

## DANIEL 1, -- FROM CAPTIVITY TO DEATH

### INTRODUCTION

This 1<sup>st</sup> Chapter of Daniel would hardly seem to offer prophetic insight. Certainly we find Daniel's captivity, but more importantly, we should find his death in the definition of "until".

*Daniel 1:12 "And Daniel continued until the first year of King Cyrus."*

**un·til**

*prep.*

1. Up to the time of: We danced until dawn.<sup>1</sup>

Many classical commentators are apparently content with silently deferring to the accepted premise that Daniel did not die in the "first year of King Cyrus", because they errantly presume he was alive in the THIRD year of Cyrus as recorded in 10:1.

*Daniel 10:1 In the third year of Cyrus king of Persia a word was revealed to Daniel, who was named Belteshaz'zar. ...*

Of these the most prominent proponent for ignoring the evidence of Daniel's death in the "first year of King Cyrus" is John Calvin:

*Expositors are puzzled with this verse, because, as we shall afterwards see, the Vision occurred to Daniel in the third year of Cyrus's reign. Some explain the word חיה, haiah, by to be "broken;" but this is by no means in accordance with the history. ...*<sup>2</sup>

So although Calvin acknowledges the literal text, he discards it in favor of a flawed perception of Scripture and history. Specifically, the commentators errantly presume Daniel 10 to be during the Medo/Persian era. But Daniel's 10<sup>th</sup> and initial verses of the 11<sup>th</sup> Chapters, (respectively) pertain to the closing days of the Babylonian era. Consider the evidence:

1. 10:1 references Cyrus as the "king of Persia", versus the 1:21 reference to Cyrus as "King Cyrus" – thereby King over Daniel.
  - Military strategists recognize that a conquering army must have a 4:1 to 10:1 advantage. Thus, at this point in history, Cyrus clearly had become more powerful than the Babylonians and had received this pre-eminent recognition in the opening verse of Chapter 10, -- in spite of not having captured the capital city of Babylon. And of course, subsequent to the 10<sup>th</sup> and 11<sup>th</sup> Chapter accounts, Cyrus conquered Babylon and became King over Daniel and the combined realm.
2. In Daniel 5, Belshaz'zar was killed by his own nobles, over Belshaz'zar's negligence in the face of threats to the empire. Belshaz'zar could have sent messengers to raise armies for the relief of the city, but instead declared a feast. Thus the nobles conspired to kill the incompetent king, and arranged to have Darius made king so as to possibly preserve their own lives and fortunes.
3. In Daniel 6, Daniel is credited with prospering "during the reign of Darius and the reign of Cyrus the Persian".

---

<sup>1</sup> [www.thefreedictionary.com/until](http://www.thefreedictionary.com/until)

<sup>2</sup> <http://www.ccel.org/ccel/calvin/calcom24.vii.xx.html?bc=right>

**Collin Sadler**

-- At first cut, if both had been Persians as the ill advised classical commentators presume, then the text would have said "... Persians", plural. Instead, there is a distinct implied Babylonian reign, and a second delineated Persian reign.

4. Daniel 9:2 specifically states that Darius was made king "*over the realm of the Chaldeans*".
  - Once again, the classical commentators craftily construct words and invent histories of a purported general or governor which cannot refute plain Scripture and recorded history.
5. In Daniel 11:1 Daniel asserts that he "*stood up to confirm and strengthen*" Darius the Mede. Who needs strengthening, the victor as the classical commentators assert, or the soon to be vanquished? Scripture, history, and common sense demand the latter.
  - See the Daniel 11 commentary portion for this full presentation.