

is your evidence, Mr. Ashbrook?

Yes, Jehoram went to fight against Hazael, king of Syria. He couldn't have done that before Hazael became king. The situation in chapter 9 is the situation of a war against Hazael king of Syria. The event ~~is~~ in the middle of chapter 8 of the anointing of Hazael to be king of Syria when Hazael said, "Is thy servant... who am I to do a great thing like this? He was just a member of the king's household. That must have preceded chapter 9. That is the sort of evidence which we have to ~~look~~ look for in all the study of the Scripture or in anything else. To see a decisive place like that that proves beyond the shadow of a doubt that the order of events ~~is~~ ~~what~~ is. Now, of course, it is not important what the order of events is, but it is something that is definitely at least. Hazael was king of Syria while the house of Ahab was still reigning in Israel. We don't know how long. It may have been a very short time after that. It may have been a few years. We are not given definite evidence. But it is very interesting that right at this point we have ~~an~~ ^{some} archeological evidence corroborating the accuracy of the general facts here recorded in the Scripture. It is ~~not~~ contained in the inscriptions from the Assyrian kings who were far across the desert over in Mesopotamia. One of these kings, king Shalmanezar^{III} describes in one of his descriptions how he fought a great battle against the kings in the west and among those whom he fought was Ahab, king of Israel, and Benhadad, king of Syria. So that we have this battle between them and a number of kings in the west including these two. Then we have a later inscription in which he mentioned the ending of the reign of Benhadad and he says, "Hazael, son of nobody seized the throne." So this Assyrian king clear across the desert speaking of Hazael as becoming king of Syria after Benhadad and calling him Hazael, son of a nobody, is a corroboration not only of the Scriptural statement ~~but~~ that Hazael was king after Benhadad but after that he was usurper and not one of the royal family. That is a very interesting corroboration of this material which otherwise would stand absolutely alone. There is no other evidence bearing upon it.