells Cyaxares (II) that a palace is ready for him whenever he wants to visit Babylon (a detail which must be told Cyaxares (II) because he has not been to Babylon).<sup>46</sup> And so in this story, Cyaxares (II) stays in Media,<sup>47</sup> and Cyrus appoints the satraps in Babylon.<sup>48</sup>

Personal Data Sheet:	
Subject: Cyaxares (II)	
<u>Categories of Qualification:</u>	
1. Gender:	
-Was this person male?	<b>Yes</b>
2. Socio-political classification:	
-Was this person involved in the taking of Babylon in 539 BC?	<b>No</b>
3. Age at fall of Babylon:	
-Was this person approximately 62 years old when Babylon fell in 539 BC?	<b>NA</b>

Table 4.3 Cyaxares' Personal Data Sheet (Phase One)

<sup>43</sup> Herodotus I.109.

<sup>44</sup> Behistun Inscription II, ¶ 5; and ¶ 14.

<sup>45</sup> Xenophon, *Cyropaedia*, VI.iii.2.

<sup>46</sup> Xenophon, VIII.v.17.

<sup>47</sup> Xenophon, VIII.v.19.

<sup>48</sup> Xenophon, VIII.vi.1.

None of these details concerning Cyaxares (II) have any corroboration from primary sources or any other source before Xenophon's time. These particular details of this historical romance appear fictional. Even so, if there was a Cyaxares (II), Xenophon is the closest and only witness to his existence and actions. Since Xenophon, as the only witness to Cyaxares (II) and his actions, does not at any time place him in Babylon, does not describe him as Babylon's king, nor is the Chaldean kingdom described as being delivered into his possession, Cyaxares (II) cannot possibly qualify to be Darius the Mede.

The age of Cyaxares (II), whom Xenophon describes as the son of Astyages, the uncle of Cyrus (the brother of Cyrus' mother, Mandane), is reported by Xenophon to be greater than Cyrus' age.<sup>49</sup> Even then, Xenophon does not provide exact information concerning how much older Cyaxares (II) was than Cyrus. (Was he one year older or many years older?) Therefore, no estimate will be ventured as to Cyaxares' (II) approximate age at the time of the fall of Babylon.

#### 4. Data Concerning Cyrus the Great (600-530 BC; r. 559-530 BC)

Cyrus the Great was the king of the Medes and the Persians who conquered Babylon in 539 BC. Because Cyrus fits the profile of Darius the Mede, the suggestion has been made that he might have been Darius the Mede. Over fifty years ago, Donald Wiseman, head of the Department of Western Asiatic Antiquities of The British Museum, mentioned in a radio broadcast that there was cuneiform evidence that Cyrus was called "the king of the Medes."<sup>50</sup>

The facts concerning Cyrus' life are well documented. Contemporary cuneiform contract tablets document Cyrus' reign over the empire from 539 to 530 BC.<sup>51</sup> In the Cyrus Cylinder, Cyrus the Great claimed, "I am Cyrus, king of the world, great king, mighty king, king of Babylon, king of Sumer and Akkad, king of the four quarters, the son of Cambyses, great king, king of Anšan, grandson of Cyrus, great king, king of Anšan, descendant of Teispes, great king, king of Anšan."<sup>52</sup> His rise to power is reported in both the Nabonidus Chronicle<sup>53</sup> and the Nabonidus Cylinder.<sup>54</sup> Cyrus is mentioned and prophesied against throughout the Verse Account of Nabonidus.<sup>55</sup> Other kinds of inscriptions also attest to his life and reign: temple bricks in Ur and Uruk,<sup>56</sup> and the palaces and inscriptions of later rulers (such as the inscription of Darius the Great at Behistun).<sup>57</sup>

---

<sup>49</sup> Xenophon, 8.5, 19.

<sup>50</sup> Donald Wiseman, "Last Days of Babylon." *Christianity Today*, II, No., 4, (Nov. 25, 1957), 10.

<sup>51</sup> Muhammad A. Dandamayev, "Cambyses," *Encyclopaedia Iranica Online*, 2009, ([www.iranica.com](http://www.iranica.com), accessed Dec 3, 2009) available on the internet at <http://www.iranica.com/newsite/articles/unicode/v4f7/v4f7a012.html>.

<sup>52</sup> Cyrus Cylinder, 20-21 (Appendix F).

<sup>53</sup> Nabonidus Chronicle ii.1-4 (appendix B).

<sup>54</sup> Nabonidus Cylinder ¶ 4 & 5 (Appendix C).

<sup>55</sup> Verse Account of Nabonidus (Appendix D).

<sup>56</sup> A. L. Oppenheim, "The Babylonian Evidence of Achaemenian Rule of Mesopotamia," in *The Cambridge History of Iran*, Vol. 2, ed. by Ilya Gershevitch (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985), 553.

<sup>57</sup> Behistun Inscription of Darius the Great, II, ¶ 5; II, ¶ 14. Herodotus, George Rawlinson, Henry Creswicke Rawlinson, and John Gardner Wilkinson. *The History of Herodotus. A New English Version, Ed. with Copious Notes and Appendices* (New York: D. Appleton and Co., 1889), 497, 501.

All accounts place Cyrus the Great in Babylon after its fall in 539 BC. Kuhrt reports that “the only other chronologically fixed data for Cyrus (aside from his death) are contained in the Babylonian Chronicle. . . . It records Cyrus’ defeat of the Median ruler, Astyages, in 550, and Cyrus’ conquest of Babylonia in 539.”<sup>58</sup>

Herodotus confirms Cyrus’ heritage and descent from Cambyses I and Mandane.<sup>59</sup> Dinon, the fourth century BC historian, is the only source to report Cyrus’ age at his death (see Appendix H): “For he lived to his seventieth year, having begun to reign at forty.”<sup>60</sup> Most modern scholars agree with the basic chronological details concerning Cyrus’ life and death. A. Shapur Shahbazi reports the statistics of Cyrus’s life: “Cyrus the Great was born in 600 b.c.e., lived seventy years. . . and died in 530 b.c.e.”<sup>61</sup> Muhammad A. Dandamayev asserts that Herodotus’ report of the parents and heritage of Cyrus the Great is the most trustworthy.<sup>62</sup> Dandamayev also agrees with Dinon’s account of Cyrus’ reign and death.<sup>63</sup> Even Rowley, who considered Darius the Mede a confusing conflation of details from other kings and the age of Cyrus, also confirms the math: “It would appear that Cyrus was in the neighborhood of sixty-two years of age at the time of his annexation of the Babylonian empire in 538 B.C.”<sup>64</sup>

Both Greek historians and Jewish tradition have long agreed that Cyrus was about forty years of age when he began to reign and reigned for about thirty years. After Rowley’s book, *Darius the Mede and the Four World Empires*, and his equation of the age of Cyrus with the age of Darius the Mede, and after Donald Wiseman’s suggestion that Darius the Mede might be another name for Cyrus the Great, some have begun to question the authority of Dinon

<sup>58</sup> Kuhrt, *Persian Empire*, 48.

<sup>59</sup> Herodotus, I.107-108; VII.11.

<sup>60</sup> Dinon is quoted by Cicero in *De Divinatione* I.xxiii(46): “nam ad septuagesimum pervenit, cum quadraginta natus annos regnare coepisset” (for he lived to his seventieth year, having begun to reign at forty). The Latin text is available in *De Divinatione* by Cicero published in the Loeb’s Classical Library, 1923. The English translation is available on the internet at [http://penelope.uchicago.edu/Thayer/E/Roman/Texts/Cicero/de\\_Divinatione/1\\*.html](http://penelope.uchicago.edu/Thayer/E/Roman/Texts/Cicero/de_Divinatione/1*.html). In his work *De Divinatione*, Cicero ridicules the belief in divination. In this polemic, he mentions many well-known historical events (besides the age of Cyrus the Great) which he reports were written by poets and historians.

<sup>61</sup> A. Shapur Shahbazi, “Cyrus I,” *Encyclopaedia Iranica Online*, 2009, ([www.iranica.com](http://www.iranica.com), accessed Dec 3, 2009) available on the internet at <http://www.iranica.com/newsite/articles/unicode/v6f5/v6f5a026.html>. Shahbazi cites Dinon as his authority for this information: Dinon, Jacoby, *Fragmente* II p. 90 fr. 8.

<sup>62</sup> Muhammad A. Dandamayev states the following concerning Cyrus being the product of the union between Cambyses I and Mardane: “Most modern scholars regard this version as reliable (Cameron, 1936:224, n. 33; P’jankov 1971b:83ff.; Weissbach 1924; cols 1128ff.)” See Muhammad A. Dandamayev, *A Political History of the Achaemenid Empire* (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1989), 10.

<sup>63</sup> Dandamayev’s source is Dinon as quoted by Cicero (*De Divinatione* 1.23.46). He follows the Greek historian Dinon, who reported that Cyrus became king when he was forty years old and then ruled for thirty years. As Cyrus died in 530 b.c.e., he must have been born around 600 b.c.e. and must have succeeded his father as king of Persia in 559 b.c.e. (cf. Stronach, p. 286).” See Muhammad A. Dandamayev, “Cyrus I,” *Encyclopaedia Iranica Online*, 2009, ([www.iranica.com](http://www.iranica.com), accessed Dec 3, 2009) available on the internet at <http://www.iranica.com/newsite/articles/unicode/v6f5/v6f5a026.html>.

<sup>64</sup> Rowley, 55. In note 5, Rowley points out that Bengel came to the same conclusion concerning Cyrus being sixty-two at the fall of Babylon (see J. Bengel, *Ordo temporum a principio per periodas oeconomiae divinae historicas atque propheticas ad finem usque*, 1770, 181). In note 6, Rowley lists all the ancient witnesses to Cyrus’ age—those not already mentioned above are as follows: “Cicero gives Dinon as his authority. Ctesias (see Muller, *Ctes. Cn. Frag.*, p. 63a) and Justin (*Hist. Phil.* I. viii, 14, ed. Gronovius, I, p. 60) also assign Cyrus a reign of thirty years, while Herodotus (*Hist.* i. 214, Loeb ed., I, p. 268) assigns him a reign of twenty-nine years, and Sulpicius Severus (*Hist. Sacr.* II.ix, ed. Migne, col. 133, or ed. Halm, p. 64, ET, p. 101) a reign of thirty-one years. Xenophon, as has been above said, allows Cyrus a reign of but nine years.”

concerning Cyrus' age. But as Kuhrt has already confirmed, the only chronological facts concerning Cyrus in the cuneiform record are his defeat of Astyages and his conquering of Babylon and the time of his death.<sup>65</sup> Cicero is the one who has preserved Dinon's original record of Cyrus' age at his death.<sup>66</sup> Cicero's record of Dinon's account should be trusted because he was not trying to establish the age of Cyrus; but Cicero was using the (then) well-known fact of Cyrus' age as an example to make one of his points against divination. There is no other evidence which contradicts the fact that Cyrus was about seventy years of age when he died in 530 BC.<sup>67</sup>

Personal Data Sheet:	
Subject: Cyrus the Great	
<u>Categories of Qualification:</u>	
1. Gender:	
-Was this person male?	<b>Yes</b>
2. Socio-political classification:	
-Was this person involved in the taking of Babylon in 539 BC?	<b>Yes</b>
3. Age at fall of Babylon:	
-Was this person approximately 62 years old when Babylon fell in 539 BC?	<b>Yes</b>

Table 4.4 Cyrus' Personal Data Sheet (Phase One)

<sup>65</sup> Kuhrt, *Persian Empire*, 48.

<sup>66</sup> Dinon is quoted by Cicero in *De Divinatione* I.xxiii(46). (See Appendix H).

<sup>67</sup> Some modern historians have surmised that Cyrus was not this age (70) at his death. Two theories have arisen to discredit Dinon's account of Cyrus' age. One theory is that Cyrus could not be called the "young servant" of the god Marduk (as he is in lines i.27-28 of an older translation of the Nabonidus Cylinder by Charles Ball, *Light from the East*, (London: Eyre and Spottiswoode, 1899), 209) if Cyrus was around fifty years of age at the time. Of course, if Cyrus was younger than Astyages (definitely) or younger than the writer, Nabonidus (highly probable), he could easily be described as "young." More recent translations reflect a better understanding of the text (see Appendix C). Cyrus is not described as the "young servant" of the god but as "second in rank" to Astyages. The modern translation understands the referent to be Astyages, and so the cuneiform document is describing the relationship between Cyrus and Astyages. Therefore, with either translation ("young servant" or "second in rank"), the account describes Cyrus relative to Astyages.

Dandamaev reports of other theories why Dinon's account has been doubted. (For the full discussion see Dandamaev, *A Political History*, 11.) In Herodotus' description of Astyages' plot to kill Cyrus as a baby, Astyages was worried that Cyrus would take his throne. The supposed problem here is that Astyages did not come to the throne until 585 BC; and if Cyrus was born in 600 BC, then Herodotus' story concerning Astyages' plot doesn't make sense, since Astyages is not yet reigning. This supposed problem is easily reduced on two counts. The first criticism of this theory is that the plot of Astyages to kill his rival makes even more sense if Astyages, then only a crown prince, had not yet taken his throne and was worried that a rival for his throne had appeared (his grandson

## 5. Data Concerning Darius the Great (r. 522-486 BC)

Because Darius the Great had the same name as “Darius the Mede,” and also similarly conquered Babylon (but in 520 BC), some scholars have suggested that he might have been the basis for Daniel’s description of Darius the Mede.<sup>68</sup> Auchincloss supported this theory with the following suggestion: “When Daniel speaks of Darius as the son of Ahasuerus he simply wished to show that Darius was descended from the Royal Median family. To say that Darius was the son of Hystaspes would not have conveyed the proper dignity.”<sup>69</sup>

Darius the Great was the first “full-blooded” Persian ruler to rule the Medo-Persian Empire and is considered by some to be the true founder of the Persian empire.<sup>70</sup> With the help of seven nobles, Darius, the son of Persian prince Hystaspes, deposed the impersonator Pseudo-Smerdis and took the Empire’s throne. The disruption of royal authority by Pseudo-Smerdis resulted in waves of rebellion throughout the empire and required that Darius re-conquer Babylon. The cuneiform records and the ancient historians provide a wealth of information concerning the life and reign of Darius the Great.

The facts concerning Darius’ life are well documented. Besides the contemporary cuneiform contract tablets from Babylonia, fortification and treasury texts from Persepolis document Darius’ reign over the empire from 522 to 486 BC.<sup>71</sup> Darius presented his own version of his ancestry up to the throne in his huge trilingual Behistun Inscription inscribed in the side of a mountain of Behistun in the land of the Medes.<sup>72</sup>

Although the inscriptions of Darius the Great do not reveal his age, Herodotus does, along with many other details. Herodotus reported that Darius the Great was the eldest son of Vistaspa (Hystaspes) and placed the year of his birth around 550 BC.<sup>73</sup> During the reign of Cambyses, Darius (son of Hystaspes) served as his spear bearer.<sup>74</sup> Darius began his own reign

Cyrus). The second criticism is that there is no problem in Mandane’s being married to Cambyses by 600 BC since another daughter of Astyages was married to Nebuchadnezzar in 614 BC. This is just another case of the modern scholar inventing reasons why the classical historians were wrong.

<sup>68</sup> Here is a list of some of the scholars who have suggested that Darius (H.) was Darius the Mede: W. S. Auchincloss, *The Only Key to Daniel's Prophecies* (New York: Van Nostrand, 1904). In the Preface to his 1<sup>st</sup> edition (1866), Bosanquet posits the “identification of the Darius of Daniel with the Darius of the books of Haggai and Zechariah,” see J. W. Bosanquet, *Messiah the Prince*, 2d. ed. (London: Longman, Green, Reader, and Dyer, 1869), lix. In the Preface to his 2<sup>nd</sup> edition he boldly states, “In the first edition of this work one chief object, with a view to the rectification of Scripture chronology, was to establish the historical fact that ‘Darius the Median,’ of the book of Daniel (v.31), was the well-known Persian king Darius, son of Hystaspes.” See Bosanquet, vii.

<sup>69</sup> Auchincloss, *The Only Key to Daniel's Prophecies*, 103. Auchincloss also noted, “When one remembers that Darius married Atossa, the daughter of king Cyrus, he must surely abandon the notion that the son-in-law ascended the throne of Persia before the father!” Auchincloss, 105. He suggested that 6:28 gives a reverse chronological order (Mede mentioned first) in the reign of Darius and in the reign of Cyrus the Persian. Auchincloss, 84.

<sup>70</sup> A. H. Sayce, “Darius,” in *A Dictionary of the Bible: Dealing with Its Language, Literature, and Contents, Including the Biblical Theology*. ed. by Hastings, James, John A. Selbie, A. B. Davidson, S. R. Driver, and Henry Barclay Swete (New York: C. Scribner's Sons, 1898), 558.

<sup>71</sup> AR. T. Hallock, “The Evidence of the Persepolis Tablets,” *Cambridge History of Iran* vol. 2, ed. Ilya Gershevitch (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985), 588-589.

<sup>72</sup> Information including the text of the Behistun Inscription of Darius the Great can be found in Herodotus, George Rawlinson, Henry Creswicke Rawlinson, and John Gardner Wilkinson. *The History of Herodotus. A New English Version, Ed. with Copious Notes and Appendices* (New York: D. Appleton and Co., 1889), 491ff.

<sup>73</sup> Herodotus I.209.

<sup>74</sup> Herodotus III.139.

in 522 BC after the deaths of Cambyses and the usurper Pseudo-Smerdis. After eventually reconquering Babylon in 520 BC, he also became the king of Babylon.

Herodotus mentioned that Darius' age was "nearly twenty" at the death of Cyrus the Great in 530 BC.<sup>75</sup> Therefore, the date of Darius' birth can be assigned to 550 BC and would make Darius not more than twelve years old at the fall of Babylon in 539 BC. Pinches has estimated that Darius was thirty-six years of age when he began to reign,<sup>76</sup> making him twenty years old when Babylon fell to Cyrus—still much too young allow Darius the Great to be Darius the Mede.

No documents have been found which confirm or deny that Darius was present at the fall of Babylon in 539 BC.<sup>77</sup>

Personal Data Sheet:	
Subject: Darius the Great	
<u>Categories of Qualification:</u>	
1. Gender:	
-Was this person male?	<b>Yes</b>
2. Socio-political classification:	
-Was this person involved in the taking of Babylon in 539 BC?	<b>NA</b>
3. Age at fall of Babylon:	
-Was this person approximately 62 years old when Babylon fell in 539 BC?	<b>No</b>

Table 4.5 Darius' (the Great) Personal Data Sheet (Phase One)

## 6. Data Concerning Gobryas / Ugbaru / Gubaru

According to the Nabonidus Chronicle, a governor of Cyrus named Gubaru helped the Medo-Persian army to conquer Babylon, and then he appointed other governors in the city. Because of this report of the Nabonidus Chronicle the suggestion has been made that Gubaru was Darius the Mede.

<sup>75</sup> Herodotus I.209.

<sup>76</sup> Theophilus Pinches, "Darius the Mede," in *A Dictionary of the Bible: Dealing with Its Language, Literature, and Contents, Including the Biblical Theology*, vol. 1, ed. by Hastings, James, John A. Selbie, A. B. Davidson, S. R. Driver, and Henry Barclay Swete. (New York: C. Scribner's Sons, 1898), 559.

<sup>77</sup> The first records which positively place Darius the Great in Babylon are those which tell of his retaking of the city in 522 BC (Behisun ¶19-20). See Kuhrt, *The Persian Empire* I, 140.

## Gobryas

The names Gobryas, Ugbaru, and Gubaru have often been used interchangeably, which situation has resulted in unfortunate mistakes in identity. Gobryas is the Greek form of the names Ugbaru and Gubaru. In his book, *Darius the Mede*, Whitcomb noted the distinction between these two names, both having been rendered “Gobryas” in Pinches’ original translation of the Nabonidus Chronicle.<sup>78</sup> The distinction between these two persons and, specifically, the separation of their individual personal data are crucial to the theory that Gubaru is Darius the Mede. In short, Ugbaru died shortly after the fall of Babylon, but Gubaru did not. Whitcomb has noted that this reading concerning the death of Ugbaru has been confirmed by other scholars.<sup>79</sup> The other Gubaru(s) named Gobryas in the works of Herodotus and Xenophon are irrelevant to this investigation.

The classical Greek sources do not provide much clarification concerning this confusion between Ugbaru and Gubaru. A person named Gobryas (the Greek name for Gubaru and Ugbaru) does appear in the classical Greek histories. Herodotus does not mention anyone named Gobryas in connection with the fall of Babylon to Cyrus, only in connection with Darius the Great. On the other hand, Xenophon does mention an Assyrian governor named Gobryas who joined Cyrus in his campaign against Babylon.<sup>80</sup>

Name	Title	Source
1. Ugbaru (Gobryas)	governor (Gutium/Assyria)	Nabonidus Chron.; Xenophon
2. Gubaru	governor	Nabonidus Chronicle
3. Gubaru	governor (Babylon & more)	Contract Tablets
4. Gubaru <sup>81</sup> (Gobryas)	accomplice of Darius (I)	Herodotus; Behistun

Table 4.6 Contemporaries of Cyrus II and Cambyses II Named Gubaru

<sup>78</sup> In his translation, Pinches rendered the names Ugbaru and Gubaru with the Greek equivalent Gobryas. These names, Ugbaru and Gubaru, are found in the text of column three of the Nabonidus Chronicle (see Pinches’ transliteration and translation in Appendix B). Ugbaru is the transliteration of the name in lines 15 and 22. Gubaru is the transliteration of the name in line 20. See Theophilus Pinches, “On a Cuneiform Tablet relating to the Capture of Babylon by Cyrus, and the Events which preceded and led to it,” in *Transactions of the Society of Biblical Archaeology* (London: Longmans, Green, Reader, and Dyer, 1872), 139-176.

<sup>79</sup> Whitcomb documents that “this reading has been confirmed” by Raymond Dougherty in his book, *Nabonidus and Belshazzar: A Study of the Closing Events of the Neo-Babylonian Empire* (1929; repr., Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock, 2008), 172, note 561; by A. Oppenheim in his latest translation found in *Ancient Near Eastern Texts Relating to the Old Testament*, 3d ed., ed. by J. Pritchard (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1969), 306; and by D. Wiseman in a letter; see Whitcomb, 21, notes 8, 9, 10. Sidney Smith also confirmed this reading; see his book, *Babylonian Historical Texts: Relating to the Capture and Downfall of Babylon* (1925; repr., New York: G. Olms, 1975), 117-118.

<sup>80</sup> Xenophon VI.4.3-4.

<sup>81</sup> Mohammad Dandamayev does not recognize the distinction between (1) Ugbaru and (2) Gubaru. This lack of distinction requires that (3) Gubaru be a different man altogether since (1) Ugbaru died shortly after the fall of Babylon. Dandamayev also recognizes the possibility that (3) and (4) could be the same man, but he provides some evidence that could make a distinction between them. Mohammad Dandamayev, *Iranians in Achaemenid Babylonia*, Columbia lectures on Iranian studies, no. 6. (Costa Mesa, Calif: Mazda Publishers in association with Bibliotheca Persica, 1992), 72-79.

Table 4.6 provides a list of the contemporary men named Gobryas / Ugbaru / Gubaru. As far as cuneiform sources are concerned, the only historiographical text in which these names appear is the Nabonidus Chronicle (where as mentioned above both Gubaru and Ugbaru are identified as governors of Cyrus).<sup>82</sup> A governor of Babylon is attested in the contract tablets beginning in the fourth year of Cyrus the Great (535 BC).<sup>83</sup> Informational data for both of these persons from primary and secondary sources from the fifth century BC or before will now be presented separately.

### Ugbaru

In the Babylonian Chronicle, Ugbaru is identified as the governor who was from Gutium.<sup>84</sup> He led part of Cyrus' army and successfully took control of Babylon on the sixteenth day of Tishri (Oct 12, 539 BC).<sup>85</sup> The armed men from Gutium secured the peace until the end of the month.<sup>86</sup> According to the Nabonidus Chronicle, Ugbaru died on the eleventh of Marcheswan (Nov 6, 539 BC).<sup>87</sup> Xenophon also identifies a Gobryas as the governor of Gutium. This governor was "an Assyrian, a man well advanced in years."<sup>88</sup> Xenophon's aged Gobryas, the governor of Gutium, seems to match Ugbaru the governor of Gutium who died soon after the fall of Babylon. Therefore, based on the fact that he died so soon after the fall of Babylon, Ugbaru, the governor of Gutium, is eliminated from any further consideration.

### Gubaru (of the Nabonidus Chronicle)

Gubaru, one of Cyrus' governors, is identified as the governor who installed other governors in Babylon on the third of Marcheswan (October 29, 539 BC).<sup>89</sup> No other details are available concerning this Gubaru in the Nabonidus Chronicles or in other similar historiographical texts. Neither is there any direct evidence which connects this Gubaru to any other one named Gubaru.

The Gubaru of the Nabonidus Chronicle has often been connected to the Gobryas of Xenophon and also to the later Gubaru who was governor of Babylon in 535-525 BC. For many years the confusion caused by these similar names caused many scholars to blend the details between these governors.<sup>90</sup> Thus it is important to discriminate between the information concerning this Gubaru and the information concerning the others also named "Gubaru." Some details concerning someone named Gobryas can be found in Xenophon's work, *Cyropaedia*. The problem here is that these details concerning Gobryas do not point to Gubaru but instead to Ugbaru, the aged local Assyrian governor of Gutium who opportunistically joined Cyrus in his

---

<sup>82</sup> The distinction between the first letter of each of these two names has been preserved by their transliteration. In the Nabonidus Chronicle, Ugbaru is the transliteration of the name in lines 22, and Gubaru is the transliteration of the name in line 20. The name in line 15 is probably Ugbaru (see Fig. 4.2, p. 104).

<sup>83</sup> See Appendix K for a list of texts attesting Gubaru.

<sup>84</sup> Nabonidus Chronicle iii.15.

<sup>85</sup> Nabonidus Chronicle iii.15-16.

<sup>86</sup> Nabonidus Chronicle iii.16-17.

<sup>87</sup> Nabonidus Chronicle iii.22.

<sup>88</sup> Xenophon IV.6.1.

<sup>89</sup> Nabonidus Chronicle iii.20.

<sup>90</sup> One of the contributions of John Whitcomb's book *Darius the Mede* was to make this distinction between Ugbaru and Gubaru; see Whitcomb, 17ff.



campaign against Babylon in order to avenge the death of his only son.<sup>91</sup> Therefore, in order not to further the confusion between these two persons, all the information from Xenophon's work should be excluded from this Gubaru's data.<sup>92</sup> Also previously noted, the information concerning Gobryas (Gubaru) in Herodotus' work is set eighteen years later in the time of Darius the Great.

A. Leo Oppenheim reported that the contemporary cuneiform contract tablets attest a Gubaru who governed the region of Babylon and a district across the river from "the fourth year of Cyrus (535/4 B.C.) to the fifth of Cambyses (525/4 B.C.)"<sup>93</sup> (A sampling of this evidence concerning Gubaru is provided in Appendix K.) At present it is unknown if the Gubaru of the Nabonidus Chronicle is the same man who is named Gubaru in the contract tablets and was the governor of Babylon from 535-525 BC.

The following is what is known about any governors of Cyrus who were named Gubaru:

- 1) The name Gubaru itself was a popular Persian masculine name and is often attested in cuneiform records and is sufficient evidence that Gubaru was male.
- 2) The Nabonidus Chronicle indicates that Gubaru installed governors in Babylon immediately after the fall of Babylon in 539 BC. (Therefore, this provides good evidence that Gubaru was present at the time of the fall of Babylon in 539 BC).
- 3) The contemporary cuneiform contract tablets indicate that someone named Gubaru was the governor over the area designated as "Babylon and the region across the river" starting in the fourth year of Cyrus (535 BC).<sup>94</sup> (The caveat here is that these two men named Gubaru might be different, since there is no evidence to indicate that these two governors were the same person.)

In order to bolster the feasibility of the theory that Gubaru was Darius the Mede, three assumptions are often made concerning the Gubaru attested in the Nabonidus Chronicle:

- a) it is assumed that Gubaru survived long enough to continue as governor during the "first year" of Cyrus' new regime in Babylon;
- b) it is assumed that he was about the age of sixty-two (usually because of confusion with the details of Ugbaru being "aged"); and
- c) it is assumed that he was the same Gubaru who was attested as governor of Babylon in Cyrus' fourth year (535 BC).

There is no direct evidence to support these three assumptions.

---

<sup>91</sup> Xenophon IV.4.3-4.

<sup>92</sup> Information relating to the appropriate age of Gobryas (in order for him to be identified as Darius the Mede) is usually taken from Xenophon's description. But as previously stated, scholars such as Whitcomb have identified Xenophon's Gobryas, the governor of Gutium, with the Ugbaru of the Nabonidus Chronicle. Thus, Xenophon's evidence concerns Ugbaru, who died and has been eliminated from further consideration, not Gubaru, who is the subject of this investigation. While there is little doubt that Xenophon described Ugbaru as "old" (Cyrop VI.4.3-4), to transfer Ugbaru's age to Gubaru would be a mistake. Information concerning Ugbaru (specifically his age) should not be assumed to also be true concerning Gubaru.

<sup>93</sup> A. Leo Oppenheim, "Babylonian Evidence of Achaemenid Rule in Mesopotamia," In *The Cambridge History of Iran*, vol. 2. ed. Ilya Gershevitch (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985), 544.

<sup>94</sup> A. L. Oppenheim, "Babylonian Evidence," 544.

Personal Data Sheet:	
Subject: Gubaru	
<u>Categories of Qualification:</u>	
1. Gender:	
-Was this person male?	<b>Yes</b>
2. Socio-political classification:	
-Was this person involved in the taking of Babylon in 539 BC?	<b>Yes</b>
3. Age at fall of Babylon:	
-Was this person approximately 62 years old when Babylon fell in 539 BC?	<b>NA</b>

Table 4.7 Gubaru's Personal Data Sheet (Phase One)

### Personal Data Sheets and Personal Data Chart

Now that the first phase of data collection concerning each candidate has been completed, the information has been organized onto individual Personal Data Sheets and arranged on the master Personal Data Chart. A Personal Data Sheet has been created for each candidate (see Appendix L).

The last step in the first phase of this method is to arrange the information from the qualifying questions on the Personal Data Chart (see Appendix M). The chart will help in analysis of the data and comparison of the candidates. The information associated with each candidate has been placed in the column labeled for that candidate in the appropriate category row.

A candidate who has negative evidence in any one of the three qualifying questions is disqualified as candidate. A single negative response disqualifies the candidate from continuing into the second phase of the identification method. On the other hand, if evidence for a particular category is "Not Available" (NA), that candidate is not disqualified by the lack of evidence. The absence of evidence, by itself, cannot disqualify.<sup>95</sup> When evidence, negative or positive, is not available for a category the question will be marked with the abbreviation "NA". Even though no evidence is available, the information will be assumed to be "possible" for that qualifying question. As long as no specific evidence disqualifies the candidate, he is deemed to be "qualified" and further research for that candidate is to be pursued concerning the remaining categories in the second phase.

A survey of the Personal Data Chart in Appendix M will show which candidates have been disqualified by the qualifying questions: Astyages, Cambyses II, Cyaxares (II), and Darius

---

<sup>95</sup> This "argument from absence" lesson should have been learned by all critics when the evidence for Belshazzar and his co-regency was found in ancient cuneiform records during the last century—after critics had long dismissed him as a fiction created by the author of the book of Daniel.

the Great.<sup>96</sup> Cyrus the Great has positive responses for each of the three qualifying questions.<sup>97</sup> Gubaru has positive responses for only two of the three qualifying questions; but, in spite of the lack of evidence for his age, Gubaru's candidacy is not disqualified.<sup>98</sup> At some future date, more evidence might appear from the archaeologist's spade which could specify his age. The candidates who are qualified to proceed into the second phase of data collection are Cyrus the Great and Gubaru.

### **Phase Two: Distinguishing Categories**

Now that two candidates, Cyrus and Gubaru, have been qualified by the first phase of this investigation, their candidacies can proceed into the second phase. In the second phase informational data were collected on these two candidates concerning the second tier of distinguishing categories (# 4–6). The purpose of these categories is to help to determine the strength or weakness of the candidate's identification as Darius the Mede.

The fourth category concerns the heritage of the candidate. The question for this category is (4.): "Could this person be described as a Mede?" The evidence to be gathered in this category is to reflect what can be known of a person's nationality and/or ethnicity. Terms which describe one's heritage can be overlapping and may even seem to be contradictory (just as someone not familiar with American culture might need an explanation for the terms African-American or Tex-Mexican). Therefore, the evidence in this category will certainly require some discussion.

The fifth category concerns the kin relations of the candidate. The question for this category is (5.): "Was this person a descendant of Ahasuerus?"

The sixth category concerns titles and is to reflect the occupation or position of someone as he functioned in his society. The question for this category is (6.): "Did this person rule as king of the Chaldeans?" The discussion of the particulars of these three categories is intended to establish whether or not one is a strong candidate.

The second phase data collection primarily focuses on the remaining categories but should also include any other distinguishing information which might be pertinent to this inquiry. The new information from this second phase of data collection will be added to the individual Personal Data Sheets and used to complete the Personal Data Chart. The quality of the evidence collected for the distinguishing questions will be appraised and placed as a point value into the Personal Data Chart. The value of the evidence reflected by the candidate's total points will also correspond to a Grade of Identification describing the reliability of his identification as Darius the Mede.

---

<sup>96</sup> Zero (0) points have been placed in their columns.

<sup>97</sup> One (1) point has been placed in Cyrus' column.

<sup>98</sup> Since no negative evidence has been found, one (1) point has been placed in Gubaru's column.