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This Festschrift is dedicated to our dear friend and esteemed colleague Professor John F. Healey, who will celebrate his 65th birthday at the beginning of 2013. Professor Healey was born on 10th February 1948 in Leeds, UK, and studied in Dublin and Cambridge before completing his doctorate on Ugaritic in 1977 at the School of Oriental and African Studies, London, under the supervision of the late Professor Donald Wiseman.

Professor Healey has been an active teacher and researcher since 1973, and for nearly four decades his teaching abilities and scientific publications have been appreciated by numerous students and scholars all over the world. He is one of the leading researchers in Nabataean and Semitic Studies, and one of the most cited researchers in Nabataean civilization as well as Syriac studies.

Professor Healey taught in several British universities including Birmingham and Cardiff, and in 1989 joined the University of Manchester. He was a Visiting Fellow at All Souls College, Oxford, and a Visiting Scholar at St John’s College, Oxford. He is a Fellow of the British Academy.

Professor Healey taught countless students and has been a supervisor for M.A. and Ph.D. students of different nationalities at the University of Durham and the University of Manchester. Many of his students were from the Middle East.

He edited several books, and his immense contributions to scholarship are indicated by his record of publications. He is one of the editors of the *Journal of Semitic Studies*, as well as being on the editorial boards of a number of other academic journals.

Professor Healey is a scholar with an interesting and remarkable formidable research profile. He has been active in the following fields of research: Semitic languages; history of the alphabet; Ugaritic studies (including language and religion); Hebrew and the Hebrew Bible; Aramaic epigraphy and linguistics (especially Egyptian Aramaic, Nabataean-
an, Palmyrene and Hatran Aramaic) and Syriac. He has also contributed to research on the Middle East during the Greek and Roman periods, Mandaic and the Mandaeans, as well as legal history (pagan and early Jewish legal documents).

He shared his expertise and knowledge internationally through visiting positions within the UK and participation in dozens of cultural events in different parts of the world.

We, the editors and contributors of this volume, are delighted to dedicate this work to our friend, teacher, and colleague, John F. Healey. We congratulate him on an outstanding career and academic reputation, and research that has profoundly influenced many people throughout his decades of teaching and research.

We are proud to offer Professor Healey this volume of essays by so many scholars who are highly appreciative of his efforts. Our warmest thanks go to them and to for their stimulating essays and commitment to this publication, and to Melonie Schmierer for copy-editing the text.

Zeyad Al-Salameen and George Kiraz
Editors
March 2012
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KAMKAM THE NABATAEAN PRIESTESS:
PRIESTHOOD AND SOCIETY IN ANCIENT ARABIA

HATOON AL FASSI
KING SAUD UNIVERSITY & QATAR UNIVERSITY

The inscribed tomb of the woman Kamkam has generated speculation ever since its discovery. Dated to 1 BCE (making it one of the earliest-known Nabataean inscribed tombs), the tomb is that of a woman of al-Hijr/Hegra who dedicated her tomb to her daughter and her daughter’s offspring. Kamkam is an unusual figure, and this paper proposes that her genealogy and deities mentioned in her tomb inscription indicate that she was in fact a priestess.

PRIESTHOOD AND SOCIETY IN ANCIENT ARABIA

To explore the role that priests and priestesses played in ancient Arabia, we will first move forward in time to the pre-Islamic era, and a 5th-century CE reference to the priestess of al-Hijr or Hegra (Madain Saleh). According to this story, 1 Abdel Muttalib bin Hashim, the grandfather of the Prophet Muhammad, made a vow to Allah that if he was given 10 sons he would slaughter one once they had reached puberty in gratitude to Allah and as revenge for an earlier dispute with his tribe of

Quraysh about digging the historic and holy well of Zamzam. He was eventually granted ten sons, and set about fulfilling his vow. He met with each of his sons to tell them of his vow and asked that each write his name on a lot to be presented to the god Hubal. The priest or guardian of the god would then draw from the lots, and select the son for slaughter. The lot fell to Abdullah, the youngest son and future father of the Prophet. When the notables of his tribe, the Quraysh, heard of this, they insisted that he not fulfil his vow and that he find another solution so that slaughtering of sons would not become a tradition. They asked that he postpone the slaughter of his son until he could find a way to be excused from the vow, and offered their help with the ransom no matter what the cost might be.

The priestess of al-Ḥijr/Ḥegra was proposed as an arbitrator, and that the final decision on slaughter or ransom would fall to her. The unhappy Abdel Muttalib visited the priestess at Khaybar, and she agreed to leave and consult her medium whom she would ask for advice. When she returned the following day she told the men that she had an answer and asked them about the customary cost of blood money, diyyah. When Abdel Muttalib told her the diyyah was ten camels, the priestess said that he should go home and slaughter ten camels and then to draw lots to choose between the camels and his son. If the lot should fall on Abdullah, Abdel Muttalib should add another ten camels and slaughter them. If the lot then fell on the camels, it would mean that the god was satisfied and his son would be saved. Returning to Makkah, Abdel Muttalib prayed to Allah and invited him to choose between his son Abdullah and the ten camels. The lot fell on Abdullah. He added a further ten and again the lot fell on Abdullah and this continued until the camels numbered one hundred, when the lot then fell on the camels and the god was satisfied. The happy father was prepared to slaughter the hundred camels as ransom for his son Abdullah, but to be certain he insisted on repeating the drawing of lots three times, and each time it pointed to the camels. He then slaughtered the camels and left them to God, not letting any person or animal eat them.

According to the version of the story related above, the priestess of al-Ḥijr/Ḥegra, was not based in al-Ḥijr/Ḥegra but in Khaybar, a town with a prominent Jewish community in the 7th century. However, the
earlier source for this story, Ibn Hišām, did not mention al-Hijr/Hegra, but al-Hijaz. According to him, Abdel Muttalib went to Yatrib (Madinah), but eventually found the priestess in Khaybar, as in the story of Ibn al-Athīr. It seems that the towns were similarly known for their oracle-givers, and the relatively short distance separating the two (approximately 100 km apart) may also have contributed to some confusion between them.

As far as I am aware, this story is not repeated in any other early Islamic source, but among the details agreed in its two versions are that there was a tradition of prediction and oracles-givers in Wadi al-Qura, in north-western Arabia (where the two towns lie), and this was a speciality exclusive to priestesses.

In antiquity, priestesses were typically associated with a ruling male relation. The first queens or wives of a king known to be high priestesses were Baranamtara of Lagash, the wife of Lugalanda, (ca. 2350 BCE), and Shag-Shag, the wife of Urukagina, also of the Early Dynastic Period in Ur. Enlēduanna, the daughter of Sargon of Akkad (ca. 2371–2316 BCE), was the high priestess of the Moon-God Nanna of Ur and the temple of An, the supreme God of Heaven, at Uruk. Enlēduanna is also the first known poetess, and left poetry and hymns to the goddess Inanna. She was followed by Enmenanna, daughter of Naram-Sin, who held the same position of Enlēduanna and called herself ‘wife of Nanna’. The tradition of appointing princesses as high-priestesses continued throughout the Sumerian and Akkadian periods.

In ancient Egypt, a similar role was occupied by royal women. In the time of Ramesses II (1289–1224 BCE) and later, they served as the so-called ‘God’s Wife of Amun, a role that combines the divine with the human in her person’. Priestesses belonged to society’s upper class, either by their connection to royalty or other elites. It seems that sacred

---

2 Ibn Hišām, strah 1: 201.
3 See for example this Akkadian proverb: ‘Man is the shadow of a god and a slave is the shadow of a man; but the king is the mirror of a god’ (Nemet-Nejat 1998: 217).
4 Woolley 1934: 33ff.
6 Hollis 1997: 224.
marriage was not exclusive to the king or priestesses: we find that in southern Arabia Madin (Minaean) women were given in marriage to the God ‘Attar, who chose himself a woman on a certain day each year.\footnote{RES 3306; Naim 2000: 710–713.}

Priests and priestesses were guardians of the gods and goddesses’ interests, preservers of their temples, supervisors of the gifts offered and sacrifices presented, mediators between gods and worshippers, making known their oracles, supervising the fertility cult of sacred marriage (especially in Sumer and Akkad), and writers and readers of the appropriate hymns and poems.\footnote{Frymer-Kensky 1992: 64.} It is possible that the Nabataean king was also the high priest of Dushara, since Dushara is the dynastic god, ‘God of (our) Lord’,\footnote{al-Fassi, 2007: 28.} and that the queen was the high priestess of the mother goddess, Allāt-Isis.\footnote{Ibid, pp. 32–35.}

Nabataean priests appear under different titles, which may denote either a hierarchy or simply different linguistic derivations. Among these titles are khn (kāhin), kmr (kamar),\footnote{Not found in Arabic.} rb (rabb) and ʾpkl (ʾafkal) and others. John F. Healey has provided a comprehensive discussion as to their probable functions,\footnote{Healey 2001: 163–164.} and it appears that reference to several of these titles for a particular god or goddess indicates a hierarchy rather than a mere linguistic difference. For Allāt, three priesthood titles are cited in two inscriptions from Wadi Ramm, which refer to a khn ʾltw ʾltw (ʾlht(’)), kāhin of Allāt the goddess,\footnote{Savignac 1932: No. 2.} and an ʾpkl.\footnote{Savignac 1933: No. 2.} A third, found in Hebran in Hawrān and dating from 47 CE, refers to a kmr ʾlt, kamar of Allāt.\footnote{CIS, II, 611.}

Al-ʿUzzā priests were given the title kāhin and appear frequently in Sinai.\footnote{CIS,II,170.} Savignac has noted that the word khn is unfamiliar in Aramaic and suggests that this word is a borrowing from Arabic,\footnote{CIS,II,170.} whereas Teixidor has regarded it as more relevant to the Canaanite culture than
Arabian. Her priests in pre-Islamic Arabia were from the tribe of banū Ṣaybān from Sulaym. In the early Arabic Islamic sources, the kāhin and sādin were those who predict, tellers of secrets of the past and present and utterers oracles, giving the exegesis of dreams with the aid of jinn, spirits or underworld creatures. There were famous kāhins at the eve of Islam, such as Saṭī and Šiqq, as well as priestesses, kāhināt, such as Sujāh and others. There is no information about Manāt’s priests, although references to her appear equally in male and female tombs at Hegra. She is the deity referred to most often after Dushara (that is, six times in five tombs: H 8, 16, 19, 31, 34). In pre-Islamic Arabia, her priests could also be men, and the clan of ‘Attāb son of Mālik from the tribe of Taqif were her servants or sadanah (pl. of sādin).

Afkal, from Akkadian apkallu, means ‘the wise,’ and this term is also found in Liyānite inscriptions (JS 277: afkal of Allāt). It is also found in many inscriptions from Sinai, in Tal al-Šuqafiyyah, in Siḥ Sīdrah and other places for different deities. Savignac has suggested that afkal was probably the highest religious authority, since the builders of the sanctuary at Ramm called themselves ʿlymw or ġlymw, ‘the servants’, of the afkal, a term normally used in relation to the Lord, or the king. Km, in Official Aramaic kmr (from Akkadian kumru) for ‘priest’ appears twice in Nabataean. Once with Allāt in Hebran and once in the Temple of Winged Lions in Raqamū-Petra, which Hammond has argued belongs to Allāt.

---

18 Teixidor 1995: 121.
19 Ibn Hilām, strah I: 78; Ibn al-Kalbī 22.
21 Ibn al-Kalbī 16.
22 Teixidor 1995: 121.
23 Littmann & Meredith 1954: No. 81; CIS, II, 526; 506, 526, 608, 766, 1236, 1748, 1885, 2491, 2665.
24 Savignac 1933: 412.
26 CIS, II, 170.
The title ptwr is attested twice in Ḥegra and Raqamū-Petra inscriptions (H 29), which might mean, according to Healey, ‘diviner or perhaps a military augur advising on campaigns on the basis of entrails, dreams and astrology’, a function possibly related to the early Arab tradition of divination by the flight of birds.

The word for ‘priestess’ is so far unattested in Nabataean. However, it is found in Lihyānite as ʾfkt which could also be ʾfkl (JS 64L) or the priest of Allat, where the ʾlam is assimilated. Pre-Islamic priestesses were known in Arabia and a few references are given here. Among these priestesses, kāhināt, there was Fatimah al-Ḥaṭʿamiyyah in Makkah, Zarqāʾ al-Yamāmah in Najd, kāhinat bani Saʿd in Wadi al-Qura (mentioned above), Hadas, from the north Arabian tribe of Ġanam, Turayfah, kāhinah of Yemen, Zabrāʾ, between al-Ṣhr and Ḥadramawt, and Salmā al-Ḥamdāniyyah al-Ḥimyariyyah.

The priestess’ role was not merely as a funcionary of the rituals or the oracle of a certain god or goddess, or to remove the spirits from a possessed person. Her role also included what in modern classification would be listed under ‘health and trade’ or more generally, the ‘public sector’. Discrimination between the public (and the secular) and the sacred have been challenged by anthropological and social studies. Here it is useful to point out some of the roles attributed to the temple and its functionaries that clarify how the ‘sacred’ system functioned.

The different roles played by priests and priestesses includes all of the following: supervision of different rituals, such as weddings, births, funerals, perhaps also circumcision; possibly the knowledge of different herbs making them expert healers; Possible involvement in ceremonies of procreation (what was known in ancient Sumer as the ‘sacred marriage’, usually conducted between the goddess Inanna-Iṣhtar - the love
and fertility goddess - or her representative, and the king, the representative of Dumuzi, Inanna’s husband, which has been interpreted in later Greek literature on Babylonia and Syria as ‘temple prostitution’).  

Moreover, since the institution of the temple in most ancient societies functioned as a bank (for example in Mesopotamia). In today’s terms, priests and priestesses would be expected to be involved in financial arrangements. The temple collected tithes or taxes on silver, gold, offerings or provisions, as well as silver or bronze coinage. The percentage of such tithes collected is not clear in the inscription found on the inner wall of the Winged Lions Temple in Raqamū-Petra. Similar arrangements are known in Jerusalem and Hatra for the setting up in public of religious rules, and a share was to be given to the priest. Also included were fines collected on breaching tomb contract conditions, as found in Hegra. The inscription on the Kamkam tomb (JS 16; H 16) clearly specifies a fined sum to be paid to the priest. In addition to these sources of revenue, the temple was paid expiation. The Winged Lions Temple inscription has a reference to a condition of payment for acts of delinquency. Although the meaning is not clear, as the slab on which the inscription is written is broken in half, one would expect such functions to take place in the temple, or that such money would be paid in to the temple. Similarly, southern Arabia has left us an abundance of expiation inscriptions.

The money that entered the treasury of the temple facilitated investment deals that priests and priestesses would have entered into, probably investment in the caravan trade in the main, but also lending money to the state or private individuals. Traces of the economic role of temples are found in early Sumer and later, where the temple was the commercial centre, and priests and priestesses were undoubtedly engaged in the commercial transactions that took place there.

Furthermore, the temple was also used as an archive centre or record house, as was noted twice in a Nabatean papyrus and on

---

38 Healey 2001: 164.
39 Hammond et al 1986: 78, 1.2.
Therefore, the temple with its crew of priests, priestesses, servants, slaves, worshippers, perhaps ‘temple prostitutes’, and perhaps travellers who stayed there, was self-sufficient. The temple functioned as a home for its priests and servants, as well as all the other roles it probably played. It encompassed the *ḥaram* or sacred space that was protected by the sanctity of the temple’s god or goddess. Its premises would usually include a source of water (either a well, cistern or spring), as seen in Allāt’s temple of Wadi Ramm. A *ḥaram* would be expected also to include a cemetery. It can be supposed that the priesthood, similar to other professions, was hereditary within a family. Children were usually dedicated to the service of the god or goddess, and this is found in many traditions, including those of Arabia, Babylonia, Egypt and Syria. Priests and priestesses had special familial or marital arrangements that did not necessarily reflect common customs, and this might have included celibacy or giving birth to children from unknown men. More of these customs are discussed in the example below.

To summarize, any attempt in the study of ancient societies to separate the spheres of social life on the basis of a division between the religious and the secular, or the sacred and the political/social, will not prove useful or informative, and it can easily perpetuate the belief that a real distinction existed.

**KAMKAM THE PRIESTESS**

The owner of tomb B19 in Ḥegra, Kamkam daughter of Wāʾilah daughter of Ḥarām, is of particular significance here. Her tomb has interesting features that can allow speculation about her identity (see plate with courtesy to Prof Healey). Kamkam’s tomb has an early date (1 BCE), and in it she ordains a fine not to the king but to the priest, the *afkal*. She does not name him or the god(dess) to whom he ministers. This is the only inscription that refers to a priest and ordains fines for

---

41 Yadin 1963; 2002 doc 3; JS 36.
42 JS 16; H16; T205, B19: 1BCE/CE
dnh kpr dy ṭbš kmkm brt wlt brt bmmw
wklyt bth hplthm w/hltm hbrt st bns
dʾ brnt mlk nhw rhm ’nh wylʾn dwšrʾ
dwšrʾ wlt mn ’mrnd wmmwth wght m m ybn
kprʾ dnh ’w m ybn ’w yrhn ’w yrhn yh ’w ynpq
him in addition to fines for the gods. It is expected that the fine that went to a deity went, in fact, to the temple. This case specifying the priest with a special fine shows, however, the important role that religion and the temple played in society at the end of the 1st century BCE. It is significant that Kamkam did not specify a fine for the king, and interestingly the other contemporary tomb (B6, which also dates from 1 BCE) also does not ordain any fines for gods or kings (JS 8; H 8). It is possible that fines paid to the king were in fact a later feature, copying an earlier allocation that directed fines to the priest. Another possibility is that in this period at the beginning of Nabataean rule over the city, the priest occupied a higher and more prestigious position in Ḥeгран society than the king or his representative, the governor.

Another unusual aspect of Kamkam’s tomb inscription relates to her matrilineal genealogy. It seems possible that Kamkam was associated with the type of temple where women were dedicated to the gods and might have undertaken sacred procreation rituals. It is possible on

---

1. This is the tomb which Kamkam d. of Wāʾilah d. of Ḥarām 2. and Kulaybah, her daughter, made for themselves and their descendants. In the month of Tebet, the 3. ninth year of Ḥarīṭah, King of the Nabataeans, lover of his people. And may Dushara 4. and his throne and Allāt of Ḥamadh and Manāt and her Qaysa curse anyone who sells 5. this tomb or who buys it or gives it in pledge or makes a gift of it or removes 6. from it body or limb or who buries in it anyone other than Kamkam and her daughter 7. and their descendants. And whoever does not act according to what is written above shall be liable 8. to Dushara and Hubal and to Manāt in the sum of 5 shamads and to the exorcist-priest for a fine of a 9. thousand areṭite selaʿs, except that whoever produces in his hand a document from the hand of 10. Kamkam or Kulaybah, her daughter, regarding this tomb, this document will be valid. 11. Wahaballāḥ s. of ʿAbdʿObadah 12. made it (Healey 1993b)
this basis, therefore, to explain why she dedicated her fine to the priest ʾpkl\(^\text{43}\) and not to the king, since her first loyalty was to the gods and the head of the temple. Alessandra Avanzini has written of women who appear in some South Arabian inscriptions with matrilineal genealogies: ‘il me semble opportun de les [polyandry and matrilineality] envisager comme des phénomènes propres à des femmes au statut spécial, probablement non-mariées, peut-être liées au culte’.\(^\text{44}\) It seems probable, therefore, that Kamkam was, in fact, a priestess, member of the second or third generation of priestesses dedicated to the temple. Hereditary professions are known in the ancient world, and it is not inconceivable that there would be a family of servants of the temple. She would have belonged to a priesthood level below that of ʾpkl.

The question remains: in whose temple was Kamkam a hereditary priestess? Kamkam, in addition to the fines, invoked particular gods for certain curses. They include Manāt and her Qays, Allāt from ʿAmnad, and Dushara’s throne, in addition to Dushara proper, and the god Ḥubal, all receiving fines. Kamkam’s inscription provides the names of five gods and two specific epithets. That is not particularly helpful in identifying which god or goddess she was priestess of, or which god the priest served, and this must remain an enigma until a temple is uncovered in Hegra and more inscriptions are found.

The exterior of her tomb is also interesting, and has an unusual design with a bas-relief of an eagle centred on the arch of the door. Curiously enough, this feature is not found in any other tomb in Hegra. Although one can relate the eagle to a solar god identified with Du-shara,\(^\text{45}\) this is not enough to establish the principal god for whom Kamkam served as priestess. The goddess Manāt, principle goddess in the Hijāz, is also a possible contender. A final and simple solution is that Kamkam was not a priestess of a specific god or goddess, but rather for all the gods known in Hegra and northern Arabia, both old and new. A dedication to all the gods also appears in the female Taymanite tomb of Wadūṭ (JS 11-12; H 11-12).

\(^\text{43}\) A partly similar situation is found in the Tal al-Šuqāfiyyah inscription, which is dated after the Ptolemaic king as well as the priest, ʾpkl (see Strugnell 1959: 31-2).

\(^\text{44}\) Avanzini 1991: 161.

\(^\text{45}\) Healey 1993a.
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Al Fassi Plate 1: Tomb of Kamkam, the Priestess B19: JS 16; H 16 (photo J. Healey)