

CRITICAL ARGUMENTS & THE DATING OF DANIEL

I. INTRO

VIEWPOINTS & DATING OF THE TEXT

A. According to the book of Daniel:

Daniel is a young Hebrew of noble or royal birth taken captive to Babylon by Nebuchadnezzar. Along with three other Hebrews of like fate, the book narrates their challenges, faithfulness and deliverance, as well as Daniel's ability to interpret dreams, his rise to high position during the 6th century BC, and his visions and prophecies about the future. The book describes various kingdoms and rulers to come, including Alexander the Great (4th cent. BC), and Antiochus Epiphanes (2nd cent. BC).

B. According to critical scholars:

Daniel is a legendary and fictional work written (whether whole or in part) in the 2nd century BC during the oppressions of Antiochus Epiphanes. Descriptions of Antiochus and previous rulers reflect specific knowledge up to a point because they were written after the fact, and only disguised as an ancient text that had been "sealed up." The correlation with historical details ends during the career of Antiochus, and is also unreliable as to the history of the 6th century BC, as it was written long after.

C. Fundamental Worldviews:

From a worldview which recognizes the Creator and the possibility of prophetic revelation and miraculous intervention, an account of prophecy and miraculous intervention does not equal fraud.

For unbelievers accepting a worldview which either precludes a Creator altogether, or at least an interactive Creator, records of accurate prophecy or real miracles are seen as literally incredible.

Obviously, our worldviews and predispositions affect our perceptions. In thinking about this, consider the 2 scenarios below:

1. **Q #1: How might a critic view Isa. 53 if it were not externally known to predate Christ?**

From long before the death of Jesus, we have undeniable evidence that the text of Isaiah was known and received as prophetic. The text had also been translated into another language (LXX), and from the DSS, we can now look directly at Hebrew mss. that were penned long before Christ.

[Note, in respect to the time of Christ, we have that also for Daniel. But with Daniel, the dates at issue are the much earlier, ranging from Persian Kings to Alexander to Antiochus E.). Now back to Isa. 53. Suppose for a moment that, as is the case with many ancient books, that we had no external evidence verifying the existence or reception of Isaiah 53 prior to 30 AD?

Were that the case, how quickly might a critic be arguing the following?

"The late theology of this text, with its single innocent but rejected servant being wounded for the sins of many, and the many being justified through his suffering and death, clearly point to a date of composition after the death of Christ and the rise of a suffering savior theology in the early church."

But with our external evidences predating 30 AD, that is not an argument that will be made.

2. Q #2: How would a Christian view this “Nostradamus” prophecy, published in 2017, after being “found” in an old trunk? <https://francoisgautier.me/2017/03/29/nostradamus-india/>

Purporting to be a prediction of the Prime Minister of India, it details his name (which is Narendra); his home district (which is Gujarat), and his father’s profession (selling tea).

How quickly might you assume that this text was not written by Nostradamus in the 1500’s?

Your incredulity might have begun with a disbelief in Nostradamus’ ability to truly prophecy, but in discussing it with someone who believed it, would you not also press the following?

- a.) this prediction was not counted among his previously collected prophecies
- b.) our earliest sighting of the prediction comes to us after the events it purports to predict

The critic views Daniel the way you would view this prediction of the Indian Prime Minister. And while the rejection of revealed prophecy would be fundamental to many critics (as a rejection of Nostradamus is fundamental to many of us), they present a large number of arguments for a late dating of Daniel (see notes below).

D. Various Critical Arguments for a late date of Daniel:

(compare from S.R. Driver, The Book of Daniel, Cambridge, 1900; pg. Xlvii & ff.)

A. HISTORICAL ARGUMENTS

1. Not part of the Prophets in the Jewish Canon
2. Ben Sirach’s silence on Daniel
3. Neb. taking captives “in the 3rd yr of Jehoiakim” (cf. Jer. 25.9; 36.29)
4. Use of “Chaldaeans” for “wisemen,” not used in this sense in Babyl. Empire
5. Belshazzar regarded as King and son of Nebuchadnezzar
6. Reign of “Darius the Mede” after the fall of Babylon
7. Dan. 9.2 ref. to Jer. In the “books,” – any such collection not the case in 538
8. *Incorrect explanation of Belshazzar in 4.8, unless assonance, not etymology.*
9. *Events thought historically improbable regarding the 4 Hebrews & Nebuchadnezzar, etc.*

B. LANGUAGE :

1. Numerous Persian words in the text (eg.; “satrap”)
2. Three Greek words in the text
3. The Aramaic is Western Aramaic, similar to Ezra, as spoken in Palestine
4. The Hebrew is not like Ezek. or Isaiah, but like Chronicles

C. THEOLOGICAL: the theology is late, regarding treatment of kingdom, named angels, resurrection & judgment

D. Aspects of 2nd CENTURY FOCUS on Antiochus: central, surprisingly distinct to a point, then the distinctness ceases

E. Arguments addressed in this lecture.

This lecture will not address all of the above, but it will focus on several of the most commonly encountered arguments from sections A & B.

From section A., Driver singled out as especially definitive points 2,4,5 and 6. I will be focusing on 3 of those (Ben Sira, Belshazzar, and Darius the Mede).

From section B., Driver famously said it was the Greek that “demands” a later date (while the Persian, Heb., and Aramaic “presuppose,” “supports,” or “permits”). I will address the Greek.

I will not be addressing section C (though compare the hypothetical exercise on Isa. 53), nor section D, and arguments relating to the history of the 2nd century, which I will leave to those

covering the latter chapters of Daniel. I will also address the commonly raised issue of canon placement, with which Raymond Hammer brings up on page 1 of his Cambridge Commentary. These then, are the arguments I will address in this lecture:

1. **CANON POSITION:** In the Hebrew canon, Daniel is not in the prophets (closed by 200 BC).
2. **GREEK WORDS:** Alexander brought in Greek in the 4th century. Daniel contains Grk. words.
3. **BEN SIRA:** c. 200 to 180 BC, has no Daniel in his list of heroes from Adam to Nehemiah.
4. **HISTORY OF RULERS IN THE 6th CENTURY:** While getting later history right, up to a certain point in the 160's BC, it records supposed events in the 6th century as follows:
 - A.) **Belshazzar** is a king, whereas the last king of Babylon was Nabonidus, B.'s father.
Belshazzar is the son of Nebucadnezzar, whereas B.'s father was Nabonidus, a usurper.
 - B.) **"Darius the Mede"** is the first ruler after the fall of Babylon, whereas Babylon fell to Cyrus (the Persian King), and Darius the Great, was a few kings later, and was a Persian.

II. SPECIFIC ARGUMENTS & REBUTTALS

1. CANON PLACEMENT: Daniel too late to be among the Hebrew Prophets

A. THE ARGUMENT

"In the English Bible, the book of Daniel occupies a place after the major prophets (Isaiah, Jeremiah, and Ezekiel), a position that it received in the Septuagint, the Greek translation of the Old testament... The Hebrew canon consists of three division, the 'Law', the 'Prophets' and the 'Writings', and Daniel is included in the third and last division. This suggests that the book was not known by 200 B.C., about the time when the collection of prophetic writings was assembled....The fact that the book is not included in the prophetic canon... supports this date in the second century B.C."

- Raymond Hammer, The Book of Daniel, Cambridge Bible Commentary, Camb. Univ. press, 1976 pg. 1, 5

"The Jewish Canon consists of three distinct parts: (1) the *Torah* or Pentateuch; (2) the *Prophets* ... and (3) the *Kethubim*, or 'Hagiographa,' comprising (according to the order adopted in ordinary Hebrew Bibles) Psalms, Proverbs, Job, the five Megilloth (Song of Songs, Ruth, Lamentations, Ecclesiastes, Esther), Daniel, Ezra-Nehemiah, and Chronicles. This is the manner in which the books are arranged in both MSS. and printed editions 1; and though little definite is known respecting the formation of the Canon, there are strong reasons for thinking that the threefold division represents three stages in the collection and canonization of the sacred books of the O.T.; - the Pent. being canonized first, the 'Prophets' (in the Jewish sense of the expression), and lastly, the *Kethubim*. The collection of the 'Prophets' could hardly have been completed before the third century B.C. 2; and had the Book of Daniel existed at the time, and been believed to be the work of a prophet, it is difficult not to think that it would have ranked accordingly, and been included with the writings of the other prophets"

-S.R. Driver, The Book of Daniel, Cambridge, 1900; pp. xlvii-xlviii

B. REBUTTAL & RESPONSE to the CANON PLACEMENT ARGUMENT:

THE CURRENT HEBREW CANON:

The books of Moses: (5 books) Gen., Exod., Lev., Num., Deut.

The Prophets: (8 books) Josh., Judg., Sam., Kings, Isa., Jer., Ezk., The 12 Minor Prophets

The Writings (11 books): Ps. Prov., Job, Song of Sol., Ruth, Lament., Eccl., Esth., Dan., Ezra, Chron.

(to avoid confusion, keep in mind that in Hebrew, 1 & 2 Sam. = 1 book, Ezra-Neh. = 1 book, 12 minor proph. = 1 book, etc.)

In this order, Daniel is firmly in the 3rd category, along with Lamentation, Ezra-Nehemiah, and Esther.

But turning to earlier centuries, we see something different:

[1.] JOSEPHUS Against Apion; Book 1 .8 (circa 100 A.D.):

“For we have not an innumerable multitude of books among us, disagreeing from and contradicting one another, [as the Greeks have,] but only twenty-two books...

five belong to Moses... the prophets, who were after Moses... in thirteen books.

The remaining four books contain hymns to God, and precepts for the conduct of human life.”

The breakdown then according to Josephus, a Jewish Pharisee of the first century:

5 books of Moses (same as current Hebrew classification)

13 books of the Prophets (NOTE: that’s 5 more than the current 8 prophets)

4 other texts of hymns and precepts for conduct (NOTE: that’s 7 less than the current 11 in writings)

Sidenote: the difference between Josephus’ 22 and the current Hebrew 24 may be due to either:

a.) Like the LXX, Josephus may be counting Judges/Ruth in 1 book and Jer./Lam. in 1 book. Likewise, Jerome later counts 22, but notes that some separate Ruth and Lamentations for a count of 24 (Jerome, Prologue Galeatus)

b.) A more remote possibility, perhaps, might be the omission of Song & Ecclesiastes, which are mentioned in the Mishnah as having been in dispute by some (Mishnah, Yadaim 3.5). Esther, the one book not found at Qumran, appears included by Jos.

Our question here, however, concerns the placement of Daniel. Where does he go? Josephus does not designate the books by name this Contra Apion text, but the following 3 points leave no doubt that he counts Daniel among the the “books of the prophets.”

- The last group (“hymns” & “precepts for the conduct of human life”) would clearly include Psalms and Proverbs, and then 2 more that would be Eccles., Song, or Job. That leaves no room for Daniel in either the first 5, or the last 4 (and Daniel is here, as we shall see in point 3).
- The chronological context gives clarity as to Jos. placing D. among the prophets:
First: *“five belong to Moses, which contain his laws and the traditions of the origin of mankind till his death. This interval of time was little short of three thousand years”*
Then: *“but as to the time from the death of Moses till the reign of Artaxerxes king of Persia, who reigned after Xerxes, **the prophets, who were after Moses, wrote down what was done in their times in thirteen books.**” < Daniel fits here.*
- Closing out the case is Jos. specific description of Daniel from an earlier text: **Antiquities 10:1-11:7 “CONCERNING DANIEL AND WHAT BEFELL HIM AT BABYLON,** But now Nebuchadnezzar, king of Babylon, took some of the most noble of the Jews ... one of whom was called Daniel... Daniel conversed with God; for he did not only **prophecy** of future events, **as did the other prophets,** but he also determined the time of their

accomplishment....All these things did this man leave in writing, as God had showed them to him, insomuch that such as read **his prophecies...**"

Regardless of current Heb. canon; for Josephus, a 1st cent. Jewish Pharisee, Dan. was in the prophets.

[B.] MELITO OF SARDIS c. 170 AD, as cited by Eusebius:

*... in the Extracts made by him the same writer [i.e. Melito] gives at the beginning of the Introduction a catalog of the acknowledged books of the Old Testament, which it is necessary to quote at this point. He writes as follows: "Melito to his brother Onesimus, greeting! ... **when I went to the East and reached the place where these things were preached and done, I learned accurately the books of the Old Testament**, and I send them to you as written below. These are their names: Of Moses five, Genesis, Exodus, Numbers, Leviticus, Deuteronomy; Joshua the son of Nun, Judges, Ruth, four of Kingdoms, two of Chronicles, the Psalms of David, Solomon's Proverbs or Wisdom, Ecclesiastes, Song of Songs, Job; **of the Prophets: Isaiah, Jeremiah, the Twelve [minor prophets] in one book, Daniel, Ezekiel, Esdras.** From which also I have made the extracts, dividing them into six books." *Such are the words of Melito.**

Though Melito was a believer in Christ, he is describing information he got from the east, and he places Daniel squarely in the prophets.

Eusebius, Ecclesiastical History iv. 26.12-14 <http://www.bible-researcher.com/melito.html>

[C.] LXX:

DANIEL AMONG THE PROPHETS See photographs of Codex Valentinus online at:

http://digi.vatlib.it/view/MSS_Vat.gr.1209 . In the manuscript's handwritten table of contents, note the sequential listing & respective page #s for Ezekiel and Daniel (as seen on page 2, column 2):

"Ezekiel -1143
Daniel -1206"

By way of contrast, note the grouping of Psalms, Proverbs, and Ecclesiastes on pages 625-762)

[D.] DEAD SEA SCROLLS

"One fragment from the fourth cave uses the title 'Daniel the prophet' " -Hammer, pg. 1

[E.] AND MOST ESPECIALLY, JESUS:

"Daniel the prophet." Mark 13:14; Matt. 24:15

Summary:

Josephus (ca. 100 A.D.) :

Daniel among the prophets

Mileto, recording info from the East (ca. 170 A.D.) :

Daniel among the prophets

LXX (in our copies from the 4th century):

Daniel among the prophets

Dead Sea Scrolls:

Daniel "the prophet"

And of course, most pertinent for believers, from the NT:

Daniel "the Prophet"

2. Daniel's Use of Greek Vocabulary Demands a Composition After Alexander

Three Greek musical words (behind the Aramaic transliterations of the text) are found in Dan. 3:

kitharis (or cithara) = lyre [NASB, ESV]; harp [NKJ, ASV]
 psalterion = psaltery [NASB, NKJ, YLT]; harp [ESV]
 sumphonia = bagpipe [NASB, ESV]; in symphony [NKJ]; the symphony [YLT]; [drum, HCSB]

A. THE ARGUMENT:

"The *Persian* words presuppose a period after the Persian empire had been well established: the Greek words *demand*, the Hebrew *supports*, and the Aramaic *permits*, a date after the conquest of Palestine by Alexander the Great (332B.C.)" -S.R. Driver

The Cambridge Bible for schools and colleges THE BOOK OF DANIEL
 - S.R.DRIVER pg. lxii, Cambridge, 1900

"the startling fact that it contains at least three Greek words... has always been to me a strong confirmation of the view that the book of Daniel in it's present form is not older than the days of Antiochus Epiphanes." - Farrar.

An Exposition of the Bible, Vol. IV; S.S.Scranton Co. Hartford CN. 1907 -Farrar p.360

B. REBUTTAL & RESPONSE to the Greek Vocabulary argument:

Yes, the text of Daniel includes 3 Greek loanwords in Dan. 3.5. They are all three musical:

"when you hear the sound of the horn, pipe, **lyre**, trigon, **harp**, **bagpipe**, and every kind of music" ESV.

And yes, Greek spread through the middle east following Alexander's conquests.

That does not mean, however, that there were not interactions with Greeks *before* Alexander.

[1.] Examples of cross culture

a.) Greeks in 6th cent. Babylon. Two 6th cent. BC examples (both with connections to music) will be cited here. The point is not at all to suggest that the instruments in Dan. 3 were brought in by either of these men. The point is to show that even with limited knowledge, we find such cross cultural contact far before Alexander.

- **Pythagorus**, of Pythagorean Theorem fame, was not limited to math for his contributions. "He is supposed to have gathered the modes into a definite system; to have invented the science of acoustics; to have increased the strings of the lyre to fifteen" -Music through the Ages, Bauer and Peyser, pg. 39

<https://archive.org/details/musicthroughthea010450mbp>

Though not being there as early as Daniel, Pythagorus was in Babylon long before Alexander, having been taken there captive from Egypt in 525 BC.

- **[B.] Antimenidas** was the older brother of Alcaeus of Mytilene, a famous Lyric Poet (lyric, as in, accompanied by the Lyre). Alcaeus was associated also with Sappho, one of the **Nine Lyric Poets**, a group of highly esteemed ancient Greeks who according to Palantine Anthology are

said to have established lyric song. Whether Antimenidas shared any of his brother's musical skills is not known, but of interest here are the lyrics of Alcaeus in honor of his brother's military service:

"Antimenidas seems to have fought as a mercenary in Palestine with the army of Nebuchadnezzar, king of Babylon, in the campaigns which culminated in the capture of Jerusalem on 15/16th March, 597 B.C. Alcaeus is proud of his brother's exploits and welcomes him home with a tribute...: Fighting with the Babylonians you achieved a great feat, and saved them from their troubles..." Greek Lyric Poetry: From Alcman to Simonides, C.M. Bowra, pg. 139 Oxford U. Press 1961

b.) Kings liked to import items from foreign lands:

- Solomon collected apes and peacocks in the 10th century. 1 Kings 10.22
- Sennacherib brought Hebrew musicians to Assyria in the 8th century



c.) Babylonian captors required Hebrew captives to play for them:

Psalm 137: 1-3

*"By the waters of Babylon, there we sat down and wept,
when we remembered Zion. On the willows there we hung up our lyres.
For there our captors required of us songs,
and our tormentors, mirth, saying, "Sing us one of the songs of Zion!"*

[2.] age of Greek words

A further argument comes from the question of the age of the words themselves. Driver states that *psalterion* was "found first in Aristotle" and *sumphonia* was "first in Plato, and in the sense of concerted music (or, perhaps, of a specific musical instrument), first in Polybius." - Driver, lviii.

[time frame note: Aristotle lived 384-322 BC, and Plato lived c. 428/424 -347 BC]

I will be focusing here on just one of these: psalterion

There is also this statement from Apollodorus, who around **140 BC** said:

"the magadis is what we now call psalterion"

-Greek Musical Writings, Vol. 1, The Musician and His Art, ed. by Andrew Barker; Cambridge, 1984; p.298

Now the phrase, "what we now call psalterion" could be taken to mean this was a recent term.

But consider: if it was current when Aristotle (who used the word) was say, age 25, then that's already about 220 years before 140 BC when Apollodorus says "what we now call" psalterion.

Put that in perspective: This is 2017. 220 years ago was 1797. While you would class "electric guitar" as a recent musical term, is that how you would view a term used over two centuries ago? So perhaps more than marking *psalterion* as a recent word, the point is to explain the identity of the obsolete word, "*magadis*."

Compare:

- "he that is **now called** a Prophet was beforetime called a **Seer**" [1Sam.9.9]: Does that make "prophet" a new word (cf.: 20.7; Ex. 7.1; Dt. 18.15)? Or does it explain the obsolete term "seer"?
- We speak of "cars," but seldom ever say "automobiles" anymore. If someone were to ask, I could explain that "an automobile is what we now call a car." I don't mean "car" is a new word (cf. motorcar, railroad car, streetcar, horsecar, etc.). Instead, I'd be explaining the more outdated word.

But returning to "psalterion," is Aristotle really our first recorded usage?

Callicratidas: Spartan naval commander (451 - 406 BC).

Through Stobaeus, the great compiler of Greek authors, we have "*psalterion*" in a text of *Callicratidas*.

τὰν ὁμοφροσύναν. ἡ ὄσδ' ἀπλῶς ἰεῖπέν, πᾶς ὁ οἶκος
καθάπερ ψαλτήριον τριῶν τούτων χρήζει τυχέν, ἐξαρτύσιος,

- Joannis Stobaie, *Florilegium*, Vol. 3; Tit. 85.16; Thomas Gaisford, 1822

Themistocles: Athenian politician and general (fought at the battle of Marathon) (524–459 BC).

Plutarch, the Greek biographer, relates the following saying in "The Life of Themistocles":

"at entertainments of a so-called liberal and polite nature, he was forced to defend himself rather rudely, saying that tuning the lyre and handling the **harp** were no accomplishments of his, but rather taking in hand a city that was small and inglorious and making it glorious and great."

-Plutarch, *Parallel Lives*, The Life of Themistocles, 2.3

http://penelope.uchicago.edu/Thayer/E/Roman/Texts/Plutarch/Lives/Themistocles*.html

The Greek text (<http://www.perseus.tufts.edu>) of the middle line above is:

λέγων, ὅτι λύραν μὲν ἀρμόσασθαι καὶ μεταχειρίσασθαι **ψαλτήριον** οὐκ ἐπίσταται.

Notice: Themistocles was born in the 6th cent. BC, only c. 15 yrs after the death of Belshazzar.

Granted, someone could charge Plutarch and Stobaeus (being later writers) with misquotation and anachronism. But if you are going to argue that we have no record of a word being used, how many records should you reject to make sure there's no record of the word being used?

[3.] Driver's view falling into disfavor:

"it is generally accepted among contemporary scholars, contrary to S.R. Driver's insistence, that Greek linguistic elements in Biblical texts do not demand a date in the Hellenistic period, but theoretically could have come into Hebrew from any period... (proposed examples are given of sword and helmet in Gen. and 1

Sam.) ... In the century since S.R.Driver's emphatic statement of the chronological linkage of Greek loanwords to the Hellenistic era, it is evident that the scholarly consensus has moved away from such a conclusion. On the contrary, those scholars who find Greek loanwords in BH have commonly placed them in an earlier period, in what they considered earlier sources (12). It is widely acknowledged that cultural interaction with Greeks was not limited to a late period. Therefore, it seems safe to conclude, that *if there are Greek loanwords in BH, they do not have any clear chronological implications for the texts in which they are found.*"

Linguistic Dating of Biblical Texts: Volume 1 By Ian Young, Robert Rezetko , chap. 11.4

For the record: this book counts Daniel as a late text, not an exilic text. The purpose here is not to defend Daniel, but merely to address how loanwords affect textual dating and correct Driver's presumption. .

[4.] Considering the issue in reverse: just 3 words out of 9,001?

The word count, in the Heb. text of Daniel, is 9001 (<http://overviewbible.com/word-counts-books-of-bible/>) For a book alleged to be from the Hellenistic period, would this relative absence of Greek words actually be proof of a pre-hellenistic date? Well, compared to Qumran & Ben Sirah, the answer is no.

"A final question to be answered, however, is whether we are able to reverse the argument. Can the *absence* of Greek loanwords be used to argue for a date before the Hellenistic period? This argument has sometimes been made, for example, for Chronicles (Japhet 1993: 23)... The Qumran scrolls, however, demonstrate this argument to be dubious. Scholars have long noted that 'Greek loans... are conspicuous by their absence, a most astounding fact', despite the fact that the majority of the non-biblical texts found in the scrolls are thought to have been composed well into the Hellenistic era (Kutscher 1982: 100; cf. Qimron 1986: 117), and were found alongside texts actually written in Greek. The argument that this reflects the linguistic conservatism of the Qumran community (Seow 1996: 660) does not cover the non-sectarian scrolls from Qumran, nor Ben Sira (Hengel 1974, i: 60), and if any case would not affect the main point, that authors of the Hellenistic era were able to avoid using Greek loanwords. Neither the presence nor the absence of Greek loanwords has any chronological significance." Linguistic Dating of Biblical Texts: V.1 Ian Young, Robert Rezetko , ch. 11.4

I cite the above in full so as to not overstate the following, but I do find the following quite interesting.

Q: How does Daniel (which is argued to be a pseudonymous work from the 2nd century BC), compare to the many pseudepigrapha that come to us from around that same era?

Going through Charlesworth's 2 Volume set on of Pseudepigrapha yielded an interesting result. Looking at the texts which date from about the 2nd century BC, you will see that most in this list go far beyond *containing* Greek words, and are actually *composed* in Greek.

1. Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs, **2nd Century BC**: "The pervasive use of technical terms for hellenistic piety for which there are no exact counterparts in Hebrew or Aramaic, in addition to the influence of hellenistic romances... points ... to the conclusion that they were **originally written in Greek.**" -The OT Pseudepigrapha, Vo. 1; pg 777, James H. Charlesworth
2. Letter of Aristeas: **3rd Century BC – 1st Century AD**: "**The original language of Aristeas is Greek**" – *ibid*, Vol. 2, pg. 8
3. Jubilees: 2nd Century BC: written in Heb. Tr. Early into Greek, then into Ethiopic, which is where our text comes from. The primary reason for assuming that the Latin and Ethiopic

tr's came via the Greek are the "internal evidence of Greek loanwords, idioms, and obvious mistranslations." - ibid Vol. 2 pg. 42

4. Prayer of Manasseh: **2nd Cent. BC – 1st Cent. AD:** "the position that the prayer was composed in Greek... is defended by many scholars... Other scholars are convinced the original language is Semitic." ibid, Vol. 2, pg 626 "Because of ... the influence of Greek upon Semitic languages ... and because of the abundant evidence of Greek influence within Palestine, it has become more and more difficult to distinguish between Greek that was translated from a Semitic source and Greek that was composed by a Hellenistic Jew who was fluent in numerous languages." **ibid., Vol.2, pg. 627**
5. Philo the Epic Poet: **3rd to 2nd cent. BC:** "The hexameter verses are **written in ... obscure Greek**"
6. Orphica: **2nd cent. BC- 1st Cent. AD:** "**written in archaizing Greek**"
7. Ezekiel the Tragedian: **2nd cent. BC:** "text extant in iambic trimeter... commonly used in Greek tragic drama... indicating **clearly that Greek was the language in which the author wrote**"
8. Fragments of Pseudo-Greek Poets: **3rd to 2nd cent. BC:** "in the hellenistic period, Jews composed many works **in Greek literary genre**" - ibid Vol .2 p 821
9. Aristobulus:**2nd cent. BC:** "no indications that the fragments were written originally in a language other than **Greek**" ibid Vol. 2 pg. 832
10. Demetrius the Chronographer: **3rd cent. BC:** "**Greek style... grammatically uncomplex and straightforward**"
11. Aristeas the Exegete (reconstructs a "Life of Job") : **prior to 1st cent. BC:** The original language of Aristeas; work, therefore, was **certainly Greek**" – ibid vol. 2 857
12. 17. Eupolemus (on Kings in Judea): **prior to 1st cent. BC:** "**originally composed in Greek**" ibid Vol. 2, 862
13. Pseudo-Eupolemus: **prior to 1st cent. BC:** "**most likely the original language was Greek**" ibid vol. 2, pg 876
14. Cleodemus Malchus (desc. Of Abram through Keturah): **prior to 1st cent. BC:** "no linguistic evidence ... for a language other than **Greek**"
15. Artapanus (Abram , Moses, and Jos. in Egypt): **3rd to 2nd cent. BC:** "no reason to suspect that the original language was other than **Greek. .. Many points of contact with classical Greek literature as well as the koine of the hellenistic age**"

Indeed, the 3 Grk. words in Dan. are quite striking, when compared with 2nd century Pseudepigrapha!

3. BEN SIRA* makes no mention of Daniel in his long list of Hebrew heroes.

**this text is referred to in several ways: Ecclesiasticus; Wisdom of Sirach, Ben Sira, Ben Sirach, Sirach, etc.*

A. THE ARGUMENT

"Ecclesiasticus in the Apocrypha (a book with is dated about 180 B.C.) refers to the saints and heroes of the past, drawing upon most of the Old Testament for its material, but makes no reference to Daniel. We can only suppose that the book was not known to the writer of Ecclesiasticus." Hammer; p. 1

"Jesus, the son of Sirach (writing c. 200 B.C.), in his enumeration of famous Israelites, Eccclus. Xliv-l, though he mentions Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, and (collectively) the twelve, is silent as to Daniel. In view of the remarkable distinctions attained by Daniel, and the faculties displayed by him, according to the Book, the statement in Eccclus. Xlix. 15 that no man had ever been born 'like unto Joseph,' seems certainly to suggest that the writer was unacquainted with the narratives respecting Daniel." -Driver' p.

Xlviii

B. REBUTTAL & RESPONSE to the Ben Sira argument

It is true that Ben Sira gives a long list of heroes, see below, and does not name Daniel. He cites **Enoch, Noah, Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, the twelve tribes, Moses, Aaron (of Levi), Phinees the son of Eleazar, Jesus (Joshua), Caleb, the Judges, Samuel, Nathan, David son of Jesse, Elias (Elijah), Ezekias (Hezekiah), Esay (Isaiah), Josias, Jeremias, Ezekiel, the twelve prophets, Zorababel, Jesus (Joshua son of Josedec), and Neemias.**

Then at the end, after repeating Enoch and now breaking chronological order (suggesting that these were an afterthought), he adds **Joseph, Sem, Seth, and Adam.**

QUESTIONS:

1.] Had he not thought to add those at the end, would this have indicated he never heard of Adam or never heard of Joseph?

2.] There are numerous other OT figures are absent in the list, including: *Eve, Abel, Sarah, Melchizedek, Job, Ruth, Boaz, Jonathan, Asaph (cf. B.S. 44.5), Ezra, Esther and Mordecai.*

For a number of these, the omission is clear, as they do not fit his stated goal:

“Let us now praise famous men, and our fathers that begat us.” 44.1

Being a list of men, neither Sarah (seen the Heb. 11 list) nor other females are included.

Being in the lineage of fathers who “begat us,” the absence of Abel, Job, and Melchizedek fits their absence from the Jewish bloodline.

But what about **Ezra**? Ezra was one of the most influential of post-exilic figures. Zerubbabel is there. Nehemiah is there. But no Ezra. Does the failure to mention Ezra mean that Ezra was unknown before 180 BC?

3.] Compare now with the list of heroes in Heb. 11:

Enoch? Noah? Abraham? Isaac? Jacob? Joseph? Moses? All named and accounted for.

But Caleb? Not mentioned. Josiah? Not mentioned. Nehemiah? Not mentioned.

Should any of that be taken as evidence that the Hebrew writer had never heard of them?

C. The critic’s Joseph argument on Ben Sira:

It’s not just that Daniel isn’t named, It’s that when Joseph is named, he specifically says:

“Neither was a young man born like Joseph” - 49.15

- A. Joseph & Daniel are both young Hebrews taken captive to a foreign land.
- B. both are morally pure and conscientious
- C. both interpret dreams
- D. both rise to political power and favor with the king

How could Ben Sirach say there had never been a young man like Joseph, if he’d known of Daniel?

D. Rebuttal & Response to the Joseph argument on Ben Sira:

Notice the word, **“neither”** in the phrase, **“Neither was a young man born like Joseph”**.

That **“neither”** points back to the last man he named as unlike any other, **Enoch**.

Next look at that text and see precisely what was so singularly unique about him:

“But upon the earth was no man created like Enoch; for he was taken from the earth.” 49.14

So in this section, (the apparent afterthought section), before saying there was no man like Joseph, Ben Sirah said there was no man was created like Enoch, for he was taken up.

QUESTION 1: *Was Enoch the only one taken up? Or was another man of God taken up?*

2 Kings 2:11: *“Elijah went up by a whirlwind into heaven”*

QUESTION 2: *Well then, might not that prove Ben Sira had never heard of Elijah?*

For how could he possibly say that there was no man created like Enoch, “for he was taken from the earth.” if he had ever heard the story of Elijah being taken up in the whirlwind?

And that might sound like a good argument.

Until you look back at Ben Sirach 48:1:

“Elias [Elijah] it was, who was covered with a whirlwind: and Eliseus [Elisha] was filled with his spirit”

So what happened to that argument?

It seems Ben Sira was not as careful with his closing comments as those who cite him wish him to be.

QUESTION 3:

Take note: What is it that he specifies about Enoch? And what is it he specifies about Joseph?

With Enoch, it was “for he was taken from the earth”

That, even though, he clearly knew about Elijah being taken up.

Yet of Joseph, what is it that he focuses on? His being captive in a foreign land? His visions? His interpretation of dreams? No. That’s not what Ben Sira singled out.

Instead, this is what he specifies:

“Neither was there a young man born like Joseph, a governor of his brethren, a stay of the people, whose bones were regarded of the Lord.”

And in regards to those specifics, Daniel isn’t so much like Joseph after all.

E. A possible motive:

There are several theoretical reasons that would fit Ben Sira not mentioning Daniel.

One (and the position of the critic), is that he’d not heard of him.

Two (as he seems to have almost done with Joseph), he could have forgotten him.

Three (like the Hebrew author himself, he may have remembered him but didn’t chose to name him - [Heb. 11 does not name Daniel, but does briefly refer to him in the “time would fail” section, 33].

Or FOUR: If Ben Sira knew the text of Daniel, he may have had a motive for leaving Daniel out:

From -Jewish Encyclopedia.com; Ben Sira:

“Ben Sira never speaks of the resurrection of the dead nor of the immortality of the soul, but, on the contrary, declares that in Sheol there will be no joy, wherefore man should taste delight in this world...”

Rabbi Abaye condemns the text for it’s “misanthropy, misogyny, and Epicureanism of the author. To Ben Sira's Epicurean tendency must be attributed his denial of a future life, and, perhaps, also his pre-Sadducean spirit of reverence for the priesthood,”

Thus, the resurrection of Daniel 12 may have provided a motive for the omission of Daniel.

4. DANIEL'S ACCOUNT OF 6th CENTURY KINGS:

"Belshazzar the King made a feast" -Dan.5.1

"In that night, Belshazzar the Chaldean King was slain" -Dan.5.30

ARGUMENT A:

NABONIDUS (Nabuna'id) WAS THE LAST KING of Babylon, NOT BELSHAZZAR

"Belshazzar ... was the son of Nabonidus (Nabuna'id). He was heir to the throne and may have acted as regent in his father's absence, but he was never actually king (despite Dan. 5:1-30; 8:1)" - Hammer
 "Belshazzar is represented as *king* of Babylon... In point of fact... Nabu-na'id" [Nabonidus] "was the last king of Babylon" -Driver

REBUTTALS & RESPONSES to Arg. A: Belshazzar Not the King

From Babylonian Inscriptions found in the 19th century:

- King Nabonidus (Belshazzar's father) went away from Babylon for several years, leaving the Prince in Babylon:
"The king (was) in Tema (while) the prince, the officers, and his army (were) in Akkad [Babylonia]." -The Nabonidus Chronicle, British Museum, acquired in 1879
- Leaving his son in command, he "**entrusted the kingship**" to him (i.e. Belshazzar)
*"He entrusted the 'Camp' to his oldest (son), the firstborn [...], the troops everywhere in the country he ordered under his (command). He let (everything) go, **entrusted the kingship to him** and, himself, he [...] started out for a long journey, the (military) forces of Akkad marching with him; he turned towards Tema (deep) in the west."*
-The Verse Account of Nabonidus, 539 BC, British Museum, acq'd: 1880
<http://www.livius.org/sources/content/onet/verse-account-of-nabonidus/>
- From ISBE: "That the city of Babylon alone was sometimes at least governed by an official called king is highly probable, since the father of Nergal-har-ucur is certainly, and the father of Nabunaid I is probably, called king of Babylon, in both of which cases, the city, or at most the province, of Babylon must have been meant, since we know to a certainty all of the kings who had been ruling over the empire of Babylon since 626 BC ... and the names of neither of these fathers of kings is found among them." -Dick Wilson, Internat. Std. Bible Encyc.; art: Belshazzar.
- That Nabonidus was the ultimate (but absent) King of the Babylonian Empire, while his firstborn has "the kingship entrusted to him" in Babylon, comports well with the curious third place offer that the frightened Belshazzar offers to Daniel:
"Now if you can read the writing and make known to me its interpretation, you shall be clothed with purple and have a chain of gold around your neck and shall be the third ruler in the kingdom." -Dan. 5:16 ESV

He is frightened. He has seen the handwriting on the wall - writing on the actual wall. Desperate for answers, what he offers Daniel is not second place in rule, but "third." With Nabonidus #1, and Belshazzar having the kingship entrusted to him as #2, it makes sense that the best seat he has to offer is #3. Without this explanation, we have a generous, but curious offer of "third

place.” With this explanation, and the Verse Account of Nabonidus, it fits nicely.

4. DANIEL’S ACCOUNT OF 6th CENTURY KINGS:

“Belshazzar... commanded to bring the golden and silver vessels which Nebuchadnezzar his father had taken out of Jerusalem” -Dan.5.2

“The King Nebuchadnezzar thy father” -Dan. 5.11

“God gave Nebuchadnezzar thy father” - Dan. 5.18

ARGUMENT B. Belshazzar was not the Son of Nebuchadnezzar

“One would expect a writer in the sixth century B.C. to be reasonably accurate on major historical events, but such is not the case. Belshazzar is represented as the son of Nebuchadnezzar (Dan. 5:11), although he was the son of Nabonidus (Nabuna’id). - Hammer, pg. 4

“Belshazzar is represented as *king* ... and Nebuchadnezzar is spoken of throughout ch. V. (vv.2, 11,13,18,22) as his father. In point of fact... “ Nabu-na’id” [Nabonidus] “was the last king of Babylon; he was a usurper, not related to Nebuchadnezzar; and his father’s name was Nabu-balatsu-ikbi... Bel-shar-uzur (i.e., Belshazzar) is mentioned in the inscriptions as his son” -Driver - pg. L

REBUTTALS & RESPONSES to Arg. B: Belshazzar Not the son of Nebuchadnezzar

Granted, from Babylonian accounts at the time, we have clear record of Belshazzar being the son of Nabonidus, who himself was a usurper to the throne, not of royal blood, the son of a nobody.

To see where the blood line (and sometimes bloody lines) ran, here’s a simple chart:

605: NEBUCHADNEZZAR > succeeded by his son:

562: EVILMERODACH > murdered by his brother in law:

560: NERIGLISSOR (also Nebuchad’s son-in-law)> succeeded by his young son:

556: Labashi-Marduk (Laborosoarchod) > killed in a conspiracy after 9 mo’s:

Throne usurped by:

556: Nabonidus (who leaves Babylon and entrusts the Kingship to his son Belshazzar)>>

Both are overtaken, and Belshazzar is killed, with the fall of Babylon in 539 BC.

- So how could Belshazzar be both the son of Nebuchadnezzar, and the son of Nabonidus?
- Generationally: 1 K. 11:6 Solomon did evil, and not as “**David his father**”
 1 K. 15.11 Asa did what was good, like as “**David his father**”
 2Chr. 28.1 Ahaz did not do what was right as “**his father David**”
 The father/son language can be used, whether it was an immediate son (Solomon),,
 a gr. gr. Grandson (Asa), or a 10x gr. Grandon (Ahaz)
- But not through his father, for Nabonidus’ father was Nabu-balatsu-ikbi, and Nabonidus claimed no royal bloodline for himself: “I am Nabonidus, the only son, who has nobody - in whose mind kingship was not” -Harran Stele inscription; [Royal Apologetic in the Ancient Near East](#), A.Knapp, pg. 338,

- So cf. Labashi-Marduk: His immediate father was Neriglissor = no blood relation to Neb. But if he was born to Neriglissor's wife, the daughter or Nebuchadnezzar., that would have made Labishi-Marduk a blood grandson of Nebuchadnezzar (even though his father was not)
- But is there any evidence that Belshazzar (son of Nabonidus) might have a daughter of Nebuchadnezzar for a mother? There is no proof, but there is some circumstantial evidence.
- Look now at the feast in Daniel 5. Who is sitting there drinking with Belshazzar? "and the King and ... his wives and his concubines, drank from them" Dan. 5.3
- Then the handwriting is seen on the wall (5ff). Belshazzar shakes with fear (6). The King calls for his enchanters & offers them the third seat of power, as those with him are perplexed (7ff).
- Then, hearing of the words of the King, WHO comes into the banquet house? The Queen.
- But not Belshazzar's wife. Belshazzar's wives and concubines were already there. So who is this, but the Queen mother?
- And what does she say? "There is a man in thy kingdom, in whom is the spirit of the holy gods: and in the days of thy father light and understanding and wisdom... were found in him: and they king Nebuchadnezzar thy father, the king, I say thy father, make him master of the magicians, enchanters, Chaldeans, and soothsayers: forasmuch as an excellent spirit, and knowledge, and understanding ... were found in the same Daniel, who the King named Belteshazzar. Now let Daniel be called, and he will show the interpretation." Dan. 5.11-12
- Notice three things that stand out as to what she knows more about. She appears to know:
 - more about the past (fitting a queen mother, not a queen wife)
 - more about Nebuchadnezzar (how does she know more than the king?)
 - and thus more about Daniel.
- Put those things together, and doesn't she sound rather like a queen mother, and daughter of Nebuchadnezzar?
- The above is the solution I prefer, though if it is not so, the ISBE article on Belshazzar has notes on how even non-blood related kings would identify as sons of a great king.

4. DANIEL'S ACCOUNT OF 6th CENTURY KINGS:

"In that night, Belshazzar the Chaldean King was slain. And Darius the Mede received the kingdom, being about threescore years old." -Dan.5.30

ARGUMENT C: AGAINST DARIUS THE MEDE

"Darius the Mede ... There seems, however, to be no room for such a ruler: for according to all other authorities, Cyrus is the immediate successor of Nabu-na'id, and the ruler of the entire Persian empire."
-Driver, pg. lii-liii

"The book also regards 'Darius the Mede' (Dan. 5:31; 6:28) as responsible for the conquest of Babylon and its first ruler. Persian records refer to the conquest by Cyrus and to the governorship of Gubaru (Gobryas), a Persian." Hammer, pg.

Note: There would later be a King Darius the Great, who ruled from 522-486, but that Darisu is a Persian,

does not become King when Babylon falls (cf. Darius the Mede in Dan.5.30-31); and does not become king until after the death of Cyrus, the death of Cambyses, and the overthrow of the shortly surviving Pseudo-Smerdis (or Gaumata).

REBUTTALS & RESPONSES to ARG. C: AGAINST DARIUS THE MEDE

This section will be more response than rebuttal, for until we historically document a “Darius the Mede,” from secular records, we lack the hard evidence, on this point, that the skeptic would accept. That does not mean we will not see some intriguing arguments and possible sightings, but like the Ivory Billed Pileated Woodpecker, until he is seen, clearly distinguished, and documented, possible identifications will not much sway the skeptic.

1.) Some general observations:

- As will be shown shortly, even major figures can be sometimes elusive when dealing with ancient records, partial records, and contradictory records.
- Two famous historians, Herodotus and Xenophon, both born in the 5th century, after the fall of Babylon in the 6th, and both of whom supply much of our information about this period, also differ with each other on a number of points, some very significant.
- “This narrative by Xenophon varies from that of Herodotus in the following principal points: - (1) According to Herodotus, the line of Median kings closes with Astyages, who had no son; Xenophon, on the contrary, speaks of Astyages as having been succeeded by his son Cyaxares on the throne. (2) According to Herodotus, Cyrus was related to the Median royal house only as being the son of the daughter of Astyages, and had a claim to the Median throne only as being the grandson of Astyages; Xenophon, on the other hand, says that he was related to the royal house of Media, not only as being the grandson of Astyages and nephew of Cyaxares II, but also as having received in marriage the daughter of his uncle Cyaxares, and along with her the dowry of the Median throne. (3) According to Herodotus, Cyrus took part in the conspiracy formed by Harpagus against Astyages, slew his grandfather in battle, and took forcible possession of the dominion over the Medes; on the contrary Xenophon relates that, though he was at variance with Cyaxares, he became again reconciled to him, and not only did not dethrone him, but permitted him to retain royal dignity even after the overthrow of Babylon, which was not brought about with his co-operation.” -Keil & Delitzsch, *Daniel*, ch. 6 <http://www.sacred-texts.com/bib/cmt/kad/dan006.htm>
- In the eyes of critics and academics, more credence is commonly given Herodotus than Xenophon, but at times they recognize the Xenophon opposite.
- As touching Daniel, a key difference is the relationship of the Medes and the Persians. Herodotus has Persia defeating and reducing the Medes to subjection, well before the Persians take Babylon. In Xenophon however, there is much better interaction between the two.



- Along this line, a relief image from the Apadana, Persepolis is interesting. It shows Medes and Persians, in intermixed alternate order. *Creative Commons Attribution*
-*Share Alike 3.0*. Photo by Aneta Ribarska

This image calls to my mind the phrase in Daniel: "The laws of the Medes and the Persians."!

2.) When Belshazzar and Darius the Mede were both "missing" together

Today, all critics accept the historicity of Belshazzar. They minimize his role of rule, and they reject a relationship to Nebuchadnezzar, but all agree, Belshazzar lived, Belshazzar was there, and Belshazzar was the son of Nabonidus.

It wasn't always that way. Before Belshazzar got "sighted" in the 1800's there were critics who attacked his name as an invention, who confused him with his father Nabonidus, and assumed Daniel was wrong. I'm going to supply some documentation here, because this is one of those cases where brethren have often heard about it, but less often seen it, and where skeptics have been prone to cry "fraud," and "lies" when being told that biblical critics ever denied the historic Belshazzar.

Das Buch Daniel; Dr. Caesar von Lengerke, Königsberg; 1835 p

LXiii-lxiv-Tr. By Edward Pusey,

"The lateness of its date is clear also through the historical inaccuracies... He calls Nebuchadnezzar erroneously the father of the last king, gives that king a false name [=Belshazzar], makes him of royal blood, and follows a false legend as to the capture of Babylon and the fate of the last king."

Irrig nennt er c. 5. den Nebukadnezar den Vater des letzten Königes der Babylonier, giebt diesem einen falschen Namen, lässt ihn aus königlichem Geblüte stammen und folgt einer falschen Sage über die Einnahme Babylons und das Schicksal des letzten Königes.

EXEGETISCHES HANDBUCH Alten

Testament Ferdinand Hitzig, Leipzig, 1850 p 75 tr. By Tim Mitchell

"We compare [Daniel] with the matching record of Xenophon, to whom the name of the Babylonian king was already unknown. Whereupon Daniel, much later, invents a new name " [=Belshazzar]. P,75

Nun beruft man sich freilich auf die übereinstimmende Angabe Xenophons (Cyrop. a. a. O.), welcher den Namen des babylon. Königes bereits nicht mehr wusste; worauf unser viel spätere Dan. einen neuen erst ausdenkt.

Selbst den Fall gesetzt, dass der fragliche König Mediens existirt habe, würde der Name, unter welchem er bei Dan. auftritt, zu beanstanden sein. Jene Zweiheit in Nabonned = Baltar wiederholt sich in Cyaxares = Darius, und wieder zu Daniels Nachtheil.

“Even supposing that the king of the Medes in question [i.e., Darius] had existed, the objection is the name under which he is referenced in Daniel. Each of the two were standardized in Nabonidus = Belshazzar which is repeated in Cyaxares = Darius, to Daniel’s discredit.” p,77

Hitzig wrote those last two quotes in 1850. He had no idea what John Taylor was going to discover in just three years later in Basra.

Working under the direction of the British government, Taylor began excavating a large mound that and found four clay cylinders at each corner. A reconstruction of an ancient Ziggurat had been conducted by King Nabonidus at the end of the Babylonian Empire. Much of the content related to the construction work. But then there was something else.



Osama Shukir Muhammed Amin FRCP (Glasg)
Creative Commons Attribution-Share Alike 4.0 International license.

It was a prayer that included this:

*As for me, Nabonidus, king of Babylon, save me from sinning against your great godhead and grant me as a present a life long of days, and as for **Belshazzar**, the eldest son - my offspring - instill reverence for your great godhead in his heart and may he not commit any cultic mistake, may he be sated with a life of plenitude.*

-<http://www.livius.org/sources/content/nabonidus-cylinder-from-ur/> (the spelling differs, not surprising, but the identity is accepted.

So now, Belshazzar is accepted. Not everything Daniel says about him, and not Daniel, and not Darius the Mede, but Belshazzar is accepted.

But rather than thinking about how Daniel had the name when Herodotus and Xenophon didn’t, you can find references on the internet where unbelievers call believers “liars” for claiming Hitzig ever denied Belshazzar.

LOOKING FOR DARIUS THE MEDE:

Reminder of the common possibility of dual names:

- Note only in individuals like:
Israel / Jacob; Simon / Peter; Matthew / Levi; Joseph / Barnabas
- But also in Kings:
Eliakim / Jehoiakim; Jehoiachin / Coniah; Agrippa / Herod ; Octavius / Augustus

Potential candidates:

Cyaxares :(acc. To Xenophon: Last King of the Medes, son of Astyages, uncle of Cyrus, gave Cyrus the Kingdom as a Dowry)

Gobryas (acc. to Xenophon: General in taking over of Babylon)

Ugbaru or Gubaru (from inscriptions; one or both likely to also be Gobryas)

Finale- Possible references to Darius the Mede?

We will address this more at the lectures, but renewed attention has been drawn to two old references in Keil & Delitzsch.

- a.) One is a reference to “Darius” that sounds to coincide with Nabonidus, after his subjection.
- b.) The other is a reference that claims the Daric (a famous coin of gold from Persia) was not named after Darius the Great - but actually to a more ancient Darius.

Perhaps these are cold trails (Darius the Mede would hardly be ancient, cf. to Darius the Great, but these types of differences can get made in transmission of information), but perhaps one, or both of these, are references to “Darius the Mede.”

You can read more about it at:

<http://www.rcyoung.org/articles/darius.pdf>

-Scott

Rather than a bibliography, resources are noted through the text, need to get this sent. Thanks