in the main thing which he was doing. It would be implying too much to say that every detail of what he does is necessarily in accordance with God's commands. That would certainly be without warrant in the Scrip ure. That is a special especially without warrant in the Scripture whether we later on at the end of the dynasty of Jehu and we read of the works of a great prophet written near the end of the reign of Jehu in which this prophet, the prophet Hozea, speaks about the vengeance which God is going to bring faxxix for the bloody of Jezreel, the vengeance which God is going to bring upon the house of Jehu. We find it in Hosea 1:4. The Lord said, "Yet a little while and I will avenge the blood of Jezreel upon the house of Jehu and will amax cause to sease the kingdom of the house of Israel." Now what do we mean by the blood of Jezreel? there is no Scripture -- there is, of course, the blood of Naboth. That happened in Jezreel but that had nothing to do with the house of Jehu so that that cannot be not what is record here. It must be something in connection with the house of Jehu and there was nothing in the Scripture connected with the house of Jehu which we are warranted in thinking of as being referred to in Hosea 1:4 except the great bloody act which Jehu performed in connection with the establishment of his kingdom. So we seem to have a commendation in Kings of Jehu for what he did and a condemnation of Jehu in Hosea. Again we ask do Hosea and Kings contradict each other or is there a way in which we can understand the two passages so that we do not have to assume that there is a contradiction and it does seem altogether reasonable to consider th t the main thing which Jehu has done is someth ng that the Lord had willed and which the Lord desired to be done but that the manner in which he did it and the extent to which he carried it out was something in which Jehu had followed his own reservainxether wicked motive instinct and for which there was vengeance to come upon the house of Jehu. That is an interpretation which recognizes both passages as truly God's way, and as having no contradiction between them. It is altogether a reasonable interpretation. If someone has another one to suggest, please write it out and