

# **IMPLICATIONS INVOLVED IN THE IDENTIFICATION OF DARIUS THE MEDE AND CYRUS THE PERSIAN AND ITS IMPACT ON THE INTERPRETATION OF THE TIME PROPHECIES IN THE BOOK OF DANIEL.**

## **Introduction**

Much has been said about Darius the Mede. His historical accuracy is still a mystery to be solved by archaeologists, historians and theologians. Nevertheless, the Bible speaks about Him in such a way that established him as a real person in a real time, and not as a fictional character invented by the writer of the book of Daniel.

## **Goals**

In this research paper several issues will be at stake. First of all, the investigator will analyze the historical and archaeological evidence available for the identification of Darius the Mede. Second, the investigator will present the biblical evidence for the support of Darius the Mede as co-ruler with Cyrus. Third, the investigator will deal with the implications involved in his identification and the accuracies of the dates provided by the internal evidence of the book of Daniel. Fourth, these implications will have a tremendous impact on the way in which the time prophecies in the book of Daniel should be interpreted. Fifth, the reader will be able to draw his/her own conclusion and accept or reject what will be presented by the investigator.

## **Methodology**

For the purpose of studying this particular subject, the author will use biblical dictionaries, Bible commentaries, Journals and any other types of printed material

available to support the bibliography. The views of different theologians will be presented along with the different trends of interpretation of the book of Daniel. Emphasis will be made on the interpretation that is the most accurate in the eyes of this investigator.

## **Analysis**

### **The Testimony of Isaiah**

Scholars have made several attempts to identify Darius the Mede within the range of rulers of the Medo-Persian Empire; nevertheless, most of them have been unsuccessful. First of all, the biblical data helps to identify this power in which Darius and Cyrus played a key role. For example, Isaiah, an older prophet than Jeremiah, prophesied about the Medes and the Persians (identified as Elam). It was said about Elam in Isaiah 22:6, "*And Elam bare the quiver with chariots of men and horsemen...*" Also, in Daniel 8, the Ram with two horns (one taller than the other) which is clearly identified as one sole power, Medo-Persia (v. 20) it is obvious that "*the Hebrew for "Ram" springs from the same root as "Elam," or Persia...*"<sup>1</sup> If this hypothesis is correct, then Isaiah the prophet foretold the future of the Persians under the original name of the tribe of "*Elam.*" God wanted to use the Medo-Persians to punish Babylon for her iniquity toward God's people. And Isaiah the prophet called the Medo-Persians His "*sanctified ones*" and His "*mighty ones*" and "*people who rejoiced in God's highness*" (Isa. 13:3). The prophet also asserted that God Himself was coming with the Medes and Persians to punish Babylon, and that they were called "*the weapons of his indignation*" (Isa. 13: 5). In addition, Isaiah 13:17 established that the Medes would come and would overcome Babylon because of

her oppression upon God's people. Obviously God was the One who was behind the scenes and used the Medes and Persians to punish Babylon for not being a merciful kingdom to the Hebrew nation in particular (Isa. 47:6). Another point of this prophecy is that the Medes in particular would not care about silver or gold at all, nor about people (v. 18); instead, they wanted the power and the fear of the people. Isaiah 44:28 and 45:1-5 stated that Cyrus, a Persian king, was destined to rule the earth. He was anointed by God Himself to perform this task. In chapter 46:11, Cyrus was called a "*ravenous bird from the east, the man that executeth my counsel from a far country...*"

It is true that these prophecies could include a broader spectrum and a key role in the end time prophecies; notwithstanding, all the details of these prophecies were supposed to be fulfilled in those times. Even so they were not fulfilled in every detail because these prophecies pointed to a bigger scene such as, the fall, rise and destruction of Satan himself (portrayed as the king of Babylon) and his followers (Isa. 14:12-23).

### **The Testimony of Jeremiah**

The prophet Jeremiah said also that Elam (Persia) was going "*to be dismayed before their enemies and before them that seek their life*" (v. 37). It says that God was going "*to set His throne in Elam*" (Persia) and "*destroy the king and the princes*" (v. 38). But at the end, God was going "*to bring to an end the captivity of Elam*" (Persia -v. 39). The most interesting thing about this particular prophecy of the prophet Jeremiah, is that it was given "*in the beginning of the reign of Zedekiah king of Judah*" (Jer. 49:34 - emphasis mine). King Zedekiah was appointed king by Nebuchadnezzar himself over Judah and Jerusalem (2 Chronicles 36: 9-10). This means that God was, even before the

rise of the Babylonian empire and even during the time of her ruling, foretelling about the ruin and doom of the Babylonians at the hands of the Medes and Persians. Some scholars believe that Jeremiah intended to speak exclusively about the Persians and not about the Medes. "*He [Jeremiah] names the Medes rather than the Persians, because Darius, or Cyaxares, was above Cyrus in power and the greatness of his kingdom.*"<sup>2</sup> Nevertheless, it is obvious that Jeremiah is not speaking of the Persians as an isolated power, but somehow linked to the Medes (Jer. 25:25). Jeremiah 49:34-39 prophesied about Elam (Persia), stating that God was going "*to break the bow of Elam*" (v. 35), and was going "*to bring the winds from the four quarters of heaven*" (v. 36). -This could well be a direct reference to the four generals of Alexander the Great that helped him to overcome the Medo-Persian empire, (see Daniel 8:8).

In Jeremiah 51:1, for example, the Medo-Persians were called "*a destroying wind*" and "*fanners*" (v. 2). A very interesting point about the prophecy of Jeremiah is that this prophet who was "*ordained to be a prophet to the nations*" (Jer. 1:5), he explicitly mentions that "*kings*" (in plural) were going to tear down the kingdom of Babylon. "*Make bright the arrows; gather the shields: the Lord hath raised up the spirit of the kings of the Medes: for his device is against Babylon, to destroy it; because it is the vengeance of the Lord, the vengeance of his temple*" (Jer. 50:28 -emphasis mine). And it is repeated in Jer. 51:28, "*Prepare against her [Babylon] the nations [Media and Persia] with the kings [Darius and Cyrus?] of the Medes [again plural], the captains thereof, and all the rulers thereof, and all the land of his dominion.*" Even the way that Babylon was to be conquered was foretold by the prophet when he said, "*...And I will dry up her sea [Euphrates river], and make her springs dry*" (v. 36). It is well known that the Euphrates

river was virtually dried up. In verse 42, the Medes and Persians also were called "*the Sea*". And in verse 48 it says "...*the spoilers* [plural again] *shall come unto her from the north.*" In addition, in Jer. 50:9, the warriors against Babylon are called "*an assembly of great nations* [plural] *from the north country.*" H

Henry says that the Medes in conjunction with the Persians and under the command of Darius and Cyrus, "*were the ruin of the Babylonian monarchy.*"<sup>3</sup> Another interesting fact in relation to this, is that 2 Chronicles 36:20 says that those who escaped from the sword were taken captives to Babylon to be servants until *the "coming of the Persians."* This text clearly proves that although the Medes were allied with the Persians, the latter would become the dominant figures in ruling the kingdom.

### **The Testimony of Ezekiel**

The prophet Ezekiel also prophesied about Elam (Persia) when he said, "*There is Elam* [Persia] *and all her multitude round about her grave, all of them slain, fallen by the sword, which are gone down uncircumcised into the nether parts of the earth, which caused their terror in the land of the living; yet have they borne their shame with them that go down to the pit...*" (Ezek. 32: 24-25). Obviously, this prophecy was fulfilled in an exact manner, because the Medo-Persians did not spare the lives of the people. And this attitude was exemplified through the imagery of the Bear (Medo-Persia) which was commanded to eat and devour much flesh (Daniel 7:5).

## Conclusion

1. It may be properly established that at least three of the great prophets of the Old Testament (Isaiah, Jeremiah and Ezekiel) foretold the coming, along with the rise and the fall of the Medo-Persian empire.
2. The Medes and Persians were very cruel to all the nations that they conquered, except with the Hebrew nation. Nevertheless, the Hebrew nation was the most favored by the most powerful and famous Mede (Darius) along with the Persian kings (Cyrus, Darius and Ahasuerus).
3. There is enough evidence to believe that Darius and Cyrus were also included in these prophecies.
4. History indeed helps to confirm the certainty of the prophecies of Isaiah, Jeremiah and Ezekiel that the punishment of Babylon and the favor shown to the Hebrew nation, involved at least two or more kings, and also two or more nations (Media and Persia), not one.
5. The implication of this biblical data is that the Bible foretold the destruction of Babylon, specifically at the hands of the Medes and Persians. Obviously, history confirms that the biblical prophecies predicted more than 150 years before the fall of Babylon were accurate. This means that God Himself is behind the world scenario ruling on earth through human instrumentalities.

On the other hand, Jeremiah sent the book that contained the doom upon Babylon to Babylon when king Zedekiah went up to Babylon in the fourth (4<sup>th</sup>) year of his rule (Jer. 51: 59-61). That means that Daniel had some knowledge of the book, especially if Jeremiah sent it to Babylon to be read to those in captivity. If this hypothesis is correct,

this might well partially explains the understanding that Daniel had about the visions (Daniel 10:1-2), and may well explain why Daniel had a copy (or the original) of Jeremiah's book in Babylon (Daniel 9:1-2).

### **Origin of the Medes and Persians**

With this background in mind it would be good to speak briefly about the origin of the Medes and the Persians. According to scholars, the Persian empire reached from India to Greece, and from the Caspian Sea to the Red Sea. "*The Persians are believed to have originated in Media, which today corresponds to western Iran and southern Azerbaijan. They settled in Persia...*"<sup>4</sup> And an early leader called Teispes, "*conquered Elam in the time of the decline of the Assyrian empire, although Cyrus II, King of Anzan, united the nation, and conquered Media, Lydia and Babylonia.*"<sup>5</sup>

### **Discrepancies according to the critics**

The critics say that there are serious discrepancies in the book of Daniel that lead one to think that the writer of the book did not have enough knowledge of the successive kings and the time when they ruled.

Keil-Delitzsch states that there is an interruption in the chronological order and events pervading the book because the visions of chapters seven and eight were recorded after Darius the Median king.<sup>6</sup> These same authors believe that there was no connection at all between Belshazzar's death and the transference of power to the Median Darius<sup>7</sup> as recorded in Daniel 5:30-31. Another problem they see, is that apparently the fall of Babylon was "*announced to come in seventy years, although it took place two years*

earlier."<sup>8</sup> Although at the same time they contradict this same statement when they say, "From the 4th year of Jehoiakim, i.e., 606 B.C., till the 1st year of the sole supremacy of Cyrus over Babylon, i.e., 536 B.C., gives a period of 70 years."<sup>9</sup>

Edwards believes that the 70 years may have more than one fulfillment, and should not necessarily be counted from 606 B.C. to 536 B.C.<sup>10</sup> Taylor believes that "Darius the Mede" is historically unidentifiable."<sup>11</sup> This approach poses some difficulties for the statement of Jesus about Daniel when He said, "When ye therefore shall see the abomination of desolation, spoken of by Daniel the prophet, stand in the holy place, (whoso readeth, let him understand:)" (Matthew 24:15). It was Jesus who called Daniel a "prophet". And Wilson says that the fact that Darius the Median king,

*"had sons living in the time of Cyrus is shown by the fact that two rebel aspirants to the throne in the time of Darius Hystaspis claimed to be his sons, to wit: Fravartish, a Median, who lied saying, "I am Khshathrita of the family of Uvakhshatara" (Behistun Inscr, col. II, v); and Citrantakhma, who said, "I am king in Sagartia of the family of Uvakhshatara" (id, II, xiv). If we accept the identification of Gubaru with Darius the Mede, then the latter may well have been another of his sons, at first a sub-king to Astyages the Scythian, as he was later to Cyrus the Persian."<sup>12</sup>*

The problem with some of these views presented above is that they minimize or ignore the internal evidence of the book of Daniel itself as we will try to prove in this paper.

According to the International Bible Commentary, the Jews returned from Babylon in 536 B.C. "under the leadership of Zerubbabel, the civil head of the community, and Joshua, the ecclesiastical."<sup>13</sup> 2 Chronicles 36:22-23. Ezra 1:1-4 established that a decree was issued by Cyrus the Persian king on behalf of the Jews.

Wright said that even the book of Isaiah is inaccurate because it mentions Cyrus as a mighty king that overcomes God's people and the world.<sup>14</sup>

What the critics are basically trying to say is that the whole book of Daniel is filled with inaccuracies in terms of events, identification of the kings, correct chronological order and synchrony. And because of this, they reject most, if not, all of the prophetic content of the book. To this fact, Hasel says, "*Caution should be exercised.*"<sup>15</sup>

### **Internal evidence of the Scriptures**

What truly pertains to this study is the identification of Darius the Mede as a real ruler in the Medo-Persian empire. According to what has been presented up to this point, the Medes and the Persians were portrayed as one power unified<sup>16</sup> to overcome Babylon. And analyzing the internal evidence of the book itself, several conclusions that support this fact can be drawn.

### **Evidence in chapter one**

For example, Daniel 1:21 states "*And Daniel continued even unto the first year of king Cyrus.*" And as Pusey said that these "*...are the simple words; but what a volume of tried faithfulness.*"<sup>17</sup> This text clearly proves that the project of writing this book was undertaken in or after the first year of Cyrus the Persian king.

### **Evidence in chapter two**

Nebuchadnezzar dreamed about a great image formed of different metals. The interpretation of the dream was a succession of kingdoms and powers that would end

with the establishment of God's kingdom on the earth (v. 44). To Nebuchadnezzar it was said that after his kingdom another kingdom would arise (v. 39). This clearly implies that God had pre-ordained other world powers to rule the earth for a period of time.

### **Evidence in chapter five**

In chapter five of Daniel, the judgment upon Babylon and Belshazzar is pronounced because of his iniquity in using the sacred vessels of God's temple for drinking in a cultic feast to the idols. A hand appeared writing on the wall the following words: "*MENE, MENE, TEKEL, UPHARSIN*" (v. 25). Daniel proceeds to interpret the writing on the wall saying,

*"MENE: God hath numbered thy kingdom, and finished"* (v. 26).

*"TEKEL: Thou art weighed in the balances, and art found wanting"* (v. 27).

*"PERES: Thy kingdom is divided, and given to the Medes and Persians"* (v. 28).

The interesting thing about this interpretation, is the last part. It says that the Babylonian kingdom was going to be "*divided, and given to the Medes [first] and Persians [later]*." Obviously, God intended that the Medes should rule Babylon first and followed by the Persians, but as one unified power.<sup>18</sup>

The next verse is striking in the light of this prophecy, because it says, "*And Darius the Median took [received] the kingdom, being about threescore and two years old*" (v. 31). In contrast to other epic narratives, the text does not say that Darius CONQUERED the kingdom, but "*received*" it, which is very meaningful at the moment of forming the puzzle.

## **Evidence in chapter six**

According to the very words of the other governors appointed by Darius the Mede, the law proclaimed by the king was not a Median law, but a Medo-Persian law (6:8). The king himself said that this law could not be revoked because of the treaties between Media and Persia (v. 12). And this obviously means that the two nations were confederated.

Anderson gives another reason why to believe that these two kings (Darius the Mede and Cyrus the Persian) were co-ruling together. For him, the fact that Ezra 5 speaks about the reign of Darius (Hystaspis?) and that the Jews made an appeal to the decree of king Cyrus to rebuild the Temple. The decree was filed, but was not found for a while. Finally, it was found in Ecbatana or Achmetha (Ezra 6:2). It is interesting to notice that this city was a Median city, and obviously it was used as a house of archives for the Medo-Persian empire. This could mean that "*the vassal king whom Daniel calls Darius the Mede was Gobryas (or Gubaru), who led the army of Cyrus to Babylon.*"<sup>19</sup>

This same Darius (the Mede) began to subdivide the kingdom in satraps in Daniel 6:1, and he appointed Daniel as one of the three governors. The chapter ends saying, "*So this Daniel prospered in the reign of Darius, and in the reign of Cyrus the Persian*" (v. 28). In this text is clearly established the sequence foretold by the ancient prophets (Isaiah, Jeremiah and Ezekiel) and furthermore Daniel. First, there is a Median king and later a Persian king. Another detail seen in this verse is that Daniel did not mention the ethnic origin of Darius (the Mede), because he ended chapter five speaking of his origin. He instead emphasizes that Cyrus (the Persian) is the next ruler after Darius. And as White says, "*Darius reigned over Medo-Persia two years after the fall of Babylon.*"<sup>20</sup> But

it may also mean in naming them together, that Daniel is trying to say that he himself prospered under the ruling of both (Darius the Mede, and Cyrus the Persian). If this hypothesis is correct, then it is proper to say that Cyrus was a co-regent with Darius, until the death of Darius two years after overcoming Babylon.

Historically, Cyrus was not declared "*king of Babylon*"<sup>21</sup> until 536 B.C. And if Babylon was overthrown in 539/538 B.C. an important question arises, who was the ruler appointed to Babylon by Cyrus between 538-536 B.C.? Shea believes that there are only two possibilities:

*"Either there was an interregnum and the throne of Babylon went unoccupied for a year, or somebody else besides Cyrus occupied the throne for that period of time."*<sup>22</sup>

Another interesting thing about this fact, is that chapter six occurred sometime during the interregnum of these two kings (Darius and Cyrus). White said the same on this respect, "*During this time, Daniel was cast into the lions' den and came out unharmed.*"<sup>23</sup>

### **Evidence in chapter seven**

Daniel 7:1 says, "*In the first year of Belshazzar king of Babylon Daniel had a dream and visions of his head upon his bed: then he wrote the dream, and told the sum of the matters.*" This verse contains several crucial elements. Primarily, the first (1<sup>st</sup>) year of Belshazzar is given for the timing of the vision, which is approximately two years before his death. This means that the vision of Daniel 7 was given during the Babylonian rule. And it also means that God repeated his message to Daniel that at the end of the Babylonian rule, that another kingdom (Medo-Persia, represented by the bear who was

commanded to "*Arise, devour much flesh*" -v.5) would come. And this point is very important because it tells the reader that at the end of the 70 years, God was going to bring another kingdom to punish Babylon because of her oppression upon His people. And this means that at the end of the 70 years, God's kingdom was not going to be established on earth as many interpreters present the matter. Instead, it means that God would allow other nations to rule the earth before setting up His everlasting kingdom.

### **Evidence in chapter eight**

Daniel 8 begins with the third year of Belshazzar king of Babylon, and he said that this vision occurred after the first one of chapter seven. Obviously the vision of chapter eight was a vision given in the exact same year in which Belshazzar was slain and Darius the Mede received the kingdom. Even Wesley came up with this conclusion when he said, "*That is, immediately after the overthrow of the kingdom of Babylon, which was the year of the Jews deliverance from captivity.*"<sup>24</sup> There are several reasons for this conclusion:

- a) Belshazzar co-ruled with his father (Nabonidus) for about three or three and a half years.
- b) This is the last time that Belshazzar was mentioned in the book.
- c) The vision given does not involve Babylon, but the subsequent powers that would rule the earth.

## Evidence in chapter nine

In Daniel 9:1-2, for example, it says, "*In the first year of Darius the son of Ahasuerus, of the seed of the Medes, which was made king over the realm of the Chaldeans; in the first year of his reign I Daniel understood by books the number of the years, whereof the word of the Lord came to Jeremiah the prophet, that he would accomplish seventy years in the desolations of Jerusalem.*" (Emphasis mine).

Many commentators believe that this Ahasuerus was the same Artaxerxes (Xerxes) mentioned in the book of Esther. The problem with this view is that it poses Daniel 9 around thirteen years after the last vision in Daniel 8, which seems improbable because of the strong connection and links between chapters eight and nine. Another problem that is not solved by taking this view, is that the Ahasuerus of Esther was from the seed of the Persians, not from the Medes, and the text in Daniel 9:1 says that he was from the nation (seed) of the Medes.

This investigator proposes that the Darius mentioned in Daniel 9:1 was Darius the Mede. The following reasons support this hypothesis.

1. He was from the seed (genetically speaking) of the Medes.
2. He was made king over the realm of the Chaldeans, which means that he did not have total control of the empire. And this matches the explanation in 5:31 where it says that Darius the Mede "*received*" the (Babylonian) kingdom.
3. If this hypothesis is correct, then the third year of Belshazzar (Daniel 8:1) and the first year of Darius (Daniel 9:1) is the same. This fact would mean that the very same year that Belshazzar was slain (third) -Daniel 5:30- is the same year

that Daniel had the visions of Daniel 8 and around that same time (third year), the angel came to give him "*wisdom and understanding*" (9:22).

**A question arises immediately. If the vision of Daniel 8 and the event of Daniel 9 occurred in the same year, why the change in the description of the kings, kingdoms and dates?**

This is a very fair question but it has only one answer (if this hypothesis is accepted). Daniel received the vision of Daniel 8 during the time in which Belshazzar was still the king (co-ruler with his father Nabonidus). But when the event of Daniel 9 took place, Belshazzar had died and Babylon had been taken by the Medes and Persians.

The idea that 13 years have passed seems very improbable. The reason for this conclusion is that the angel came back (in Daniel 9) to explain the part of the vision unexplained in Daniel 8. And according to the pattern found in the book in answer to prayers, Daniel received the answer to his prayers quickly (Daniel 2, 6, 9, 10); and this pattern is consistently seen throughout the whole book.

Another problem that the 13 year delay presents, is that Daniel 11:1 says, "*Also I in the first year of Darius the Mede, even I, stood to confirm and to strengthen him.*" This clearly means that in order for Darius to "*receive*" the kingdom and to establish the kingdom, the Messenger Himself came to help him. Therefore this all means that Daniel 5, 8 and 9 occurred the very same year.

### **Evidence in chapter ten**

Going back to the sequence presented, Daniel 10:1 reads, "*In the third year of Cyrus king of Persia a thing was revealed unto Daniel, whose name was called*

*Belteshazzar; and the thing was true, but the time appointed was long: and he understood the thing, and had understanding of the vision."*

The date for this and the subsequent chapters is the third year of king Cyrus, the Persian king. Daniel 1:21 states that Daniel continued until the first year of this same king. This means that the whole book of Daniel was written between the first and the third year of Cyrus the king, which historically would mean between 538 B.C. - 536 B.C. If Darius the Mede and Cyrus the Persian were co-ruling together, the first year of Darius is the same for Cyrus.

Nevertheless, another possibility is raised. If Daniel is counting the time of the co-ruling of these two kings, the very first year of Cyrus the Persian would be the last year of Darius the Mede as king (536 B.C.). And the whole book was therefore written between 536 B.C. - 534 B.C. The problem with this last view, is that disconnects the strong links presented in this paper and belittle the prophecies of the co-regency of the Mede and Persian kings.

### **Evidence in chapter eleven**

Another point in behalf of the hypothesis presented by this investigator is that Daniel 11:2 reads, "*And now I will shew thee the truth. Behold, there shall stand up yet three kings in Persia; and the fourth shall be far richer than they all: and by his strength through his riches he shall stir up all against the realm of Greece.*"

Several things are found in this text. First of all, the Messenger explained that three more kings would rule in "*Persia.*" He begins speaking of a Median king (Darius the Mede) and then switches to Persian kings. The reality is that after this vision, no other

king from the Medes ruled the empire, only Persian kings ruled. And again the sequence for ruling is striking, first a Median king, then Persian kings (although both nations were unified). Second, literally there were more than four Persian kings from the time of Cyrus until the conquering of Alexander the Great (Grecia -Greece); nevertheless, the most notable kings are presented in the prophecy. As Shea says,

*"The reason the Persian kings are only listed down to Xerxes is that it was he who by his wars against Greece caused it to rebound and to become a reputable power in the Near east. After this critical turning point in history the rest of the Persian kings no longer held any great prophetic significance and so were not mentioned."<sup>25</sup>*

Clearly, if Ahasuerus is the same Artaxerxes (from a Persian seed) of Esther and he is the "*fourth*" king, and with him the Medo-Persian empire ended. How could it be that his son Darius (from a Median seed) ruled after him according to Daniel 9:1? This would be the most faulty interpretation of the whole book of Daniel.

### **Implications/Conclusion**

How does this conclusion affect the prophecies presented in the book of Daniel itself? It strongly affects the way of interpretation. Because it does not give space for the interpretation that some of the prophecies must have had literal fulfillment in the times of Daniel, such as the 2300 evenings and mornings and the 70 weeks.

God did not intend to establish His kingdom at the end of the seventy weeks, as many interpreters believe. Innumerable theologians believe that because of the sins of the people and the lack of faithfulness of God's people to the Covenant, God had to change His plans and to come up with something else. Instead, the proposal of this investigator is

that He intended to allow other nations to rule, despite the faithfulness or unfaithfulness of His people before establishing an everlasting kingdom of peace and justice.

- 
- <sup>1</sup> Jamieson, Fausset and Brown. (1996). *Commentary of the Old Testament*, Vol. 2, Daniel. (Software Ages:Albany); p. 1156.
- <sup>2</sup> Ibid., p. 812.
- <sup>3</sup> Matthew, Henry. (1996). *Commentary on Gen-Deut* (Ages Software: Albany); p. 196.
- <sup>4</sup> Taken from <http://www.execulink.com/~wblank/persia.htm> (-emphasis mine).
- <sup>5</sup> Idem.
- <sup>6</sup> Keil-Delitzsch (1996). *Old Testament Commentary, Vol. 9, Eze-Dan*. (Ages Software: Albany); p. 747.
- <sup>7</sup> Ibid., p. 869.
- <sup>8</sup> Keil-Delitzsch (1996). *Old Testament Commentary, Vol. 8, Jer-Lam*. (Ages Software: Albany); p. 383.
- <sup>9</sup> Idem.-
- <sup>10</sup> Edwards, Jonathan. (1996) *The Works of Jonathan Edwards*. Vol. 1 ((Ages Software: Albany); p. 247.
- <sup>11</sup> Taken from <http://www.infidels.org/~ltaylor/bible-notes/darius-empires.html>.
- <sup>12</sup> International Standard Bible Encyclopedia, Vol. 1. A-Azzur. (Ages Software: Albany); p. 285.
- <sup>13</sup> Ibid., Vol. 5 H-IZ. (Ages Software: Albany); p. 26.
- <sup>14</sup> G. E. Wright. (1964). *Isaiah* (London); p. 8-10.
- <sup>15</sup> Hasel, Gerhard F. (1985). *Biblical Interpretation Today: An Analysis of Modern Methods of Biblical Interpretation and Proposals for the Interpretation of the Bible as the Word of God*. (Nebraska: College View Printers); p. 32.
- <sup>16</sup> Ford, Desmond. (1978). *Daniel*. (Tennessee: Southern Publishing Association); pp.39-40
- <sup>17</sup> Ibid., p. 83. Quoted by Ford (Pusey, pp. 88-89).
- <sup>18</sup> Henry, Matthew. (1996). *Matthew Henry Commentary: Commentary on Ezequiel - Malachi*, vol. 7. (Albany: Software Ages); p. 640.
- <sup>19</sup> Anderson, Robert. (1996). *The Coming Prince*. (Albany: Ages Software); p. 7.
- <sup>20</sup> White, Ellen G. (The Review and Herald -Periodicals); March 21, 1907.
- <sup>21</sup> Shea, William H. (1971-1972). *An unrecognized Vassal King of Babylon in the Early Achaemenid Period*. (Berrien Springs: Andrews University Seminary Studies), vols. 9-10; Nos. 1-2.
- <sup>22</sup> Shea, William H. (1982). *Selected Studies on Prophetic Interpretation*. Vol. 1. (Washington, D.C.: The Review and Herald Publishing Association); p. 29.
- <sup>23</sup> White, Ellen G. (The Review and Herald -Periodicals); March 21, 1907.
- <sup>24</sup> Wesley, John. (1996). *Wesley's Notes on the Bible*. (Albany: Ages Software); p. 2139.
- <sup>25</sup> Ibid., p. 33.