***The Basilica of Mopsuestia***

On the road leading from Tarsus to Antioch near ancient Mopsuestia (Figure 1)[[1]](#footnote-1) sits an enigma, an archeological mystery. In 1955 Ludwig Budde excavated a basilica site that was south of the river Pyramos, beyond the walls of the old city. The remains indicated a narthex, a nave and four aisles (two on each side), along with significantly damaged mosaic floor pavements (Figure 3)[[2]](#footnote-2). Was this a church or a synagogue? No definitive conclusion has been agreed to by scholars.

Using knowledge of early Christian ritual and symbol, what can be determined about the 4th century CE (to possibly 6th century CE)[[3]](#footnote-3) Basilica at Mopsuestia? After careful examination of available published sources, including Budde’s extensive excavation results[[4]](#footnote-4), the strongest conclusion is that this site could have been a community Basilica, not necessarily dedicated to a specific religion (Christianity or Judaism) but possibly used by pagans, Christians, and Jews alike as a civic gathering place and/or a place of worship or study for both religions. This paper also suggests that this unusual thesis is stronger than either a case for use as *just* a Christian church or a Jewish synagogue, and this situation may exist for a number of other ambiguous sites (at least 9)[[5]](#footnote-5) in the Jewish Diaspora areas of what are now Turkey & Syria.

Supporting this thesis are the following claims: 1) The revolutionary nature of Christianity and the Synagogue allowed for joint use because of a radical shift in thinking about the sacred and the dwelling place of the Divine, 2) The architecture indicated by the ruins at the site and the symbols found in mosaic floors could refer to either religion, but are inclusive of all three sensibilities- pagan, Christian, and Jewish, 3) Patrons played a strong role in creating architecture during this period and may have influenced this basilica’s form and decoration, 4) A survey of sources finds them generally problematic but some clues are found to co-worship in what *is said* and what *is not said*, 5) Some archeologists and scholars support the theory that away from the capital cities an attitude of tolerance among ordinary people was more the norm than the exception, 6) Neither the case for a Jewish Synagogue nor for a Christian church is particularly strong. The conclusion will comment on what’s physically missing from the evidence (wall mosaics and paintings, columns, external decoration for example), current scholarship on first-century synagogues and how these issues impact other potential thesis positions.

***Revolutions in the dwelling place of the Divine***

Revolutionary nature of both Christianity and the Synagogue would allow for the joint use of a building because of a radical shift in thinking about the dwelling place of the divine and parallels in liturgy.

For pagans, the presence of their god(s) was usually represented by a statue in an inaccessible temple sanctuary. This became a sacred dwelling place for the god and communion with the god for the worshippers was only through rites and sacrifices performed by priests.[[6]](#footnote-6) In contrast, the Jews never came before an identifiable divine person who could be represented in statue form. However, the Jewish God did dwell (at the Divine will) in the holy of holies - originally a perfect cube - of the Jewish Temple, which retained some outward features similar to a pagan temple. For example, the holy place was only accessible to priests who performed highly ritual sacrifices, with an *external* court for the worshipers.[[7]](#footnote-7)

The Jews also worshipped in synagogues. Levine has called this “one of the most revolutionary developments in the history of ancient Judaism.”[[8]](#footnote-8) Cultic practice was no longer confined to priests, leadership in the synagogue was open to the community and the ceremonies were conducted in view of the people. Worship shifted dramatically from sacrifice to prayer and study. There was only one central Temple (Jerusalem) called for in Deuteronomy but a synagogue (Greek for “assembly”[[9]](#footnote-9)) could be built anywhere. Scholars and literary sources vary on the date synagogues started- (seventh century BCE to first century CE) - but synagogues were well established as an institution and a building type by the date of the Basilica at Mopsuestia, the fourth century CE. The foremost activity in the synagogue was the reading of the Torah but other functions of the building included: prayer, study, sacred meals, a repository for community funds and resources, courts, a general assembly hall, a hostel for travelers, and a residence for synagogue officials.[[10]](#footnote-10)

Christianity presented an even more revolutionary and shocking development than the Jewish synagogue did. The presence of Christ among the worshipers themselves, the Body of Christ, meant an end to, and the elimination of, all holy places and sacred rituals as well as the mediating priesthoods (at least in the earliest times). The presence of the living God was transferred to the *community of believers*. Through the Holy Spirit the believers became the dwelling place of the Divine Presence. “For where two or three have gathered in My name, I am there in their midst.” (Matt.18.20)[[11]](#footnote-11) The community of believers gathered together in the name of Christ *becomes the new temple*.[[12]](#footnote-12) “Do you not know that you are a temple of God and that the spirit of God dwells in you?” (1 Cor. 3.16) Thus, the early Christians were free to worship anywhere and they did- in the open countryside or seashore, in synagogues, in homes, in co-opted buildings renovated from former uses[[13]](#footnote-13).

Even though the Christian church began to evolve in the fourth century CE gave rise again to a priestly structure and sacred places based on the remains of martyrs, the concepts of synagogue as a multi-use space and the freedom of Christian worship from a “sacred dwelling place” would allow for use of a community basilica as a place of worship.

The basilica form came from a Roman civic building, used for a Law Court or as a covered market.[[14]](#footnote-14) It was used as the archetype for both synagogues and churches throughout Palestine and the Jewish Diaspora (which included North Africa, Egypt, Syria, Turkey, and other parts of the Mediterranean). The basilica form persisted even beyond the sixth and seventh centuries CE (even seen in some modern churches) and scholars have had difficulty establishing the true evolution of the architectural elements of early ecclesiastic architecture.[[15]](#footnote-15) In the fourth century it is particularly difficult to determine if synagogues or churches set precedents for certain features (mosaic floors, Greek inscriptions, biblical story representations). This is perhaps because of general principles that restrain architecture and cause buildings in the same geographic area and economic culture to be similar. These factors include: availability and access to building materials (stone, wood, concrete, glass, marble), structural capacities of those building materials (limiting spans of beams limit width of spaces), skills of builders in the area, the general wealth of the community or political agenda’s of wealthy patrons in the community, the site features (compass orientation, steepness, prevailing breeze, proximity to other structures, access roads) and lighting possibilities (location of openings, lamps).

Parallels in liturgy and ritual in the Byzantine period would also support the ability of Jews and Christians to use the same building form for worship services. Both included entry processions (Jews to the Torah shrine, Christians of the bishop and book of Gospels), call to prayer, readings of the scriptures, sermons, and a blessing at the end. [[16]](#footnote-16) For both, the part of the building designated the nave corresponded with earthly things and the sanctuary corresponded with heavenly things, [[17]](#footnote-17) sometimes these themes were alluded to in mosaic floor decorations with representations of the creation in the nave and religious themes in the main sanctuary.[[18]](#footnote-18) The key difference as far as building form was concerned was the need for, and importance of, a baptistery for the Christians. The art in the Basilica of Mopsuestia (floor mosaics) does not appear to support any particular Jewish or Christian liturgical function.

***Specific Archeological Findings at the Basilica of Mopsuestia***

The fourth century Basilica of Mopsuestia- near modern day Misis, Turkey -has a square building footprint measuring 25m. X 25m. The remains indicate structure for a narthex, a nave and four aisles (two on each side). The absence of a *bema* – the raised area for a Torah shrine is notable for a synagogue of the period. The absence of a baptistery is notable for a Christian church at this time, however other examples from the period[[19]](#footnote-19) have the baptistery as a separate “occasional building”[[20]](#footnote-20) and the proximity to the river made it possible (although unlikely in the fourth century due to highly ritualized baptisms) to perform baptism there. The poor condition of the site may account for the missing baptistery and or bema, or their absence may speak to the civic or joint use of this basilica.

The floors were polychrome mosaic; however, by the time of Ludwig Budde’s excavations in 1960 most of the pavement was eroded or severely damaged.[[21]](#footnote-21) The figures, patterns, and forms found in the mosaics are either secularly common neutral patterns or can be interpreted as symbolically satisfying *both* Christian and Jewish congregations. Similar examples of all the symbols, patterns, and forms can be found in both other churches and other synagogues.

The Nave had three large depictions set in borders, but only one survives intact, that of Noah’s ark as a chest surrounded by animals and birds. There is no doubt of the subject due to the inscription translated as: “the ark of Noah the R(edeemer)” or “the r(edeeming) ark of Noah.” Avi-Yonah notes that the ark was portrayed as a chest by early Christians but this may be because it is based on earlier Jewish art.[[22]](#footnote-22) For the Jews, the ark represented the Ark of the Covenant and the story of Noah and the flood. For Christians, the scene of Noah’s ark could represent baptism.[[23]](#footnote-23) Since Noah’s ark is connected with many local cities in Asia Minor, this might also have been a subject popular with the local people (even used on third century coins). In Palestine the use of biblical scenes is neither rare nor common- regular motifs are David, Daniel, Aaron and the Tabernacle, Temple appurtenances and offerings, along with symbols of the twelve Jewish tribes.[[24]](#footnote-24)

There is floral ornamentation, mostly acanthus leaves, along a wide border around the ark scene that includes geometric patterns, animals, birds in cages, and what are possibly depictions of ritual objects: chandeliers, candlestick lamps, and bowls of fruit. [[25]](#footnote-25) These are neutral implements which could be used by either Christians or Jews.

The typical Jewish liturgical utensils depicted in the synagogue floors in Palestine included the menorah, the *shofar* (ram’s horn), the *lulav* (palm branch), the *ethrog* (citron), and Torah shrine. A typical Palestinian example of these utensils is at the top of Figure 4, the synagogue mosaic floor at Hammat Tiberias. However, with the exception of Dura Europos, this particularly Jewish cluster never appears in this prominent a fashion in the Diaspora synagogues, [[26]](#footnote-26)therefore their absence in the Basilica at Mopsuestia’s case is not significant.

In the center of the Nave, excavators were fairly certain that the depiction of a fish may have been from a scene that featured the story of Jonah and the Whale, which would be meaningful to either Jewish or Christian congregations. Old Testament scenes are rare in Christian art, but an exception is the church at Aquileia (313-319 CE)[[27]](#footnote-27) which does show Jonah and the Whale, a popular Christian theme. For Christians, Jonah and the Whale could represent salvation and baptism, as well as Christ’s resurrection.[[28]](#footnote-28)

Or, this fish could also have been part of a zodiac wheel depicting the sign of Pisces, in which case this decoration is most likely Jewish since the zodiac (Figure 4)[[29]](#footnote-29) has been found in multiple synagogue sites[[30]](#footnote-30) but no Christian churches. Due to lack of physical evidence at the site - the fish is partially destroyed and there is nothing surviving of its surroundings - there isn’t any definitive way to establish whether the fish is the Whale or a portion of the symbol for Pisces.

The inner northern and southern aisles of the basilica were paved with elaborate geometric patterns (Figure 6)[[31]](#footnote-31) that are similar to those found in a square monastic Byzantine church at Maresha, Beit Govrin (Figure 7).[[32]](#footnote-32) The geometry includes the incorporation of forms of the cross: swastikas and loop crosses for example, but they are quite subtle. The larger geometric patterns used are found across a wide geographic area, so they could also be considered secular or Jewish. The use of large geometric patterns is common in the mosaic floors found in almost every building from the fourth to the sixth century discovered in the Diaspora. [[33]](#footnote-33)

According to mosaic expert Michael Avi-Yonah, artists were most likely employed by both Christians and Jews and many sections of mosaics may have been assembled off-site in Antioch or Italy and sent to the churches and synagogues from the same ateliers.[[34]](#footnote-34) Therefore, use of the commonly familiar patterns would be expected to be wide spread and indiscriminate with regard to religious use of the building. Levine goes further, stating that with the exception of the Jewish liturgical utensils, “all the artistic motifs and styles of the ancient synagogues of Palestine and the Diaspora were in one way or another borrowed from the surrounding culture and reflected the styles and patterns of the immediate context”.[[35]](#footnote-35)

In one of the southern aisles, a non-typical geometric pattern encloses peacocks on vine tendrils (Figure 8)[[36]](#footnote-36). For Jews this scene could have recalled abundance and eternal life, and for Christians it would have referred to Christ (the vine) as the way to eternal life (the peacocks).

The outer northern aisle of the Basilica of Mopsuestia has a slightly raised floor and, in nine sequential scenes, depicts the story of Samson - the first known example in a mosaic floor. [[37]](#footnote-37) The Greek inscriptions, partially destroyed, leave enough remains for a positive identification as the Septuagint version of the story. Avi-Yonah speculates that the selection of this particular story may have occurred because Samson is similar in character to the local legendary hero, Mopsus, the founder of Mopsuestia. Both figures are noted for their clever riddles and Mopsus counts amongst his descendants a king of the *DNNYM,* which is similar to Samson’s Israelite tribe of Dan.[[38]](#footnote-38) This resemblance may have been an attempt on the part of either a church or a synagogue to lure local pagans in by presenting a familiar legend. Or, if the building was truly a more neutral community center, this connection to a local hero would also make sense and speak to varied locals.

There is a small later floor restoration of Noah and his sons that will not be addressed in this paper since the thesis applies to the time the prominent floor mosaics were originally put in place. This basilica, like others in the region, may have passed from civic to Jewish to Christian hands and back several times during its functional life.

***The Role of Patrons***

Hundreds of inscriptions found on synagogues and churches in the broader region demonstrate the influential role of patrons. Most of these inscriptions, both Jewish and Christian, were in Greek with a few areas of Hebrew and Aramaic dominance (Golan, Judaea, and small Galilean villages).[[39]](#footnote-39) According to Joseph Baumgarten, for many synagogues “the driving influence (for mosaic decoration) came from wealthy Jewish patrons, close to the patriarchal family, who viewed the synagogue not only as a source of salvation but as a means of displaying their acculturation in the Hellenistic world.”[[40]](#footnote-40)

It is reasonable to think that a powerful patron in the area, particularly a merchant, would want to satisfy or impress all three contingents - pagan, Jew, and particularly ruling Christians - if the building funded was a civic basilica. Or speculating further, the patron could have been a local Jew wanting to appease the more powerful ruling Christians but still not conceding with entirely Christian images. An earlier example in Luke 7.1-10 is the story of an influential centurion who has built a synagogue and is well regarded for it. Luke’s passage includes honorific language commonly found in building inscriptions among both Jews and pagans.[[41]](#footnote-41)

Answers to the following questions were not found in the sources studied and could shed more light on this subject: Would the resources of a community this size support more than one major civic building? Are there examples of similar communities where a civic basilica, a synagogue, and a church were built? How large was the population and what would have been the likely distribution of this city’s population between the religions? If Christians or Jews were known to have been a significant majority, or to hold the main resources in the area, this could weigh in favor of the basilica as a synagogue or a church, even though the Christians were the dominant political rulers in the region?

***Written Sources***

A survey of literary document sources as an interpretation method suggested by Jensen[[42]](#footnote-42) finds those contemporary with or before the Basilica of Mopsuestia’s time period generally problematic, but they offer some clues.

The architect Vitruvius (first century BC) established detailed methods for creating mosaics[[43]](#footnote-43) and documented them in his *De Architectura*. These mosaic methods continued during the fourth century, creating conformity in most all building types, which are used up to the present day. This detailed treatise was widely used by as the guide for architecture and engineering for centuries (rediscovered later to greatly influence Renaissance, Baroque and Neoclassical architecture). Vitruvius expounds on pagan temple design criteria but was writing too early for any mention of churches and does not refer to synagogues.

The Jewish historian Josephus (37-100 CE) offers little detail about the synagogue’s organization or building details but some convergence occurs with the archeological remains of Jewish communities like Sardis and Delos.[[44]](#footnote-44)

Both Theodore of Mopsuestia (ordained 383 CE) and John of Chrysostom (ordained 386 CE), bishops in the region, railed against local heresies and members of the church who were accused of judaizing.[[45]](#footnote-45) For this much specific attention to be put to written protest, Christians in the area were most likely attending synagogue and Jewish festivals. This implies a certain tolerance and peace between the two groups, as well as the potential for co-use of the same facility. It is also known from Chrysostom’s writings that Christians preferred to use synagogues for the signing of contracts and taking of oaths.[[46]](#footnote-46)

This phenomenon of Christian attraction to Judaism in the late fourth and early fifth centuries was also indicated by other documents including the *Apostolic Constitutions* which found it necessary to decree: no entering the synagogue to pray, no clergy is to feast with the Jews or participate in their festivals, no Christian is to light lamps on Jewish holidays. The reality behind such declarations is usually an indication of their practice[[47]](#footnote-47), all of which shows the potential mixing of communities and ease of using the same building, especially in areas away from the main controlling central cities.

It is noted by White that synagogues are mentioned frequently in Luke-Acts, particularly with regard to Paul’s travels, but that Paul’s letters do not make reference to the synagogue at all, neither as an institution nor as a place.[[48]](#footnote-48) The word in Greek means “assembly” and may imply simply a gathering anywhere, including in homes as was known to be common and in other building types, which might also include the basilica. Neither the archeological nor the written record is entirely clear on who used which buildings and when and current scholars on the first century are beginning to embrace the idea that community assembly would have taken place in locations other than purpose-built structures.[[49]](#footnote-49) It seems reasonable that socio-economic factors also impacted the fourth century institution, particularly in outlying areas of the Diaspora. White also protests that the legal status and organization of sizeable Jewish populations at Antioch and Alexandria are wrongly assumed to also apply to small diverse communities in the Diaspora.[[50]](#footnote-50)

***Archeological Sources in the Greater Region***

There are several Jewish Diaspora communities that contribute to the support of a theory of joint use or at least peaceful tolerance between Jews and Christians.

*Dura Europos* was a caravan way station that housed a Jewish synagogue, a Christian house church, a Mithraeum, and other pagan temples, all richly decorated.[[51]](#footnote-51) Presumably due to economic factors and the nature of a city with a transient caravan and heavy immigrant population, these factions were housed in close proximity and similar structures to each other (houses with renovated interiors). [[52]](#footnote-52)

*Sardis* At a synagogue site in Sadis, the firmly established the social center of city’s civic life, donor honorariums seem to indicate not all the original patrons were Jews.[[53]](#footnote-53) Later during the Byzantine period, on the basis of reciprocal respect for symbolic objects found in connected shops and the synagogue, a peaceful co-existence between Jewish and Christian groups was assumed by scholars. Pagan images were, however, found defaced. It is purported this peace lasted until at least the seventh century when Sardis was destroyed.[[54]](#footnote-54)

A relevant Christian archeological source is the *Church of the Nativity in Bethlehem*. Built originally under Constantine, it commemorates the site of the Cave of the Nativity. An octagonal mosaic floor (Figure 4)[[55]](#footnote-55), surrounding the opening to the site of the Nativity, is similar in style to the mosaic floors at the Basilica of Mopsuestia The similarity of such geographically separated floors could be accounted for in several ways: the same pattern book was used by the craftsmen, pieces of floors were actually assembled off-site in Antioch which has a tradition of mosaic shops that spanned centuries[[56]](#footnote-56), or they were both churches. The latter theory seems less likely as other churches have not been found that have similar floor styles (some secular buildings do use this style) and no literary or documentary evidence has been found that the church dictated such specific decoration styles.

***Contributions of Current Scholarship***

John Crawford concludes from his excavations at Beth Alph, Beth She’arim, the Golan, Capernaum, Ostia, Priene, Dura Europos, Delos, Bova Marina (Italy), and Sardis that toleration was more the rule than the exception. Sardis is particularly thought to demonstrate that ordinary people away from the capital had an attitude of tolerance towards other religionists. He states: “As Kraabel noted in 1983, the nature of our primary literary sources has for a long time distorted the accepted picture of Byzantine Judeo-Christian relations. Many primary literary and iconographic sources tend naturally towards extremism, because they were produced by extremists.” Crawford believes the archaeological evidence can balance the written understanding.[[57]](#footnote-57)

Twentieth scholarship took a fresh look at religious “gatherings” (both Jewish and early Christian) in the first century, particularly examining the enthusiasm for finding purpose built structures. In the 1990’s Howard Kee challenged the prevailing view that “synagogue” meant a specific structure, pointing out the Greek word meant simply “gathering”. Heather McKay took a similar minimal stance on the worship practices of the early synagogue, while Richard Horsley stated of the Galilee region: “Once the first-century landscape has been cleared of the synagogue buildings so desperately sought by modern scholars we can more readily catch sight of the community assemblies that had almost certainly been there for centuries”.[[58]](#footnote-58) These points are relevant to the fourth century basilica in that they demonstrate how difficult it is to untangle what is a social institution and when it implies a purpose built facility.

An analogy from today would be that although we have various political parties who are usually housed in separate office buildings, there isn’t a particular “Republican,” “Christian Democratic,” or “Labor Party” architectural or decorative interior form, even if each might gravitate towards certain styles and display certain symbols that reflect their principles and country of origin.

***Indications for Other Interpretations***

Because the walls, columns, roofs, and ceilings are missing at the site, it is difficult to know what symbolic clues might be gained from these elements. The definitive form of a cross or menorah, or an inscription dedicating the church or synagogue would provide us with a quite different thesis.

One small bronze cross was found at the site but it might not have been connected to the time of the mosaic floors.[[59]](#footnote-59)

The easterly orientation could be indicative of a Christian building but synagogues all over Asia Minor (Sardis, Miletus, Priene) were oriented towards the east, just as Christian churches were.[[60]](#footnote-60)

***Conclusion***

Even if the Basilica of Mopsuestia cannot yield definitive evidence of a mixed use civic building, the concept is worth considering for all ambiguous sites.

1. Levine, Lee I. *The Ancient Synagogue, The First Thousand Years* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2005), p. 251. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. Avi-Yonah, Michael. “The Mosaics of Mopsuestia – Church or Synagogue?” Ed. Lee I. Levine. *Ancient Synagogues Revealed* (Detroit, Wayne State University Press, 1982), p. 186 [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. The issue of dating the site is beyond the scope of the paper as scholars agree the featured mosaics, which are the basis of the thesis, fall between the 4th-6th century CE, a cohesive period for Christianity. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. Budde, Ludwig. *Antike Mosaiken in Kilikien* (Germany: Verlag Aurel Bongers Recklinghausen, 1969). [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. Levine, Lee I., p. 251. [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. Bieler, Andre. *Architecture in Worship: the Christian Place of Worship* (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1965), p. 4-5. [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
7. Bieler, p. 6-8. [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
8. Levine, Lee I., ed. *Ancient Synagogues Revealed* (Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1982), p. 1. [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
9. Bieler, p. 17. [↑](#footnote-ref-9)
10. Levine, p. 3-4. [↑](#footnote-ref-10)
11. Barker, Kenneth, ed. *NASB Study Bible* (Grand Rapids:Zondervan, 1999). [↑](#footnote-ref-11)
12. Bieler, p. 15. [↑](#footnote-ref-12)
13. White, Michael L. *The Social Origins of Christian Architecture, Vol. 1* (Valley Forge: Trinity Press International, 1990), p. 117. [↑](#footnote-ref-13)
14. Bieler, p. 28. [↑](#footnote-ref-14)
15. Tsarfir, Yoram, ed. *Ancient Churches Revealed* (Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 1993), p. 13. [↑](#footnote-ref-15)
16. Tsarfir, p. 18. [↑](#footnote-ref-16)
17. Tsarfir, p. 18. [↑](#footnote-ref-17)
18. Kitzinger, Ernst. *Israeli Mosaics of the Byzantine Period* (UNESCO, 1965), p. 11. [↑](#footnote-ref-18)
19. Tsarfir, p. 1-18. [↑](#footnote-ref-19)
20. Foley, Edward. From Age to Age (Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 1996), p. 88-90. [↑](#footnote-ref-20)
21. Avi-Yonah, Michael. “The Mosaics of Mopsuestia – Church or Synagogue? Ed. Lee I. Levine. *Ancient Synagogues Revealed* (Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1982), p. 186-190. [↑](#footnote-ref-21)
22. Avi-Yonah, p. 186. [↑](#footnote-ref-22)
23. Skanberg, Tuve. *Lecture CH546*, 2/24/2010. [↑](#footnote-ref-23)
24. Levine, p. 362. [↑](#footnote-ref-24)
25. Avi-Yonah, p. 186 [↑](#footnote-ref-25)
26. Levine, p. 307. [↑](#footnote-ref-26)
27. Avi-Yonah, p. 188. [↑](#footnote-ref-27)
28. Skanberg, Tuve. *Lecture CH546*, 2/10/2010. [↑](#footnote-ref-28)
29. Levine, ed. *Ancient Synagogues Revealed*, p. 228. [↑](#footnote-ref-29)
30. Levine, ed. *Ancient Synagogues Revealed*, p. 9. [↑](#footnote-ref-30)
31. Budde, p. 61. [↑](#footnote-ref-31)
32. Tsarfir, p.260-1. [↑](#footnote-ref-32)
33. Levine, *The Ancient Synagogue*, p. 619. [↑](#footnote-ref-33)
34. Avi-Yonah, Michael. *Ancient Mosaics* (London: Cassell, 1975), p. 41-61. [↑](#footnote-ref-34)
35. Levine, p. 619-621. [↑](#footnote-ref-35)
36. Budde, image 131. [↑](#footnote-ref-36)
37. Avi-Yonah, p. 187. [↑](#footnote-ref-37)
38. Avi-Yonah, p. 190. [↑](#footnote-ref-38)
39. Levine, ed., p. 6. [↑](#footnote-ref-39)
40. Baumgarten, Joseph M. “Art in the Synagogue”, Ed. Steven Fine. *Jews, Christians, and Polytheists in the Ancient Synagogue* (London: Routledge, 1999), p. 82. [↑](#footnote-ref-40)
41. White, Michael L. *The Social Origins of Christian Architecture*, *Vol. 1* (Valley Forge, Trinity Press International, 1990), p. 86. [↑](#footnote-ref-41)
42. Jensen, Robin Margaret. *Understanding Early Christian Art* (New York: Routledge, 2000), p. 30. [↑](#footnote-ref-42)
43. Avi-Yonah, *Ancient Mosaics*, p. 88. [↑](#footnote-ref-43)
44. White, p. 86. [↑](#footnote-ref-44)
45. Levine, The Ancient Synagogue, p. 294. [↑](#footnote-ref-45)
46. Levine, p. 295. [↑](#footnote-ref-46)
47. Johnson, Todd. *Lecture CH546,* 2/17/2010. [↑](#footnote-ref-47)
48. White, p. 87. [↑](#footnote-ref-48)
49. Catto, Stephen K. Reconstructing the First-Century Synagogue (New York: T&T Clark, 2007), p. 3. [↑](#footnote-ref-49)
50. White, p. 87. [↑](#footnote-ref-50)
51. Jensen, Robin M. “The Dura Europos Synagogue, Early-Christian Art, and Religious Life in Dura Europos.” Ed. Steven Fine, Ed. Steven Fine. *Jews, Christians, and Polytheists in the Ancient Synagogue* (London: Routledge, 1999), p. 174. [↑](#footnote-ref-51)
52. White, p. 93-97. [↑](#footnote-ref-52)
53. White, p. 98-101. [↑](#footnote-ref-53)
54. Crawford, John S. “Jews, Christians, and Polytheists in Late-Antique Sardis.” Ed. Steven Fine. Ed. Steven Fine. *Jews, Christians, and Polytheists in the Ancient Synagogue* (London: Routledge, 1999), p. 190-200. [↑](#footnote-ref-54)
55. Levine, ed. *The Ancient Synagogue*, p. 228. [↑](#footnote-ref-55)
56. Avi-Yonah, Michael. *Ancient Mosaics*, p. 88-91. [↑](#footnote-ref-56)
57. Crawford, p. 190. [↑](#footnote-ref-57)
58. Catto, Stephen K. Reconstructing the First-Century Synagogue (New York, T & T Clark International, 2007), p. 10-13. [↑](#footnote-ref-58)
59. Avi-Yonah, p. 189. [↑](#footnote-ref-59)
60. Avi-Yonah, p. 189. [↑](#footnote-ref-60)