

the princes, the counsellors, and the captains, have consulted together to establish a royal statute, and to make a firm decree, that whosoever shall ask a petition of any God or man for thirty days, save of thee, O king, he shall be cast into the den of lions. Now, O king, establish the decree, and sign the writing, that it be not changed, according to the law of the Medes and Persians, which altereth not. Wherefore king Darius signed the writing and the decree (Dan. 6:7-9).

Although Darius lamented his foolish decree, he could not annul or change it, because the law of the Medes and Persians could not be altered—not even by the one who made the decree! "Then these men assembled unto the king, and said unto the king, Know, O king, that the law of the Medes and Persians is, That no decree nor statute which the king establisheth may be changed" (Dan. 6:15; cf. 6:8, 12). Darius was amazed by the power of God to deliver Daniel from the lion's den, and he sought to glorify the true living "God of Daniel." The same Darius who made the blasphemous decree would then make a quite different decree:

I make a decree, That in every dominion of my kingdom men tremble and fear before the God of Daniel: for he is the living God, and stedfast for ever, and his kingdom that which shall not be destroyed, and his dominion shall be even unto the end. He delivereth and rescueth, and he worketh signs and wonders in heaven and in earth, who hath delivered Daniel from the power of the lions (Dan. 6:26-27).

## The Darius of Daniel 9:1

Brother Turner believed that Daniel 9:1 is a reference to yet another Darius, who was neither the Darius of Daniel 5:31 nor of 6:1-28 (*Daniel* 196). Daniel wrote, "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" (Dan. 9:1-2).

Brother Turner believed that the events of Daniel chapter 9 took place later in time, during the reign of Darius I Hystaspes the Great (521-486 B.C.), who ruled when the rebuilding of the temple was finally completed (515 B.C.).

Generally, the commentators have held that two of the references to a "Darius"-that is, chapters 6:1 and 9:1-are references to the same person; namely Gubaru, or Darius of the seed of the Medes, who governed Babylon under Cyrus the Persian, but there was a third Darius who figured promi-

nently in the history of the Medes and Persians, and may he have been that third Darius? (298).

Further, in contemplation of Darius' activities and ac-complishments, who can really doubt that the Darius of Daniel 9:1 was the Darius I Hystaspes of 521 BC? If the evi-dence be granted, then the ninth chapter of Daniel was the last revelation which Daniel received (301).

Gill was strongly opposed to the view that this Darius could be Darius I Hystaspes:

This is the same with Darius the Median, that took the kingdom after the death of Belshazzar; so called, to distinguish him from Darius the Persian; and yet Porphyry has the gall to assert that this was Darius the Persian, under whom the temple was built, that Daniel might appear to live later than he did: Ahasuerus, whose son he was, is not he that was the husband of Esther, and was many years later than this; but the same with Astyages king of the Medes, and who is called Ahasuerus, in the Apocrypha:

'But before he died he heard of the destruction of Nineve, which was taken by Nabuchodonosor and Assuerus: and before his death he rejoiced over Nineve.' (Tobit 14:15)

the father of Cyaxares, the same with this Darius,...was uncle to Cyrus that conquered Babylon.

Whitcomb argued that the references to Darius in Daniel 9:1 and throughout the Book of Daniel (5:31, 6:1-28, 9:1, and 11:1) are all referring to Gubaru (*Daniel* 79-81, 120, 144; *Darius* 7-8, 24, 40, 44; cf. Daugherty 116-117, 172, 206). Whitcomb wrote, "There are strong reasons for believing that Gubaru could have been given the honorific name of Darius upon being installed as vice-king in Babylon. We have further shown that Gubaru could very well have been the son of Ahasuerus, and that he also could have been a Mede" (*Darius* 40). One arguing Whitcomb's position would emphasize that this Darius of Daniel 9:1 "was made king over the realm of the Chaldeans," thus maintaining that this was a reference to Cyrus' appointing Gubaru as ruler over Babylon (cf. "received the kingdom," Dan. 5:31 ASV).

Myers, Pryor, and Rechtin wrote, "In light of inconclusive evidence, we cannot be too specific about Darius' identity. Nevertheless, we should not conclude that (1) such a person never existed; (2) Daniel, therefore, is unreliable; or (3) the author was ignorant of contemporary history" (184).

To be continued next week, if the Lord wills...