

Iulian MOGA

BUILDING GOD'S DWELLING PLACE. SYNAGOGUES AND HOUSES OF PRAYER IN ANATOLIA AND EASTERN EUROPE DURING THE ROMAN PERIOD

UDK 904:726.3>(398 Anatolia)“00/02”
904:726.3>(4-11)“00/02”

Original scientific paper

Received: 2.07.2011.

Approved: 16.08.2011.

Iulian Moga

Universitatea A.I. Cuza Iasi

Facultatea de Istorie

Bd. Carol I, Nr. 11

RO-700506 Cuza Iasi

e-mail: chairman_me2000@yahoo.co.uk

The purpose of this communication is to underline the major structural and architectural traits of the synagogues and houses of prayer within the ancient Graeco-Roman world during Classical times, insisting mainly on Anatolia and South-Eastern Europe. Apart from the physical features, their institutional role is also to be taken into consideration, especially as they represented religious and social centres proper to the local community as well. Nevertheless, even if sometimes contested, their power of attraction over the gentiles and their degree of influence on the local environment take the measure for the high integration of the Diaspora Jews within local societies.

Key words: *synagogues, houses of prayer, Anatolia, South-Eastern Europe, Roman Period*

Judaism was perceived by the Gentiles as a conservative system that depended on a written law, which still 'regularly adapted its interpretations of that law to apply to new conditions.' Secondly, even if it claimed a firm monotheism, they found numerous ways to accommodate to the new rulers and their pretensions. Thirdly, though essentially ethnocentric, it tended to be universalist in practice, especially in the Diasporan communities, as it could easily attract new converts, in spite of a restrictive legislation towards proselytism.

At the very heart of the cult remained the Temple

of Jerusalem. It had preeminence because it was in the Holy of Holies that the divinity specially dwelt in. There was a clearly stated or just alluded idea in the Palestinian Jewish texts that the world is divided as a concentric system with levels of sanctity according to the proximity to the Temple. The most sacred place was considered the Holy of Holies, where only the *Kohen Gadol* or the high priest was supposed to enter once a year on the Yom Kippur to pronounce God's holiest name. The emptiness of this inner shrine was not due to the absence of God himself but to the incapacity of

the people to represent Him. The next in sanctity was the court of the priests, the court of Israel, that of the women, and that of the Gentiles. Then it followed the areas of Jerusalem that were situated outside the Temple. Jerusalem, as it was the holy city, was more sacred than the rest of Palestine, and the Holy Land was even hollier than the Diaspora. But when the Romans managed to take the Temple they did this because the divine dweller left it to its fate. For the Jews this represented the abomination of desolation as any sacrifice was virtually impossible from then on. According to Josephus, a voice from above Jerusalem was heard from the skies stating: 'We are departing from this place' (GOODMAN 2007, 219). According to some views, logically after this moment the synagogue replaced the Temple as a place of the highest sacrality, because the latter had lost its own and was no longer inhabited by God himself. Thus, what happened was a sort of transfer of sacrality from the Temple to the synagogue. Some researchers like Howard Kee or Heather Mc Kay even argued moreover that before AD 70 there had been no separate synagogal buildings and if they were, their purpose did not serve as places to worship the Sabbath (VAN DER HORST 1999, 16-17; FITYPATRICK-MCKINLEY 2002, 56).

Two important modifications of the Herodian rebuilding programme of the Temple, i.e. the introduction of a court for the gentiles and another for the women, reflected the changing features in Judaism and the tendencies of the epoch. The series of the courtyards which, as we mentioned, indicated different degrees of holliness and proximity to God's presence, represented one of the most important social and religious aspects of the Temple. The first alteration provided a place for the Gentiles, whose interest in Judaism grew considerably, to have a place to approach near, without being included in. The introduction of such an element could also indirectly reflect the numbers of the Gentiles who joined Judaism as proselytes. Still, there was no specific provision for the latter (RICHARDSON 2004, 328). In the second case, that of the women, their social and religious role increased by the first century BC, and this trend continues for the next few centuries visibly. Thus, some of the most important donors who contributed for the construction or renovation programmes in Roman Anatolia for example were women.

Even if in some respects the synagogues adopted the model of the Temple itself, they were in no way special institutions designed to replace the role of the Temple,

because they were incapable of doing this, as the sacrifices could no longer be performed after its destruction and the priestly titles remained only as a mark of honor (BLOEDHORN, HÜTTENMEISTER 1999, 270). The origins of the synagogues remain obscure, yet what is almost clear is that they did not lie 'in a historical crisis or specific challenge, but were the result of lengthy experimentation with building forms learned first in the Diaspora' (RICHARDSON 2004, 207). The most clear among the biblical passages that could indicate the origins of the synagogue during the Babylonian exile is Ezekiel 11, 16: 'I will remove them far off among the nations and scatter them among the countries, and I will be a little sanctuary to them in the countries where they are scattered', which could be interpreted according to the Targum of Jonathan as follows 'And I will give them synagogues in addition to my sanctuary, and they will remain only a little in the countries where they are scattered' (BLOEDHORN, HÜTTENMEISTER 1999, 267).

The first direct references to the *proseuchai* as 'houses of prayer' or 'places of prayer' (or even 'prayer hall') (RUNESSON *et al.* 2008, 17) could be traced in the Hellenistic Egypt, during the reign of Ptolemy III Euergetes (246-221 BC). Their locations were at Schedia, south of Alexandria and at Arsinoë-Crocodilopolis in the Fayum (JIWE, 22, 117; KASHER 1995, 205; HORBURY 1999, 360). The two inscriptions have an almost identical content. The first one was translated as follows 'On behalf of king Ptolemy and queen Berenice his sister and wife and their children, the Jews (dedicated) the proseuchē', while the second is dedicated 'On behalf of king Ptolemy, son of Ptolemy, and queen Berenice, his wife and sister and their children, the Jews in Crocodilopolis (dedicated) the proseuchē. Yet, in the case of Egypt we can say that three out of the ten inscriptions mentioning the houses of prayer could also be attributed to the sympathizers worshipping the Most High God, because the Jews, according to Walter Ameling, never made a direct dedication to God himself as they considered Him to be 'too exaltry to be addressed publicly in such a manner' (AMELING 2009, 209; *contra* KASHER 1995, 210).

The terminology used for the Jewish public building and for the community itself varied considerably according to region, period, and type of evidence employed. It seems that initially the term *proseuchē* was preferred because it better expressed the purpose for which it was designed: the public praying and the To-

rah-reading. Both Josephus Flavius and Philo insist on the two non-sacrificial functions that the synagogues provided. These meetings in the houses of prayer were also probably intended to encourage group solidarity and to discuss common interests and concerns (FITYPATRICK-MCKINLEY 2002, 58-59).

The term *proseuchē* tended to be replaced from the beginning of the first century AD especially by the equivalent *synagogē*, which expressed more vividly the *social function* of the institution that started to be developed more and more not only in Diaspora, but also in Palestine (RICHARDSON 2004, 190). The first inscription which mentions *synagogē* both as a building and as a community was found in Berenike in Cyrenaica and date specifically from the second half of the first century AD (FITYPATRICK-MCKINLEY 2002, 57). The old term for the building was occasionally used even in Latin inscriptions as we do have the example at *Mursa* (nowadays Osijek), where on an inscription dated in 198-210 AD, which honours Septimius Severus, his sons, Caracalla and Geta, and their mother Iulia Domna, we can read that a certain Secundus (?) 'has restored from the foundations the prayer-house fallen from age' (IJO, I, Pan5). In the Bosporean region it remained in use until the 4th-5th century: here *proseuchē* tended to be used for the building, while *synagogē* was preferred for the community.

Still, there is a wide range of other terms employed to define both the building and the institution itself: *oikos proseuchēs* or simply *oikos*, *hagiotatos topos*, *synagogeion*, *synodos*, *collegium*, *thiasos*, *sabbatetion*, *politeumai*, *therapeutai*, and *hieron* (BLOEDHORN, HÜTTENMEISTER 1999, 269-270; RICHARDSON 2004, 211-212). Bloedhorn and Hüttenmeister consider that the use on the inscriptions from the fourth century on of the terms like *atrā q'dišā* and *hagios/hagiotatos topos* point to a predominantly cultic function (BLOEDHORN, HÜTTENMEISTER 1999, 268).

The Jews preferred mostly those terms like *synodos*, *thiasos*, and *therapeutai*, because they expressed the overlap in terminology between the voluntary associations and the Jewish communities. For example, a series of three decrees of Sardis starting from 49 BC indicate the care of the Jewish community, which formed an 'association' (*synodos*), to receive in care 'a place of their own' (*topos idion*) 'in which they may gather together with their wives and children and offer their ancestral prayers and sacrifices to God' (TREBILCO 1991, 38-39).

There was a long-term debate over the nature of the synagogues as institutions and how they were perceived in the Diaspora. For example, Kee considered it an informal gathering of people, Horsley as a public formal gathering, and Oster more recently as a public assembly in a purpose-built edifice, but Hengel, Richardson and Harland identified it with a voluntary association similar to the same category as the Graeco-Roman *collegia* (RUNESSON *et al.* 2008, 11-12). This last option is the most credible, even if some corrections were operated by Anne Fitzpatrick McKinley and Lee I. Levine. The former points to a relative exclusivism within these groups based largely on an ethno-religious identity. She gives as example the passage from Josephus (*War*, 2, 488) which records that the Ptolemies gave the Jews a quarter in the city so that '... they might observe a purer life, mixing less with people of other races.' This aspect could be seen from other perspectives as well and denotes the complexity of relations between the Jews and the Gentiles in the same area and the care to avoid any confrontation. It is sufficient to think that at certain occasions Jews, proselytes and Godfearers created mixed associations as the *dekania* from Aphrodisias in order to perform a certain social task like aiding the poor of the city through the donations to the soup-kitchen (*patella*) who provided them the daily food (MITCHELL 2005, 216-217).

Besides its spiritual, religious and cultural role, the synagogue had also in the Roman period an entirely secular role. It was probably on this ground that the term *synagogē* was preferred as it implied a *social component*. The dichotomy is visible through its form of the community organization, as the administrative functions were normally different from the religious ones. The Jewish communities adopted the model of the voluntary associations from the Graeco-Roman world, but created a structure of their own. On the administrative side, the community was normally headed by a *gerousia* which was the local Sanhedrin, having as members numerous *presbyteroi*. The *archontes* formed a sort of executive committee who supervised the activity of the *archon pases times* or the general treasurer, the administrator of the goods, i.e. the *phrontistes*, and the secretary of the community, the *grammateus*. On the strictly religious side, the one who presided the congregation during the religious events was the *archisynagogos* who assured the order in the synagogue, delegated the persons who were supposed to read from the Torah, addressed a sermon or took care of the proper conser-

vation of the goods in the building. He was helped in his duties by a certain *hyperetes*, which in the rabbinical sources is known under the name of *hazzan*. The very same structure as that of the Jewish communities of the Diaspora was also adopted by a pagan association of sympathizers called 'association of worshippers' (*synelthontes threskeutai*) who dedicated an inscription to Zeus Hypsistos in AD 250: '... The assembled worshippers of the God Zeus Hypsistos put up the stele, when Urbanianus Bilistus was *logistes*, Aurelius Nigerion was *archon* under the *archisynagogos* Aurelius Cepion of Pierion, and Aurelius Severus was *prostates*, and Aurelius Theophilos formerly of Pierion was *grammateus*, and the other worshippers who are written below...' This inscription proves a certain relationship between this pagan community and the Jewish environment and moreover impact over these pagans.

Ocasionally the Gentiles or proselytes were entrusted certain titles of honour in exchange of their commitment and support over the Jewish community itself. These titles were *archisynagogos* or *archon* for life, *prostates* (the so-called 'patron' or 'advocate of the community'), *pater laou* ('father of the people'), *pater* or *meter synagoges* ('father' or 'mother of the synagogues').

Several examples prove the active implication of the Gentiles and the proselytes alike in the building programmes of the Jewish communities as a proof of good relationships between the Jews and other local religious groups. On the contrary, some other external sources apparently indicate bitter attitudes regarding the Jews and their activity, but could easily turn to misleading conclusions. Let's first analyze the case of Sardis.

When we deal with the relationships of the Jewish communities and of the synagogue as its interface, several anachronistic situations should be clearly avoided. The first one is to perceive Judaism and Christianity as totally opposed to each other and having no sort of institutional as well as individual contact. The second is to see the Jewish associations as segregated communities living in a hostile environment in virtual isolation (RUTGERS 1995, 260-261). The third one is to consider that the rabbis played an important role in the diasporan synagogues prior to the 4th century (RUNESSON *et al.* 2008, 3).

Besides the previous structural analysis of the communities, there are two other ways of analyzing the potential relationships between the Jews and the Godfearers and the local ground. The first one is to value the adaptation to the social background by taking into

account the degree of integration to the patron-client system. The second is to follow the professional environment of the two groups in order to estimate their compatibility. At least three examples, besides the Sardis inscriptions and the previously-mentioned examples, prove the implication in the patronage system through the important donations made by the pagan sympathizers for the Jewish synagogues, the most famous being the one of Iulia Severa from Akmonia, which dates from the first century AD and mentions that the building or the hall (*oikos*) was donated to the community by her (RAJAK 1999, 143sq., LIFSHITZ 1967, 34-36; WHITE II, 1997, 307-310; RUNESSON, BINDER, OLSSON 2008, 134-135). The epigraphic and the literary material, as far as we know indicate the recruitment of the proselytes and Godfearers alike from the same social and professional environment. This fact acts as an argument against the theories regarding the social seclusion of the Jews in this period. We see that the occupations preferred by the Jews were connected to the productive and commercial activities which implied control of money and of valuable goods. A Christian inscription from Ephesos (IJO, II, 35) clearly mentions 'the Jewish love for money'. The most common occupations attested by the literary, archaeological and epigraphical sources were those related to the textile and leather industry (carpet-makers, linen-weavers, dyers, tent-makers, shoemakers). Also widespread were the categories of merchants, goldsmiths, bronzesmiths, blacksmiths and doctors, but also at least in the European provinces, bankers, painters, meat-sellers, and actors. In at least two instances, the Jews and the Godfearers were members of the same professional guilds. At Hierapolis, the Jew Publius Aurelius Glykon entrusts two associations, one of purple-dyers and the other one of carpet-weavers the task to take care of his own grave and to decorate it on the Festival of Passover and that of Pentecost (TREBILCO 1991, 178).

The epigraphic and the literary material, as far as we know indicate the recruitment of the proselytes and Godfearers alike from the same social and professional environment. This fact acts as an argument against the theories regarding the social seclusion of the Jews in this period.

The inscription of Aphrodisias is the one which most visibly underlines two aspects regarding the social life of the Diasporan Jews: on one side, it expresses the local interaction at the level of the socio-professional relationships, and on the other side it shows the importance

represented by the implication of Jews in the charitable actions. Despite the interminable disputes regarding the datation of this evidence, what is really important here is the fact that we clearly have the indication regarding the clear-cut distinction between the true-born Jews, the proselytes and the Godfearers.

In the case of the Aphrodisias material, those who deny the initial datation (among them A. Chaniotis and M.H. Williams) try to demonstrate that the real proselytization activity started with the moment when Christianity became legal in the Roman Empire at the beginning of the 4th century as a result of the discriminatory measures applied to the Jews. Thus they would have eventually coped with this situation by trying to strengthen the support and sympathy from their fellow Christians and pagans in the local communities. With the reserve of the observation that this change of attitude toward the Jews started only with the reign of Theodosius I, we shall underline that clear evidences indicate the fact that this activity started centuries earlier. We previously mentioned that Herodes the Great modified the structure of the Temple by adding the courts of women and of the Gentiles, which corresponded to the demands and trends in the epoch. On the other hand, another indication could be furnished by the very modification of the rules regarding conversion and intermarriage. Up to the 2nd century AD, the offspring of a mixed marriage was considered a Jew if the father were a Jew. We find numerous examples of

the kind in the books of the Old and New Testament, for example in the passages that indicate the ancestry of Jesus. After this date, apparently unexplainable, the rabbinic sources obviously specify that the lineage should be taken according to the matrilineal principle. We believe that the most plausible explanation is that the enforcement of restrictive measures from the 2nd century on would have determined such a turn. It is the very case of the legislative decisions pertaining to Hadrian and Antoninus Pius, that were reinforced by Septimius Severus which stressed upon two main aspects: (1) the interdiction to circumcize the non-Jews and (2) the limitation of the activities regarding proselytism. Through these proselytizing activities the Jews actually promoted their own socio-institutional and religious image among the Gentiles. The fact that these legislative measures would have been a hard blow for Judaism is indicated mostly by this modification of the principle of lineage. Moreover, it is not by hazzard as it evidenced mostly by the Microasian inscriptions, that the role of the women was so important. A great deal among them were sympathizers or proselytes. Therefore, the most plausible explanation is that women were especially focused on to be converted, an action that was supposed to take place without any risks and without circumcision. In addition, the initial ethnical belonging was in most of the cases difficult to prove in their respect. And the son of a proselyte was automatically recognized as being a Jew, and thus, in both cases they didn't break any law of the Roman state.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- AASGAARD R. 2005 *Among Gentiles, Jews, and Christians. Formation of Christian Identity in Melito of Sardis*, in R. S. Ascough (ed.), *Religious Rivalries and the Struggle for Success in Sardis and Smyrna*, Wilfrid Laurier University Press, Waterloo, Ontario, 156-174.
- AMELING W. 2009 *The Epigraphic Habit and the Jewish Diasporas of Asia Minor and Syria*, in H.M. Cotton, R.G. Hoyland, J.J. Price, D.J. Wasserstein (eds.), *From Hellenism to Islam. Cultural and Linguistic Change in the Roman Near East*, Cambridge University Press, 203-234.
- ASCOUGH R. S. (ed.) 2005 *Religious Rivalries and the Struggle for Success in Sardis and Smyrna*, Wilfrid Laurier University Press, Waterloo, Ontario.
- ATHANASSIADI P., FREDE M. (eds.) 1999 *Pagan Monotheism in Late Antiquity*, Clarendon Press, Oxford.
- BAKER M. 2005 *Who Was Sitting in the Theatre at Miletos?*, in *Journal for the Study of Judaism*, 36, 1, 397-416.
- BARCLAY J.M.G. 1997 *The Family as the Bearer of Religion in Judaism and Early Christianity*, in H. Moxnes (ed.), *Constructing Early Christian Families. Family as Social Reality and Metaphor*, Routledge, London and New York, 66-80.
- BARCLAY J.M.G. 2004 *Negotiating Diaspora. Jewish Strategies in the Roman Empire*, T&T Clark International, London-New York.
- BLOEDHORN H., HÜTTENMEISTER G. 1999 *The Synagogue*, in W. Horbury, W.D. Davies, J. Sturdy (eds.), *The Cambridge History of Judaism, III, The Early Roman Period*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 267-297.
- BONZ M.P. 1990 *The Jewish Community of Ancient Sardis: A Reassessment of its Rise to Prominence*, in *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology*, 93, 343-359.
- BONZ M.P. 1994 *The Jewish Donor Inscriptions from Aphrodisias: Are They Both Third-Century, and Who Are the Theosebeis?*, in *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology*, 96, 281-299.
- ÇEVIK N., ÇOMEZOĞLU Ö., ÖZTÜRK H.S., TÜRKÖĞLU İ. 2010 *A Unique Discovery in Lycia: The Ancient Synagogue at Adrianike, Port of Myra*, in *Adalya*, 13, 335-353.
- CHANIOTIS A. 2002 *The Jews of Aphrodisias: New Evidence and Old Problems*, in *Scripta Classica Israelica*, 21, 209-242.
- COHEN S.J.D. 1985 *The Origins of the Matrilineal Principle in Rabbinic Law*, in *Association for Jewish Studies Review*, 10, 1, 19-53.
- CRAWFORD J.S. 1999 *Jews, Christians, and Polytheists in Late-Antique Sardis*, in S. Fine (ed.), *Jews, Christians and Polytheists in the Ancient Synagogue. Cultural Interaction during the Greco-Roman Period*, Routledge, London and New York, 168-197.
- CROSS F.M. 2002 *The Hebrew Inscriptions from Sardis*, in *The Harvard Theological Review*, 95, 1, 3-19.
- Eusebiu de Cezareea, *Scrieri, I, Istoria bisericească. Martirii din Palestina*, traducere, studiu introductiv, note și comentarii de pr. Prof. T. Bodogae, colecția PSB nr. 13, Ed. IBMBOR, București, 1987.
- FELDMAN L.H. 1950 *Jewish "Sympathizers" in Classical Literature and Inscriptions*, in *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association*, 81, 200-208.
- FELDMAN L.H. 1993 *Jew and Gentile in the Ancient World. Attitudes and Interactions from Alexander to Justinian*, Princeton University Press, Princeton, New Jersey, 1993.
- FITZPATRICK-MCKINLEY A. 2002 *Synagogue Communities in the Greco-Roman Cities*, in J.R. Bartlett (ed.), *Jews in the Hellenistic and Roman Cities*, Routledge, London-New York, 55-87.

- GAGER J.G. 1986 *Jews, Gentiles, and Synagogues in the Book of Acts*, in *Harvard Theological Review*, 79, 1-3, 91-99.
- GOODMAN M. 1994 *Mission and Conversion. Prozeltyzing in the Religious History of the Roman Empire*, Claredon Press, Oxford.
- GOODMAN M. 2007 *Judaism in the Roman World. Collected Essays*, Brill, Leiden-Boston.
- HAMMER K.E., MURRAY M., 2005 *Acquaintancies, Supporters, and Competitors. Evidence of Interconnectedness and Rivalry among the Religious Groups in Sardis*, in R. S. Ascough (ed.), *Religious Rivalries and the Struggle for Success in Sardis and Smyrna*, Wilfrid Laurier University Press, Waterloo, Ontario, 175-194.
- HARLAND Ph.A. 2005 *Familial Dimensions of Group Identity: "Brothers" (ΑΔΕΛΦΟΙ) in Associations of the Greek East*, in *Journal of Biblical Literature*, 124, 3, 491-513.
- HARLAND Ph.A. 2007 *Familial Dimensions of Group Identity (II): "Mothers" and "Fathers" in Associations and Synagogues of the Greek World*, in *Journal for the Study of Judaism*, 38, 57-79.
- VAN HENTEN J.W., VAN DER HORST P.W. (eds.) 1994 *Studies in Early Jewish Epigraphy*, E.J. Brill, Leiden-New York, Köln.
- VAN DER HORST P.W. 1991 *Ancient Jewish Epitaphs. An Introductory Survey of a Millenium of a Jewish Funerary Epigraphy (300 BCE-700 CE)*, Kok Pharos Publishing House, Kampen, The Netherlands.
- VAN DER HORST P.W. 2006 *Jews and Christians in their Greco-Roman Context. Selected Essays on Early Judaism, Samaritanism, Hellenism, and Christianity*, Mohr Siebeck, Tübingen.
- IERONIM, SF,
ILAN T. 2006 *Despre bărbății iluștri și alte scrieri*, Ed. Paideia, București, 1997.
The New Jewish Inscriptions from Hierapolis and the Question of Jewish Diaspora Cemeteries, in *Scripta Classica Israelica*, 25, 71-86.
- JANOWITZ N. 2000 *Thinking Jewish Identity in Late Antiquity*, in S. Mitchell, G. Greatrex (eds.), *Ethnicity and Culture in Late Antiquity*, Duckworth and The Classical Press of Wales, London-Swansea, 205-219.
- JENSEN R.M. 1999 *The Dura Europos Synagogue, Early-Christian Art, and Religious Life in Dura Europos* in S. Fine (ed.), *Jews, Christians and Polytheists in the Ancient Synagogue. Cultural Interaction during the Greco-Roman Period*, Routledge, London and New York, 154-167.
- JOHNSON L.T. 2009 *Greco-Roman Religion and Christianity*, Yale University Press, New Haven-London.
- JUDGE E.A. 2002 *Jews, Proselytes, and God-fearers Club Together*, in *New Documents Illustrating Early Christianity*, IX, A Review of the Greek Inscriptions and Papyri Published in 1986-1987, edited by S.R. Llewelyn, William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, Grand Rapids, Michigan/Cambridge, UK, 73-80.
- KRAABEL A.T., 1984 *New Evidence of the Samaritan Diaspora has been Found on Delos*, in *The Biblical Archaeologist*, 47, 1, 44-46.
- KRAABEL A.T. 1995 *The Diaspora Synagogue: Archaeological and Epigraphic Evidence since Sukenik*, in D. Urman, P.V.M. Flesher (eds.), *Ancient Synagogues. Historical Analysis and Archaeological Discovery*, I, E.J. Brill, Leiden-New York-Köln, 95-126.
- KRAEMER R.S. 1989 *On the Meaning on the Term 'Jew' in the Graeco-Roman Inscriptions*, in *The Harvard Theological Review*, 82, 1, 35-53.
- KROLL J.H. 2001 *The Greek Inscriptions of the Sardis Synagogue*, in *The Harvard Theological Review*, 94, 1, 5-55.
- LANE FOX R. 1997 *Paiens et chrétiens. La Religion et la vie religieuse dans l'Empire Romain de la mort de Commode au Concile de Nicée*, présenté par Jean-Marie Pailler, traduit par Ruth Alimi, Maurice Montabrut, Emmanuel Pailler, Presses Universitaires du Mirail,

- Toulouse.
- LEVINE L.I. 1981 *Ancient Synagogues Revealed*, Israel Exploration Society, Jerusalem.
- LEVINE L.I. 2005 *The Ancient Synagogue. The First Thousand Years*, Yale University Press, New Haven-London.
- LIFSHITZ B. 1967 *Donateurs et fondateurs dans les synagogues juives. Répertoire des dédicaces grecques relatives à la construction et à la réfection des synagogues*, J. Gabalda et C^{ie}, Paris.
- LINDER A. 1987 *The Jews in Roman Imperial Legislation*, Wayne State University Press/The Israel Academy of Sciences and Humanities, Detroit, Michigan-Jerusalem.
- MÉLITON DE SARDES, *Sur la Pâque et fragments*, introduction, texte critique, traduction et notes par Othmar Perler, coll. «Sources chrétiennes» nr. 123, Les Éditions du CERF, Paris, 1966.
- MILLAR F. 2006 *Rome, the Greek World, and the East*, III, *The Greek World*, The University of North California Press, Chapel Hill.
- MIRANDA E. 1999-2000 *La comunità giudaica di Hierapolis di Frigia*, in *Epigraphica Anatolica*, 31, 109-156.
- MITCHELL S. 2005 *An Apostle to Ankara from the New Jerusalem: Montanists and Jews in Late Roman Asia Minori*, in *Scripta Classica Israelica*, 24, 207-223.
- MITCHELL S., VAN NUFFELEN P. 2010 *One God. Pagan Monotheism in the Roman Empire*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- MOGA I. 2004 *The Worship of the Unknown God in Asia Minor, the Bosporan Kingdom, and the Lower Danube Area*, in *Aspects of Spiritual Life in South East Europe from Prehistory to the Middle Ages*, Iași, 213-220.
- MOGA I. 2006 *Le Très-Haut et la hiérarchie des anges*, in *Studia historiae et religionis Daco-Romanae. In honorem Silvii Samiae*, edited by L. Mihailescu-Bîrliba and O. Bounegru, Ed. Academiei Române, Bucharest, 139-159.
- MOGA I. 2007 *The Worship of the Unknown God. God-fearers, Jews, and Christians in Asia Minor, in Eirene. Studia Graeca et Latina (Archaeologica)*, XLIII, 104-109.
- MOGA I. 2008 *Expressing Jewish Identity in the Anatolian World. Contacts, Acculturation and Proselytism*, in *Migration und Akkulturation im Osten des Mittelmeerraumes in hellenistischer und römischer Zeit*, Akten der Tagung in Iași, 3.-7. Oktober 2007, Herausgegeben von Lucrețiu Mihailescu-Bîrliba, Octavian Bounegru, Harrassowitz Verlag, 60-73.
- MUIR S.C. 2005 *“Caring for All the Weak.” Polytheist and Christian Charity in Sardis and Smyrna*, in R. S. Ascough (ed.), *Religious Rivalries and the Struggle for Success in Sardis and Smyrna*, Wilfrid Laurier University Press, Waterloo, Ontario, 123-140.
- MURRAY M. 2004 *Playing a Jewish Game. Gentile Christian Judaizing in the First and Second Centuries CE*, Wilfrid Laurier University Press, Waterloo, Ontario.
- MURRAY M. 2005 *Down the Road from Sardis. Adaptive Religious Structures and Religious Interaction in the Ancient City of Priene*, in R. S. Ascough (ed.), *Religious Rivalries and the Struggle for Success in Sardis and Smyrna*, Wilfrid Laurier University Press, Waterloo, Ontario, 197-210.
- MUSSIES G. 1994 *Jewish Personal Names in Some Non-Literary Sources*, in van Henten, J.W., van der Horst, P.W. (eds.), *Studies in Early Jewish Epigraphy*, E.J. Brill, Leiden-New York, Köln, 242-276.
- MYLONOPOULOS J. 2008 *The Dynamics of Ritual Space in the Hellenistic and Roman East*, in *Kernos*, 21, 49-79.
- NEUFELD D. 2005 *Christian Communities in Sardis and Smyrna*, in R. S. Ascough (ed.), *Religious Rivalries and the Struggle for Success in Sardis and Smyrna*, Wilfrid Laurier University

- Press, Waterloo, Ontario, 25-39.
- PANAYOTOV A. 2004 *The Jews in the Balkan Provinces of the Roman Empire: The Evidence from the Territory of Bulgaria*, in Barclay, J.M.G., *Negotiating Diaspora. Jewish Strategies in the Roman Empire*, T&T Clark International, London-New York, 38-65.
- PETZL, G. 2002 *Zum religiösen Leben im westlichen Kleinasien: Einflüsse und Wechselwirkungen*, in H. Blum, B. Faist, P. Pfälzner, A.-M. Wittke (eds.), *Brükenland Anatolien?*, Attempto Verlag, Tübingen, 381-391 (= *Asia Minor Studien*, 45, 2003, p. 93-101).
- PUCCI BEN ZEEV M. 1998 *Jewish Rights in the Roman World. The Greek and Roman Documents Quoted by Josephus Flavius*, Mohr Siebeck, Tübingen.
- RABELLO A.M. 1975 *The Ban on Circumcision as a Cause of Bar Kochba's Rebellion*, in *Israel Law Review*, 29, 176-214 (= idem, *The Jews in the Roman Empire: Legal Problems, from Herod to Justinian*, Variorum Collected Studies, Ashgate/Variorum Reprints, Aldershot-Burlington USA-Singapore-Sydney, V, 176-214).
- RABELLO A.M. 1999 *The Attitude of Rome towards Conversions to Judaism (Atheism, Circumcision, Proselytism)*, in A. Gambaro, A.M. Rabello (eds.), *Towards a New European, Italian, and Israeli Law in Occasion of 50 Years of EU and of the State of Israel*, Jerusalem, 37-68 (= idem, *The Jews in the Roman Empire: Legal Problems, from Herod to Justinian*, Variorum Collected Studies, Ashgate/Variorum Reprints, Aldershot-Burlington USA-Singapore-Sydney, XIV, 37-68).
- RAJAK T. 1984 *Was There a Roman Charter for the Jews?*, in *Journal of Roman Studies*, 74, 107-123.
- RAJAK T. 1999 *The Synagogue within the Greco-Roman City*, in S. Fine (ed.), *Jews, Christians and Polytheists in the Ancient Synagogue. Cultural Interaction during the Greco-Roman Period*, Routledge, London and New York, 143-153.
- REYNOLDS J., TANNENBAUM R. 1987 *Jews and God-fearers at Aphrodisias. Greek Inscriptions with Commentary*, texts from the excavations at Aphrodisias conducted by Kenan T. Erim, The Cambridge Philological Society, Cambridge.
- RICHARDSON P. 2004 *Building Jewish in the Roman East*, Baylor University Press, Waco, Texas.
- ROSENFELD B.-Z., MENIRAV J. 1999 *The Ancient Synagogue as an Economic Center*, in *Journal of Near Eastern Studies*, 58, 4, 259-276.
- RUNESSON A., BINDER D.D., OLSSON B. 2008 *The Ancient Synagogue from its Origins to 200 CE. A Sourcebook*, Brill, Leiden-Boston.
- RUTGERS L.V. 1992 *Archaeological Evidence for the Interaction of Jews and Non-Jews in Late Antiquity*, in *American Journal of Archaeology*, 96, 101-118.
- RUTGERS L.V. 1995 *Attitudes to Judaism in the Greco-Roman Period: Reflections on Feldman's 'Jew and Gentile in the Ancient World'*, in *The Jewish Quarterly Review*, N.S., 85, 3-4, 361-395.
- RUTGERS L.V. 1995 *The Jews in Late Ancient Rome. Evidence of Cultural Interaction in the Roman Diaspora*, E.J. Brill, Leiden-New York-Köln.
- SAFRAI S., STERN M. (eds.) 1976 *The Jewish People in the First Century. Historical Geography, Political History, Social, Cultural, and Religious Life and Institutions*, Fortress Press, Philadelphia.
- SHEPPARD A.R.R. 1979 *RECAM Notes and Studies No. 6. Jews, Christians and Heretics in Acmonia and Eumeneia*, in *Anatolian Studies*, 29, 169-180.
- SOLIN H. 1983 *Juden und Syrer im westlichen Teil der römischen Welt. Eine ethnisch-demographische Studie mit besonderer Berücksichtigung der sprachlichen Zustände*, in *ANRW*, II, 29.2, 587-1088.

- STRUBBE J.H.M. 1994 *Curses against Violation of the Grave in Jewish Epitaphs of Asia Minor*, in van Henten, J.W., van der Horst, P.W. (eds.), *Studies in Early Jewish Epigraphy*, E.J. Brill, Leiden-New York, Köln, 70-128.
- TREBILCO P.R. 1991 *Jewish Communities in Asia Minor*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge-New York-Port Chester-Melbourne-Sydney.
- TREBILCO P. 2004 *The Christian and Jewish Eumeneian Formula*, in Barclay, J.M.G., *Negotiating Diaspora. Jewish Strategies in the Roman Empire*, T&T Clark International, London-New York, 66-88.
- TREBILCO P. 2004 *The Early Christians in Ephesus from Paul to Ignatius*, Mohr Siebeck, Tübingen.
- TRÜMPER M. 2004 *The Oldest Original Synagogue Building in the Diaspora. The Delos Synagogue Reconsidered*, in *Hesperia*, 73, 513-598.
- WHITE L.M. 1987 *The Delos Synagogue Revisited. Recent Fieldwork in the Graeco-Roman Diaspora*, in *The Harvard Theological Review*, 80, 2, 133-160.
- WHITE L.M., *The Social Origins of Christian Architecture*, Trinity Press International, Valley Forge, Pennsylvania, I, Building House in the Roman World: Architectural Adaptation among Pagans, Jews, and Christians, 1996; II, Texts and Monuments for the Christian Domus Ecclesiae in its Environment, 1997.
- WHITE L.M. 1999 *Reading the Ostia Synagogue: A Reply to A. Runesson*, in *The Harvard Theological Review*, 92, 4, 435-464.
- WHITTAKER M. 1984 *Jews and Christians: Graeco-Roman Views*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge-London-New York-New Rochelle-Melbourne-Sydney.
- WILLIAMS M.H. 2007 *Semitic Name-Use by Jews in Roman Asia Minor and the Dating of the Aphrodisias Stele Inscriptions*, in E. Matthews (ed.), *Old and New Worlds in Greek Onomastics*, Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2007, 73-197.

SAŽETAK

IZGRADNJA BOŽJE KUĆE. SINAGOGE I MOLITVENE KUĆE U ANATOLIJI I ISTOČNOJ EUROPI TIJEKOM RIMSKOG DOBA

Iulian MOGA

Svrha ovog rada jest da istakne glavne strukturalne i arhitektonske osobine sinogoga i molitvenih kuća u antičkom grčko-rimskom svijetu tijekom klasičnoga doba, usredotočujući se uglavnom na Anatoliju i jugoistočnu Europu. Osim fizičkih obilježja, također se mora uzeti u obzir njihova institucionalna uloga, jer su one predstavljale vjerska i društvena središta svojstvena mjesnim zajednicama. Ipak, iako ponekad osporavana, moć kojom su privlačile nežidove i stupanj njihova utjecaja na mjesnu sredinu znatno su utjecale na visok stupanj uklapanja židova iseljenika u mjesna društva.