

simply for the ~~supreme~~ top one. He would be at least the top one of an area. It is a pretty exalted name, but there have been individual kings with many kings under them. Well, now, that is ~~it~~ then a possibility. To prove on the one had that you have a great Median empire, and then a great Persian empire succeeding it. That we know wasn't, but to prove that that was the concept of the author of Daniel sufficient to lead him to represent a part of the body as the Babylonians, and then another great ~~partion~~ as the Medians, and another great portion as the Persian empire, and more than that to lead him in ch. 7 to represent one great animal as the Babylonian, and another great animal as the Median and another great animal the Persian, that is way beyond what evidence we have, the concept that the liberals claim is there. But now let us ask this question. There is no evidence that Darius the Mede was a great emperor with a great empire who destroyed the Babylonians and was himself destroyed by the Persian, I don't mean there was that, but evidence the author of Daniel thought that. There is no evidence of that. But on the other hand, is there any evidence that Darius the Mede was thought of by the ~~author~~ author of Daniel as a subordinate? ~~rather~~ rather than as the great conqueror. Well, you look back there to chapter 5 and what it told us was that the empire was to be divided, the kingdom was to be ~~divided~~ divided and given to the Medes and Persians, is what it says, and then we find "In that night was Belshazzar the king of the Chaldeans slain and ~~the~~ Darius the Median (the A.V. says) took the kingdom, (but the Revised is a bit more precise -- received the kingdom.)" Darius the ~~the~~ Persian received the kingdom. Now take is a more ~~general~~ general term than received. It is not an incorrect translation. He received it. He took it. Take is a more general term, but take can include as a phase of it, meaning to cease, to gain control by force, that is not in this word. This word is to receive. You may receive it as the result of your taking it by force, it doesn't prove the contrary, but it looks in the other direction. It looks more as if it was handed to you, than as if you seized it. Now, what about the other reference to Darius the Mede becoming king? Where is that one? 9:1, Yes, "In the first year of Darius the son of Ahasuerus, of the seed of the Medes, which ~~was made king of~~ conquered the