

Now at this point Prof. Dougherty of the Yale University took up the study, and in 1928 he published a book of the series of Yale Oriental Researches, a book called "Nabonitus and Belshazar". In this book Prof. Dougherty went through all the cuneiform evidence and found that in the latter years of his reign Nabonitus left Babylon and went off to T_____ and _____ in the Arabian Desert and he lived there (studying archaeology there), and leaving the control and the direction of the kingdom to his son whom he made co-king with him. So Belshazar was the ruler, he was the man who was commander of the army, in charge of Babylon, but second to his father, they were coordinate kings. And Prof. Dougherty said, "How were these facts known at the time of the Maccabees?" He said, "The book of Daniel is superior in this regard to any other ancient writings up to the time of Josephus". And Josephus, of course, gets his ideas from Daniel, as you know.

But Dougherty read all the literature in between, that had come down to us that referred to Babylon into the latter days of Babylon, and he found nothing else except the book of Daniel that preserved the mention of Belshazar, any record of his existence, any record of his name, any record of the fact that he was killed in connection with the destruction of the city. And he said the book of Daniel is superior in another way, too, because as you notice in three different verses I read to you, it records the fact that there was a dual rulership in the kingdom because Daniel would be made "the third ruler". There we have a little hint of the historical situation ("the third ruler"), that was in the Bible all these centuries, and I don't know how many people figured out from it what the situation was.

God has given us little hints like that in history and in science in the Bible in different places, and if we study it who knows what we may find in the Bible, in some little hint that throws a flood of light on some point of history or of science.