THE QUESTION “WHO IS ISRAEL?” REVERBERATES THROUGH BIBLICAL sacred history. From Genesis to 2 Kings, a succession of creation sto- ries—cosmological, biological, ethnological, and political—offers answers to this question. This narrative is also extraordinarily interest- ed in establishing Israel’s uniqueness among the nations of the world and in specifying and enforcing its cultural boundaries. The omniscient, anonymous narrator, whose voice uni- fi es the multi- sourced text, conveys the sense of “Israel” as a single people with his- torical continuity stretching back to the ancestor Abraham and for- ward to the Babylonian exile, divided for a time into two political states but nonetheless one people, YHWH’s people. As with all reli- gious communities with a sense of their own history, however, this retrospective assumption of continuous peoplehood obscures the contests over cultural definition that had surely existed. The view that an essential Israelite identity moved steadily forward across time and space cannot be sustained.

A number of anthropologists, social theorists, and cultural critics have recently reexamined the way that group identities are con- structed. They argue that ethnic, national, religious, or other forms of identity are not stable or continuous frames of reference but rather changing processes.1 In contrast to the older view that identity is a constant and coherent set of values, beliefs, attitudes, and behaviors, this view recognizes that identity is always in flux, always a matter of negotiation among competing forces. For biblical studies this means that the literary creation (i.e., the construction in and by means of biblical literature) of a continuous Israel from the days of Moses to
the days of Ezra occludes the ongoing process of identity formation among groups claiming the mantle of "Israel."

This essay is about one of many traces of that process that exist within the Bible. Here, I focus on the book of Deuteronomy, a book clearly distinct from the rest of the Pentateuch in style, phraseology, and perspective. Recounting Moses’ valedictory addresses at the edge of the wilderness just before Israel enters the promised land, Deuteronomy depicts Moses establishing a second covenant between God and Israel and giving the law all over again. In its conception of a new covenant and its detailing of the stipulations of that covenant, Deuteronomy defines Israel’s cultural boundaries. Freed from its context in the Pentateuch and read as a charter or manifesto of Israelite values at a particular historical moment, Deuteronomy becomes a prime locus for examining Israelite identity formation. A brief look at that moment will provide the necessary backdrop for my analysis.

Ever since W. M. L. De Wette in 1805 called the book of Deuteronomy a “pious fraud,” biblical scholars have debated the origins and purpose of this unique book.2 De Wette hypothesized that Deuteronomy was the mysterious scroll found during the reign of King Josiah (ca. 622 B.C.E.) in the Temple in Jerusalem, as described in 2 Kings 22. He further argued that the book was not an ancient document but a recent composition, written to fuel Josiah’s political and religious reformation.

While the current consensus continues to link Deuteronomy to the reign of Josiah, the nature of the relationship between them differs. One group of scholars, including A. Alt and H. W. Wolff, insists that Deuteronomy was produced in northern Israel and brought south to Judah by refugees after the Assyrian conquest, to emerge during Josiah’s reign.3 Others, like G. von Rad, posited a Judean origin. M. Weinfeld has linked Deuteronomy to the reigns of both Hezekiah and Josiah by arguing that the nationalistic and patriotic atmosphere of the book may well reflect the national renaissance underway as Judah sought to reassert its independence in the wake of Assyria’s collapse.4 Weinfeld also has shown remarkable formal and substantive parallels between Deuteronomy and the Assyrian king Esarhaddon’s vassal treaties and has argued that Josiah’s covenant between Assyria and Judah, described in 2 Kings, chapters 22–23, likely was meant to substitute for the former treaty between Assyria and Judah.5 B. Halpern and R. Friedman have argued that the Shilonite
priesthood, which championed Josiah’s cause, composed Deuteronomy, while Friedman has gone further by attributing the book, indeed the whole Deuteronomistic history (Joshua through 2 Kings) to Jeremiah. Most recently, N. Gottwald has offered a “class” reading according to which Deuteronomy served as the ideological foundation for Josiah’s effort to raise new revenues and rally the Judahite population in order to expand into the formerly Assyrian province of northern Israel.

Although De Wette’s term “pious fraud” may strike the wrong chord, his hypothesis set the study of Deuteronomy on a productive course. Despite the disagreements about the origin and purpose of Deuteronomy, the core of the book most likely first functioned in the late seventh century either to instigate or support Josiah’s political and cultic reform. But beyond that overt function, Deuteronomy expresses a vision of what Israel ought to be, offers a construction of Israelite identity. By means of its literary representation of the final charge that Moses delivers to his people, Deuteronomy defines a clear border between who is included in “Israel” and who is excluded. The book situates its audience in relation to a particular memory of the Mosaic past and a particular posture toward those defined as non-Israelites. In this essay I will approach this process of identity construction by examining Deuteronomy’s representation of these two relationships: to the past and to the Other. Let me begin with the relationship to the past.

Crucial to cultural identity is a common sense of the past. Cultural memories lay a foundation for the present, enabling us to orient ourselves in the world. Yet the past is always changing, or better, whatever elements of the past our culture chooses to remember changes. As anthropologist Stuart Hall puts it:

Cultural identities come from somewhere, have histories. But, like everything else which is historical, they undergo constant transformation. Far from being eternally fixed in some essentialized past, they are subject to the continuous play of history, culture, and power. Far from being grounded in a “mere” recovery of the past, which is waiting to be found, and which, when found, will secure our sense of ourselves into eternity, identities are the names we give
to different ways we are positioned by, and position ourselves within the narratives of the past.\(^8\)

It is not that the past never was or that we invent it from whole cloth. Rather, our cultural memories are always selective. A group chooses (or its leaders choose) to remember and celebrate or commemorate certain aspects of the past that legitimate its power and authority. A group may reshape the ancient past better to lead up to itself or may devalorize the more recent past in the effort to secure for itself more noble origins. Early Islam in Arabia, for instance, adopted and adapted the story of Abraham from distant Palestine in order to delegitimize exclusive Jewish claims to him as the founding father while at the same time it spurned the more recent history of Arabia as the “days of ignorance.” Similarly, I want to show that the text of Deuteronomy, through the voice of Moses, appeals to a memory of Israelite origins that it constructs for itself as an ideological foundation for a redefined “Israel.”

The rhetorical strategy of Deuteronomy is to link its seventh-century B.C.E. audience with the age of Moses by collapsing the temporal distance between them. The reader of Deuteronomy always senses the immediacy of the Mosaic past and its relevance—indeed its inexorable connection—to the present. How is this accomplished? For one thing, the narrator rarely interrupts the voice of Moses to call attention to himself. Because the narrator’s own “reporting speech” occupies only fifty-six verses in the entire book, his identity easily coalesces with that of Moses. As Robert Poizin has argued, this rhetorical identification allows the narrator to project himself as the Moses of his own generation whose interpretation of the Mosaic law is authoritative.\(^9\) In another rhetorical move, the narrator, when setting the stage at the outset of Deuteronomy, locates the narrated present not in relationship to his own present (as Genesis does, for instance, with the repeated phrase “until this day” [e.g., Gen. 19:38]) but rather in relationship to the exodus from Egypt forty years earlier. So the “this day” of the covenant in Moab is easily transposed into the hearer’s present; attention is not drawn to the temporal gap between them.

Most striking is that Moses’ recollection of the past in the first address does not proceed linearly but in a series of rapid temporal shifts back and forth in time that involve geographical shifts as well. Only
after he describes the journey from Horeb to Moab, for instance, does he double-back to recall the revelation at Horeb that preceded the wilderness trek. Then he looks ahead to life in the land of Canaan across the Jordan, “when you have begotten children and children’s children.” (4:25) These repeated dislocations again serve to situate hearers in the midst of the story being told, as witnesses rather than auditors of a distant past. If the story that Moses narrates begins with the departure from Horeb (chaps. 1–3), the memory to which he appeals in the first address (1:6–4:40) is the fearsome theophany preceding the transmission of the Decalogue (4:10–14). Though there are references to the antecedent exodus from Egypt (e.g., 4:20, 34, 37) and even allusions to the more ancient oath that God made with the fathers (e.g., 4:31), Moses begins Israel’s story with the revelation at Horeb, Deuteronomic bedrock. Deuteronomy thus creates retrospectively an origin for Israel, embedded in the mystery of revelation, that can serve as the exclusive source of its values and norms.

Deuteronomy makes the past bear on the present not only by rhetorical indirection but also by Moses’ explicit and repeated injunction to remember. Commanding Israel to remember what God has done in the past, Moses insists that memory must be the foundation for obedience to the divine law in the present: “But take utmost care and watch yourselves scrupulously; so that you do not forget the things that you saw with your own eyes and so that they do not fade from your mind as long as you live. And make them known to your children and your children’s children.” (4:9) What did Israel see with its own eyes? Several different memories may be distinguished. One includes dramatic acts of divine wrath: against those who followed Baal-Peor in Moab (4:3) and Dathan and Abiram in the wilderness (11:6) and against the Egyptians in Egypt and the Sea of Reeds (11:2–5). Another is the awesome sight of the blazing mountain at Sinai (4:9–14). The voice of Moses insists that his addressees on the plains of Moab witnessed this event (4:9) even though the generation that left Egypt and stood at Horeb was to have died out by the time Israel reached Moab (1:35). The commandment to remember and to transmit to the children promotes the identification of the seventh-century B.C.E. audience with that first generation.

So Deuteronomy’s Moses begins the narrative of Israel’s memory with the revelation at Horeb and alludes to earlier and later moments of divine intervention. But the focus of memory is the wilderness trek
from Horeb to Moab: “Remember the long way that the LORD your God has made you travel in the wilderness these past forty years, that he might test you by hardships. . . .” (8:2). The people are specifically urged to remember the trials and deprivations of the wilderness when they are comfortably settled in the land living in houses that they did not build and eating from vineyards that they did not plant. Those memories aim to purge them of pride, remind them that what they have they did not earn. In that moment, apart from the normal ravages of time (“the clothes upon you did not wear out, nor did your feet swell these forty years” [8:4]) and securities of civilization (“a parched land with no water in it” [8:15]), the “real” dynamics of Israelite existence were exposed. Then and there Israel had to rely upon YHWH alone who provided water and manna. If the trappings of civilization have obscured the basic reality that Israel’s existence depends on YHWH alone, the Deuteronomist means to cut through those trappings to the very source of Israelite survival.

Deuteronomy thus creates an arche, a story of origins, rooted in what the anthropologist Victor Turner would call a liminal period. In this moment in and out of time, betwixt and between the civilizations of Egypt and Canaan, former slaves, like candidates in an initiation ritual, are being ground down to be born anew as Israelites.10 Recounting the trials and provisions in the wilderness, Deuteronomy focuses on the value of vulnerability and so urges it upon its hearers. Dying symbolically to the old life (and not only symbolically, for the generation that left Egypt does not make it to Canaan), Israelites in the Deuteronomic imagination are threshold beings, “liminars,” offered a new life in the promised land. The Deuteronomist presses its audience to identify with this Israel, to understand itself as ideologically continuous with it.

Indeed, for Deuteronomy, memory itself is the key to survival. By means of the recitation of YHWH’s words at all times and in all places (11:18–20), the memory of the foundational story is to serve as the chief stimulus for the obedience to the commandments that enables Israel to prosper. To forget is to persist (8:19–20). Deuteronomy’s strategy is to construct a memory that will motivate obedience. When you properly remember whence you came, asks Moses, how can you worship other gods? Through its cultivation of a particular memory of Israel’s vulnerability and YHWH’s unending mercy, Deuteron-
omy, in Stuart Hall’s terms, positions its audience within a certain narrative of the past.

Not only does Deuteronomy command memory; it also censors it. In particular, Moses demands the obliteration of the memory of the Amalekites and of the practices of the indigenous Canaanites. The case of Amalek is especially contorted. Moses commands Israel to remember Amalek’s cruelty in order to stimulate future generations to destroy the Amalekites so that no memory of them remains (25:17–19). Here, memory is meant to lead ultimately to forgetting, yet paradoxically the preservation of the commandment in order to forget results in the preservation of memory. Conversely, indigenous gods and their worship are to be actively forgotten in order to cement loyalty to the memory of YHWH’s deeds. “Do not inquire about their gods, saying, ‘How did those nations worship their gods? I too wilt follow those practices’” (12:30). Those gods with whom Israel has no previous relationship are gods, as the Deuteronomist is fond of saying, whom Israel has not “experienced” (yada’) (e.g., 13:3, 7, 14). To remember other gods in the face of this memory would be folly, stupidity, disloyalty.11

There is also a geographical dimension in this censorship of memory. When living in its land, Israel is to remember YHWH’s deeds outside that land, in Egypt and in the wilderness. Israel is forbidden from remembering the gods of the land itself. What happened in the land before Israel’s arrival is of no consequence; for the Deuteronomist, Israel imports all that it needs to remember. Peter Machinist has shown that whereas in Mesopotamia and Egypt, the status of new and outsider tends to connote the barbaric or immoral, in biblical writings, that same status is seen as a sign of special divine chosenness.12 Deuteronomy indeed constructs and appeals to a memory of Israel’s outsiderhood, to a relationship with God uncorrupted by the practices of the land of Canaan, here deemed abhorrent. The Deuteronomist skips over the history of Israel in its land asking his readers to identify with “this day” at Moab and “that day” at Horeb back then and over there. By developing a memory of origins that takes place wholly outside the land that Israel inhabits and by forbidding all memory of those who inhabited the land before them, the Deuteronomist strikes out against autochthony in his construction of Israelite identity.
Equally prominent in defining cultural identity is the relationship to the Other, those classified as different, outsiders, often inferior. The members of a group perceive the Other as bearing undesirable physical, behavioral, or moral traits and threatening to undermine, infiltrate, or invade them. A group may classify the Other in terms of ethnicity, nationality, religion, race, occupation, geography, or sexuality, to name but a few, but in every case some perception of difference forms the basis for a set of images or stereotypes in which the Other is set apart. Often stereotypes of the Other give shape to our own anxieties and vulnerabilities; groups project onto the Other what they fear most in themselves.

Just as a group's relationship to its past is always in flux, so is its naming and classification of the Other. The Other is not fixed, not a group different in some significantly objective way. Rather, the boundaries of otherness shift according to the situation of the reference group. As Jonathan Z. Smith puts it:

"Otherness is not a descriptive category, an artifact of the perception of difference or commonality. Nor is it the result of the determination of biological descent or affinity. It is a political and linguistic project, a matter of rhetoric and judgment." 13

Otherness, that is, is in the mind of the beholder and expresses itself in the way in which a group talks about and chooses to define those it categorizes as belonging to a common out-group. Deuteronomy establishes the uniqueness of Israel, in part, by constructing an image of the Canaanite Other whose cultic depravities contrast in every way with the behavior to which Israel is summoned. And these “Canaanites” and “Amorites,” I want to claim, stand for those groups of Israelites who opposed Josiah’s reformation and whom Deuteronomy aimed to read out of Israel.

Prominent in Moses’ addresses is the polemic against idolatry in all of its manifestations and against the indigenous inhabitants of Canaan who practice it. Over and over again, the voice of Moses emphasizes the uniqueness of Israel’s relationship to YHWH, its mode of worship, and its singular place of worship by contrasting them to those of the inhabitants of Canaan and those of the nations about them. Earlier sources similarly draw this contrast (e.g., Exod. 23:23–
33) but without Deuteronomy’s rhetorical flare and consistency. This polemic is sharpened by Deuteronomy’s distinctive language. Moshe Weinfeld’s exhaustive list of Deuteronomic phraseology consists overwhelmingly of expressions that contrast Israel to the Canaanite Other. For example, eighteen phrases are warnings against foreign worship, seven phrases refer specifically to idolatry (e.g., to’avat YHWH gilulim), and thirty-seven, by contrast, refer to loyalty to the covenant. This discourse of admonition and advocacy creates a stereotyped image of the peoples of Canaan, the primary Other against which Israelite identity is constructed.

What principally distinguishes Israel from the nations, according to Deuteronomy, is not language, or race, or ethnicity but its relationship to YHWH. Moses here claims that it was YHWH himself who allotted the heavenly bodies to the other nations for their worship but reserved Israel as his own (4:19–20; cf. Deut. 32:8–9). Thus, Israel alone worships the supreme God who is the source of the gods that the other peoples worship. While other nations may make images of and bow down to their gods, for Israel to do the same would be not only betrayal but foolishness. Israel has YHWH “in your midst” (beqirbeka). (6:15) As proof of the uniqueness of YHWH’s relationship with Israel, Moses stresses the incomparability of YHWH’s salvific acts: “Has any people heard the voice of a god speaking out of a fire, as you have, and survived? Or has any god ventured to go and take for himself one nation from the midst of another by prodigious acts, by signs and portents. . . .” (4:32–33). By means of this representation of the contrast between the God of Israel and the gods of the nations, Deuteronomy constructs an Other which is spiritually benighted, stuck in the worship of inferior deities and incapable of recognizing the superiority of YHWH.

Along with its insistence on Israel’s exclusive relationship with and worship of YHWH, Deuteronomy demands the destruction of all the sancta involved in the worship of other gods: their altars, pillars, posts, and images (7:2, 3, 5; cf. 12:2–3). What we see of the autochthonous peoples is not their agriculture, their family life, their laws, or even their religious beliefs. Instead, Deuteronomy offers a reductionistic picture of native religion that shows only the physical remains of the cult. That is who the Other is, a person without history or culture but absorbed in the fetishes of idolatry. The Other has no voice; he is present only in his absence.
The distinctiveness of Israel is reinforced by Deuteronomy’s ban on intermarriage with the natives. This ban is intimately related to the destruction of the sancta, for Moses warns that intermarriage will turn Israelites toward the abhorrent practices of the native partner (7:3–4). Both the natives and their idols are regarded as “snares” (7:16, 25) to Israel. So it is the cultic consequences and not any sort of moral or racial superiority that demands the herem. What is more, Israel is warned that the natives’ ways will survive them (12:30) to entrap Israel even after the natives are gone. While demanding, on the one hand, that Israel totally dispossess the Canaanite Other, Deuteronomy, on the other hand, denigrates forbidden religious practices by identifying them as survivals of ancient Canaanite ritual. Thus, in his call for the destruction of the Other who dwelled in the land before Israel, Moses points forward in time to the Other who dwells within the Israel of the Deuteronomist.

Deuteronomy differentiates Israel from the Other not only by the object of worship but also by the method. By banning all forms of intermediation augurers, soothsayers, diviners, necromancers (18:9–14), the Deuteronomist labels what had likely been accepted Israelite practices as alien. Just as sculptured images stood between God and the individual worshipper, so did intermediaries. Conjoined with this prohibition is Moses’ recall of God’s promise to raise up a prophet like Moses (18:15–19). As Poizin shows, the Deuteronomist who champions Moses’ words is here making an implicit claim to be that prophet, to bring Moses directly to his generation. Offering himself as Moses’ successor and interpreter, the Deuteronomist displaces and disenfranchises other intermediaries, again pointing obliquely to a contemporary Other from which he wants to differentiate Israel.

In place of the many gods, Deuteronomy offers one alone; in place of the many intermediaries, Deuteronomy authenticates one prophet only. And instead of the many altars and shrines, Deuteronomy insists upon only “the site that the LORD your God will choose amidst all your tribes as His habitation, to establish His name there” (12:5). Contrasting the present in Moab, when “every man does as he pleases” (12:8), to the future in the land when all sacrifice will be brought to a central shrine, Moses demands that exclusive loyalty to YHWH necessitates an exclusive place of worship. This insistence on cultic centralization clearly distinguishes the Deuteronomist’s Israel from that same Other whose gods and practices have been proscribed.
Deuteronomy thus differentiates Israel from the indigenous inhabitants of the land primarily on cultic grounds. Unlike the Holiness Code in Leviticus, Deuteronomy does not detail moral corruption, only cultic depravity. Furthermore, Israel is commanded to extirpate these practices only in the land that they are to occupy; there is no call for holy war against false worship wherever it exists. In fact, by indicating that YHWH allotted the “host of the heaven” to the nations, Deuteronomy acknowledges the legitimacy of the worship of those nations. Only in Canaan itself, where YHWH and his people reside, is such practice abhorrent. For Israelites, singly favored by God, to fall into the trap of worshipping the gods of the land, using their intermediaries, or offering sacrifices, even to YHWH, in any place that they choose would be a pernicious reversion. For the impending fate of the native peoples, Moses admonishes, can just as easily be Israel’s should Israel not extirpate and permanently reject Canaanite practice.

In its image of the cultic otherness of the Canaanites who preceded Israel in its land, Deuteronomy, as a seventh-century polemic, shapes a narrative past that situates an Israel in the seventh-century present. By then—indeed, long before—the “Canaanites” and the other peoples listed formulaically as the indigenous inhabitants of the land had surely ceased to exist as national or ethnic entities. The Deuteronomist simply used these ancient names to populate pre-Israelite Canaan. But if this story of origins in the ancient past had contemporary significance, the “Canaanites” must have stood as well for that Other who threatened the Deuteronomist’s Israel. In its polemic against the “Canaanites,” Deuteronomy is tarring most likely those nativist elements that its authors oppose, elements whom they seek to read out of Israel. What Deuteronomy represents as Moses’ repudiation of alien gods “which you have not known” is more than likely the Deuteronomist’s attack against Israelite gods viewed by many of his contemporaries as within YHWH’s pantheon but subordinate to him. That is, in reconstructing an Israelite identity based on exclusive devotion to YHWH, Deuteronomy delegitimates deities, images, and practices certainly considered authentically “Israelite” by powerful segments of the population. While from the time of Solomon, foreign gods had been introduced into Israel’s cult, the native gods of Canaan likely remained as well, all of them eventually subordinated to YHWH. But Josiah’s reformation turned
against both folk religion and elements of the official cult that were stigmatized as alien. Deuteronomy thus appeals to an imagined Mosaic past to legitimize a purity of worship that never existed in fact. Those Israelites who resisted the Josian reforms became for the Deuteronomist “Canaanites” and “Amorites.”

The Israel that Deuteronomy aimed to forge by means of this definition of the Other has a sharply drawn cultural boundary. By excluding from “Israel” those who worshipped the native baalim and asherot, astral deities, and the sculptured images, those who contacted intermediaries, and those who refused to acknowledge the exclusivity of the house of YHWH in Jerusalem, the Deuteronomist in the person of Moses created a revolution by redefinition. Although the apostle Paul may have been the first to declare, “Not all Israel is Israel,” the Deuteronomist surely anticipated him. By having Moses condemn current practice as “Canaanite,” the Deuteronomist gathers in the wagons around an Israel newly intolerant of diversity.

In this essay I have read Deuteronomy as an expression of the construction of a cultural identity. In the guise of Moses’ valedictory speeches to the Israel that emerged from the wilderness trek, the Deuteronomist addresses his own contemporaries with a definition of who Israel is. He transforms the ancient image of Moses from law giver to law interpreter and by indirection claims Moses’ mantle in his own generation. By reshaping the ancient past to legitimate his own vision of Israel in the present, the Deuteronomist positions his community as the sole owner of that past. In the process he labels rival claimants to that history “Canaanite” and defines their otherness in cultic terms. Reviving and reinvigorating the older cultural definition of Israel as a covenant community with exclusive loyalty to YHWH, the Deuteronomist, in his polemic, reveals the points at which he finds that definition threatened. When we read Deuteronomy in this light, we can hear it as a record of a contest between rival constructions of who and what constituted Israel. Though we witness only one side of the debate, we can recognize in the silenced “Canaanites” the Other that the Deuteronomist opposed. By their own definition, those whom Deuteronomy disenfranchised surely considered themselves Israel. Yet the more exclusive construction of Israel by Deuteronomy eventually prevailed, for from its position in the biblical canon, it came to define both the past and the Other.
NOTES


14. Weinfeld includes, for instance, twenty-five phrases relating to the struggle against idolatry, twenty-four relating to exodus, covenant, and election, thirty-nine relating to loyalty or disloyalty to the covenant, and seventeen relating to Israel’s inheritance of the land. Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomic Tradition*, 320–59.

15. The Septuagint version of Deut. 32:8 reads benei’el (“sons of god”)
for *benei yisra’el* ("sons of Israel"), thus agreeing with the claim in Deut. 4:19–20 that God apportioned the nations to the control of subordinate heavenly beings (elsewhere known as his "host").


18. Thus, it is not surprising that the Other against which Deuteronomy rails includes not only the Canaanites "outside" but also traitorous Israelites "inside." In a series of three hypotheticals, Moses warns against a prophet, a close relative, and scoundrels from an Israelite town who tempt people to worship another god. He also commands the death penalty for the tempters and, in the latter case, declares that the whole town is to be put under the *herem* (13:2–19). Similarly, any individual caught worshipping other gods is to be stoned (17:2–5). That these Israelites as individuals meet the same fate as the dispossessed nations suggests that, for the Deuteronomist, "Canaanite" denotes those Israelites, who by their practice, are now to be excluded from the new Israel.