

The Bible Student and Teacher

Volume IV

FEBRUARY, 1906

Number 2

BELSHAZZAR AND DARIUS THE MEDE

Prof. Robert Dick Wilson, D. D., Theological Seminary, Princeton, N. J.

In the following pages we shall attempt to show that the statements of the Bible with regard to Belshazzar and Darius the Mede are not contradictory to those of the monuments.

In Aramaic, the word **malkatz** is the equivalent of the Assyrio-Babylonian words **sarru**, **malku**, **pahatu**, **bel pahate** and **hazannu**. Each of these would also be a **sheleet**, or ruler; and the **pahatu**, **bel pahate** and **hazannu** would be called **rabr'been**, or magnates of H king (comp. Dan. v. 1). Any one of these Assyrian words might be rendered into H Hebrew, also, by **melek**, "king".

We have only to look upon Nabonidus as the **sarru**, or better the **sar sarrani** (king of kings), and upon Belshazzar as simply **sarru**, **malku** (or even **pahatu**, **bel pahate**, or **hazannu** of the city), to account for the fact that Belshazzar is in Daniel called **malkatz**.

In like manner, Cyrus could be "king of kings", "king of lands" or "sar Babili", while Darius the Mede was **malkatz** of the city, or province, of Babylon.

In Nabonidus' prayer to Sin the moon-god, we learn that his first born son was Belshazzar (KB III.^{II} 96). In the Annals of Nabonidus, the son of the king is said to have been present in Accad with the soldiers, or army, accompanied by the nobles, or chiefs (**rabuti**). See "Beitrag zur Assyriologie", article by Hagen, pages 218, seq., Col. II lines 5, 10, 13, 19, 23. Perhaps we may infer from line 13, that he was at Dur-karasu, above Sippar on the Euphrates. In Tammuz (Col. III, line 12), a battle was fought between Cyrus' army and the army of Accad. On the fourteenth of Tammuz, Sippar was taken (line 14). On the sixteenth, Ugbaru (Gubaru, Gobryas) who is called the governor of the land of Gutium (**amel pahate mat Gu-ti-um**) and the soldiers of Cyrus, entered Babylon (line 15). Afterwards, but in the same month (i. e., Tammuz, the 4th month), Nabonidus was taken in Babylon (line 16). Cyrus entered Babylon on the 3rd of the 8th month (line 18) and made Gubaru the governor in Babylon (**amel Gubaru amel pihatisu, pahate ina Bahili iptikid**, line 20). In the night of the 11th day of the 8th month, Gubaru attacked [Esakkil, or some part of the city where the son of the king was] and put to death the son (?) of the king (lines 22, 23) who was lamented by the Babylonians from the 27th of Adar to the 3rd of Nisan of the following year (line 23).

On Nisan the 4th, Cambyses, the son of Cyrus, grasped the hands of Nebo, i. e., probably became king of Babylon (line 24).

Notice, that from the above account of the course of events, it is clear that for the national party that was opposed to Cyrus, the son of the king, i. e., Belshazzar, must have been *de facto* king of the part of Babylon which had not yet surrendered, from the latter part of the 4th month of the seventeenth year of Nabonidus, when his father, or predecessor, Nabonidus was captured, until the 11th of the 8th month when the son of the king was killed in an attack made upon him in the place where he was making his last stand, by Gobryas the governor of Gutium.

It is worthy of note that in the Annals (Col. II lines 5, 10, 19, and 23), the son of the king is said to have been accompanied not merely by his army but by the *amel rabuti*, "lords" or "magnates". So in Daniel, Belshazzar made a feast for a thousand of his "lords" or "magnates". The word for "lord" is in both cases *rab*.

Regarding the "Third Year" of Belshazzar (Daniel viii. 1).

The above, it seems to me, meets all the requirements of the Biblical records with regard to Belshazzar, except the statement of Daniel viii. 1 about the 3rd year of Belshazzar. As to this I shall make but three remarks:

First, Cambyses was king of Babylon, and is even called "king of the lands" for at least one year and three months before the death of Cyrus. The first Babylonian tablet bearing a subscription dated in the reign of Cambyses, is one from his year of accession, the sixth month and twelfth day. The last tablet known to have the name of Cyrus in the subscription is as follows: "Babylon, Kislev (i. e., the 9th month), the 25th day of year one of Cambyses, King of Babylon, in the day when Cyrus his father (was) king of the lands". (See Strassmaier's "Inscripfen im Cambyses", 81.)*

Now, in the tablets from the reign of Cambyses dated before No. 81, we find the following subscriptions, to wit:

- (1) "Cambyses" alone, in Nos. 27, 29, 44(?), 59(?).
- (2) "Cambyses, king of Babylon" alone, in Nos. 28, 39, 40, 45, 48, 50, 51, 57, 58, 60, 63(?), 73, 82, 85 and 86 [the tablets from 82-86 are dated earlier than 81].
- (3) "Cambyses, king of the lands" alone, in Nos. 4, 18, 22 and 30.
- (4) "Cambyses, King of Babylon, King of the lands", in Nos. 1, 2, 3, 5, 7, 9, 10, 11, 12, 14-17, 19-21, 23-26, 31-33, 37, 38, 47, 52, 54, 55, 61, 62, 65-70, 74, 75, 77-80, 83, 84.
- (4) "Cambyses, King of Babylon and of the lands", in Nos. 6, 8, 13, 43, 53, 56, 64, 71, 76.

*Some read this "year eleven" of Cambyses, as Cyrus.

(6) "Cambyses King of Babylon, king [of the lands (?)] king [of kings (?)]", in No. 35 (?).

(7) "Cambyses, King of Babylon, son of Cyrus, King of lands", in Nos. 36, 42 and 72.

(8) "Cambyses, King of Babylon, when (enuma) Cyrus his father (was) king of lands", in No. 46.

(9) "Cambyses, king of Babylon, in the day when [lit. in his day and (that of)] Cyrus his father (was) king of lands", in No. 81.

It is obvious from the above list of titles that Cyrus and Cambyses reigned together as kings of Babylon and the lands from the 6th month of one year to the 9th month of the next following year, i. e., for one year and three months. But this remarkable fact is made known to us merely from the subscriptions of two tablets. Why was the subscription not on more tablets? What if these two had never been found? What sure evidence that the co-regency ceased in the 9th month of Cambyses' first year,* or began in the so-called accession year of Cambyses? In fact, there is positive evidence that Cambyses was king of Babylon from the very first year of Cyrus king of lands; for the subscription of tablet No. 16 of Strassmaier's "Inschriften von Cyrus" reads as follows: "Siman (i. e., the 3rd month), day 10, year one, of Ku-ras, king of lands". The Reverse has: "Ka-am-bu-si-i, king of Babylon".†

Secondly, we know that the son of king Nabonidus had command of the army in Accad, as early, certainly, as the 7th year of Nabonidus (see Annals of Nabonidus, Col. II, line 5); and the fact that he still held this command is reiterated in the annals of years nine, ten and eleven. (Id. Col. II, lines 10, 19, 23.) This army of Accad was defeated by Cyrus in the 4th month of Nabonidus' 17th year, and the son of the king is next heard of as being killed by Gobryas in the final assault on the citadel of Babylon. (Id. Col. III, line 22.)

From this, it would seem that Belshazzar was in command in Accad from the 7th to the 17th year of Nabonidus. He may have been all through the reign of Nabonidus; for the records of the first six years are so broken as to give no information on this point. If he were a co-regent during this whole period, as the annals indicate that he may well have been, the confusion of Josephus when he speaks of Beltasar whom the Greeks call Nabonidel (i. e., Nabonidus) would be explained. So would Xenophon's custom of speaking, in the Cyropaedia, of the "King of Assyria" or "The Assyrian" without mentioning his name; inasmuch as the fact that there had been two kings, rendered it impossible for him after so long an interval to distinguish them by name, so he avoided the difficulty by simply

*I use first year here according to the method of reckoning among the Babylonians. We would call it his second year.

†If Cambyses became "king of Babylon" in Cyrus' first year as "king of lands," the eleventh year of Cambyses' reign, mentioned possibly in tablet 81 of Cambyses' tablets, would be Cambyses' 3rd year as "king of lands."

calling the ruler of Babylon the king of Assyria. Whatever may have been the title of Belshazzar in Babylonian during these years of command, or co-regency, what better title can one suggest in Aramaic than *malkatz*; or, as the calling of Daniel third ruler (*shaleet malkatz*) would suggest, the second ruler of the kingdom?

Thirdly, only the first year of Belshazzar king of Babylon is mentioned in the Bible, i. e., in Dan. vii. 1. In Daniel v. 1 and viii. 1 he is called "Belshazzar the king"; and in v. 9 "the king Belshazzar". In Dan. v. 30 he is called "Belshazzar the Chaldean king". Elsewhere, he is called Belshazzar alone, as in Dan. v. 2, 22, 29; or "the king" alone, as in Dan. v. 2, 3, 5, bis, 6, 7 bis, 8 bis, 10 bis, and often.

From the above, it is clear, that he is only once called "king of Babylon" and that but the first year of his reign as king of Babylon is mentioned. Who knows how long he may have been the Chaldean king, or king of the Chaldeans? Can anyone prove that Chaldean king and king of Babylon are phrases of exactly the same content or meaning? Full many a king of the Chaldeans desired to be king of Babylon in the times before Nebuchadnezzar and perished miserably, his wish still unattained, amid the swamps of his nation's habitat on the shores of the Persian Gulf. And no one knows enough of the reign of Nabonidus to assert with confidence, or truthfulness, that the statements of the book of Daniel with regard to Belshazzar may not all be historically true.

Was Belshazzar "the Son of Nebuchadnezzar"?

But, how then about his being called in Daniel the son of Nebuchadnezzar, whereas Nabonidus calls him his son? No doubt, if we knew all the circumstances of that time, we could explain this apparent discrepancy with satisfaction. As it is, who knows, first, that Belshazzar may not have been the son of Nebuchadnezzar by blood and the son of Nabonidus by adoption? Or, secondly, that the mother of Belshazzar was not a daughter of Nebuchadnezzar and at the same time the wife of Nabonidus, so that Belshazzar would be the grandson of Nebuchadnezzar, and could in consequence thereof be called, in the manner of the Hebrews and Aramaeans, his son? Or, finally, he could be called the son of Nebuchadnezzar, in the same sense that Jehu is called on the Assyrian monuments the son of Omri; or Xerxes the son of Cambyses and Cyrus, by Herodotus in the genealogy of Xerxes given in Bk. VII. 11 of Herodotus' history, i. e., as his legitimate successor on the throne, without regard to blood relationship.

In favor of adoption of Belshazzar by Nabonidus, as a way out of the difficulties, is the fact that Josephus quotes Berossus as saying that Nabonidus was a Babylonian, whereas Daniel calls Belshazzar "the Chaldean king". What might have been better policy on the part of Nabonidus than to attempt to unite the Babylonians and their Chaldean conquerors by

adopting as his, the Babylonian's, successor, the son or grandson of Nebuchadnezzar, the greatest of all the Chaldean kings? This last statement is based upon Winckler's interpretation of Berossus' words: "Nabonnedus, a certain one of those from Babylon". See Winckler's "Geschichte von Bab. und Ass.", page 315.

As to Belshazzar's being the son of Nebuchadnezzar rather than his grandson, no one can doubt or deny its possibility; since Nebuchadnezzar died in 562 B. C. and Belshazzar was slain in 539 B. C. The queen of Dan. v. 10 may have been the mother of Belshazzar and the wife of the great Nebuchadnezzar and still have been a young woman when the glory of the Chaldee's excellency passed into the hands of the conquering Medo-Perians, under Gobryas and Cyrus.

In Dan. v. 30, it is said that Belshazzar the king was killed in the last night of his reign. In the Annals of Nabonidus, it is said that some one died, or was slain, on the last night when Gobryas made his assault and captured the last defenses of Babylon. Winckler reads, or did read, the sign as one which means "wife"; whereas Hagen, Delitzsch and Pinches finally united in reading the doubtful sign as one meaning "son". In addition to their arguments from the spaces and traces of a sign, may be adduced the other reason, that it would seem hardly necessary to mention the death of a wife of the king on such an occasion; whereas, after Nabonidus had been taken prisoner in the fourth month, the death of the son of the king, his actual or prospective successor, would be most worthy of mention, inasmuch as it would mean most probably the end of all opposition to the acceptance of the new regime. As a matter of fact, the book of Daniel states the case very graphically when it says: "In that same night was Belshazzar the Chaldean king slain; and Darius the Mede received the kingdom".

A natural question arises here, namely, how could Belshazzar be called by Nabonidus, not merely the "son of the king", but "Belshazzar the first-born son" ("Der Grosse Insc. von Ur," K. B. III. II. 83,89, mar ris-tu-u), and "Belshazzar the first-born son, the offspring of my heart" ("Die Klein Ins. von Ur", K. B. id. 97), if he were not the born son of Nabonidus? Fortunately, this question is answered in Meissner's "Altbabylonisches Privatrecht", 98, where we learn that an adopted son could be called, not merely "the son", but "the eldest son" of his adopted parents. (See, also, John's "Babylonian and Assyrian Laws," page 156.) It will be seen that this law answers the objection that might be raised, arising from the fact that, on the Behistun Inscription, the rebels against Darius, Nadin-tubel and Arachu, both assumed the name of "Nebuchadnezzar the son of Nabonidus". (See Bezold's "Achamenideninschriften", lines 31-40 and 84-89.) There may have been an own son of Nabonidus, with the name of Nebuchadnezzar, and yet his adopted son might be called the

first-born son and be the heir-apparent. (See John's "Bab. and Ass. Laws," page 156.)*

Gobryas and "Darius the Mede."

It will be noted that in Col. III line 26 of the Annals of Nabonidus, it is said, that Gobryas was made *amel pahate*, i. e., governor, of Babylon on the 3rd of the 8th month, and that Cambyses the son of Cyrus grasped the hand of Nebo on the 4th of Nisan in the following year. As the grasping of the hand of Nebo was a ceremony in connection with the inauguration as king, we may suppose that Gobryas was governor of Babylon from the 8th month of one year to the beginning of the next.

Now, if we suppose with Pinches (who, it seems to me, has written best on this matter), that Darius the Mede was the same as Gobryas, the Bible and the monuments will be in entire accord. For (1) the Bible mentions but his first year. According to the monuments, even if he is to be reckoned as *sar Babili* instead of as *Bel pihate*, and if in consequence the tablets were to be dated after him, he would have reigned but three months and a half of his accession's year (*sattu ris sarruti*) and three days of his first year.

A point in the discussion with regard to Darius the Mede that has been lost sight of is the statement in Dan. vi. 29 that "Daniel prospered in the kingdom of Darius and in the kingdom of Cyrus the Persian". This might mean that Cyrus was the successor of Darius. It may, also, mean that they reigned contemporaneously. For example, in the introduction to the "History of Addai the Apostle" in Syriac, we find the following date: "In the year 343 of the kingdom of the Greeks, in the kingdom of our Lord, Tiberius Caesar, the Roman, and in the kingdom of Abgar, the king, the son of Ma'nu, the king, in the month Tisri, the First, on the 12th day". But Tiberius and Abgar were contemporaneous and the latter probably subject to the former. But we have equally sure evidence not so far afield in the tablets from the reigns of Cyrus and Cambyses; to wit, in Strassmaier's tablets of Cyrus, No. 16, the subscription reads: "In the tenth day of the 3rd month of the first year of Cyrus king of lands, Cambyses (being) king of Babylon." [The last clause on reverse.] In tablet No. 81 of Cambyses, it reads: "Babylon, Kislev 25, year one of Kambuziya king of Babylon in his day and that of Kuras, his father, king of lands". Compare tablet 46: "Babylon, Duzu 25, year one of Kambusiya, king of Babylon, when (enuma) Kurasu, his father, (was) king of lands". In tablet 425, both Cyrus and Cambyses are called "king of Babylon, king of the lands":

*In addition to the above places, which are given in Schrader's "Keilschriftliche Bibliothek," Belshazzar is called "the Son of the king" in the "Inscriptionen vom Nabonidus" by Strassmaier, No. 581, line 4, and 1043, line 4; and "Belshazzar, the son of the king" in the same book, No. 184, and No. 581 lines 2, 3, and No. 688 line 3 and No. 270, lines 4, 6, 9 and 21; also, Belshazzar alone, on No. 581, line 9. Tablets 184, 581 and 688 are referred to and translated in "Records of the Past," New Series, Vol. III, 124-127.

but the tablet is unfortunately so broken as to render the connection illegible. In No. 426, "Kambusiya king of Babylon" is twice preceded by the phrase "king of lands"; but unfortunately again, the name of the king is illegible. Still, it could scarcely have been any other than Cyrus. On tablet 42 occurs: "Babylon, Duzu 9, year one, of Kambusiya, king of Babylon, son of Kuras, king of lands". It will be seen from these documents, that Cyrus and Cambyses were both given the title of king simultaneously, and this in the first year of Cyrus and again in the first year of Cambyses. It is to be presumed that Cambyses enjoyed his office and title as king of Babylon all the time that his father was king of the lands. But when did he become king of Babylon? The earliest tablet that mentions him under this title is the one given above which dates from the tenth day of the 3rd month of the first year of Cyrus. How long before this he might have claimed the title is not certain; but in view of the fact, that on the fourth of Nisan of the same year he is said in the Annals of Nabonidus (Col. III line) to have grasped the hand of Nebo, and since this ceremony was performed by the ruler at the new year's festival (see Muss-Arnolt's Dict. p. 861), we can fairly conclude that he was king from the 4th of Nisan of the year one of Cyrus. Especially may we so conclude in agreement with Winckler's statement on page xxxvi. of his "Inscriptions of Sargon" that a king submitted to this ceremony in order to be rightly proclaimed as king of Babylon.

Now, we have seen above that Gobryas was Cyrus' governor (*amel pihate su*) of Babylon as early at least as the 3rd day of the 8th month of Cyrus' accession year. (Annals of Nabonidus Col. III line 20.) He was in command on the 11th of the same month, when Belshazzar was slain. It is most probable—there is nothing, at least, against the supposition—that he remained in command and at the head of the government, until Cambyses was installed as king of Babylon on the 4th of Nisan of the following year. The only question, then, is: what would be the title in Hebrew and Aramaic of Gobryas as *amel pihate* of Babylon? In answer, we can only say, that *malkatz* and *malek* (*sarah*) would be the only suitable words; and that Gobryas could rightly be called by this title as long as he was *amel pihate* of the city or province of Babylon, i. e., from the 3rd of the 8th month of Cyrus' accession's year to the 3rd of Nisan of his first year.

In favor of Darius, the Mede, having been sub-king rather than the king of kings we notice the fact that, in Daniel vi. 1, it is said, that Darius the Mede received the kingdom; (see Pinches "The Old Testament in the Light of the Historical Lands of Assyria and Sabgtonia," p. 419); and in Daniel ix. 1 it is said, that he "was made king (*hamlak*) over the kingdom of the Chaldeans". How well this harmonizes with the statement of the Annals of Nabonidus Col. III line 20, where Gobryas is called Cyrus' governor! How well it suits the other statements of Daniel that he succeeded "the Chaldean king", "Belshazzar the king of Babylon"!

Notice that not one word is said about Darius the Mede having been king of Persia nor even of Media, in any book of the Bible.

But it is said, that no contracts are dated from the reigns of Belshazzar and Darius the Mede. We should rather say, that none have as yet been found dated from their reigns. But this is no conclusive argument. For notice, first, that out of the ten years of the cotemporaneous reigns of Cyrus and Cambyses, only three tablets containing the names and titles of both have been found, one from the first year (so-called) of Cyrus, and two from the first year, so-called, of Cambyses. How could we expect to find one from the four month reigns of Belshazzar and Darius the Mede? As a matter of fact, Strassmaier gives but twelve tablets from the end of the 4th month of the 17th year of Nabonidus when Nabonidus was captured, until the 11th of the 8th month, when Belshazzar was slain; and all of these are dated with the name of Nabonidus, except one bearing the name of "Cyrus king of Babylon and of the lands" and dated the 7th (or perhaps better the 4th) month of the accession-year. Only one tablet bearing the name of Nabonidus has been found dated after that fatal night on the eleventh of the eighth month. It bears date "the ninth month [day not given] of the 17th year of Nabonidus king of Babylon". (See Strassmaier, "Ins. von Nab.," No. 1055.) From the time when Gobryas was made governor of Babylon, until the 4th of Nisan, we have besides this one tablet of Nabonidus, eight tablets dated with the name of Cyrus. All of these, with perhaps one exception (that of tablet three, where the subscription is injured) have the title "king of lands" alone. On no monument, moreover, is it ever said, that some one else was not during this time king of Babylon. Besides, at no time, except during the co-regency of Cyrus and Cambyses have we as yet found any evidence that the name of the governor (or sub-king) of Babylon, as well as, or instead of, that of the king of kings, was ever placed upon the contract tablets of Babylon.

As to the age of Darius, the Mede, we know nothing absolutely explicit, except the statement of Dan. v. 31, that he was about sixty-two years of age, when he became king. This will accord with the statements of Xenophon with regard to Gobryas. For, when he went over to Cyrus, he had a marriageable daughter; and some time before this, his grown up (?) son had been killed by the king of Assyria (i. e., Babylon).

But some one will say, How do you explain the difference of name? The easiest explanation would be to suppose that an error had crept into the Biblical text. Still, we are by no means shut up to this explanation. Many kings in ancient, as well as modern, times had two, or more names; especially a pre-regnal and a regnal name. The great Rameses the Second (or Usertesen as Lethe claims), king of Egypt, seems to be the same as the Sesostris of the Greeks. But Sesostris is found perhaps but twice,

and then with different spellings, among the almost innumerable titles and monuments of this king. (See "Le Livre des Rois" by Brugsch and Bouriant, p. 444.) So Solomon is the same as Jedidiah. But coming nearer to the time of Cyrus, we find that Artaxerxes was called Cyrus before he became king (Josephus); that Darius Nothus was called Ochus, before he became king; and the last Darius, Codomannus. Why may not the name Darius have been assumed first of all by Gobryas the Mede, when he became king of Babylon? If we could only be sure as to the meaning of the word Darius, we might understand better, why the name was given, or assumed, as a royal or princely appellation. Who knows, that Darius is not the translation of Gubaru? Or, that if, as good authorities claim, the first part of the name is the same as the new Persian *dara*, "king", the name Darius may not mean some such thing as *regulus*. Or if the name be derived from the old Persian verb "tar" to hold, who knows that it was not originally a title meaning simply "holder of the scepter"? The title in either case would be appropriate to Gobryas as sub-king of Babylon, and also to Darius, the son of Hystaspes, who was by birth a king, second in rank and race to Cyrus alone. (See "Behistun Inscripten," lines 2 and 3.)

But another indication that Gobryas may have borne the name of Darius also, is to be found in the fact that his daughter, according to Xenophon, married Hystaspes, and that the son of Hystaspes was called Darius. This name is not met with among the royal descendants of Achaemenes before this time. If Darius Hystaspes was not called after an ancestor on his father's side, what more natural than that he should have been named after his maternal grandfather? While saying this, I am aware that there are difficulties connected with believing that the daughter of Gobryas could have been the mother of Darius Hystaspes; difficulties arising however from our ignorance of the time when Hystaspis married this wife, and from our ignorance of the age of Darius Hystaspes when he became king of Persia. For the marriage of Hystaspes and for the age of Darius when he became king, we have to depend upon the Greek historians; and the Greek historians give discrepant statements. Assuming, however, that Gobryas' daughter was Darius Hystaspes' mother, it would afford a ground for assuming, that Gobryas, also, bore the name of Darius. For it was customary to transmit names of fathers to their grandsons; e. g., the grandfather of Cyrus was Cyrus, and both father and son of Cyrus were named Cambyses. (See Cyrus Cylinder, lines 20, 21.) So Artaxerxes the Second was the son of Darius the son of Artaxerxes the First; and Artaxerxes the First was the grandson of Darius Hystaspes. (See Inscription of Artaxerxes Mnemon in Bezold's "Achaemenideninschriften", No. XVII.) Among the Achaemenidae we have three (or four) Dariuses, two Xerxes and two Artaxerxes. Of the Seleucids, who succeeded them, there were seventeen who bore the name of Antiochus. All of the Arsacids, the successors of the Seleucids, took the regnal name of Arsa-

ces. Of their successors (or contemporaries?), the kings of Edessa, out of twenty-nine in all, ten were named Abgar and ten Ma'nu (see "The Doctrine of Addai", note on page one). While such examples do not prove that Gobryas was, also, named Darius, they do afford a presumption in favor of the probability that he was; and in view of the other indications in its favor, they prohibit any one from asserting that Gobryas and Darius the Mede were not the same.

But was Gobryas a Mede? He is called in the Annals of Nabonidus, Col. III line 15, the "amel pihat mat Gutium", i. e., the governor of the land of Gutium. Now, according to the Cyrus Cylinder (line 13) Cyrus conquered Gutium (Kuti) the totality of the host of the Manda (umman-Manda). Sayce and others maintain that Manda and Mada are the same. If so, Gobryas would be a Mede. At any rate Gutium lay at the foot of the pass that led from Nineveh to Egbatana, the capital of the Medes, and the country might well have been looked upon by the dwellers in Babylon as a part of Media. So that it would be quibbling to deny that Daniel might justly have called Gobryas a Mede.

There remains one point to be explained. Darius the Mede is said to have placed over the kingdom one hundred and twenty satraps, who should be in all the kingdom (Dan. vi. 1). This accords with the statement of the Annals of Nabonidus, that Gobryas appointed pihate in Babylon. Notice that neither in the Bible, nor on the monuments is anything said about the appointment of satraps in Persia, but in Babylon. Now, since, in the first verse of Esther, it is said that in the time of Xerxes there were an hundred and twenty-seven provinces of the Persian empire, it has been assumed that here in Daniel, there is a confusing of the Dariuses, and that this confusing is an evidence of late origin for the book.

But notice, first, that nothing is said in Daniel about "provinces"; and that even if there were, the word used in Esther for province *mideenah* is a difficult one to closely define. It may mean "province" or "satrapy", as in Esther i. 1. It may also mean "city", as commonly in Syriac and Arabic, and as probably in Dan. iii. 1, 2 and 1 Kings xx. 14. In the latter place, it is said that Ahab gathered two hundred and thirty two sons of the princes of the provinces *naaree saray ham-deenoth*. It would be impossible to suppose that these provinces were of large extent. Would not "judicial district", or "*Gerichtsbezirk*", of whatever size, express the original meaning of *Medina*?

Again, the word *satrap* is ambiguous. Taking Haug's derivation as the correct one, it meant originally simply "land-protector". As to the character of the duties, and especially as to the extent of the land ruled over, there is nothing in the word itself to give us light. Besides, the writer of Daniel applies the term to the officers of Nebuchadnezzar (Dan. iii. 2, 27), so that, in his view at least, the term can not have meant merely

governor of a Persian satrapy. Moreover, according to Xenophon's *Cyropaedia*, Cyrus appointed at first only six satraps; and these were sent to rule over only a small part of his domains (see Bk. VIII. 6). Darius Hystaspis says, in the Behistun inscription, that twenty-three provinces were subject to him, and he mentions the names of the lands (see Berzold's "Achamenideninschriften," lines 4-7). In the Naqs-i-Rustam inscription of the same Darius thirty-two different provinces are mentioned. (See Bezold, page 35.) Now, Gobryas was governor of Gutium when he conquered Babylon. If he were also governor of Babylonia, his dominion would extend over all the country from the mountains of Media to the deserts of Arabia. How many satraps, or *pihates*, he would find necessary to help govern such a country, at such a time of conquest, we might safely leave to his judgment of the circumstances. Furthermore, if this extensive rule belonged to Gobryas, who can say that one of his *pihates* was not a man named Darius, and that this Darius was not the *malkeetz* of the city of Babylon? [This last statement was suggested by a remark made by my assistant, the Rev. Kerr McMillan, when, in criticizing my paper, he asked "Why might not Darius have been one of the *pihates* appointed by Gobryas?"]

Finally, in this connection, it may be remarked that the word which is employed in the Annals of Nabonidus in the phrase, "Gobryas his (i.e., Cyrus) *pihatu* appointed *pihates*", is of the same root as that employed in "Kings" of Ahab when he is said to have mustered (*maqad*) the young men of the princes of the provinces. The same verb and form were employed by Darius Hystaspes on the Naqs-i-Rustan inscription, line 22, where he says "Ahuramazda appointed me to be king" (*anaku ina muhhi-ina ana sarruti iptekid*).

THE NECESSITY OF INTELLECTUAL ARREST

Rev. William Lisle, West Newton, Mass.

The recognition of limitation is a necessity. This necessity is wide spread. We live in a universe of limitations. The lines are staked everywhere. The earth is cross-corded with circles of latitude and longitude. Other paths are marked for it with relation to other worlds. Even comets in their wide flight must regard the "stop here" signs on the confines of space. Creation is everywhere marked by classification, and classification is limitation. It is a rising series from lowest to highest realms. There are beginnings and endings. Nature starts small but is under irresistible impulsion to reach her physical ideal. But she knows her limitations and keeps within them. The human body is her Ideal and is differentiated from the beast by an imperious law of nature. Man as an animal is inferior to the eagle which can see further, the owl and bat which can