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Creating Civic Space through Religious Innovation?

The Case of the Post-Seleucid Beqaa Valley

Michael Sommer

Strolling through the Beqaa Valley and the mountain ranges which surround the plateau is an extraordinary adventure. Within no time, you are likely to bump into either a checkpoint manned by martial Hezbollah warriors, or a Roman temple. That is how ubiquitous both literally are. Your guess is correct: this paper is not about Hezbollah, but about the in total forty-six Roman temples which are the most conspicuous, and at the same time the most mysterious, heritage of the Beqaa’s Roman history. To be precise, I will not focus on the sanctuaries of Baalbek, which duly receive much scholarly attention, but rather on the temples of all sizes and types which adorn the more remote parts of the area. These temples which date from the 1st to 3rd centuries AD make the Beqaa one of the densest sacral landscapes of the ancient world. All the same, it is not easy to explain their existence. Remote as they were, they hardly were centres of pilgrimage, nor could they have acted as civic sanctuaries, for the Beqaa Valley, in sharp contrast to the Phoenician coastal plain, lacks anything which could be labelled an urban settlement before Late Antiquity. Its striking fertility and importance for interregional traffic notwithstanding, the Beqaa Valley always was, and practically still is, an overwhelmingly rural area.

The Sanctuaries

The two volumes published by Daniel Krencker and Willy Zschietzschmann in 1938 still represent the most comprehensive study of the sanctuaries of the Beqaa Valley and the neighbouring mountains. They are based on fieldwork carried out by members of the German Baalbek expedition (1901-1904) and on a survey done by the authors in 1933. Though some new evidence has been found since then (in particular a number of inscriptions, many of them still unpublished), the major results of Krencker’s and Zschietzschmann’s study are unchallenged down to the present day. A century ago, when the Baalbek expedition visited them, many of the buildings were in a much better condition than today, a number of ‘Green Revolutions’, political crises and civil wars later. It should not be forgotten that the Roman architectural heritage of Lebanon, as well as the legacy of other historical periods, is under constant threat and its gradual decay seems to be irresistible in many parts of the country.

The temples which stand on the slopes of Mount Lebanon, Mount Hermon and the Antilebanon, can be chronologically divided into two groups. The typological criteria for the relative dating include the style and scale of the ornament, forms of profiles, existence of a podium and size of the stones. Generally, it can be said that the earlier sanctuaries
- are less rich in ornament and decoration;
- have profiles which reflect pre-Hellenistic (‘Phoenician’) forms;
- lack a podium and crypt;
- are built of smaller stones.

In addition, Krencker and Zschietzschmann pointed out that most buildings belonging to the second group seem to have been unfinished. The ‘Phoenician’ style of the earlier temple as well as the alleged unfinished state of the later ones may be questionable criteria, but the remaining ones are in line with observations from elsewhere in the Roman Near East and need not be doubted. An absolute chronology can be established on the base of some extant building inscriptions. Three inscriptions serve as criteria for the absolute chronology of the first group: they all point towards the middle of the 1st century AD. According to two other inscriptions, the second group can be attributed to the period of Commodus and the Severans, roughly the late 2nd century AD.

Thirty-six of the forty-six sanctuaries either belong to the second group or cannot be dated with certainty. Those temples dating to the Antonine or Severan periods were built at a time when Rome firmly controlled the Beqaa Valley and the neighbouring mountain ranges. Historically more interesting are therefore the ten remaining tem-
ples belonging to the Julio-Claudian period, and hence to a time when Roman power was still in the process of taking shape. Six of them lie in the massif of Mount Lebanon: Bet Jalluk, Bziza, Afqa, Qalaat Faqra, Niha and Shlifa.

The temple of Bet Jalluk (fig. 1) near the modern village of Fnaideq on the western slopes of Mount Lebanon, a few kilometres from Tripolis, is a middle-sized peripteros, overlooking the charming valley of the Nahr al-Musa. The temple was already badly preserved when the Baalbek expedition did its survey. The temple featured a cela with prostyle in antis and an elevated adyton, but no podium.

Fig. 1. Plan of temple at Bet Jalluk, from Krencker/Zschietzschmann 1938, Taf. 52.

Fig. 2. Temple ruins at Bziza, from Krencker/Zschietzschmann 1938, Taf. 4.
The prostyle in the modern village of Bziza (fig. 2), to the south of Tripolis, with its four Ionian columns is much better preserved. The sanctuary, which has no podium, had once been converted into a church. Two entranceways provide access from the pronao to the cella, a massive portal with a lavishly decorated border and a tiny door to its left. The central intercolumniation of the front portico is much wider than the lateral ones. Both the side entrance to the cella and the unequal width of the intercolumniations make the Bziza temple distinctive.

In the vicinity of the headwaters of the creek Afqa lie the remains of a major Corinthian prostyle with an elevated adyton. Eusebius of Caesarea, who notes its destruction by order of Constantine, attributes the sanctuary to the source goddess Aphrodite Aphakitis (Vit. Const. 3.55).

Both temples belonging to the complex of Qalaaat Faqra date to the first phase. They are located about twenty kilometres west of Beirut, over 1,800 m high, near the ridge of Mount Lebanon. The larger temple is a Corinthian prostyle which stands in a rectangular courtyard on a low podium (fig. 3). It features an adyton subdivided into three parts which towers over the cella. According to Krencker and Zschietschmann, the adyton had a flat roof with a crenellated fringe, whereas cella and pronoes were covered with a saddle roof. The temple, erected above impressive substructures, was dedicated to a deity named Beelgalasos. The second temple, smaller in size, is comparatively badly preserved. It was dedicated to Atargatis. The small temple features only two rooms, an antecella and an adyton, lacking any kind of pronao and even columns. In addition to the two temples, the complex of Qalaaat Faqra consisted of a tower-like building with at least two floors (perhaps a tomb tower) and a structure with columns believed to be an altar. A number of inscriptions have been found throughout the complex, the one in the tower dating the building to the year 355 of the Seleucid era (AD 43/44).

Close to Zahle in the western Beqaa, in a tributary valley, lies the site of Niha with its two large prostyles. The larger temple A dates to the second phase. Temple B, smaller and in a considerably worse state of preservation, belongs to the mid-1st century AD (fig. 4). In the imperial period the site belonged to a pagus Augustus, but was most likely inhabited by a local population. In temple B, a cippus was found dedicated to the god Haranes, who is also testified in Hierapolis-Bambyke on the Euphrates, and the goddess Hachmaea.
The deity is represented in a similar way to those of Baalbek which may point to some sort of relation between the two places of worship. Hadaranis may have been the head of a local triad similar to that of Baalbek.14

Finally, the well-preserved prostylos in antis of Shlifa, overlooking the Beqaa Valley to the northwest of Baalbek, features an elevated adyton and a crypt underneath.

Three temples of the first phase are situated in the Antilebanon: Qasr Nimrud, Bekka and el-Kneise. On the lofty ridge of the mountain massif stands the Dorian peripteros of Qasr Nimrud (fig. 5). The temple had a flat roof. The cella was accessible through three doorways of which the central one was wider and larger - a typical feature of Syrian peripteroi. The rather large prostylos of Bekka is located on the southern slopes of the Antilebanon (fig. 6). The temple has no podium and no traces of an adyton or a crypt. Close to Bekka, towards the east, stands the small prostylos in antis of el-Kneise, a building partly carved into the rock.

Only one temple of the many sanctuaries covering the slopes of Mount Hermon belongs to the first phase with certainty: the sanctuary of the Leukothea in Rahle, in the southern Beqaa.15 Of the temple remains nothing but an inscribed lintel re-used in a Christian basilica. Another temple in the Hermon area, the one of Burkush, may be attributed to roughly the same period.

**The Historical Setting**

The sanctuaries’ importance can be fathomed out only with the peculiar history of the Beqaa Valley since the later Seleucid period in mind. When the empire was in vigour, the region lay close to the Seleucid heartlands in Northern Syria. But its dissolution soon affected central areas of the kingdom as well as the peripheries. In the period of Seleucid agony, from the second half of the 2nd century BC onwards, entire portions broke away from the empire and became practically independent territories under indigenous dynasts. With the empire giving way to an increasing number of petty kingdoms the border between arable land and steppe began to shift. The imperial circuit which, from the dawn of history, determined
the extent of settlement and cultivation in the Near East was set in motion once again.\(^\text{16}\)

This process brought about little states *in statu nascendi*, with dynasties often taking up pre-Hellenistic local traditions and grounded in a notion of ‘ethnic’ identity shared by their subjects.\(^\text{17}\) Part of this fragmented post-Seleucid power-vacuum was the Beqaa Valley, which was the scene of the settlement and ethnogenesis of the Ituraeans.\(^\text{18}\) In the plain, two minor principalities, so-called tetrarchies, arose, one centred at Chalcis,\(^\text{19}\) the other at Arqa.\(^\text{20}\) When Pompey came to Syria in order to establish the new Roman province, the ruler of Chalcis, a certain Ptolemy, son of Mannaios, had sufficient funds to bribe Pompey with a substantial amount of money.\(^\text{21}\) Ptolemy stayed in power and ruled the principality for another quarter of a century. Of the neighbouring (and perhaps rivalling) tetrarchy of Arqa we lack almost any evidence: its eponymous capital was renamed Caesarea under Augustus and was later known as ‘Caesarea of the Ituraeans’.\(^\text{22}\)

But, apparently, the process of sedentarisation and state-building did not affect the entire population of the Beqaa Valley. Strabo points out that an endemic conflict upset the Massyas Valley (the ancient name for the Beqaa), a conflict between the people of the plain, ‘all of whom are peasants’, and those of the mountains, ‘which are now held by Ituraeans and Arabs, who are all brigands’.\(^\text{23}\) According to Strabo, the brigands used fortified places as bases from where they undertook incursions into the cultivated land: ‘From here, the brigands overwhelmed Byblos and the neighbouring city, Berytus, which is located between Sidon and Theuproposopon.’\(^\text{24}\) Stabo notes that not only the Phoenician coastal cities, but also the people living in the fertile Massyas, lived under constant pressure from the *Ituraioi te kai Arabes*. Hardly more flattering to the Ituraeans is Cicero’s charge against Mark Antony that he ordered Ituraeans - *homines omnium gentium maxime barbaros* - to parade on the Forum.\(^\text{25}\)

Strabo’s account requires explanation. To be sure, the use of words such as ‘brigands’ and ‘robbers’ in his work is inflated, but at least in this case it is almost certain that he refers to people with a nomadic lifestyle who populate the slopes of Mount Lebanon and regularly beset the adjacent plains, i.e. the Phoenician coast and the Beqaa Valley. Geography and the use of the ethnonym *Arabes* point to a specific kind of nomadism: one which anthropologists call ‘enclosed nomadism’ and which occurs in combination with transhumance. Transhumance is a specific pattern of pastoralism which until very recently was extremely common in many parts of Scandinavia, Scotland, the Alps, the Balkan Peninsula and Western as well as Central Asia.\(^\text{26}\) It is by no means uniform, neither in its genesis nor in its morphology, and
nomadic transhumance is just one of its many manifestations. Enclosed nomadism, as opposed to present-day Bedouin nomadism, has a far more limited range, tends to be seasonal, and relies heavily on the interaction with settled populations.27

Strabo’s Ituraeans most likely reflect a society practising enclosed nomadism and transhumance between the loftier parts of the mountains and the plains. Conflict and competition between pastoralists and agriculturalists loom when the seasonal migration of the herds affects the arable land of the peasants. The scramble for territory accounts for the bad reputation pastoralists usually have among settled people and it may well underlie Strabo’s and Cicero’s contempt of the Ituraeans. Even though they have different lifestyles, both the people of the plain and those of the mountains apparently shared the same ethnic identity: they were both Ituraeans, and it is unlikely that this is just an ethnic label applied to them by classical authors. Rather, the common ethnic identity of settled agriculturalists and nomadic pastoralists echoes patterns well known from other parts of the Partho-Roman Near East, namely the territories of Hatra, Palmyra and in the Hawran.

In the eastern Jezirah, the city of Hatra maintained close relations with the nomadic population of the surrounding steppe. Migrant pastoralists formed part of the urban institutions, and townspeople and nomads shared bonds of tribal identity, actual or fictitious genealogies and possibly conubium.28 The society of the eastern Jezirah has been characterised as a ‘dimorphic society’, where pastoralists, villagers and urban dwellers live in a symbiotic relationship - from which a mutual solidarity and overlapping sense of tribal affiliation emerge.29 Similar structures seem to have prevailed in the Palmyrene, where nomads participated in the city’s trade, tribal elites spent parts of the year in town and parts in the desert, and genuine tribal identities accounted for the city’s peculiar social and political climate.30 In the Hawran in southern Syria, the evidence suggests that the notion of a shared tribal affiliation survived the process of sedentarisation of parts of a nomadic environment, and the odd conflict between villagers and nomads could not belie the overall image of a peaceful co-existence.31

The example of the Hawran is instructive in more than one way. It is in the scanty environment of this range of hills that we can grasp the dialectic effect that imperial rule had on the equilibrium of a dimorphic society. On the one hand, the co-existence of the Roman military and the pastoralists was rather beneficial for both sides: the so-called ‘Safaites’ in the Hawran supplied animals and meat for the army - certainly not a bad deal for them. Entire tribes entered Roman service in auxiliary units - also a lucrative option which, in addition, in the long run provided the nomads with Roman citizenship. On the other hand, the Roman infrastructure deeply changed the conditions for the pastoralists. Roads cut their territory into pieces, artificial irrigation extended the arable surface and the army watched cultivated land and infrastructure such as quarries and mines. Under such circumstances, pastoralists were marginalised, their sphere of action massively restricted.32

This image from the Hawran, scanty as it is, provides a sustainable analogy for the Beqaa Valley as well: an ethnic group known as the Ituraeans took possession of the plain and the adjacent mountain ranges when the power of the Seleucid Empire faded. Whereas the Ituraeans of the plain, where conditions for agriculture were favourable,33 became gradually sedentary, those of the mountains continued to lead a migratory lifestyle as transhumant pastoralists. Before the coming of Rome, the peasants and their nomadic neighbours lived in a symbiotic relationship in which they continued to perceive themselves as kindred, even though the conditions under which they lived were so utterly different. With the arrival of the Roman empire, the relationship changed gradually. Under the auspices of the Pax Romana, the pastoralists’ base of subsistence became more and more precarious. Those who had once lived in a balance of mutualism with villagers and townspeople were now, under the regime of the imperial peace, dangerous outlaws: Strabo’s robbers and brigands.

In order to control a region which was anything but easy to control for the Romans, Pompey applied the proven instrument of indirect rule. He left in office most of the petty monarchs who ruled the bits and pieces to which the Seleucid Empire had fallen apart. Only the Syrian Tetrapolis and Phoenicia were incorporated in the new province of Syria. The remaining parts - Comagene, the tetrarchies of the Beqaa and the Orontes valley, and of course Hasmonean Judaea - stayed under indigenous dynasts. But Rome was far from running a consistent policy towards its eastern periphery. Rome’s dithering between the granting of autonomy to Judaea and straightforward annexationism since the time of Pompey was characteristic of this inconsistency.34 Its treatment
of the Ituraean question was no better: the successor of Ptolemy of Chalcis, who had bribed Pompey, was deposed and killed by Mark Antony (36 BC), and his territory given to Cleopatra. Augustus divided the small tetrarchy in four even smaller autonomous principalities, which were, in the 1st century AD, gradually incorporated into the Roman province of Syria. The entire land of the Ituraeans definitely came under Roman rule when Agrippa II, who had received parts of the Beqaa under Claudius, died in or shortly after AD 93. The completion of the region’s provincialisation was then in line with the policy of annexation pursued by the Flavians and by Trajan.

THE SANCTUARIES REVISITED - A MODEL

How can the construction boom that changed the Beqaa Valley’s face towards the middle of the 1st century AD be fit in the historical scenery of gradual intensification of Roman rule - from informal to formal empire - in a dimorphic environment? What explains the sudden building activity and why did those who were responsible for the constructions choose such conspicuous but remote sites for the sanctuaries? Finally, who was in charge of the building activity and who paid the money for it?

At least the last question seems relatively easy to answer. The buildings themselves are typical representatives of the specific Near Eastern variation of the Graeco-Roman temple, ‘western’ at first sight, but distinctly local in many less overt features, such as the elevated *adyton* (which most temples in the Beqaa region share), the crypt, the flat roof which can be accessed through spiral staircases and specific local forms of ornament (for example the crenellations framing the tops of their walls). Inscriptions and images point towards local deities (which were often associated with Greek gods) worshipped in the sanctuaries. All this suggests that the people who ordered the building of the temples had local roots. As local rulers, tetrarchs and petty kings were a species threatened by extinction by the time the temples were built; their builders and sponsors are most likely to be found in the nearby towns and villages, in the Phoenician coastal plain, but especially - since most temples face towards the Beqaa - in the great depression between the mountain ranges of Mount Lebanon, Antilebanon and Mount Hermon.

Trickier to answer are the remaining questions. The meaning of the sanctuaries does not become accessible immediately through the buildings themselves. As a matter of course, the individual characters of the deities worshipped in each cult site and the requirements for their respective cults played their decisive roles. And to be sure, rural sanctuaries did exist in many parts of the ancient world - and beyond it. But the placing of sanctuaries and the construction of sacral topographies everywhere followed different patterns. Rural sanctuaries had different meanings and uses, but there seems to be one pattern underlying most rural topographies of the sacred. If we accept that the function of religion consists in attributing meaning to things which seem superficially meaningless, of constituting an autonomous symbolic universe which can be opposed to other, alien and potentially hostile systems of belief and thus of building a protective ‘iron wall’ around the community adhering to it, then sacral topographies convert simple ‘space’ into ‘place’. They cover empty space with meaning and make it, by doing so, accessible to the human mind. In a world view largely defined by religious concepts, rural sanctuaries form barriers of the sacred, ‘remparts symboliques’ as François de Polignac has called them, which delimit human communities from others. Very convincingly, de Polignac has emphasised the key role such sanctuaries played in the formation process of the Archaic Greek polis. Rural sanctuaries serve as symbolic landmarks: they integrate centre and periphery into the structure of one political body, the polis, linking them through periodic, recurrent rituals, processions and feasts. The individual sanctuaries are connected by highly effective, albeit invisible, lines through a landscape which otherwise lacks points of orientation (fig. 7). They mark territory and demarcate zones of ‘ego’ and ‘alter’. The divine beings which inhabit the sanctuaries provide protection against ‘alter’ and enhance the defensive capabilities of the community ensuring its territorial integrity. Safeguarded and structured by its ‘rempart symbolique’, the Archaic Greek *polis* could develop its identity, its institutional framework and its characteristic sense of community embracing town as well as countryside. The ‘rempart symbolique’ is exclusive as well as inclusive.

Some years ago, in an article for *Historia*, I used de Polignac’s model in order to provide an explanation for the early imperial sanctuaries in the Beqaa Valley, emphasising the exclusive function of the ‘rempart symbolique’. I pointed out that the post-Seleucid Beqaa - typologically, not genetically - resembles Archaic Greece, inasmuch as it saw the rise of actors who were in search of
Fig. 7. Map of the Lebanon and Antilebanon mountain ranges, from Krencker/Zschietschmann 1938, Taf. 1.
a collective identity as well as territorial integrity. The temples in this model served as landmarks of the settled, rural population’s victory over the pastoralists of the mountains. Helped by the Romans, the plain’s peasants had got the upper hand over the threat of nomadism.

Taking into account the dimorphic background of the Beqaa’s population and the symbiotic, though at times ambivalent, relationship between nomads and peasants, I have to revise, or at least to refine, this negative, exclusive model of a sacral topography. The temples which linked the peaks and the remote areas of Mount Lebanon, Mount Hermon and Antilebanon to the plain and its central cult place at Baalbek, did not, or not exclusively, serve to celebrate the triumph over the nomads. Much more than this, they were an outstretched hand towards the nomads, an invitation to join the settled with whom they shared such strong bonds of mutuality and common ethnic identity. Rather than landmarks of victory, they were inclusive symbols of integration, monumental proofs that peaceful co-existence between unequal brothers was a viable option.
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