

“Holiness & Enfolding Mission: A Riddle”

Deuteronomy 23:1-8

September 20, 2026

Faith Presbyterian Church – Morning Service

Pastor Nicoletti

The Reading of the Word

We return this morning to our series in the Book of Deuteronomy. Moses is instructing God’s people as to how they are to live in the land.

We’re going through Deuteronomy in its entirety, without skipping portions. Tonight we’ll look at the end of Deuteronomy 22. As I’ve mentioned, that sermon will cover sensitive themes of abuse and assault in the realm of human sexuality, and so I encourage you to use discretion for you and your children on how you approach the service this evening, and whether you attend.

This morning we look at the beginning of chapter 23.

And two “heads-ups” as we do.

First, the first verse is a bit more earthy than we tend to like to be in church.

In some ways, this should be a reminder that God is not squeamish about the physical realities of life or the human body. Judging by the Bible, God seems to be far more comfortable with those realities than we are. [Leithart, 51]

Another heads-up is that as you hear this morning’s text, it might raise some questions and even concerns for you.

If it does, that’s good. Because I want to argue that it’s exactly in that discomfort that God is calling us to wrestle with and to ponder, in a riddle that’s at the heart of this text.¹

Now, to untangle that riddle, we’ll have to ponder together how a number of Bible passages all fit together. So, we’ll need to spend a bit more time than usual wrestling with the Scriptures. But hopefully doing that together should both give us a better sense of how the Bible fits together as a whole, as it also leads us to an answer to the riddle embedded in our text this morning.

With that said – prepared for some uncomfortable vocabulary as well as some puzzling laws – let’s turn now to our text: Deuteronomy 23:1-8.

Please do listen carefully, for this is God’s Word for us this morning.

Moses said to the people:

¹ Henri De Lubac, in his book explaining the hermeneutics of Origen of Alexandria highlighted that for Origen, elements in the Biblical text that strike us as problematic or contradictory are not there to be rushed passed or brushed aside, but they are rather there to call us to stop, and consider the meaning of the text more closely. [De Lubac, 113]

^{23:1} “No one whose testicles are crushed or whose male organ is cut off shall enter the assembly of Yahweh.

² “No one born of a forbidden union may enter the assembly of Yahweh. Even to the tenth generation, none of his descendants may enter the assembly of Yahweh.

³ “No Ammonite or Moabite may enter the assembly of Yahweh. Even to the tenth generation, none of them may enter the assembly of Yahweh forever, ⁴ because they did not meet you with bread and with water on the way, when you came out of Egypt, and because they hired against you Balaam the son of Beor from Pethor of Mesopotamia, to curse you. ⁵ But Yahweh your God would not listen to Balaam; instead Yahweh your God turned the curse into a blessing for you, because Yahweh your God loved you. ⁶ You shall not seek their peace or their prosperity all your days forever.

⁷ “You shall not abhor an Edomite, for he is your brother. You shall not abhor an Egyptian, because you were a sojourner in his land. ⁸ Children born to them in the third generation may enter the assembly of Yahweh.

This is the word of the Lord. (Thanks be to God.)

“All people are like grass, and all their glory is like the flowers of the field; the grass withers and the flowers fall, but the word of the Lord endures forever.” [1 Peter 1:24-25]

Let’s pray ...

Prayer of Illumination

Lord, this morning we come to a challenging passage of your Word.

And so we ask you to give us eyes to see, ears to hear, and hearts to understand your word to us, For our good, and for your glory.

We ask it in Jesus’s name, Amen.

Introduction

Our text this morning is all about “the assembly of the Lord” – the “assembly of Yahweh” – who can enter it, and who can’t.

Now, what does that mean?

Well, the “assembly of Yahweh” refers to those who are full members of the covenant community, who can participate fully in the political life of Israel, and who could draw close to God’s special presence in temple worship. [Block, 534, 538; Wright, 247; Alter, 992; Craigie, 296; Smith, Part 1]

There were a number of gradations between believers in the Old Testament: between believing Israelites and believing Gentiles, between Israelites who were ceremonially clean and Israelites who were, for a time, ceremonially unclean, between Israelites consecrated as holy – like priests and Levites – and those designated as “common” in Israel.

These weren't designations of salvation – they didn't define who could be saved, or go to heaven, or who could be right with God. But they formed a symbolic system in this life that was meant to instruct God's people. Israelites could draw closer than non-Israelites. Ceremonially clean Israelites could come closer than ceremonially unclean Israelites. Israelites consecrated as holy could come closer than common Israelites.

Each of these distinctions communicated something about God's nature, and what it takes to draw close to him. Each was meant to both guard God's holiness and to instruct Israel. But none of them were statements of the individual person's status when it came to salvation. A common, unclean individual could be saved, and go to heaven, if they trusted in Yahweh, the God of the Bible, from the heart. And a ceremonially clean, ceremonially holy, high priest of Israel could be unsaved, and spiritually separated from God, and facing eternal judgment, if they did not trust in Yahweh from the heart.

In one sense, the “assembly of Yahweh” designates one level of this gathering in God's special presence, in worship, in this life, as the holy people of God. That's what we're looking at here.

And so, what's in view here is not who could and couldn't be saved ... but who could draw especially close to God in this life, in the Old Testament era. [Smith, Parts 1 & 4]

Even so, these distinctions were meaningful. They taught something – about what was required to draw close to God. And also, these distinctions impacted people's lives in significant ways. Imagine, three times a year, the people of your village all make their way to the tabernacle or the temple, to draw close to God in a special time of festival ... but you are told that you can't come. There's something about you that makes it so that you can't draw close to God at that moment, while others can.

And then, imagine that the reason you couldn't draw close wasn't even because of anything you did ... but because of something someone else had done.

That's the beginning of the tension this text introduces for us. But as I said, it goes deeper than that too.

We're going to dive into that tension and explore it. Because what I think we see here is that: In this text, the holiness of God seems to come into conflict with the enfolding mission of God, presenting us with a riddle, that only the gospel can solve.

Let me say that again: In this text, the holiness of God seems to come into conflict with the enfolding mission of God, presenting us with a riddle, that only the gospel can solve.

Let's take that one piece at a time.

The Holiness of God in This Text

First, in this text we see the holiness of God.

The Bible teaches that God is holy: he is perfect, and he is set apart and separated from all that is imperfect. He is whole, not broken; he is pure, not corrupt; he is as he should be, and he is distinct and separate from all that is not as it should be.

And in this passage, Moses seems at first to be highlighting this truth.

First, in verse 1, he draws a line of separation between God and someone who was made a eunuch. While they appear to be broken in this aspect of their physical form, God is perfect. Their condition, in some sense, points to the brokenness of this world. And so, because God is holy and perfect, and they are in this way broken and imperfect, a separation exists, and they should be kept at a distance from God's special presence, and excluded from the assembly of Yahweh. Their brokenness points to the curse on this world. But God is separated from that curse – he is holy. And so, he must be separated from them. That's what we see in verse 1. [Wright, 247; Smith, Part 4]²

Next, those born of “a forbidden union” are excluded from the assembly of God. The Hebrew word used here is a rare one. It likely refers especially to those born out of incestuous unions that are forbidden in Leviticus. But it may also refer to those born out of wedlock, those born between a believing Israelite and an unbelieving non-Israelite, or those born to pagan cult prostitutes [Wright, 247; Alter, 991; Block, 535; Smith, Part 5; Millar, 138; Criagie, 297; Brown, 219]

Again, the idea is that this individual is the result of something that should not have been: the result of a union that God had not intended to be a part of his world. As such, while they are not guilty of any sin in that forbidden union that made them, they still point to that sin – that brokenness – that led to their birth. And so once again, they are excluded from the special presence of God – from the assembly of Yahweh.

But it's not just the immediate child that's excluded. Moses writes: “even to the tenth generation, none of his descendants may enter the assembly of the Yahweh.”

We have here a radical statement about God's holiness and purity. If two people engage in an unlawful union – a union contrary to God's commands – then it's not just the couple or the child who cannot enter the assembly, but any subsequent descendant. It says “even to ten generations” but commentators argue that this is just a phrase that actually means “forever” – which verse 3 seems to confirm. [Block, 535; Craigie, 297 n.9; Smith, Part 5] That line of human beings, forever, is cut off from the assembly of God, in this life.

Again, this doesn't mean that they can't be saved. But in ancient Israel, in this life, they cannot draw close to the assembly of God.

Next, in verses three, the text forbids descendants of the Ammonites and the Moabites from the assembly of Yahweh, “even to the tenth generation, none of them may enter the assembly of Yahweh forever.”

² The prohibition also points to similar laws for sacrificial animals and priests. [Block, 534] Sacrificial animals and priestly men could not have any major physical defect – including castration. And that requirement here is extended to the entire assembly that draws close to Yahweh. [Block, 534; Smith, Part 1]

There may have also been an additional concern that such castration was the result of a pagan religious rite, which God wants his people to utterly reject. [Wright, 247; Block, 535; Millar, 137-138; Brown, 219] And, in fact, castration was “fairly commonly practiced in the ancient Near East.” [Alter, 991]

In verses four and five, the explanation is given: The Ammonites did not provide bread or water for the Israelites when they came out of Egypt, and the Moabites tried to call down a curse on the people, and tempted them towards sin and rebellion [Numbers 22-24, 31:16]. [Wright, 248; Brown, 220]

For this reason, in a phrase that probably refers to foreign alliances or political treaties [Brown, 220; Craigie, 298], Moses says of the Moabites and Ammonites: “You shall not seek their peace or their prosperity all your days forever.”

These nations had rejected the Lord, and sought to harm his people. And all who descend from them, remain linked, in some sense, to that act of rebellion and rejection. And so again, this group of people, who grow out of the brokenness and rebellion and wickedness of the Moabites and the Ammonites, they cannot enter into the assembly of God, and draw close to his special presence, because he is holy, and their people are unholy.

In verses 7 and 8, Moses turns to the Edomites and the Egyptians. Their judgment is lighter – only two generations of exclusion from the assembly of God. But even that meant multiple generations of believing Edomites and Egyptians who could not draw close to God, because they too came from a people who had rejected God and his people.³

We have here six groups of people who are excluded from the assembly of God. And each exclusion is meant to point to God’s holiness: to the fact that he is perfect, and he must be separate from all that is broken, fallen, and imperfect. [Block, 535; Smith, Part 1]

So the first thing we see in this text is the holiness of God.

The Apparent Conflict with the Enfolding Mission of God, Which Presents Us with a Riddle

But the next thing we see is that in this text, the holiness of God seems to come into conflict with the enfolding mission of God, presenting us with a riddle.

Now, our first sense of this conflict may be intuitive.

Each of the people listed here is excluded not for something they did ... but for something they had no real control over.

An individual has no control over whether they’re born of a forbidden union, or into a Moabite, Ammonite, Edomite, or Egyptian family.

³ By “do not abhor” the text seems to mean that the Israelites should not exclude them from the worshipping community indefinitely, through restrictions still remain. [Wright, 253]

The charge for a more lenient approach to the Egyptians seems to point back to the hospitality of the Egyptians before they enslaved the Israelites. [Wright, 248; Millar, 152-153]

Even a eunuch often didn't have much say over his condition, because in Mesopotamia, castration was often done when someone was still a child. [Block, 534 n.2] In other words, it wasn't something they did. It was something done to them. [Aiuto]

And while we know that God is holy, and we know that these exclusions are not about salvation, it still often strikes us as in conflict with the character of God to exclude such people from the assembly of his people, for things they themselves had never done.

Many of us feel this intuitively.

But it's not just our intuition that comes into conflict with this text. It's the Bible itself that presents a conflict with the text.

And as we dig deeper, we soon see that biblical conflicts emerge with every single exclusion listed in this passage.

Consider verse 2, and the ban on those who were descendants of a forbidden union from entering the assembly of God. At the moment Moses spoke those words to the assembly of Israel, there were entire clans of Israel, who were, at that moment, included in the assembly of God, by Moses, but who were also the descendants of a forbidden union.

Back in the days of the Patriarchs, Judah, in an act of sexual sin, engaged in a forbidden union with his daughter-in-law Tamar, resulting in twin sons: Perez and Zerah. By the days of Moses, the descendants of these two men, born of that forbidden union, were now to clans within Israel: the Perezites and the Zerahites. [Numbers 26:20-22]

And they were included in the assembly of Yahweh. But verse 2 said they shouldn't be. Likely verse 2 meant that they should be excluded for the assembly forever. [Block, 535; Craigie, 297 n.9; Smith, Part 5] But if it only meant 10 generations, it was still highly unlikely that the Perezites and Zerahites were ten generations removed from that forbidden union. [Smith, Part 5]

And so, in that moment as Moses spoke the words of verse 2, there were literally thousands of descendants of a forbidden union, present in the assembly of God, whom Moses himself had counted among the assembly of God [Numbers 26:20-22]. And then they hear this law. And they had to be scratching their heads. They knew where they came from. And any Israelite who knew the stories of Genesis would have turned to the clans of the Perezites and the Zerahites, and said "Wait ... what?"

Now, Moses wasn't stupid. He didn't forget what he wrote in Genesis. Deuteronomy is an incredibly crafted work of literature – the author didn't have an "oopsie" here. No – the Israelites then, and Christians who know their Bible now, will be scratching their heads in confusion as they hear this verse, because Moses wants them scratching their heads. Moses wants us to stop. He wants us to ponder. He wants us to wrestle with God's Word. That's the point. That's the intention. [De Lubac, 113; Smith, Parts 1, 2, 5]

As Ralph Allan Smith argues, I think that in these verses, Moses wanted those ancient Israelites to hear this command not first and foremost as a law ... but as a riddle. Smith writes: "A statute which seems to be so strict, but which alludes obviously to a well-known case of the rule being broken is a riddle, not a law." [Smith, Part 5 (see also Parts 7 & 8)]

There are riddles in the Bible. Jesus often spoke in riddle-like parables.

The riddle before us here is that God’s holiness demands that a group of people be excluded because who they are points to the brokenness and rebellion of this world ... and at the same time, God enfolds those very people into his family, and draws them close anyway. That is the riddle.

And that riddle isn’t limited to verse 2.

Consider verses 7 and 8: the exclusion of Edomites and Egyptians until the third generation.

Several questions arise as we consider these verses.⁴

But one that would strike that first audience of Israelites, gathered before Moses, is that, once again, in that very assembly, there were numerous people who were first or second generation descendants of Egyptians. And every indication from the Books of Moses is that they too had already been fully enfolded into the assembly of Yahweh.

Back in Exodus 12:38, we’re told that the group that left Egypt, following Moses, was not just ethnic Israelites. But it was a “mixed multitude” that went out – meaning they weren’t all ethnic Israelites. Many of them, it seems, were Egyptians, who, in light of all that God had done, had decided to throw in their lot with Israel. Leviticus 24:10 seems to support this idea. [Smith, Part 7]

There were Egyptians already present in Israel. And most, at this point, depending on their age, would be the first or second generation to leave Egypt – not the third. And yet, they seem to have been absorbed and enfolded into the clans and tribes of Israel, not set apart. But now Moses seems to be saying that people like them should be excluded from the assembly. But Moses himself has already included them in the assembly. And they knew where they came from. And so, once again, they would look at each other and say: “Wait ... what?”

Because once again, God’s holiness demands that a group of people be excluded because who they are points to the brokenness and rebellion of this world ... and at the same time, God enfolds those very people into his family, and draws them close anyway. That is the riddle.

And the same riddle comes to us in verses 3 through 6. In those verses, the Ammonites and Moabites and their descendants are excluded forever from the assembly of God, and the people are charged not to seek the Moabites or the Ammonites peace or prosperity, forever.

But earlier in the Book of Deuteronomy, God explicitly discusses his care for the Ammonites and the Moabites. In Deuteronomy 2:9 Yahweh explains how he has given land to the Moabites, and he calls on Israel to act peacefully towards them. A few verses later, he says the same thing of the Ammonites [2:19, 21]. [Millar, 151-2; Smith, Part 6] God, in those very verses is seeking to

⁴ For one thing, it is strange that the Ammonites and Edomites are permanently excluded, when the Edomites and the Egyptians were not. The Edomites met the Israelites in the wilderness with at least as much hostility as the Ammonites [Numbers 20:14-21; Millar, 152; Block, 535, 536 n.13; Smith, Part 7] and the Egyptians enslaved the Israelites for generations, and then tried “to murder the entire population of male infants.” [Alter, 992; Smith, Part 7] This too should have led Moses’s audience to consider God’s tendency to enfold members of nations that have rejected him.

preserve the peace and prosperity of the Moabites and the Ammonites. Why then, in verse 6 of our text, does he forbid his people from seeking the peace or prosperity of the same people?

And here's another thing that may have struck the Israelites. Moses had told them that when God called Abraham, and promised to make from him the nation of Israel, one of the things he promised to Abraham, is that he said to him "in your offspring shall all the nations of the earth be blessed." [22:18]

Through Israel "all nations" would be blessed. Wouldn't that include the Ammonites and Moabites?

As we look back at these texts, we're struck with these apparent conflicts. But it gets worse when we look forward.

Because not too long after Moses spoke these words, and Israel entered the land – just a generation after the conquest – Boaz, a man who is noted for his faithfulness, will marry Ruth, a Moabite. And both Ruth and her descendants will quickly be enfolded into the people of God, as full members of the assembly.

And Boaz, who welcomed her into the people of God, obviously knew the book of Deuteronomy – he was careful to act according to Deuteronomy 23. So surely he would know these laws just two chapters earlier. [Smith, Parts 6 & 9]

And yet, he embraces and enfolds Ruth, a Moabite. And the Bible clearly affirms that decision. It lists Ruth alongside Leah and Rachel [Ruth 4:11], and presents her as an example of virtue, naming a book of the Bible after her. [Block, 540; see also Alter, 992]

So, God, through the Bible, seems to affirm this decision, even though it's in conflict with our text. How did Boaz know that God would respond positively to what he was doing?

Well, Ralph Smith notes that perhaps Boaz was especially equipped to navigate such a situation faithfully. Because Boaz's mother was also an exception to what looked like an absolute rule. Boaz's mother was Rahab – a woman from a Canaanite nation condemned for its wickedness ... but when she trusted in the Lord, she was spared, and enfolded into God's people. [Matthew 1:5 with Ruth 4:21; Smith, Part 6 & 9] Boaz would know that if his Canaanite mother could be enfolded into the assembly of the Lord, then surely a faithful Moabite like Ruth could be as well. And so Boaz enfolds Ruth into the assembly of God, even though it seems to be in conflict with verses 3 through 6 of our text – which he probably knew.

And redemptive history seems to affirm his decision, because David, the anointed King of Israel, chosen by God, was a descendant of Boaz and Ruth – only three generations removed from Moab. [Ruth 4:18-22; Smith, Part 6]

And David too would go on to include and enfold a faithful Moabite among his mighty men [1 Chronicles 11:46] and to seek to work with the King of Moab [1 Samuel 22:3-4]. [Smith, Part 9]

Neither Boaz nor David seemed to think that Deuteronomy 23 called on them to absolutely exclude the Moabites forever.

And so again, we have a riddle. God’s holiness demands that a group of people be excluded because who they are points to the brokenness and rebellion of this world ... and at the same time, God enfolds those very people into his family, and draws them close anyway. That is the riddle.

And the riddle exists in the case of the eunuch as well.

Deuteronomy 23:1 says that no eunuch “shall enter the assembly of Yahweh.”

But then, the Prophet Isaiah wrote these words – he said:

Let not the foreigner who has joined himself to Yahweh say,

“Yahweh will surely separate me from his people”;

and let not the eunuch say,

“Behold, I am a dry tree.”

For thus says Yahweh:

“To the eunuchs who keep my Sabbaths,

who choose the things that please me

and hold fast my covenant,

I will give in my house and within my walls

a monument and a name

better than sons and daughters;

I will give them an everlasting name

that shall not be cut off.

“And the foreigners who join themselves to Yahweh,

to minister to him, to love the name of Yahweh,

and to be his servants,

everyone who keeps the Sabbath and does not profane it,

and holds fast my covenant—

these I will bring to my holy mountain,

and make them joyful in my house of prayer;

their burnt offerings and their sacrifices

will be accepted on my altar;

for my house shall be called a house of prayer

for all peoples.”

Verse 1 of our text says a eunuch shall not enter the assembly of Yahweh. But in Isaiah, the same Lord says that any eunuch who trusts in him, will have a monument and a special place within the house of God. And he invites them into the assembly to make sacrifices and offer prayers, enfolding them into the assembly of God. [Wright, 248; Block, 539-540]

Again, we find the same riddle: God’s holiness demands that a group of people be excluded because who they are points to the brokenness and rebellion of this world ... and at the same time, God enfolds those very people into his family, and draws them close anyway. That is the riddle.

Every verse of this passage presses this riddle forward.

So, what’s the answer to this riddle?

A Riddle That Only the Gospel Can Solve

And we can find the answer if we look to another eunuch.

In Acts 8, Philip, a follower of Jesus, comes upon a eunuch from Ethiopia, who had just traveled to Jerusalem – to worship at the temple of Yahweh.

But given that he was a foreigner, and a eunuch, chances are that he barred, by the temple leaders, from the assembly of Yahweh. [Aiuto] Maybe even these verses were cited.

And now, as he's traveling back home, seated in a chariot, he's reading the Book of Isaiah. And we can't help but wonder if he turned to Isaiah in part because of those words of chapter 56 that we heard a moment ago – those promises that God would invite, into his assembly, faithful eunuchs like him. Maybe this man too was struck by this riddle of God's holy exclusion combined with his enfolding mission.

At the moment when Philip arrived, the eunuch was reading a passage just a few chapters earlier in Isaiah:

“Like a sheep he was led to the slaughter
and like a lamb before its shearer is silent,
so he opens not his mouth.
In his humiliation justice was denied him.
Who can describe his generation?
For his life is taken away from the earth.”

And the eunuch asks Philip: “About whom [...] does the prophet say this, about himself or about someone else?”

And whether he realized it or not, in the answer to that question the eunuch would also find the answer to the riddle of his status in the assembly of Yahweh.

In response, we're told that “Philip opened his mouth, and beginning with this Scripture he told him the good news about Jesus.”

It was the good news that Jesus was the answer to the riddle of how God could be holy and also be the one who embraces the defective and broken. He was the answer to the riddle, as Paul put it, as to how God could be just, and the justifier of the ungodly, if the trust in Jesus. [Romans 3:26 & 4:5]

Because Jesus received the exclusion that we deserve, so that we could be enfolded into the assembly of God, and embraced with the love of God.

Jesus was cast out so that we could be welcomed in.

Jesus satisfied the holiness of God, while also being the means by which God could draw in and enfold those who were broken and imperfect.

Jesus was pierced and marred and broken on the cross, so that we could be made whole, and healed, and fit for God's presence.

When the holiness of God seems to come into conflict with the enfolding mission of God, we are being presented with a riddle. And only the gospel of Jesus Christ can solve it.

The problem, at the heart of religion, is: If God is so holy, and perfect, then how can he receive and embrace people like us, who are so imperfect, marred, and broken?

In so many religions, the answer is that you need to fix yourself, to make yourself good enough for God. But if you know yourself at all, then you know that's impossible.

The Bible gives a different answer.

Yes, God, is perfect and holy. The Bible proclaims that boldly.

And we are imperfect, and unholy. The Bible is clear about that too. In fact: we are under a curse for our sin and rebellion. And we cannot overcome that curse ourselves. We are broken. And we cannot fix ourselves.

But there is something else we need to know about the God of the Bible. In his love, he delights in turning curses into blessings. That's the truth at the heart of this text. We see it in verse 5.⁵

And God did that by coming to earth, in the person of Jesus Christ, and going to the cross – receiving the curse that we deserved, so that we might be blessed.

In the gospel of Jesus Christ, God turned your curse into blessing, because he loves you.

That is the mystery of the gospel which our passage this morning points us towards.

Conclusion

And so, brothers and sisters, however you are experiencing the curse of this fallen world this morning ... in whatever ways you are feeling bruised and broken by the fall ... in whatever ways you are feeling unfit for the presence of God, and the assembly of his saints ... let our text, and all the conflicting texts it evokes or alludes to this morning remind you that we serve a God who, because of his love, delights in turning curses into blessings ... who delights in enfolding those who seem like they should be excluded ... who gathers in the outcast ... who himself was cast out and broken, so that he might draw us in and make us whole.

Trust in his love. Enter his assembly. And let his love enfold and embrace you, replacing the curses of the fall with the blessings of his presence.

Amen.

⁵ Of course, in the immediate context this verse is describing an unrighteous curse that the Lord turned into a blessing for his people. Even so, the inclusion of this explanation, in the middle of this riddle about inclusion and exclusion – cursing and blessing – seems to me to be a hint for the hearer as to how this riddle is solved through the gospel.

This sermon draws on material from:

- Aiuto, Vito. “What Jesus Continues To Do: Evangelism” *Lower Manhattan Community Church*. June 7 2026.
<https://www.lowermanhattanchurch.com/sermons/2026/6/7/what-jesus-continues-to-do-evangelism>
- Alter, Robert. *The Five Books of Moses: A Translation with Commentary*. New York, NY: Norton, 2004.
- Block, Daniel I. *The NIV Application Commentary: Deuteronomy*. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 2012.
- Brown, Raymond. *The Message of Deuteronomy: Not by Bread Alone*. The Bible Speaks Today. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 1993.
- Copan, Paul. *Is God a Moral Monster?: Making Sense of the Old Testament God*. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Books, 2011.
- Craigie, Peter C. *The Book of Deuteronomy*. NICOT. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1976.
- De Lubac, Henri. *History and Spirit: The Understanding of Scripture According to Origen*. Translated by Anne Englund Nash. San Francisco, CA: Ignatius Press, 2007. (Written in French in 1950)
- Leithart, Peter. *Against Christianity*. Moscow, ID: Canon, Press, 2003.
- Millar, J. Gary. *Now Choose Life: Theology and Ethics in Deuteronomy*. Downers Grove, IL: Apollos, 1998.
- Smith, Ralph Allen. “Law and History: How to Read the Law of Moses.” *Theopolis Institute*. 2013. Nine-Part Series:
 1) <https://theopolisinstitute.com/law-and-history-how-to-read-the-law-of-moses/>
 2) <https://theopolisinstitute.com/law-and-history-how-to-read-the-law-of-moses-2/>
 3) <https://theopolisinstitute.com/law-and-history-how-to-read-the-law-of-moses-3/>
 4) <https://theopolisinstitute.com/law-and-history-how-to-read-the-law-of-moses-4/>
 5) <https://theopolisinstitute.com/law-and-history-how-to-read-the-law-of-moses-5/>
 6) <https://theopolisinstitute.com/law-and-history-how-to-read-the-law-of-moses-6/>
 7) <https://theopolisinstitute.com/law-and-history-how-to-read-the-law-of-moses-7/>
 8) <https://theopolisinstitute.com/law-and-history-how-to-read-the-law-of-moses-8/>
 9) <https://theopolisinstitute.com/law-and-history-how-to-read-the-law-of-moses-9/>
- Wright, Christopher. *Deuteronomy*. NIBC. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1996.

Note: In my preaching I often cite and draw from a range of sources, which includes material from Christians within my theological tradition, Christians outside my theological tradition (in keeping with our church’s core value of “Reformed Catholicity”), and also (following the Apostle Paul’s example in Acts 17) non-Christians who are well outside of Christian orthodoxy and orthopraxy. And so, when I cite an author or a source, that citation should not be understood or construed as me necessarily agreeing with, endorsing, or recommending to others anything else from that author or source, except for what I explicitly say I agree with, endorse, or recommend. When engaging with different materials and thinkers, all Christians must exercise wisdom and discernment to determine what is helpful, appropriate, and edifying for each person, taking into account their current needs, wisdom, and spiritual maturity.