

Model Peacemaker

1 Samuel 25:24-31

By Phillip G. Kayser at DCC on 1-8-2012

Introduction

Jewish tradition makes Abigail one of seven prophetesses in the Old Testament, and they treat the speech she gave here as being an inspired prophecy. And there are some modern commentaries that do the same thing. This is based on five hints in the passage: First, in verse 26 she says that it is the LORD Himself who is holding David back, not just herself. Second, she gives accurate predictions of David's future victory and kingship. Third, David acknowledges in verse 32 that God had sent her to him. Fourth, David told her that he would obey her voice in verse 35. That implies some authority in her voice. And fifth, in verse 35 David said that he respected her person – a statement that almost treats her as having an office. Other commentators are not convinced that this evidence is quite conclusive. I haven't totally made up my mind.

But whether she was a prophetess or not, her speech is indeed a remarkable speech. It is the longest recorded speech of a woman in the Bible, and it is a fantastic example of both interposition (which we have talked about before) and peacemaking.

And this morning I want to answer the question, "Why was she so successful?" She stopped a whole army in its tracks. They were mad; they were out for blood, and she stopped them. Why? There are two parts to the answer. Ultimately God alone can bless interpositions and attempts at peacemaking. I have seen wonderful efforts met with sinful responses. There was nothing wrong with the peacemaking, but one or both of the parties were so set on their sin, that there was nothing that could be done. So God must bless our efforts. That is the ultimate reason that she was successful. She depended upon the Lord.

But this sermon is going to focus on the characteristics of her peacemaking. If God had not matured her spiritually and given her the kind of wisdom, tact, humility, and other things that the peace making passages like 2 Corinthians 7, Galatians 6, etc. talk about, she would likely not have been successful. So we are going to quickly go through fifteen points.

I. Humble (v. 23b-24a)

First, she went into this peacemaking with no arrogance or pride showing. Beginning with verse 23:

1Samuel 25:23 Now when Abigail saw David, she dismounted quickly from the donkey, fell on her face before David, and bowed down to the ground. 1Samuel 25:24 So she fell at his feet and said:

This was a position of respect as well as pleading. Now granted, her husband's life was in danger. But when you couple this posture with the whole tone of the speech, you see that it flowed from a genuine humility.

When pride is present, it is so easy for anger to flare and destroy the whole process. When pride is present, it is so easy to see everyone else's fault and not see your own. From my perspective, she didn't personally have much fault, yet her humility enabled her to see the whole situation from David's perspective. You can't do that if you are a proud person. Humility gives you new eyes to see conflicts in a totally different way. This is why Galatians 6 wants those who intervene to consider their own weakness and their own vulnerabilities.

She was not making demands or pridefully rebuking David. What David was doing deserved rebuke. There is no doubt about it. It was a rash move that would have involved him in murder, and he later realizes it. But her humble petition to please listen to your maidservant stopped him in his tracks. There is a power in humility. And there is nothing that turns an angry person off more than pride. And certainly the Scripture indicates that if you meet anger with anger, it just escalates the problem. But humility injects a critical element into peacemaking. It indicates to others that you are going to approach the interposition in a reasonable fashion.

And by the way, you can start off humble, but when you see the arrogance, mouthiness, and pride of the other person, it is very easy to cast aside humility, to start getting angry, and before you know it, things have escalated into a competition between the peacemaker and one or both of the parties. And the peacemaker is offended, and he becomes useless for the job. This is a critical point.

II. Willing to take heat so that others are saved (v. 24b)

The second thing that we see is that she was willing to take heat so that others could be saved. Look at verse 24. She says, "**On me, my lord, on me let this iniquity be!**" In other words, she was willing to take the blame and to suffer the consequences. This is absolutely remarkable, and shows the

degree of love that she has for her despicable husband. This is not blind love, because she is able to discuss his sin. This is not an enabling love, because we have already seen that she is doing the opposite of enabling – she is intervening even without his permission. This is not doormat passivity; she is anything but passive. But this is a God-given love that cares about others so much, that she is willing to suffer on their behalf.

And I can assure you that this is not something man-made. This is the kind of burden for others that the Spirit of God gave Paul in Romans 9. In fact, I am going to have you go ahead and turn there. Romans 9, beginning at verse 1. And keep in mind that Paul's evangelistic efforts were efforts at peacemaking par excellence – reconciling people to God. Paul says,

Romans 9:1 I tell the truth in Christ, I am not lying, my conscience also bearing me witness in the Holy Spirit,

Three times he emphasizes that what he is about to say is not an exaggeration because people will have a hard time believing it. He's willing to go to hell so that these Jews could be saved!! *That's the kind of burden that he had!* That just doesn't seem possible. But it was a Spirit-given reality with Paul. So he insists, "I am not lying." Verse 2:

Romans 9:2 that I have great sorrow and continual grief in my heart.

Romans 9:3 For I could wish that I myself were accursed from Christ for my brethren, my countrymen according to the flesh, Romans 9:4 who are Israelites, to whom *pertain* the adoption, the glory, the covenants, the giving of the law, the service of God, and the promises;

Romans 9:5 of whom *are* the fathers and from whom, according to the flesh, Christ *came*, who is over all, *the* eternally blessed God. Amen.

Paul was opening up his heart so that people could see how much he loved those who were outside of Christ. Even when they didn't reciprocate his love, God enabled him to love them. And it is this kind of self-sacrificing attitude that can make a peacemaker more successful.

Now, let me emphasize that no peacemaker will be 100% successful. Paul was an evangelist who was seeking to bring hateful people into a relationship of peace with God (that's the ultimate peacemaking, isn't it?), and they hated him for it. They tried to kill him. They slandered him. But Paul was one of the most successful evangelists. This was mainly because he was gifted, but it was also in part because he exemplified the principles of peacemaking in this chapter so well.

And one of those was this willingness to take heat so that others might be saved. Commentators point out that Abigail's whole reason for doing this was to rescue her husband and the other males in that tribe. She probably would not have been personally killed, but this wasn't about her. She was willing to take the heat of David's fury in order to save others.

Some of you might be tempted to do the opposite. With the media blitz that has slandered my name, it would be easy to get offended. But I think God has given me a willingness to take this heat if it advances His cause, His truth, and their salvation. And I think it is. There are more unbelievers listening to and reading my sermons now than ever before. And it is my prayer that they would find true peace in Jesus Christ. I hold them no ill will. I can honestly say that.

III. Uses appeal rather than demands (v. 24c)

The third thing that I see in Abigail is that she appeals to David rather than making demands of David. Granted, she is not in a very good position to make demands, even if she was a prophetess. But her approach is the approach that is most likely to gain a hearing. Abigail wisely says, "**And please let your maidservant speak in your ears, and hear the words of your maidservant.**" And she has this language of appeal all the way through her speech. "Please let your maidservant."

If a guy is already so mad that he doesn't listen to you, then saying, "Please, listen to what a friend has to say," is much more likely to break through the anger than saying, "What is the matter with you? Stop this nonsense!" There is a place for both approaches, but let me assure you that when I have tried the second approach it hasn't worked so well. Beginning with a soft appeal is the usual way for successful peacemakers. A soft answer turns away wrath. A peacemaker is not only concerned about speaking the truth (she does do that), but she is also concerned about the *way* the truth is spoken, and the *context*, and the *motive*.

IV. Does not cover for Nabal or minimize his sin (v. 25a), but neither does she cover for David or minimize his sin (v. 26c,31)

Now, it is not as if she is covering for Nabal's sin. Not at all. Verse 25 says, "**Please, let not my lord regard this scoundrel Nabal. For as his name is, so is he: Nabal is his name, and folly is with him!**" She is saying, "Look. I agree with you that Nabal is in the wrong here. Everyone knows that Nabal's character is not good. I'm not going to cover for him. But this is not the way to deal with it." That's in effect what she is saying. And you

might think that she is now taking sides with David. Well, in one sense yes, and in another sense, no. If you are going to engage in interposition, you need to be prepared to protect all sides and point out the error in all sides. Minimizing sin is enablement, pure and simple. It does not solve the problem. And she doesn't cover for either Nabal or David. She is gracious, yet she points out the sin in both men. Take a look for example at the third clause in verse 26. She describes what David is attempting to do as “**coming to bloodshed**” and “**avenging yourself with your own hand**,” and in verse 31 she makes it clear that it would be shedding blood without cause – in other words, it would have been murder. There would have been no justification for this slaughter. So she does not ignore the sin of either one.

And this is a very important part of peacemaking. If you minimize the sin of one party, the other party is not going to take any of your recommendations seriously. They are going to feel that you are being unfair. And if you only point out the sins of one person you will also have a hard time bringing the two together. So peacemaking is not about ignoring sin, or minimizing sin. It is about bringing reconciliation (if possible) despite the sin that is present, and dealing with the sin that is present.

V. Gives new information that was unknown (v. 25b)

The fifth thing that I see here is in the second clause of verse 25: “**But I, your maidservant, did not see the young men of my lord whom you sent.**” She is giving new information to David, and encouraging David to look at all angles of this problem. There is more than just Nabal involved here. She is in effect saying, “Have you considered my involvement?”

When there is a clash of personalities, both parties tend to have tunnel vision, and they have a hard time seeing other possible explanations, solutions, or collateral damage. Has David given anybody else a chance to fix this problem? No. He's going to punish the whole group, even though some in the group were ignorant of what had happened. And so one of the jobs of a peacemaker is to inject new information into the discussion that the two parties have not seen. And of course, there is a sense in which everything she is saying is doing exactly that.

VI. Assurances of her impartiality (v. 26a)

In verse 26 we see that Abigail is seeking to be impartial. “**Now therefore, my lord, as the LORD lives and as your soul lives.**” She is taking an oath of truthfulness here. Her goal is not to manipulate an outcome. Her goal is not to say anything needed to stop a confrontation. That's the problem I have with the movie, *The Negotiator*. You can say

anything, so long as the outcome is OK. No, that's not the Biblical way. What she is going to say is going to be fair and impartial, and it is going to be the truth. And of course, she will immediately dive into pointing out David's sin too. But this phrase is highlighting the fact that she is saying this honestly before God.

VII. Assume that the one you are talking to wants the best outcome (v. 26b)

In verse 26 she goes on to say, “**Since the LORD has held you back from coming to bloodshed...**” One liberal commentator said that this verse must be out of order because David hasn't promised to stop his planned vengeance. But most commentators say that she is simply assuming that David will do the right thing once he understands the situation. She is assuming the best about him. Now it may be that this was a prophetic utterance, but either way, it still highlights that when we assume the best about others, we often get it, and when we assume the worst in others, we often get the worst. It almost becomes a self-fulfilling prophecy. But when you have two believers who are indwelt by the Spirit of God, how much more should we have a 1 Corinthians 13 love that “**believes all things, hopes all things, endures all things**”? In fact, I want to read the whole description of love in 1 Corinthians 13, because I think Abigail's speech exemplifies it so well.

1Corinthians 13:1 Though I speak with the tongues of men and of angels, but have not love, I have become sounding brass or a clanging cymbal.

Applying this to peacemaking – even the most brilliant speaker in the world can be ineffective. Peacemaking is not simply skill in speaking. He goes on...

1Corinthians 13:2 And though I have *the gift of prophecy*, and understand all mysteries and all knowledge, and though I have all faith, so that I could remove mountains, but have not love, I am nothing.

1Corinthians 13:3 And though I bestow all my goods to feed *the poor*, and though I give my body to be burned, but have not love, it profits me nothing.

1Corinthians 13:4 Love suffers long *and* is kind; love does not envy; love does not parade itself, is not puffed up;

1Corinthians 13:5 does not behave rudely, does not seek its own, is not provoked, thinks no evil;

1Corinthians 13:6 does not rejoice in iniquity, but rejoices in the truth;

1Corinthians 13:7 bears all things, believes all things, hopes all things, endures all things.

1Corinthians 13:8 Love never fails.

Well, you look at each of those descriptions of love, and I think you will agree that Abigail had them.

VIII. But don't skip over the seriousness of his sins either (v. 26c)

One of those is that love rejoices in the truth. It does not tell a lie. And so Abigail tells the truth as she sees it with David, even if it might be offensive to David. This is point VIII. She has already couched her language in such tactfulness, humility, and grace that it makes it easier for David to swallow. But her peacemaking efforts did not overlook the seriousness of David's sins.

IX. It is appropriate to take sides, even when both sides have sin (v. 26d)

And it is in having pointed out the sins of both David and Nabal, that she could be taken seriously when she sided with David on the overall scheme of things. That's point IX. In other words she is not engaged in boot licking. She is interested in glorifying God in this process. So it is appropriate to take sides, so long as in the process it is God that you are seeking to please. And if people argue about whose side you are taking, you can say, "I'm trying to be for both of you, but ultimately it is God and His Scriptures that we must all side with. It's an issue of siding with God, not with one of you." If you are trying to side with God, then when you disagree with either person, it will not be perceived as a personal rejection quite as easily. Of course, some people (like Nabal) are so self-centered, that if you don't blindly side with them, they won't like it no matter what. But ultimately that doesn't matter. It is God that you are pleasing.

X. Restitution? A good-will gift? (v. 27)

Now you might wonder about my summary of verse 27, and that is why I have put the two possibilities as question marks. But let me read it first, and then comment on it. She says,

1Samuel 25:27 And now this present which your maidservant has brought to my lord, let it be given to the young men who follow my lord.

She is providing the thing that her husband refused to provide. Peacemaking is not simply about getting two sides to bury their hatchet. It is about making sure that injustices are rectified. Not everybody can achieve this, but since she could, she did.

But I have put question marks behind this because she doesn't call it restitution; she calls the food a gift or a present, or literally, a blessing. And

it may flow from that fact that though Nabal had clearly sinned, she was going to point out that David could not insist on payment. She is about to say that the bloodshed would be without cause. So even though she is addressing David's hurt feelings, she is not necessarily admitting that this is restitution. But I think my first point still stands, that whether David could demand it or not, she wanted to make sure that wrongs were rectified.

XI. She sought forgiveness for even her unintentional hurting of David (v. 28a)

In verse 28 she asked forgiveness for even her unintentional oversight. She had already insisted that she didn't know that the messengers had come and had asked for consideration. And you can see that she is tiptoeing very carefully through some land mines here. Commentators point out that on the one hand she cannot be disloyal to her husband. David could hardly respect that. So she is willing to stick with her husband by taking the blame herself. But by taking the blame; by calling it a trespass, she is agreeing that David has a right to be offended; that there has been sin involved. Yet, on the other hand, by agreeing with David, she does not in any way want to say that she agrees with everything that David is doing. She will immediately try to keep him from sin. So this is very delicately worded.

And it highlights the fact that when doing peacemaking, it sometimes requires incredible tact. One commentator thought that she was simply asking forgiveness for continuing to talk. I don't think so, and most commentators don't think so. Most think that she is expressing the fact that she feels very badly that Nabal had not given David anything. She would have given David something. She feels very badly David's feelings were hurt, and this was a good will gift to patch up the feelings. But she does insist that it is a present.

XII. She affirms what is good in David

The twelfth thing that I see is that she affirms what is good in David. David is about to do something that is monstrously evil and that would have been grossly out of proportion to the sin of Nabal. She will address that in a moment. But she first of all affirms the good that is in David. And I think this is very, very important to do in peacemaking. When you point out sins in a David, it is very easy for him to only see the criticism. So she is careful to not ignore the huge amount of good that David has done. And by doing this it will actually add power to her point that all of that could be lost on others if he insists on acting rashly. You've got such a good reputation, and it is all going to be blown up in this one selfish act.

A. God's promises for him (v. 28b)

So here are three things that she says that she appreciates about David. First of all she affirms that she believes God's promises that he will indeed be king. She is in agreement with those God-given promises. Verse 28 goes on to say, "**For the LORD will certainly make for my lord an enduring house...**" He will be king, but as she will shortly point out, that carries with it the responsibilities to act consistently with that fact.

B. David's sacrificial service for God (v. 28c)

Second, she appreciates the fact that David has been very sacrificial for God. She says, "**...because my lord fights the battles of the LORD...**" Now again, that is a subtle reminder that he needs to continue to be thinking about serving the *Lord* in this situation instead of serving his pride. But she is saying it positively. Up until this time you have certainly been serving the Lord, and I appreciate that about you.

C. The good reputation he has had (v. 28d)

The third thing that she appreciates is that David has had an impeccable reputation. She says, "**...and evil is not found in you throughout your days.**" And the implication will shortly be made that he might lose that good reputation if he follows through on his plans. So think about your good reputation. So even the good in David that she mentions is going to be leveraged to make her point.

XIII. She expresses legitimate sympathy for David's plight (v. 29a)

Points 13 and 14 give two more ways that she seeks to be positive about David before she launches into her final reason that what he was doing was wrong. She shows sympathy for the difficult straights that David found himself in. He was in a tough position. He was totally dependent upon the goodwill of others. She says, "**Yet a man has risen to pursue you and seek your life...**" Though she does not excuse his sin, she certainly understands the pressures that fleeing from Saul had produced. And so she shows sympathy and understanding. Those are critical components of peacemaking.

XIV. And encourages David to look to God in faith during this situation (v. 29b-30)

But even on this there is no excuse. Instead, she encourages David to look to God in faith during this trying situation. This is the second part of

verse 29 through verse 30. She says, “...but the life of my lord shall be bound in the bundle of the living with the LORD your God; and the lives of your enemies He shall sling out, *as from* the pocket of a sling. And it shall come to pass, when the LORD has done for my lord according to all the good that He has spoken concerning you, and has appointed you ruler over Israel.” And I will stop there. Though it doesn’t look as if God’s promises will be fulfilled, she has faith that they will be, and she encourages David to have faith that they will be. And the images she uses are wonderful.

The first image is that David’s life is like household jewels or money that is wrapped up in cloth for safekeeping. She is saying to David, “You are precious in the sight of the Lord, and he will bundle you up for safekeeping. You are His jewel, and you can trust Him to protect you.” That is exactly what she is saying. And there are marvelous implications of that image that I won’t get into. But you could study that image sometime. It is very encouraging.

The second image is of a sling that God is whirling around and getting ready to release, and the stone that is about to be thrown out of that sling is David’s enemies. David is bound up and the enemies are about to be slung away. David was a slinger, so this was a powerful image. Your enemies will be thrown a long ways from you, and God will use your enemies as part of the process of gaining Him the victory. Who is God shooting at? His enemies. God is using our enemies to fight against our enemies. And again, there are wonderful implications of that statement. God can make Satan’s slander and attacks to work against Satan’s kingdom. God uses our enemies in His own sling. What a wonderful metaphor.

Then she reminds David of the promises that God had made to him through Samuel. God had promised that David would be a king and would be prospered. How did she know about those promises? If she was a prophetess, the Lord could have revealed them to her. But the overall story of this book makes it clear that by this time, news of David’s anointing and calling to kingship were likely widespread. Either way, she is calling David to walk by faith in the promises of God, and what he has been contemplating doing would be to do the opposite.

Now, here is an important thing to consider: of all the previous fourteen points, at least twelve of them don’t deal directly with David’s sin. Isn’t that interesting? David’s sin is the crisis that needs to be dealt with, yet it is the smallest portion of what she speaks about. There is a sense in which

all of these other points are preliminary to pointing out the stupidity of what David is about to do. It's giving perspective. Once he has perspective, it would be easier to convince him.

And this too should inform our peacemaking. If the only thing we do in peacemaking is to point out other people's sins, we are missing out on the kind of affirmation that is needed. Peacemakers seek to understand the why, the wherefore, and the circumstances that have led to the conflict. They don't just bash the two parties. They make it clear that they are for the two parties. They must show in many ways that they care. They go overboard in showing care, humility, understanding, and sensitivity to the situation. Galatians 6, which is another peacemaking passage, deals with all of these issues. And one of the points that Paul makes in that chapter is that peacemakers must learn to bear the burdens of others while bearing their own. Bearing one another's burdens in the midst of confronting them for their sins is the sugar that helps to make the bitter medicine go down.

XV. She encourages David to repent by appealing to the consequences of his actions (v. 31)

A. She tries to get him to see how he might react to this in the future (v. 31a)

But now comes the bitter medicine in verse 31. Let's look at it phrase by phrase. Even this is worded carefully. She says that she has interposed herself because she does not want David to later have to regret this action. So she is still for him, even though she disagrees with what he is doing. She says, "**that this will be no grief to you, nor offense of heart to my lord...**" "This is not something you are going to proud of. In fact, you are going to grieve over this and find it offensive." "Grief" is the result of his sin, and "offense" is the character of his sin. But interestingly, she is trying to have him look at it from his own future perspective.

And peacemakers have to give perspective. Peacemakers try to get the parties to look at the problem from the other person's perspective, from the perspective of onlookers, from God's perspective, and also from the perspective of what he himself will think in the future. She tries to convince him that he will grieve over it and it will become something offensive to his heart.

B. She tries to get him to see the seriousness of the sin in its own right (v. 31a) because:

Next she tries to get him to see the seriousness of the sin in its own right. Here's what he is going to regret: **“either that you have shed blood without cause, or that my lord has avenged himself.”**

1. He will have shed innocent blood (v. 31b) and will thus be no different than Saul.

The first serious charge was that he was about to shed blood without cause. That is a euphemistic way of speaking of murder. Killing someone in self-defense is with cause and so it is not murder. But unless the Bible specifically authorizes the spilling of blood, you are engaged in murder. And as David himself pointed out, with 99% of all spilling of blood, it is a civil magistrate alone who is allowed to do it. Self-defense, yes, but vengeance, no. In the previous chapter David had written the imprecatory Psalm, Psalm 35, against all those who spill blood without cause. He pronounced curses on those murderers. So that means that in chapter 24 he hated the very thing that now he wants to do. In Psalm 7, he would later pronounce a curse upon himself if he had spilled blood without cause. So this is a serious sin, and she is seeking to point out the seriousness of that sin.

2. He will have acted as a revolutionary (v. 31c) and will thus reap the same in his kingdom.

The second thing she is accusing him of is acting as a revolutionary: **“or that my lord has avenged himself.”** When the New Testament commands us to not take vengeance into our own hands, but to love our enemies, it's quoting the Old Testament. It is quoting from Deuteronomy 32, and from other passages. And I think this would have stuck to David like glue, because he had spent so much time in the previous chapters convincing his men that it was wrong for private citizens to take vengeance. He refused to raise the sword against Saul. He refused to take out Doeg, even though he suspected that Doeg would tell Saul of his whereabouts. He had been a model of the Reformed principle of self-control under tyranny, and was about to let all that go out the window in one act of revolutionary vengeance. If he had killed Nabal and his men he would have been no better than Saul, and it would have been hypocritical of him to write those Psalms against Saul. If he had acted as a revolutionary, he would have reaped revolution in his own kingdom. And of course, when he murdered Uriah the Hittite much later in his life, revolution came to haunt his kingdom, didn't it? So the Old

Testament principle that she is stating here is well summarized in two New Testament passages. Let me read those for you.

Romans 12:19 Beloved, do not avenge yourselves, but *rather* give place to wrath; for it is written, “*Vengeance is Mine, I will repay,*” says the Lord.

How does God repay? The next chapter, Romans 13 tells us – through the civil magistrate as well as through his own providential judgments. When we give the vengeance of Romans 13 to the civil magistrate, then we are freed up to love as Romans 12 commands us to. It commands us to bless those who curse us, and it commands us to do good to those who persecute us. And when he says, “**If your enemy is hungry, feed him; if he is thirsty, give him a drink,**” He is quoting Proverbs 25.

The second passage explicitly quotes the civil penalties of the Old Testament and says,

Hebrews 10:30 For we know Him who said, “*Vengeance is Mine, I will repay,*” says the Lord. And again, “*The LORD will judge His people.*”

There has been a lot of controversy over my views on the death penalty recently. But the irony is that unless citizens understand what is within the state’s jurisdiction and what is within the civilian’s jurisdiction, there is no safety for anyone. The death threats that I have been receiving show that these people think they can take vengeance into their own hand. On our part, we don’t believe that. Because we truly believe that the first few verses of Romans 13 belong to the government and vengeance is their responsibility, we are freed up to love our enemies and to do good to our enemies and to preach the Gospel to them as Romans 12 commands. But we must believe a theology of Romans 13 in order to consistently be able to practice the love of Romans 12. And David was almost forgetting that balance.

C. She tries to get him to see that there will be other collateral damage from this action (v. 31e)

The last thing that she throws out there is that there are innocent people who can be hurt when people take vengeance into their own hands. There is collateral damage. In this case, she would be one of the ones who would have suffered at David’s hands. So she says, “**But when the LORD has dealt well with my lord, then remember your maidservant.**” Of course, she had been so gracious, and so humble in her entreaty, that it was impossible for David to be upset with her.

Conclusion

He blesses her, repents of his sin, receives her gift, and assures her that he will do them no harm. But David was so impressed with this woman, that when her husband died, he asked her if she would marry him. And she did. Now, that is another story for another time. But I think that there is a lot you can learn for your own attempts at peacemaking from this wonderful woman. Hopefully, my having systematized the speech will make it easier for you to try to emulate her. But may God prosper all of our efforts at peacemaking. Amen.

Youth Notes

Draw a picture of the sermon

Word checklist: check words off as Pastor Kayser says them.

- prophetess
- interposition
- peacemaking
- arrogance
- humility
- sacrifice
- please
- minimize
- information
- impartiality
- love
- tactfulness
- restitution
- unintentional
- reputation
- sympathy
- faith
- burdens
- medicine
- perspective
- bless
- collateral

Things I need to do:

Try the following wordsearch puzzle. All answers are to the right.

D	A	Z	K	D	C	S	P	Y	K	O	I	G	P	E	R	S	P	E	C	T	I	V	E	N
L	W	J	T	O	T	X	H	M	R	S	F	A	R	R	O	G	A	N	C	E	Y	Q	E	S
U	E	M	U	U	Z	T	P	H	U	E	I	N	T	E	R	P	O	S	I	T	I	O	N	F
B	U	L	Q	Y	A	I	I	Q	N	Y	S	S	K	Q	B	Q	K	E	I	G	T	E	E	F
M	P	F	M	P	Z	Q	Z	O	I	I	P	T	H	U	V	X	U	X	N	D	D	M	S	S
R	I	O	M	U	D	U	I	Q	N	Y	M	F	I	W	Z	D	G	I	J	R	K	S	W	C
J	E	Y	I	E	Z	T	S	K	T	W	E	P	Y	T	T	L	K	U	U	B	E	O	T	P
B	S	D	V	G	A	W	S	C	E	C	D	R	A	Z	U	A	T	B	I	T	X	W	A	L
L	G	O	D	T	X	T	E	U	N	O	I	Q	M	R	M	T	S	N	E	W	I	Z	C	E
C	L	H	U	H	H	T	J	I	T	M	C	D	S	E	T	H	I	H	Y	Q	J	W	T	A
A	S	P	T	W	H	V	I	Y	I	W	I	U	C	X	C	I	P	O	I	J	P	A	F	S
M	E	I	R	M	K	A	M	H	O	K	N	A	M	O	P	O	A	V	N	Q	J	E	U	E
R	A	O	G	A	B	B	A	D	N	D	E	P	A	G	R	C	U	L	F	S	E	H	L	N
F	H	U	M	I	L	I	T	Y	A	P	F	D	P	P	K	E	C	Y	I	I	G	M	N	P
G	N	N	U	P	P	Z	L	T	L	S	A	C	R	I	F	I	C	E	F	T	A	M	E	L
I	N	F	O	R	M	A	T	I	O	N	N	A	H	H	M	L	I	G	F	G	Y	C	S	D
P	B	B	L	E	S	S	M	M	I	N	I	M	I	Z	E	X	C	Z	G	X	V	Y	S	Z

Model Peacemaker

1 Samuel 25:24-31

By Phillip G. Kayser at DCC on 1-8-2012

Introduction

- I. Humble (v. 23b-24a)
- II. Willing to take heat so that others are saved (v. 24b)
- III. Uses appeal rather than demands (v. 24c)
- IV. Does not cover for Nabal or minimize his sin (v. 25a), but neither does she cover for David or minimize his sin (v. 26c,31)
- V. Gives new information that was unknown (v. 25b)
- VI. Assurances of her impartiality (v. 26a)
- VII. Assume that the one you are talking to wants the best outcome (v. 26b)
- VIII. But don't skip over the seriousness of his sins either (v. 26c)
- IX. It is appropriate to take sides, even when both sides have sin (v. 26d)
- X. Restitution? A good-will gift? (v. 27)
- XI. She sought forgiveness for even her unintentional hurting of David (v. 28a)
- XII. She affirms what is good in David
 - A. God's promises for him (v. 28b)
 - B. David's sacrificial service for God (v. 28c)
 - C. The good reputation he has had (v. 28d)
- XIII. She expresses legitimate sympathy for David's plight (v. 29a)
- XIV. And encourages David to look to God in faith during this situation (v. 29b-30)
- XV. She encourages David to repent by appealing to the consequences of his actions (v. 31)
 - A. She tries to get him to see how he might react to this in the future (v. 31a)
 - B. She tries to get him to see the seriousness of the sin in its own right (v. 31a) because:
 1. He will have shed innocent blood (v. 31b) and will thus be no different than Saul.
 2. He will have acted as a revolutionary (v. 31c) and will thus reap the same in his kingdom.
 - C. She tries to get him to see that there will be other collateral damage from this action (v. 31e)

Conclusion

Blessed are the PEACEMAKERS

