

Naegelsbach makes an interesting remark¹ that the fact that Media is referred to in verse 17 rather than Persia is a strong proof of the fact that this prophecy was not composed during the exile. His argument is that in the exile, after the event, one forging such a prophecy would certainly have made the Persians and not the Medes play the role of destroyer. And yet the prophet looking ahead can comprehend the Medo-Persian Empire under the name of the Medes who were in fact on the horizon at the time of Isaiah's writing. But are we reduced to arguing for the historicity of prophetic sections by showing that they are not quite right? If it is not proper history, neither, one would think, is it proper prophecy. The argument proceeds on our judgment of the exact situation at the time of the conquest. We may with profit remember that Belshazzar was similarly called an error of the Bible until recently. It should be noted that in Dan.5:30, in the history of the conquest, Daniel says that Darius the Mede received the kingdom, being about threescore and two years old. If this be so, Isaiah, speaking a century or so before, would be giving the facts exactly as they occurred. Critics on the other hand, attempting to deny the historicity of the Daniel, have said that he misstates the situation in making Darius the Mede, a man hitherto unidentified, the conqueror of Babylon, whereas it was actually Cyrus, the Persian. If critics by this point would like to put Daniel in later years they must also put our present chapter in Isaiah at the same late time that Daniel is said to have been composed. But no one would claim that Isaiah or any parts of it were written as late as the time of the Maccabees, when Daniel is said to have been written. Therefore, if the critics argue against the historicity of Daniel because of the occurrence

1. Lange, Commentary, p.180.