

Uriel d'Acosta had been the victim of a similar ban of excommunication a generation earlier. Unlike d'Acosta, Spinoza never recanted and had no further contact with the Jewish community. Later, he helped to develop modern notions of freedom of religion.

The ban continued to be used very widely throughout the 18th century, both against suspected heretics, such as followers of Shabbetai Tsevi, and as enforcement for many sorts of Jewish communal obligations, such as payment of community taxes. Bans were also used in the modern period to enforce copyright restrictions within the Jewish world. The ban could be used even further as a tool in intra-communal controversy. For instance, toward the end of the 18th century, rabbinic courts in Vilna and elsewhere in eastern Europe used the ban to try to quash the nascent Hasidic movement.

In 1781, Moses Mendelssohn – the seminal figure of the 18th-century Jewish Enlightenment – published his *Jerusalem*, one of whose central themes was that Judaism, and all religions, should strive to be inclusive. Mendelssohn thus argued that the ban, or *herem*, has no place in Judaism, which should rather seek to teach and uplift: it should not seek to exclude.

Over the course of the 19th century, however, the ban became less and less effective as a means of coercion, even in eastern Europe. In 1804, in an effort to stem persecution of the Hasidim, the Tsarist government prohibited the use of the ban. This Tsarist policy was an inconsistent one, however: in 1820, for example, the Vilna rabbinate was encouraged to issue a ban against smuggling. Both that ban and the bans issued in the controversy of 1869–71 between the Hasidim of Sandz and those of Sadagora in Austrian Galicia tended to confirm the limited scope of rabbinic power in the period.

In the large, cosmopolitan Jewish communities of the 19th and 20th century, individuals Jews could ordinarily turn their backs on the group which issued a ban. However, in small, cohesive Orthodox Jewish communities, the ban continued to function as an effective means of coercion. For instance, the small ultra-Orthodox Jewish community of 19th- and early 20th-century Jerusalem used the ban extensively and quite successfully to enforce conformity within its ranks and to fight modernization and Westernization. Even today, and even in the absence of real coercive force, the *herem* continues to be used frequently by the ultra-Orthodox (*haredi*) rabbinate as a gesture of strong criticism and social pressure.

**Bibliography:** ■ Bleich, J., "Rabbinic Responses to Nonobservance in the Modern Era," in *Jewish Tradition and the Non-traditional Jew* (ed. J. Schacter; New York 1992) 54–62. ■ Green, K., "Moses Mendelssohn's Opposition to the Herem: The First Step Toward Denominationalism," *Modern Judaism* 12 (1992) 39–60. ■ Mendelssohn, M., *Jerusalem: or on Religious Power and Judaism* (trans. A. Arkush; Hanover,

N.H./London 1983). ■ Nadler, S., *Spinoza: A Life* (Cambridge 1999).

Joseph Davis

See also → Amalek, Amalekites; → Anathema, Anathematism; → Canaanites; → Cities of Refuge; → Excommunication; → Exile

## Band

**1. Ornament.** Several Hebrew terms are translated "band" in reference to an ornament. The "decorated band" (MT *hēšēb*) is found only in connection to the priestly ephod (Exod 28: 8, 27, 28; 29: 5; 39: 5, 20, 21; Lev 8: 7) and is not used anywhere else in the Bible. However, it appears in a Dead Sea Scroll of the *Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice*: "And all their designs are brightly blended, an *artistry* like woven work" (4Q405 23 II, 10: *wkwl mhšbyhm mmwlh iwhr hšb km'sy 'wrg*; Newsom: 362, emphasis added). It is noteworthy that the description of angelic garments found in this text features ephods (I, 5), though the two words are not closely connected like in Exodus and Leviticus.

The meaning of *hēšēb* is unclear; if it is related to the Hebrew *hošēb* "designer" (Exod 28: 6) and *maššāb* "design" (4Q405 23 II, 10), it may be translated "ingenious work" (BDB) or "artistry" (Newsom). Driver (258) believes that the primary meaning of the root *hšb* is "drew, put together" and translates *hēšēb* "band"; Dillmann (334) suggests a derivation from the root *hbs* "bind" (after metathesis), which allows for a translation of *hēšēb* as "binding, girdle."

If the latter meaning is retained (HAL) or combined with the former (e.g., "decorated band" [NRSV]), this band may have been used as a belt to gird the ephod around the waist (Houtman: 486–87). It has also been suggested (Propp: 436) that the *hēšēb* together with the shoulder pieces by which it is suspended constitute the ephod.

Other terms are sometimes translated "band." In 2 Sam 1: 10, *'eš'ādā* (NIV "band") seems to be an armband; it may bear the same meaning in Num 31: 50, the only other occurrence of the term, though a translation "walking-chain" has been suggested (HAL). In Job 38: 9, one finds the only occurrence of *hātullā*, related to the verb *hṭl* "to swathe" (Ezek 16: 4) and the noun *hittūl* "bandage" (Ezek 30: 21); hence the translation "swaddling band." In Dan 4: 15, 23 (MT 4: 12, 20), *'āsūr* does not refer to a "band" *per se*, but to a "bond."

**2. Social Group.** Armed groups of people are sometimes portrayed as raiding and looting the land: a "band" (MT *gēdūd*) of Amalekites raiding the Negeb (1 Sam 30: 8, 15, 23); Arameans (2 Kgs 5: 2; 6: 23); Moabites (2 Kgs 13: 21); Chaldeans and Ammonites (2 Kgs 24: 2); etc. Such groups are commanded by leaders (*šar*, 2 Sam 4: 2; 1 Kgs 11: 24) or heads (*ro'š*, 1 Chr 12: 19), and may be part of an army (1 Chr

7: 4; 2 Chr 26: 11). The term itself does not necessarily convey a negative image, as it is positively used of Israelites (2 Sam 3: 22; 1 Chr 12: 22) or God's troops (Job 19: 12; 25: 3); the expression "troops of fire" found in an Aramaic Dead Sea Scroll of the *Words of Michael* (4Q529 1, 2: *gdwdy nwr*) may well refer to angels (Puech: 4–6).

In 2 Sam 2: 25, another term (*ʾāguddā*) is used with a similar meaning, but other occurrences (Exod 12: 22; Isa 58: 6) may indicate that emphasis is put on the disposal (a "grouping") rather than the group itself. In 2 Sam 23: 13, another term (*ḥayyā*) is translated "band," but its etymology is disputed (either "to live," hence a "community," or "to gather," hence a "group"). In Ezra 8: 22 the term *ḥayil*, translated as "band" (NRSV), literally means "power" and designates a military force.

Bands are not always of a military kind. In 1 Sam 10: 5, 10; 19: 20, the term "band" is applied to prophets, but none of the Hebrew words mentioned above is used: *ḥebel* (found in the first two occurrences) derives from a root meaning "to bind," hence a "band" or "union" of prophets; *lahāqā* (in the third occurrence) is of uncertain etymology, but may refer to a group of elders. Such groups of prophets are also found under the title "sons of the prophets" in 1 Kgs 20: 35; 2 Kgs 2: 3, 5, 7, 15; 4: 1, 38; 5: 22; 6: 1; 9: 1 (Wilson: 140–41). Internal evidence suggests that these groups may have been organized into schools or communities.

**Bibliography:** ■ Dillmann, A., *Die Bücher Exodus und Leviticus* (Leipzig 31897). ■ Driver, G. R., "Technical Terms in the Pentateuch," WO 2 (Göttingen 1956) 254–63. ■ Houtman, C., *Exodus*, vol. 3 (Leuven 2000). ■ Newsom, C., "Shirot 'Olat HaShabbat," in *Qumran Cave 4 VI* (eds. E. Eshel et al.; DJD 11; Oxford 1998) 173–401. ■ Propp, W. H. C., *Exodus 19–40* (New York et al. 2006). ■ Puech, E., *Qumrān grotte 4 XXII* (DJD 31; Oxford 2001). ■ Rinaldi, G., "Sull'uso di ḡdh (*ʾāguddā*) nell' A.T.," BeO 27/4 (1985) 202–4. ■ Wilson, R., *Prophecy and Society in Ancient Israel* (Philadelphia, Pa. 1980).

Michael Langlois

## Banditry

A variety of ancient sources (legal codes and documents, personal correspondence, astrological and oneiromantic texts, historical works, novels, and inscriptions) attest that banditry was a common occurrence in the Roman world. Legal papyri treat victimization to banditry as a catastrophe comparable to fire and shipwreck. Plutarch's observation that the only people immune to banditry were those who stay home is an exaggeration (*Mor.* 165D), but it nonetheless illustrates the frequency of the problem, as does the development of the standard epigraphic funerary formula *interfecta a latronibus* ("killed by bandits"). The establishment of military forts, watchtowers, and guard posts on roads throughout the Roman Empire is probably best ex-

plained as a safeguard against banditry. Given such widespread concerns, it is no surprise that Paul listed bandits in the catalogue of dangers he faced on his mission travels (2 Cor 11: 26).

Though the term "bandits" (*latrones*, *λησται*) often refers to common brigands, it is also applied to other men on the fringes of Roman society who employ violence (e.g., leaders of slave revolts, military opponents who use guerilla tactics, and anti-imperial rebels). In addition, it serves as an insult hurled at political rivals (e.g., bad emperors, false imperial pretenders, unfavorable imperial aspirants, and local client kings; see Grünewald; van Hoof; Shaw) or even disliked authorities. Thus, rabbinic sources direct the Greek loanword *listim* at both robbers and Romans (Isaac).

Josephus makes several references to "bandits" in Palestine. When Herod the Great was appointed by his father to govern Galilee, he gained both fame and notoriety for suppressing bandits led by Hezekiah on the Syrian border (*J.W.* 1.204–11, *Ant.* 14.158–77). Later, Herod rooted out bandits from caves near the Galilean village of Arbela (*J.W.* 1.304–13, *Ant.* 14.415–30). Josephus writes that Judea was filled with banditry in the wake of Herod's death, describing uprisings led by Hezekiah's son Judas, a slave of Herod named Simon, and Athronges, a shepherd (*J.W.* 2.55–65, *Ant.* 17.269–85). He also describes a dramatic increase in banditry after the death of Agrippa I in 44 CE (*J.W.* 2.238; *Ant.* 20.124, 215, 255). The problem of banditry continued until the revolt against Rome, in which some bandit groups participated.

Some have argued that many of the incidents described by Josephus are illuminated by anthropologist Eric Hobsbawm's model of "social banditry" (Hanson; Horsley/Hanson). According to this model, social banditry occurs in peasant societies in times of crisis or transition and reflects pre-political resistance to injustice and oppression fostered by governing and social elites. Others, however, have strongly questioned the application of the social banditry model to the Roman period, noting that it is based on comparative studies of the early modern, not ancient, period. They also emphasize that the classical writers' liberality with the term "bandits" and their highly stylized descriptions of banditry make the social realities behind such references difficult to discern (Grünewald; van Hoof). Josephus' employment of the term *λησται* appears to be typical of Greco-Roman usage: he applies it derogatorily to a wide range of groups and figures, including common brigands, anti-Roman guerrillas, and political aspirants. Thus, Josephus characterizes Hezekiah and similar figures as bandits because they fomented political rebellion. He labels John of Gischala as a bandit, since John was a political and military rival whom he held in special contempt (*J.W.* 2.587). To place too readily the different