

differ nt form. Of the identity of the two names, there can be no doubt.

The first time we find an alliance between Israel and Damascus in order to hold back the oncoming Assyrians is in the reign of Shalmanizir III, the successor of Ashur-Nasirpal. The conquest of Ashur-Nasirpal from whose words we have already quoted gave an idea of what might be expected from this powerful Assyrian attack. The kings of the west composed their differences long enough to meet Shalmanizir and check his advance. In his account of it, he mentions the names of Hadad-Idri of Damascus and of Ahab, the Israelite. It is very interesting to find Ahab who occurs so prominently ⁱⁿ with the stories of the time of Elijah mentioned on the Assyrian inscriptions, even though the Bible does not mention this particular alliance and battle at ^{Qua}qar.

In his annals, Shalmanizir claims to have been victorious but he did not press forward and attempt to subdue the country as he undoubtedly would have done if he had won a real victory against this coalition.

In the account of his third campaign, Shalmanizir again refers to Hadad-Idri of Damascus. In the account of the fourth campaign, he replaces his name by the name of Hazael of Damascus and substituted for Ahab of Israel, the name of Jehu, son of Omri. Still another inscription which gives a summary of his wars, he says after speaking of Hadad-Idri, Hazael, son of a nobody, seized the throne. The mention of Ahab of Israel before this and of Jehu in connection with the mention of Hazael fits into the account which we find in the Bible of the appointment of Jehu to destroy the line of Ahab and establish himself as king and of the simultaneous notification to Hazael that he should become king of Damascus in place of his master, Ben Hadad.