

THE TRANSFER OF KNOWLEDGE FROM MESOPOTAMIA TO EGYPT

SUSANNE BECK (TÜBINGEN)

Models of Transfer of Knowledge

Several approaches exist in the human and social sciences to dealing with contacts between different cultures.¹ The associated terminology has been the subject of much controversy. There is often no differentiation between the terms “exchange” and “transfer”.² An exchange between two cultures is non-binding but can be either continuable or singular. Exchange can occur over a long or short period.³ In contrast, a transfer of knowledge⁴ between two cultures can be seen in terms of an intentional, deliberate, and reason-based venture. In such instances, goods, be they objects or ideas, are transmitted only when a need arises.⁵ Inspired to analyze these processes, a new method was developed: culture transfer research. This approach usually focuses on the culture, which has received the transmitted (material/immaterial) product and

1 See e.g. TENBRUCK, 1992, pp. 13-35, who discusses the history of cultural comparison and critically analyses the method; Theda SKOCPOL/SOMERS, 1980, pp. 174-197; see also GEROGIORGAKIS/SCHEEL/SCHORKOWITZ, 2011, pp. 385-422; BOSSE, 2013, pp. 65-78; GRASSL, 2014, pp. 313-324. In relation to network theory, see BISANG, 2004, pp. 1-52; REICHE, 2004, pp. 35-69 (with reference to ancient Egypt).

2 GEROGIORGAKIS/SCHEEL/SCHORKOWITZ, 2011, pp. 386f.

3 *IBID.*, p. 395; see also JENSEN, 1998, pp. 51-68; LIVERANI, 2001, pp. 5-8.

4 For other terms used instead of “transfer of knowledge”, see THIEL, 2001, p. 29.

5 GEROGIORGAKIS/SCHEEL/SCHORKOWITZ, 2011, pp. 395f.; BOSSE, 2013, p. 66. For the use of the term “transfer” in different disciplines, see EISENBERG, 2003, p. 414.

investigates how it was adapted.⁶ But for a transfer, it is not only necessary to analyze the receiving culture but also the culture, which produced it and how the product was used there. This is the only way – showing the similarities and the differences – to detect to what extent the transferred product has been changed.⁷ Both material objects and ideas can be transferred.⁸

Several models for describing the transfer of knowledge have been developed in the field of transfer research.⁹ However, in the sphere of industrial management, more detailed theories concerning the procedure of an occurrence of knowledge transfer can be found and therefore one of them is used here. This theory, developed by Karsten Heppner,¹⁰ models the different levels and fields involved in a transfer of knowledge and is briefly discussed below.¹¹

Generally speaking, every transfer consists of three basic units: the producer (*Sender*) – the process of transfer (*Transferprozess*) – the receiver (*Empfänger*).¹² The producer¹³ possesses information or knowledge, which is

6 EISENBERG, 2003, p. 399; BISANG, 2004, pp. 4f.; BOSSE, 2013, p. 66. See also GEROGIORGAKIS/SCHEEL/SCHORKOWITZ, 2011, pp. 392-394; WERNER, 2009, pp. 15-23, gives more general information on the research on cultural transfer.

7 GEROGIORGAKIS/SCHEEL/SCHORKOWITZ, 2011, p. 394; ULF, 2014, p. 509.

8 See WERNER, 2009, p. 15; GEROGIORGAKIS/SCHEEL/SCHORKOWITZ, 2011, pp. 391f., 419.

9 ANTOS, 2001, pp. 3-33, presents a general view of the contents and functions of the transfer research, which he defines (p. 5) as follows: “Die Transferwissenschaft erforscht Bedingungen, Prinzipien, Formen, Strategien sowie Probleme und Erfolgchancen des Metawissens über Wissen zum Zwecke einer nicht eingeschränkten Verfügbarkeit von (Sonder-)Wissen für alle potentiell an Wissen Interessierten.” [*The transfer research investigates conditions, principles, nature, strategies as well as difficulties and chances of success of the metaknowledge for knowledge for the purpose of unlimited availability of (special) knowledge for all potentially interested in knowledge.*]. Compare also note 1.

10 HEPPNER, 1997.

11 Heppner’s theory was developed for the transfer of knowledge in globalized companies. The basic pattern “producer–process of transfer–receiver” was introduced and used before but it was never described in much detail, and that is why Heppner’s pattern is used here. See also HEPPNER, 1997, p. 359. For general information on the transfer of knowledge, see ASH, 2006, pp. 181-189. Compare also STEUER, 2006, pp. 295-330.

12 NORTH, 2009, p. 1, referring to SCHMALE, calls these units *Ausgangskultur* (starting point culture), *Vermittlungsinstanz* (mediating authority) and *Zielkultur* (destination culture). STEUER, 2006, generally speaks about participating actors, in particular about the provider of knowledge and addressee. BALLOD, 2005, pp. 13f., calls them *Emittenten* and *Rezipienten*. GRASSL, 2014, p. 314, calls them producer

relevant to a receiver's issue. The knowledge can either deliberately be given to the receiver ("push principle") or the receiver can ask for it ("pull principle"). In any case, the producer and the receiver assume that there is a need for that specific knowledge.¹⁴ The process of transfer covers all actions necessary to transfer the producer's information to the receiver, including the tailoring of the knowledge to the receiver's problem.¹⁵ The order of actions is determined by certain criteria. In the beginning, the available resources (e.g., time, subjects, etc.) and the environment (e.g., established law, social standards, etc.) are of major interest to the producer in order to make a decision how and to which extent the material/immaterial product is transferred. If the goal of the transfer is known, then the subsequent actions required can be identified.¹⁶ Additionally, the willingness and abilities of the particular individuals should not be underestimated.¹⁷

The transfer of knowledge can be structured into three levels, forming a hierarchy in which the lower levels always form the basis of the higher ones.¹⁸ The basal level is called "learning". Here, the transfer of knowledge takes place between two individuals. The receiver learns something during the transfer process that alters their knowledge base. The knowledge base consists of all forms of knowledge and can be divided into an individual knowledge base, which is part of a person, and a collective knowledge base, which group members have recourse to.¹⁹ The new knowledge need not be exclusively imparted by language but may also be learned through watching.²⁰

and receiver, *Transmittor* (transmitter) and *Rezipient* (receiver). ULF, 2014, p. 513, describes the units as producer, transmitter and recipient.

- 13 Heppner does not differentiate between the producer and/or the holder of knowledge, which is not necessary in the field where his theory was developed. This differentiation can be useful, however it might be difficult to apply in the classical studies considering the usual lack of sources.
- 14 THIEL, 2001, pp. 34-45.
- 15 HEPPNER, 1997, pp. 15, 187; THIEL, 2001, pp. 58-60 (fig. 11).
- 16 HEPPNER, 1997, pp. 16-18, fig. 1; THIEL, 2001, pp. 61-64.
- 17 HEPPNER, 1997, pp. 7f.; BURKE, 2000, p. 17; THIEL, 2001, pp. 39-42 (fig. 5, tables 5, 6), 116, in relation to the motivation of the participating individuals see especially 117-160. For more general information on the conditions, see BISANG, 2004, p. 6; STEUER, 2006, pp. 298-302, fig. 1; ULF, 2014, p. 514.
- 18 HEPPNER, 1997, pp. 187f.; THIEL, 2001, pp. 42f.; compare also ESPAGNE/WERNER, 1985, p. 506.
- 19 HEPPNER, 1997, pp. 187f., 211. See also the following text.
- 20 HEPPNER, 1997, pp. 187f., 190f., 195f., 199; THIEL, 2001, pp. 23, 44f.

Furthermore, it is necessary to consider the type of knowledge that is being transferred in such cases. Knowledge can be divided into two categories according to how it is articulated: *knowing how* and *knowing that*.²¹ *Knowing how* describes any skill or ability in which it is not necessary to know the theory but simply be capable of performing the action: e.g., finding one's way or being able to swim.²² In contrast, *knowing that* describes articulated knowledge, e.g., mathematical theories.²³ Gilbert Ryle, who proposed the division of the different forms of knowledge into *knowing how* and *knowing that*,²⁴ assumed a strict separation of both. Jan Janzen, among others, has pointed out that, if a person has an ability or skill and is unable to perform it due to an accident or an illness, then this person has still the knowledge of this particular activity.²⁵ Hence, the transfer of knowledge is bound by the producer's ability to articulate the knowledge. If they are unable to do so or limited in their ability, the transfer will be complicated.²⁶

The producer is not alone in playing a crucial role in the transfer of knowledge, the receiver is perhaps equally important, and must also meet certain requirements in order to understand the transferred knowledge and thus bring about a successful transfer.²⁷ Questions arise related to the extent of the overlap between the receiver's and the producer's knowledge bases. In general, the larger the shared knowledge base, the more likely a successful

21 For a general discussion of the topics of *knowing how* and *knowing that*, see RYLE, 1990, pp. 26-60.

22 RYLE, 1990, pp. 41, 46; HEPPNER, 1997, p. 200; THIEL, 2001, pp. 17, 99f.; ABEL, 2004, pp. 319-327; JANISCH, 2005, p. 24; HEMPFER/TRANINGER, 2007, pp. 9-12, 17; compare also THIEL, 2001, pp. 11-13.

23 THIEL, 2001, pp. 16f., 20; ABEL, 2004, pp. 322f.; HEMPFER/TRANINGER, 2007, pp. 9-12, 17; JANZEN, 2007, p. 42; cf. also THIEL, 2001, pp. 10f.

24 See RYLE, 1990, pp. 26-60.

25 JANZEN, 2007, pp. 25, 39f., especially 40. From a neurophysiological view, both kinds of knowledge are "saved" in different parts of the brain, see THIEL, 2001, p. 17.

26 Knowledge need not be articulated but can also be obtained through watching (see above). HEPPNER, 1997, pp. 203f.; BURKE, 2000, p. 17; THIEL, 2001, pp. 22f., 47f. BADURA 1971, pp. 79-81; ESPAGNE/WERNER, 1985, p. 507; and BISANG, 2004, p. 5, all validly point out that language plays a major role in an episode of cultural transfer.

27 HEPPNER, 1997, p. 203; THIEL, 2001, pp. 23, 48f. STEUER, 2006, p. 313, remarks that barriers impeding a transfer of knowledge can also develop when both the producer and the receiver are not willing to reflect on the knowledge being transferred and to be responsive to each other.

transfer of knowledge will take place.²⁸ These knowledge bases are influenced by several different factors, including the cultural, national, and professional backgrounds of the individuals. Furthermore, the depth of experience that individuals already were able to acquire in the particular field of the transfer of knowledge is important.²⁹

The next level of a transfer of knowledge is called “socialization” and relates to the ways in which knowledge is transferred between an individual and a collective in a group setting or the other way around. Here “socialization” refers to the process of learning the thought and behavior patterns of the collective.³⁰ The relationship between the individual and the group goes both ways. The contact between the individual and the group can affect both in a positive and a negative way. This contact also results in changes to the knowledge base of both the individual and the group.³¹ During this level, both the ability of the producer or producers to articulate the knowledge being transferred, and the ability of the receiver or receivers to understand it are key (see above).

As just noted, the transfer can go both ways. While the individual’s personal abilities can affect the process, far more important is the structure of the knowledge base. In a group, which is composed of members with different professions and abilities it is more likely that a member of the collective will have a knowledge base that overlaps with the producer.³² After the transmission, the new knowledge has to be communicated so that it can spread within the group. A homogeneous collective (a group with members of same profession and abilities) in contrast, is often more resistant to outside influences and therefore less likely to add new information to its knowledge base.³³

28 HEPPNER, 1997, pp. 209-211; compare also STEUER, 2006, p. 300.

29 HEPPNER, 1997, pp. 210f.; THIEL, 2001, p. 102, for the professional vernacular in this context see BADURA, 1971, p. 91.

30 HEPPNER, 1997, p. 212; see also SEGLER, 1985, p. 138. In general see, among others, ELIAS, 1994, especially the *summary*; PARSONS, 1958, especially pp. 19-88, 212-274, 386-439.

31 HEPPNER, 1997, pp. 213, 219; THIEL, 2001, p. 49. For general information on interactions between an individual and a group, see MEAD, 2010.

32 HEPPNER, 1997, p. 220; THIEL, 2001, pp. 103f.

33 HEPPNER, 1997, pp. 221f., fig. 27, 223f.; THIEL, 2001, pp. 103f.

The highest level of a transfer of knowledge is called “acculturation”³⁴, in which the transfer of knowledge takes place between fully differentiated groups. “Acculturation” refers in Heppner’s model to the adaptive process that occurs when these two groups have direct contact and one or both experience a measurable change. Difficulties can arise however from the collective character of the involved communities.³⁵ Transfer of knowledge in the form of “acculturation” occurs in three stages: contact, conflict and consolidation. It is necessary for the transfer that both groups come in contact to each other and discuss the problem. When the involved groups could find an agreement for the terms of the transfer of knowledge this part (*contact*) is concluded. Following this a period of conflict may occur, in which the old ways of thinking are dropped and new information has to be processed. This information can often be incomprehensible in the beginning resulting in either denial or resistance. Consequently, cooperation between the producer and the receiver can suffer. The relationship between both parties will improve during the consolidation period.

There are four basic outcomes possible depending on how the conflict stage was solved: *integration*, *assimilation*, *segregation*, and *deculturation*. In *integration* the knowledge bases of both communities are combined so that a new interpretive pattern results. The identity of both collectives survives.

Another is *assimilation*, in which a one-sided adaption process occurs. The receiver adopts the producer’s solution, but does not adapt it to its own needs. Usually the new pattern is perceived by the receiver as poor.

In *segregation* both groups make attempts to persuade the other to adopt their own interpretive pattern, but each side’s advice is ignored. Thus either no transmission takes place and the transfer of knowledge fails or the receiver adopts the producer’s interpretive pattern without reflecting on it.

In case of *deculturation*, the receiver drops their old interpretive pattern because it does not provide a solution but also refuses to adopt the producer’s recommendation. Instead transfer of knowledge only occurs in a person to

34 The controversial term “acculturation” is adopted and used here because it is part of Heppner’s model. For general information on the term “acculturation”, see DOHRENWEND/SMITH, 1962, pp. 30-39; BERRY, 1983, pp. 65-78; compare also ESPAGNE/WERNER, 1985, pp. 504f.; GEROGIORGAKIS/SHEEL/SCHORKOWITZ, 2011, pp. 392, 396. For a definition of the term see HEPPNER, 1997, p. 225.

35 HEPPNER, 1997, pp. 225f.; THIEL, 2001, pp. 50f.

person interaction (basal level “learning”). Typically *deculturation* can occur when the groups tried to avoid the conflict.³⁶

Equally, the ability of the producer to articulate the knowledge and the ability of the receiver to comprehend it is in question (see above). Difficulties can arise when the knowledge that is supposed to be transferred is tied to a particular contentual component or a particular structure of the producers’ and receivers’ knowledge bases.³⁷

Moreover every transfer of knowledge brings about a transformation of the knowledge and not every need of every involved member of the groups is met. Furthermore, several communities display a higher degree of willingness to adapt foreign (material/immaterial) products in comparison to others.³⁸ Whether or not the transfer of knowledge is “successful” can be difficult to evaluate because – as mentioned before – the new information has to be transformed and adapted to the receiver’s own problem. Usually, it takes some time before you can see that a change has occurred. Additionally, it is important to identify the extent the producer as well as the receiver are willing to carry out a transfer and show an interest in the other party. Likewise, it is crucial that adequate resources are utilized for the transfer process.³⁹

36 HEPPNER, 1997, pp. 227-231; THIEL, 2001, pp. 51-54. Compare on this also BERRY, 1983, pp. 66-68, especially 68; BURKE, 2000, pp. 28-33; EISENBERG, 2003, pp. 410f.; GEROGIORGAKIS/SCHEEL/SCHORKOWITZ, 2011, p. 397.

37 HEPPNER, 1997, pp. 232-234, fig. 29.

38 SCHRADER, 1999, p. 103; BURKE, 2000, pp. 13, 26; ANTOS, 2001, p. 26; THIEL, 2001, p. 32; EISENBERG, 2003, pp. 399, 404, 410-412; BALLOD, 2005, p. 13; ASH, 2006, p. 183; BURKE, 2009, p. 70; NORTH, 2009, pp. 1f.; WERNER, 2009, p. 17; GEROGIORGAKIS/SCHEEL/SCHORKOWITZ, 2011, pp. 393f., 413, 420; BROSIUS, 2014, p. 286; ULF, 2014, p. 517; compare also ESPAGNE/WERNER, 1985, p. 508.

39 See on this BADURA, 1971, pp. 92, 154f., 157, 163f., 166, 169; BURKE, 2000, pp. 17, 19; ANTOS, 2001, p. 26; THIEL, 2001, pp. 40-42 (fig. 5, tables 5, 6), 65-74 (table 7), 115f.; BALLOD, 2005, pp. 13f., 17; JANISCH, 2005, pp. 25f., 30f., 33, 37; cf. STEUER, 2006, pp. 309, 318-327, especially 324-327, who compiled a catalogue of the things necessary for a “successful” transfer of knowledge. ULF, 2014, pp. 533-551, describes different ways of dealing with new knowledge. See also BECK, 2015a, pp. 237-241. Compare also ELLEN’S paper in this publication.

Cultural Interactions During the New Kingdom (approx. 1550-1070 BCE)

As early as the Early Dynastic Period (approximately 3032-2707 BCE), contacts between the ancient Near East and Egypt existed and increased even further by the New Kingdom. The New Kingdom is characterized by various relations to the Near East. Egyptian military campaigns captured numerous prisoners of war, and many of these prisoners were settled as workers in temple complexes.⁴⁰ Additionally, diplomatic hostages served a twofold purpose, both as pledge and as a means of ensuring future vassals well educated in Egyptian traditions.⁴¹ Near Eastern princesses were also sent to the Egyptian court, so they could marry the ruling king. These ladies always brought abundant gifts and servants with them, and they maintained contact with their home courts through meeting diplomats and by corresponding with their families abroad. Additionally, the Egyptians had direct contact with various kingdoms like Babylon, Assyria, Mitanni and Hittite in the Near East. They exchanged presents, assisted each other on different occasions and attempted to have a friendly relationship.⁴² Moreover “foreigners” were often not regarded as so “alien” in Egypt – at least at the royal court where they could occupy highest positions, such as the steward of the king. Usually, these foreigners were so well integrated that it is almost impossible to detect who was not actually born in Egypt.⁴³ The same can be said for the military. Entire units were composed of foreigners and they were able to occupy positions of leadership.⁴⁴ Usually, there were specific quarters in bigger cities where people of foreign origin were settled according to their holding of certain skills – e.g., glass working. In all likelihood these people communicated in their mother

40 HELCK, 1971, pp. 345f.; SCHNEIDER, 2006, p. 205; WINNICKI, 2009, pp. 11-34, 62.

41 SCHNEIDER, 2006, p. 206; WINNICKI, 2009, p. 14.

42 For general information on these relations see LIVERANI, 1997, pp. 101-111; LIVERANI, 2006, pp. 90-118, with additional literature; COLLINS, 2008, pp. 14-118; WINNICKI, 2009, pp. 11-34, 64. For the relations to western Asia minor, especially the geography according to Egyptian sources, see HAIDER, 2003, pp. 174-192.

43 SCHNEIDER, 2006, pp. 202-216, especially 206-210; WINNICKI, 2009, pp. 49-61. In contrast, cf. on this HELCK, 1964, pp. 103-114. On “foreigners” in general in Egypt through all time periods, see BRESCIANI, 1997, pp. 221-253; SCHNEIDER, 2010, pp. 143-163, to the New Kingdom especially, 154f.; as well as WINNICKI, 2009, pp. 66-69, 90-92, 95f., 99f.

44 HELCK, 1971, p. 346; SCHNEIDER, 2006, p. 205; WINNICKI, 2009, p. 65.

tongue in these quarters.⁴⁵ The trade too brought merchants from different areas to Egypt,⁴⁶ and their business deals were made using foreign languages to communicate.⁴⁷ That the Egyptians came into contact with other languages is attested by abundant loan words.⁴⁸ The diplomatic relations between the Egyptians and the Near Eastern countries were made in the lingua franca of those days: Akkadian. Besides that, Egyptian scribes were also able to communicate in Hittite, Hurrian and other languages of the Canaanite territory. It can be assumed that bi- and multilingualism were not rare.⁴⁹ Communication in general as well as in different languages was essential for the transfer of knowledge.⁵⁰

From Mesopotamia to Egypt

In the following section, the transfer of knowledge from Mesopotamia to Egypt is presented through a case study on an ancient Near Eastern demonic being called Sāmānu. This disease demon can be found in numerous texts in Mesopotamia and Egypt across a wide range of time. In Mesopotamia, Sāmānu is attested from the Ur III period (approx. 2100-2000 BCE) to the Hellenistic Period (approx. 330-63 BCE) in incantations, medical texts/recipes, lexical lists, omens, and astronomical diaries. Usually, he is written in Sumerian as *sa-ma-na*, *sa-ma-na₂*, *nim-nim* and as a pest *ur-me-me*. In Akkadian, the demon is only attested as *sa-ma-nu-(um)*. As a Mesopotamian demonic being, he is able to afflict gods, mankind, animals (cattle, sheep and donkeys), plants (as rust and pest), and can be an occurrence in rivers (see below).⁵¹ In

45 HELCK, 1971, pp. 500f.; SCHNEIDER, 2006, p. 205; SCHNEIDER, 2011, p. 183; WINNICKI, 2009, p. 62.

46 Of course, Egyptian traders also traveled to the ancient Near East.

47 Compare on this papyrus Turin 2008 + 2016 R:II14, in which is stated that a business deal was made in the Syrian language, see BECK, 2015a, p. 245; JANSSEN, 1961, pp. 59, 71, 73, pl. 3, translates this passage in a more reserved manner; compare also RÖMER, 1992, p. 279.

48 See HELCK, 1971, pp. 505-575; HOCH, 1994.

49 KITCHEN, 1969, pp. 83f.; HELCK, 1971, pp. 435-454; BRESCIANI, 1997, p. 229; SCHNEIDER, 2011, pp. 182f.

50 For the cultural interactions during the New Kingdom see also BECK, 2015a, pp. 244f.

51 For a general overview of the Mesopotamian Sāmānu, see BECK, 2015a, pp. 171-174, for the attestations, BECK, 2015a, pp. 3-91, in each case with further citations.

Egypt, the demon is referred to as *s²-m^ʿ (w)-n³*, a loanword written in the typical syllabic writing system of the New Kingdom. But he is also known as Akhu (*ḫ.w*) in Egyptian. That Akhu is identical to Sāmānu comes from papyrus Leiden I 343 + 345, which contains fourteen incantations; of which eight are duplicates. On the recto page of the manuscript, Sāmānu is usually exorcised, while Akhu is usually expelled on the verso page in the duplicated spells. In Egypt, the demonic being only occurs as an ailment of men in magical-medical texts dating almost exclusively to the New Kingdom.⁵²

In order to analyze the entire transfer of knowledge, it is not only important to have a closer look at the receiver's idea of Sāmānu – here the Egyptians – but also to examine what was the original Mesopotamian (the producing culture) knowledge of that demon.⁵³ That is why both “forms” of Sāmānu are discussed below.

In Mesopotamia, the outward appearance of the demon is precisely described:

sa-ma-na ka piriĝ-ĝa zu₂ muš ušum-gal umbin [ḫu-ri₂]-in-na kuĝ₂
a[1]-lu₅

Sāmānu, (with) a lion's mouth, teeth of a dragon's snake, claws of an eagle (and) a crab's tail⁵⁴

In the ancient Near East, Sāmānu represents the idea of a red evil – his name is a nominal derivation from the Akkadian word *sāmu* “red” and literally means “the red one”.⁵⁵ Mesopotamian texts play with this association, for example:

[s]a-ma-na šu ḫuš [ĝ]iri₃ ḫuš ^den-lil₂-la₂

Sāmānu, reddish claw, reddish paw of Enlil⁵⁶

52 See BECK, 2015a, pp. 174-176, for general information, and BECK, 2015a, pp. 93-169, for the sources in Egypt (with further citations). The most recent attestation dates to the Ptolemaic Period.

53 On this, see the first section of the paper.

54 Cuneiform tablet AO 11276 R:1-5, see BECK, 2015a, pp. 10-14 (with further citations).

55 BECK, 2015a, p. 172.

56 Cuneiform tablet HS 1555 + 1587 R:1-2, see BECK, 2015a, pp. 6-10 (with further citations). For the god Enlil, see, for example, BLACK/GREEN, 2011, p. 76; see also

Another significant characterization of the demon is his canine form. In Mesopotamia, Sāmānu is usually described as the evil dog of different deities, especially of the healing goddess Gula:⁵⁷

ur huš^den-lil₂-la₂ gu₂ sur^den-ki-ka ka uš₂ tuḫ-tuḫ^dnin-^si₁isin₂-na-ka ur ka tuḫ-a diḡir-re-ne

red dog of Enlil, neck-breaker of Enki, the frequently open bloody mouth of Ninisina, dog with opened mouth of the gods⁵⁸

Egyptian texts, as is their habit, do not typically describe the demon's appearance. Neither the redness nor the canine form occurs. The demon can also be called Akhu (*ḫ.w*) in Egyptian. The word *ḫ.w* is derived from the root *ḫj*⁵⁹ and means "the burning/burned one". Nonetheless, it is unclear if the term Akhu is a reference in any way to the Mesopotamian tradition regarding the demon's redness.⁶⁰ The only statement alluding to Sāmānu/Akhu as dog, can be found in papyrus Leiden I 343 + 345, which is the major source for this disease demon in Egypt:

[p?]jw^jw wš[*t*] ks.w

o dog who chews bones⁶¹

Additionally, the origin of the entity is named in the Mesopotamian texts. As is customary for such creatures, he is said to come from the mountains:

KREBERNIK, 2012, p. 76, who convincingly speaks against the interpretation of Enlil as a kind of storm god.

57 BECK, 2015a, pp. 176-179.

58 Cuneiform tablet AO 11276 R:6-9, see BECK, 2015a, pp. 10-14 (with further citations). See also cuneiform tablet HS 1555 + 1587 R:3f. (BECK, 2015a, pp. 6-10), VAT 6819 R:1-7 (BECK, 2015a, pp. 18f.), S.U. 51/128 + 129 + 233 (= STT 178) and duplicates (R:2-7; BECK, 2015a, pp. 22-31). For the gods, see the particular keyword BLACK/GREEN, 2011.

59 ERMAN/GRAPOW, 1926, 223.13-20, 224.13.

60 See BECK, 2015a, pp. 174, 246.

61 Papyrus Leiden I 343 + 345 V:IV9 (incantation 12 line 1-2), see BECK, 2015a, pp. 155-158 (with further citations). It could be that this subject is missing due to the partially fragmentary condition of the manuscript.

kur-ta ġen-na kur-ta <e₄>-da sa-ma-na kur-ta ġen-na kur-ta e₄-da
[ḥur-sa]ġ ki sikil-ta du [kur-t]a e₄-da

coming from the mountains, <coming down> from the mountains, Sāmānu, coming from the mountains, coming down from the mountains, coming from the [foothil]ls, the pure place, coming from the [moun]tains⁶²

An analogous statement is made in the Egyptian sources:

mj ḥȝy ḥr pȝ jwtn s:ḥpr tw° ḥr tȝ.j.t jr.t trj [tw=k]

Come, fall upon the ground, which created you, upon the mound, which respected [you]!⁶³

or

jw=k n nȝ n(j) ȝ.w šmȝ(m).w n.ty ḥr ḥȝs.t

You belong to the wandering donkeys, which are in the desert.⁶⁴

The “wandering donkeys”, which can only refer to untamed animals, particularly stress the foreign origin of Sāmānu/Akhu in Egypt. The demon’s actions are a major topic in Mesopotamian sources. He is capable of troubling gods in Mesopotamia, which is extremely unusual.⁶⁵

diġir an-na an-na im-mi-keše₂ diġir ki ki-a im-mi-ib₂-keše₂ ^dutu
an-ur₃-ra i[m-mi]-ib₂-k[eše₂] ^dnanna su₄-an-n[a im]-mi-i[b₂-keš]e₂

62 Cuneiform tablet 6 NT 145 R:II-7 (e₄ = e₁₁.d), see BECK, 2015a, pp. 3-6, compare also S.U. 51/128 + 129 + 233 (=STT 178) and duplicates (R:8-9; BECK, 2015a, pp. 22-31) with a similar statement.

63 Papyrus Leiden I 343 + 345 R:IV6-7/V:VII2f. (incantation 3 line 20-21), see BECK, 2015a, pp. 111-119 (with further citations).

64 Papyrus Leiden I 343 + 345 R:III7-8/V:VI2f. (incantation 3 line 7), see BECK, 2015a, pp. 111-119 (with further citations).

65 According to Sonik’s taxonomy, *daimons* were usually restricted to the human sphere, but she mentions Sāmānu as an exception to this “rule”, SONIK, 2013, p. 115, note 37. For Sāmānu as dangerous to gods, see BECK, 2015a, pp. 181f.

He has bound the god of heaven in heaven, he has bound the god of earth in earth, he has bo[und] Utu in the horizon, he has [bou]nd Nanna in the red evening sky⁶⁶

But the most common victims of Sāmānu are men:

ʿguruš ʿ ḥaš₂-a-na-ʿta ʿ ba-ʿni-i[n ...] // eṭ-lu [ina] šap ʿ-ri-š₂ i[š-bat]
 ki-sikil GIŠ.GABA-na-ʿke₄ ʿ // [...] ʿar₂ ʿ[...] ina ši-ti-iq ʿir ʿ-ti-ša₂ i[š-bat]
 lu₂-tur ga-naḡ-e sa gu₂-bi ba-[...] // šer₂-ru e-niq ši-iz-bi ina la[-ba-nu iš-bat]

the man's thigh is sei[zed] (by him), the woman's breastbone (?) is sei[zed] (by him), the suckling child's neck-tendons are sei[zed] (by him).⁶⁷

Usually, humans are afflicted on the skin of their heads, necks, shoulders, breasts (especially women), and thighs.⁶⁸ Furthermore, this entity can attack different animals – cattle, donkey and sheep:

gud-e a-ub-<ba> ba-ni-ba udu umbin-si-ba ba-ni-ba anše ḡeštu-ba
 ba-ni-ba

The bull caught him by <his> horn's edge. The sheep caught him by his hoof. The donkey caught him by his ear.⁶⁹

Moreover, Sāmānu is attested as an occurrence in rivers as well as an ailment of plants in the ancient Near East. In the case of the latter, Sāmānu can affect plants either as a fungus (rust) or a pest. In an incantation, one of the Mesopotamian rivers is afflicted by Sāmānu:

idigna pu₂¹(LAGAB)-ba ba-ni-ba

66 Cuneiform tablet A 7885 R:5-8, see BECK, 2015a, pp. 15-17 (with further citations). Compare also HS 1555 + 1587 R:5-8 (BECK, 2015a, pp. 6-10).

67 Cuneiform tablet S.U. 51/128 + 129 + 233 and duplicates (BECK, 2015a, pp. 22-31). Similar statements are given in 6 NT 145 R:18-19 (BECK, 2015a, pp. 3-6), HS 1555 + 1587 R:10-12, V:13 (BECK, 2015a, pp. 6-10), AO 11276 R:11-15 (BECK, 2015a, pp. 10-14).

68 For an analysis of Sāmānu as a disease of humankind from a present-day perspective, see BECK, 2015a, pp. 182-193, and BECK, 2015b, pp. 33-46.

69 Cuneiform tablet HS 1555 + 1587 V:14-16 (ba = b-as (AK)), see BECK, 2015a, pp. 6-10 (with further citations). For a discussion of Sāmānu as a disease of sheep, cattle and donkey, see BECK, 2015a, pp. 193-199.

The Tigris caught him by his side (?).⁷⁰

As a rust – mostly attested in omens – Sāmānu usually affects barley:

DIŠ *i-na qu2-tu-un qer-bi* MI.IB.ĤI 'sa ˁ-mu na-di nu-uh-ĥu-ul-lu i-te-eb-ba-am-ma še-a-am sa-ma-nu DAB-at

If a red sign lies in the constrictions of the entrails: *Nuḥḥullu* (= a destructive storm) springs up and Sāmānu affects the barley.⁷¹

If the demon is addressed as pest, Sāmānu is able to destroy any field crops:

KA.INIM.MA 'BURU5 mu ˁ-na 'a-ki-la mu ˁ-bat-'ti-ra ṣa-ṣi-ri ˁ sa-ma-'na ˁ kal-mat A.ŠA3 ina ŠA3 A.ŠA3 ṣu-li-i

Incantation to remove locust, caterpillar, “devourer”-pest, *mubbattiru*-pest, cricket, Sāmānu (and) the vermin of the field from within the field.⁷²

In the ancient Near East, this demonic being acts as a kind of universal evil from whom nobody and nothing is safe.⁷³ In contrast, the Egyptian Sāmānu/Akhu is limited to humans but there he can occur on and in the entire body, not just the skin:

m p3 rd 2 n.ty hr šm.t° m t3 mn.t(w) 2 n.ty hr šhsh° m p3 ph.wj n.ty hr kz.t=f° m {n3}<t3> j3.t p3 z3y(w) <n.j> ˁ.t° m p3y=f rmn 2 m nḥb.t=f m t3y=f dr.ty 2° n.ty [...] n=f n.ty m- ˁ=f° m jw-d3-m 3y-n3° n.ty m mḥt(.w)=f n.ty m3(ˁ.w)° [m] gg.t 2° hnˁ p3 h3.ty m wf3(w)=f°

70 Cuneiform tablet HS 1555 + 1587 V:17, see BECK, 2015a, pp. 6-10 (with further citations). See also BECK, 2015a, pp. 207f.

71 Cuneiform tablet AO 7539 V:72', see BECK, 2015a, p. 72 (with further citations). Compare BM 22696 V:22'-23' (BECK, 2015a, p. 72), K 2162+ R:19 (BECK, 2015a, pp. 74f.), K 229 R:18' + (BECK, 2015a, pp. 73f.), BM 46229 V:32-33 (BECK, 2015a, p. 76), Farmer's instructions line 71 (BECK, 2015a, pp. 70f.). For a discussion of Sāmānu as a plant disease, see BECK, 2015a, pp. 199-203.

72 Cuneiform tablet S.U. 52/214 V:1-2, see BECK, 2015a, pp. 77f. (with further citations). Compare also BM 45686 R:II29-31 (BECK, 2015a, pp. 81f.), tablet 81-2-4,319 R:6'-7' (Beck, 2015a, p. 80), BM 123370 II6' (BECK, 2015a, pp. 80f.). For an analysis of the demon as pest, see BECK, 2015a, pp. 204-207.

73 BECK, 2015a, pp. 174, 241f.

*hn^c ḏrw.w=f m pȝy=f [...]^o m tȝy=f sp.t 2 n.ty ḥr md(w) {w}.t^o m {rš} <šr>.t=f tȝ ḥb(y)
[m tȝj]=f jr.tj 2.t n.ty ḥr ptr(j)^o m tȝ ȝ(z).w<f> 7 n.t ḏȝȝ=f^o*

in the two lower legs that walk, in the two thighs that run, in the back that bows, in the spine, the beam <of> the body, in his two shoulders, in his neck, in both h[i]s hands that [...] for him, which is with him in the *Jdmn* (?), which is in his entrails, which are in good condition, [in] the two kidneys (?) and in the heart, in his lung and his sides, in his [two ears that hear (?)], in his two lips that speak, in his nose, the bubbling one (?), [in his] both eyes that see, in the seven orifices of his head.⁷⁴

Additionally, Sāmānu/Akhu can have an impact on the cosmic order:

*jn-jw jy.n=k r [wȝ³ ...] j[n]-j[w ... wȝ³] n.(j) ḥh^o r nḥm s:kḏ m wȝ^{3o} jn-[j]w [j]y.n=k r ḥr(.t)
jn^o r jšf šw.t*

Did you come to [the barque ... Did you come ... to the barque] of the millions to prevent travel in the barque? [Did] you come to keep away [the sun disk], to enlarge (?) the emptiness?⁷⁵

In the Egyptian conjurations, it is far more important to enumerate the actions, which are undertaken against Sāmānu/Akhu. Therefore, they emphasize the expulsion of both the demon and the gang that accompanies him:

*jr nȝ n.w zmȝ.yt jn.n=k ḥn<=k> r ḥȝ ḏd.tw ḥmt ḥȝ m ḏȝȝ.w=sn jr pȝ stp(.w) n.j r(m)ȝ
jn.n=k ḥn<=k r ḥȝ ḥȝ<=sn nȝy=sn nȝkȝw st w^crt(.w)*

As to the band whom you have brought with <you> to fight: In their heads, much copper shall be given. As to the choicest of people whom you have brought with you to fight: They abandoned their trulls (?). They have fled.⁷⁶

The most significant adversary of Sāmānu/Akhu is the weather god Seth/Baal. He usually defeats him in the Egyptian texts:

-
- 74 Papyrus Leiden I 343 + 345 R:VIII1-VIII4, ostrakon Strasbourg H 115 R:5-11 (incantation 5, line 22-29), see BECK, 2015a, pp. 126-140 (with further citations).
75 Papyrus Leiden I 343 + 345 V:IX9f. (incantation 13, line 9-11), see BECK, 2015a, pp. 158-160 (with further citations).
76 Papyrus Leiden I 343 + 345 R: II4-6/V:III10-IV2 (incantation 2, line 12-14), see BECK, 2015a, pp. 103-111 (with further citations).

pʒ kh(ʒ)b(w) n(.j) Stḥ r pʒ [ʕ.]w/p[ʒ s-m-n]° pʒ ḥḏnḏn n(.j) Bʕyr r=kʒ pʒ kh(ʒ)b n(.j) pʒ ḥʒ[ḥʒ.tj] jw=f hr jb h(w)<.t> r b p.t r=k° kʒ ʕḏn=f tʒ ph.ty pʒy=f ḥpš 2 ḥr=k° kʒ dp{.t}=k nʒ dp(w) pʒ [...].n-mʕ m ḏr.t=f

The rage of Seth is against [Ak]hu/[Sāmānu]. The uproar of Baal is against you. The rage of the sto[rm] while it is thirsting for rain from the sky is against you. It shall exhaust its (bodily) strength [...] (lit. to put an end to), his two arms above you. You shall taste that which the [S]ea has tasted by his hand!⁷⁷

Here an allusion to the Baal Cycle is used, specifically to the episode where Baal fights against Yamm, the sea.⁷⁸ Thus, the Egyptian sources focus on actions against the demon rather than the demon’s own actions.

	Mesopotamia	Egypt
Shape:	lion’s mouth, teeth of a dragon’s snake, “red appearance” etc.	no
“Dog”:	dog of gods, especially the healing goddess Gula	(yes)
Origin:	mountains	earth, mound
	“uninhabited territories”	
Actions:	Sāmānu’s campaigns against everybody or everything → “active”	campaigns against Sāmānu → “passive”
	alone	leader of gang
Address:	third person singular	second person singular masculine

Table 1: Comparison between the Mesopotamian and Egyptian Sāmānu.

77 Papyrus Leiden I 343 + 345 R:IV9-13/V:VII5-7 (incantation 4, line 1-5), see BECK, 2015a, pp. 119-126 (with further citations).

78 DIETRICH/LORETZ/SANMARTÍN, 2013, p. 9; PARKER et al., 1997, pp. 103-105, as already noted by MÜLLER, 2008, 282, note 162.

While Sāmānu obviously originated in the ancient Near East, he experienced major changes on his way to Egypt. It is not just that the style of the incantation is different, but he evolves from a single evil being who attacks indiscriminately into the leader of a demon group that seizes only men. The difference between genuine Egyptian demon groups and Sāmānu’s group is that he is not associated with a certain god. Interestingly it is more important to describe the actions taken against Sāmānu/Akhu in the Egyptian texts than his own doing there. This does not mean that he is less dangerous in Egypt. As for the substantial Mesopotamian topic “Sāmānu as dog”, it does not play a role in Egypt. Perhaps the lack of information on such a role is due to the fragmentary state of the Egyptian sources. The only conformity between the Mesopotamian and Egyptian Sāmānu can be found in the identification of their origin, i.e., uninhabited territories, which is considered a common origin to all (disease) demons in both cultures.

The comparison (see Table 1) between the Mesopotamian and Egyptian Sāmānu clearly shows that the knowledge of this demonic being was not directly transferred from Mesopotamia to Egypt. The question is what was the route of transfer? The Mesopotamian sources do not provide an answer but the Egyptian texts do. As we have seen before, Papyrus Leiden I 343 + 345 contains topics, which are not typically Egyptian, including references to the Baal Cycle (see above). The gods mentioned in the manuscript are also not typically Egyptian, such as Baal, Rešep and his wife Adamma, the god above/the moon god and his wife Nikkal, Astarte or Anat.⁷⁹ There are also allusions to myth and legends of the Canaanite territory. The first example comes from the aforementioned Baal Cycle, too:

’n . b’l . qdm . ydh k tgd . arz . b ymnh

Baal sees the orient. His hand flips, the cedar in his right hand.⁸⁰

This passage is similarly stated in papyrus Leiden I 343 + 345:

[h](w){t}y B’yr’ r=k m p’ § n.ty m dr.t=f° wħm=f tw m n’(j) hny.wt n(.wt) § n.ty m dr.t=f°

79 BECK, 2015a, p. 242 (with further citations).

80 DIETRICH/LORETZ/SANMARTÍN, 2013, p. 23 (CAT 1.4 VII 40f.); see PARKER et al., 1997, p. 137.

Baal shall strike against you with <spears> of coniferous wood, which are in his hand. He repeatedly strikes against you with spears of coniferous wood, which are in his hand.⁸¹

The following description also comes from Baal's epic cycle:

ṯm . ḥrbm . its . anšq [b]ḥtm

There, (with) a sword I will destroy! I will burn the houses!⁸²

A similar statement is found in the Egyptian manuscript:

k3 pn^c Stḥ² pȝy=k dmj.t

The weather god shall destroy your town!⁸³

But there are not only allusions to the Baal Cycle but also to the Legend of Keret. In this section, King Keret answers his son Yassib when the latter asks if he can ascend to the throne:

yṯbr ḥrn . y bn . yṯbr . ḥrn risk . ṯtrt . šm . b'l qdq{r}<k>

May Horon crack, o son, may Horon crack your skull, Astarte name-of-Baal, <your> head!⁸⁴

Papyrus Leiden I 343 +345 contains the passage:

p3 ḥpš Stḥ² r=k p3 s3-m'-n3° p3 k(š)tp(w) n(j) B'yr' m d3d3=k° p[β] s3-m'-n3 p3 ḥmt n(j) Ḥr(w) m wp.t=k°

81 Papyrus Leiden I 343 + 345 R:V1-2/V:VII8f. (incantation 4 line 6-8), see BECK, 2015a, pp. 119-126 (with further citations).

82 DIETRICH/LORETZ/SANMARTÍN, 2013, p. 9 (CAT 1.2 IV 4f.); see PARKER et al., 1997, p. 102. CAT suggests the restoration [p]ṯtm “temple”.

83 Papyrus Leiden I 343 + 345 R:II9/V:5 (incantation 2 line 5f.), see BECK, 2015a, pp. 103-111 (with further citations).

84 DIETRICH/LORETZ/SANMARTÍN, 2013, p. 48 (CAT 1.16 VI 54-57); PARKER et al., 1997, p. 42; appears in similar fashion in CAT 1.2 II 7f.

Seth's khopesh is against you, o Sāmānu/[o Akhu]. The *ketep* of Baal is in your head, o Sāmānu/[o Akhu]. Horus' copper is in your vertex!⁸⁵

The same Ugaritic legend contains the following lines:

tqln . b gbl šntk . b hpnk . w t'cn

You shall fall upon the tip of your teeth and you shall be humiliated by your greed/with your fist.⁸⁶

In the Egyptian manuscript a similar statement occurs in the same incantation, but before the aforementioned passage of the Legend of Keret:

[kʔ] hʔy=k hr hr=[kʔ hr tbn.t n.t] dʷ [n]ʔ [... jr]=k hʔy.t hr jbh.w=k hr ndh[.t=k hrʔ] pʔ dʷ

You shall fall upon your face. [...] You shall [fall (?)] upon your teeth, upon [your] tu[sks ... upon (?)] the top of the mountain!⁸⁷

Ugaritic Incantation RIH 78/20 states:

aphm kšpm . dbbm . ygrš . hrn hbrm . w glm . d'tm

immediately afterwards, Horon cast out the companions (with) sorcery (and) incantations (?) and the boy the fellows.⁸⁸

In comparison, Papyrus Leiden I 343 + 345 says:

jr nʔ n.w zmʔ.yt jn.n=k hn<=>k r ʔhʔ dd.tw hmt ʔʔ m dʔdʔ.w=sn jr pʔ stp(.w) n.j r(m) jn.n=k hn<=>k r ʔhʔ hʔ<=>sn nʔy=sn nʔkʔw st wʔrt(.w)

85 Papyrus Leiden I 343 + 345 R:II2-4/V:III9f. (incantation 2 line 10f.), see BECK, 2015a, pp. 103-111 (with further citations).

86 DIETRICH/LORETZ/SANMARTÍN, 2013, p. 48 (CAT 1.16 VI 57f.); see PARKER et al., 1997, p. 42. *Šntk* is usually translated as “your years”, though *šnt* can also be “teeth”, see DEL OLMO LETE/SANMARTÍN, 2003, p. 832.

87 Papyrus Leiden I 343 + 345 R:III1f./V:III7-9 (incantation 2 line 8-10), see BECK, 2015a, pp. 103-111 (with further citations).

88 BORDREUIL/CAQUOT, 1980, p. 346.

As to the band whom you have brought with you to fight: In their heads, much copper shall be given. As to the choicest of people whom you have brought with you to fight: They abandoned their trulls (?). They have fled.⁸⁹

The last example is not taken from Ugaritic sources, but from a Mesopotamian curse formula used on Kudurrū (boundary stones):

kāma serrēmu ina kamât šubtišu lirtappud

may he always roam as an onager in the desert of his dwelling place.⁹⁰

In Papyrus Leiden I 343 + 345 the passage is alluded to as followed:

jw=k n nš n(j) ʔ.w šmš{m}.w n.ty hr hš.t

You belong to the wandering donkeys, which are in the desert.⁹¹

These examples clearly show that the “producer” of the knowledge of Sāmānu were not the Mesopotamians. Rather nearly every allusion indicates a Canaanite origin for the transfer of knowledge to Egypt making the Canaanite territory a rather likely producer.

The next role to be considered here is the transmitter. Unfortunately, at present it is not possible to ascertain how the knowledge of the demonic being got to Egypt due to missing sources. As mentioned before, there were abundant connections between the ancient Near East and Egypt, especially during the New Kingdom (see Cultural Interactions during the New Kingdom). One possibility is that the knowledge was brought to Egypt and the transfer took place in Egypt itself. Another opportunity would be that the Egyptians came in contact with this particular disease (demon) in the Levant, made attempts to find a solution or better cure to Sāmānu, and brought this knowledge back with them to Egypt.⁹²

89 Papyrus Leiden I 343 + 345 R:II4-6/V:III10-IV2 (incantation 2 line 12-14), see BECK, 2015a, pp. 103-111 (with further citations).

90 See WATANABE, 1984, pp. 100-104, especially 104 and 106-109. For a more detailed discussion of this example, see FISCHER-ELFERT, 2011, p. 193.

91 Papyrus Leiden I 343 + 345 R:III7f./V:VI2f. (incantation 3 line 7), see BECK, 2015a, pp. 111-119 (with further citations).

92 See BECK, 2015b, p. 245.

The last role in a transfer of knowledge is the receiver. In this context the receiver is certain: the Egyptians. During the New Kingdom, a new ailment known as Sāmānu in Mesopotamia apparently appeared in Egypt, probably through influx of foreign population groups.⁹³ The Egyptians had to deal with this new problem and find a solution (treatment). The next step was an intercultural contact of some kind. Who exactly was involved in the transmission process cannot be said. Most probably persons dealing with magic and medicine participated – at least on the Egyptian side since they had to face the problem. It is very likely that language was the medium of the transfer because the knowledge can be articulated that way. Furthermore, it can be presumed that the persons involved were bilingual⁹⁴ because of the use of foreign deities and topics in Papyrus Leiden I 343 + 345. Due to the fact that there are Egyptian sources mentioning Sāmānu it is obvious that the Egyptians, i.e., the receiver, were able to comprehend the knowledge presented to them. Equally, the producer (Canaanites) was capable of articulating the knowledge.

Final Remarks

The transfer of knowledge from Mesopotamia to Egypt occurred as “acculturation” (highest level of the transfer of knowledge) because the communication took place between one culture (producer: Canaanite territory) and another one (receiver: Egypt), both societies were differentiated, a direct contact happened and a detectable change took place at least in one of them.⁹⁵ The “acculturation” led to an *integration* during the consolidation, the last step of this transfer of knowledge. Hence, the knowledge, which was necessary to deal with the new issue (= Sāmānu), was initially adopted and afterwards adapted. It became part of the Egyptian culture. No *assimilation* occurred because Egyptian norms still formed the basis for the new knowledge, i.e., the spells were written in the

93 As stated before, it could also be that the Egyptians came in contact with this disease in the ancient Near East.

94 GÖPPERICH, 2006, pp. 174, 177. BURKE, 2009, p. 72, and cultural interactions during the New Kingdom in this article. Compare also BROSIUS, 2014, p. 287, on multilingualism of scribes.

95 It is not possible to state whether the producer was changed by the transfer of knowledge since he is not really tangible (see above).

Egyptian language and specific Egyptian formulae were used.⁹⁶ Furthermore, the transformation of knowledge can also be seen by the structure of the incantations. Mesopotamian spells use the third person singular but Egyptian texts directly address the demon in the second person masculine singular. Additionally, Sāmānu employs a gang, which helps him to do harm, but acts alone in Mesopotamia.⁹⁷ Consequently, it can be stated that the knowledge was clearly transformed and adjusted to the needs of the Egyptians. In fact, the adaption of the word Sāmānu as Akhu in Egyptian shows that the receiver gave thought to this phenomenon.⁹⁸ Therefore, a new concept of Sāmānu was developed in Egypt.

In conclusion, a transfer of the “knowledge” of the Mesopotamian concept of Sāmānu to Egypt occurred via the Canaanite territory. Exact statements concerning the producer and the process of transfer cannot be given. In contrast, something can be said about the receiver. The transfer occurred on the highest level: “acculturation” in the form of an *integration*.⁹⁹

Bibliography

- ABEL, GÜNTER, Zeichen der Wirklichkeit. Frankfurt am Main 2004.
- ANTOS, GERD, Transferwissenschaft. Chancen und Barrieren des Zugangs zu Wissen in Zeiten der Informationsflut und der Wissensexpllosion, in: Wissenstransfer zwischen Experten und Laien. Umriss einer Transferwissenschaft (Transferwissenschaften 1), edited by GERD ANTOS/SIGURD WICHTER, Frankfurt am Main 2001, pp. 3-33.

96 For example, the magician identifies himself with a god or the demon is asked rhetorical questions. Compare also BECK, 2015a, pp. 230-236.

97 BECK, 2015c, pp. 94-100.

98 That Sāmānu was “translated” as *ḫ.w* and not as *dšr.w* could be related to the fact that the Egyptians were probably not aware of the original meaning of the Akkadian word *Sāmānu* (“the red one”). This is indicated by the fact that the Egyptian incantations do not have references to the redness of this evil. Furthermore, the extensive changes of the “knowledge” of the Mesopotamian Sāmānu in contrast to the Egyptian version also demonstrates this.

99 For a more detailed analysis of the transfer of knowledge of Sāmānu from Mesopotamia to Egypt, see BECK, 2015a, pp. 241-249.

- ASH, MITCHELL G., Wissens- und Wissenschaftstransfer – Einführende Bemerkungen, in: *Berichte zur Wissenschaftsgeschichte* 29 (2006), pp. 181-189.
- BADURA, BERNHARD, Sprachbarrieren. Zur Soziologie der Kommunikation. Stuttgart 1971.
- BALLOD, MATTHIAS, Die Qualität des Wissenstransfers aus informationsdidaktischer Perspektive, in: *Transferqualität, Bedingungen und Voraussetzungen für Effektivität, Effizienz, Erfolg des Wissenstransfers (Transferwissenschaften 4)*, edited by GERD ANTOS/TILO WEBER, Frankfurt am Main 2005, pp. 11-21.
- BECK, SUSANNE, Sāmānu. Ein vorderasiatischer Dämon in Ägypten, Ägypten und Altes Testament 83. Münster 2015a.
- EAD., Sāmānu as a Human Disease, in: *Le journal des médecines cunéiformes* 26 (2015b), pp. 33-46.
- EAD., Sāmānu: Konzepte der Dämonendarstellung, in: *Text: Wissen – Wirkung – Wahrnehmung. Beiträge des vierten Münchner Arbeitskreises Junge Aegyptologie (MAJA 4)*, 29.11. bis 1.12.2013 (Göttinger Orientalforschungen IV/59), edited by GREGOR NEUNERT et al., Wiesbaden 2015c, 89-103.
- BERRY, JOHN W., Acculturation: a Comparative Analysis, in: *Perspectives in Immigrant and Minority Education*, edited by RONALD J. SAMUDA/SANDRA L. WOODS, Lanham 1983, pp. 65-78.
- BISANG, WALTER, Kultur und Sprache aus der Perspektive des Kontaktes, in: *Kultur, Sprache, Kontakt (Kulturelle und sprachliche Kontakte 1)*, edited by WALTER BISANG et al., Würzburg 2004, pp. 1-52.
- BLACK, JEREMY A./GREEN, ANTHONY, *Gods, Demons and Symbols of Ancient Mesopotamia. An Illustrated Dictionary*, Austin 2011.
- BORDREUIL, PIERRE/CAQUOT, ANDRE, Les textes en cunéiformes alphabétiques découverts en 1978 à Ibn Hani, in: *Syria* 57 (1980), pp. 343-367.
- BOSSE, ANKE, Interkulturalität – von ‘Transfer’ zu ‘Vernetzung’, in: *Zwischen Transfer und Vergleich. Theorien und Methoden der Literatur- und Kulturbeziehungen aus deutsch-französischer Perspektive (Vice Versa. Deutsch-französische Kulturstudien 5)*, edited by CHRISTIANE SOLLTE-GRESSER, Stuttgart 2013, pp. 65-78.
- BRESCIANI, EDDA, Foreigners, in: *The Egyptians*, edited by SERGIO DONADONI, Chicago 1997, pp. 221-253.

- BROSIUS, MARIA, Some Remarks on the Channels of the Transmission of Knowledge in the Ancient Mediterranean World, in: *Kulturkontakte in antiken Welten: vom Denkmodell zum Fallbeispiel (Colloquia antiqua 10)*, edited by ROBERT ROLLINGER/KORDULA SCHNEGG, Leuven 2014, 285-300.
- BURKE, PETER, *Kultureller Austausch (Erbschaft unserer Zeit 8)*, translated by BURKHARDT WOLF, Frankfurt am Main 2000.
- ID., *Translating Knowledge. Translating Cultures*, in: *Kultureller Austausch. Bilanz und Perspektiven der Frühnezeitforschung*, edited by MICHAEL NORTH, Cologne 2009, pp. 69-77.
- COLLINS, PAUL, *From Egypt to Babylon. The International Age 1550-500 BC*. London 2008.
- DIETRICH, MANFRIED/LORETZ, OSWALD/SANMARTÍN, JOAQUÍN, *Die keilalphabetischen Texte aus Ugarit, Ras Ibn Hani und andere Orte*, KTU: 3rd edition (*Alter Orient und Altes Testament 360.1*), Münster 2013.
- DOHRENWEND, BRUCE P./SMITH, ROBERT J., *Theory of Acculturation*, in: *Southwestern Journal of Anthropology* 18.1 (1962), pp. 30-39.
- EISENBERG, CHRISTIANE, *Kulturtransfer als historischer Prozess. Ein Beitrag zur Komparatistik*, in: *Vergleich und Transfer. Komparatistik in den Sozial-, Geschichts- und Kulturwissenschaften*, edited by HARTMUT KAEBLE/JÜRGEN SCHRIEWER, Frankfurt am Main/New York, pp. 399-417.
- ELIAS, NORBERT, *Über den Prozeß der Zivilisation, Soziogenetische und psychogenetische Untersuchungen, I–II*, 18th edition, Frankfurt am Main, 1994.
- ERMAN, ADOLF/GRAPOW, HERMANN (eds.), *Wörterbuch der Aegyptischen Sprache I*. Berlin 1926.
- ESPAGNE, MICHEL/WERNER, MICHAEL, *Deutsch-französischer Kulturtransfer im 18. und 19. Jahrhundert. Zu einem neuen interdisziplinären Forschungsprogramm des C.N.R.S*, Francia 13 (1985), pp. 502-510.
- FISCHER-ELFERT, HANS-WERNER, *Sāmānu on the Nile: The Transfer of a Near Eastern Demon and Magico-medical Concepts into the New Kingdom*, in: *Ramesside Studies in Honour of K. A. Kitchen*, edited by MARK COLLIER et al., Bolton 2011, pp. 189-198.
- GEROGIORGAKIS, STAMATIOS/SHEEL, ROLAND/SCHORKOWITZ, DITTMAR, *Kulturtransfer vergleichend betrachtet*, in: *Integration und Desintegration der Kulturen im europäischen Mittelalter (Europa im Mittelalter 18)*, edited by MICHAEL BORGOLTE et al., Berlin 2011, pp. 385-466.

- GÖPFERICH, SUSANNE, Transferwissenschaft: Eine Subdisziplin der Translationswissenschaft? in: Wissenstransfer – Erfolgskontrolle und Rückmeldungen aus der Praxis (Transferwissenschaften 5), edited by SIGUR WICHTER/ALBERT BUSCH, Frankfurt am Main 2006, pp. 167-187.
- GRASSL, HERBERT, Gütertransfer und Kulturkontakte, in: Kulturkontakte in antiken Welten: vom Denkmodell zum Fallbeispiel (Colloquia antiqua 10), edited by ROBERT ROLLINGER/KORDULA SCHNEGG, Leuven 2014, pp. 313-324.
- HAIDER, PETER W., Westkleinasien nach ägyptischen Quellen des Neuen Reichs, in: Der neue Streit um Troia. Eine Bilanz, edited by CHRISTOPH ULF, Munich 2003, pp. 174-192.
- HELCK, WOLFGANG, Die Ägypter und die Fremden, in: Saeculum 15 (1964), pp. 103-114.
- ID., Die Beziehungen Ägyptens zu Vorderasien im 3. und 2. Jahrtausend v. Chr. (Ägyptologische Abhandlungen 5), 2nd edition, Wiesbaden 1971.
- HEMPFER, KLAUS W./TRANINGER, ANITA, Einführung, in: Dynamiken des Wissens, edited by KLAUS W. HEMPFER/ANITA TRANINGER, Freiburg im Breisgau 2007, pp. 7-21.
- HEPPNER, KARSTEN, Organisation des Wissenstransfers. Grundlagen, Barrieren und Instrumente, Wiesbaden 1997.
- HOCH, JAMES E., Semitic Words in Egyptian Texts of the New Kingdom and the Third Intermediate Period, Princeton 1994.
- JANISCH, NINA, Richtig und falsch oder “Anleitung zum Querdenken”? Zur Frage des Anspruchs an Wissenstransfer, in: Transferqualität, Bedingungen und Voraussetzungen für Effektivität, Effizienz, Erfolg des Wissenstransfers (Transferwissenschaften 4), edited by GERD ANTOS/TILO WEBER, Frankfurt am Main 2005, pp. 23-39.
- JANSSEN, JAC J., Two Ancient Egyptian Ship’s Logs: Papyrus Leiden I 350 verso and Papyrus Turin 2008 + 2016 (Oudheidkundige Mededelingen uit het Rijksmuseum van Oudheden Suppl. 42), Leiden 1961.
- JANZEN, JAN, Verstehen, was sich zeigt. Verstehen und praktisches Wissen in Wittgensteins Logisch-philosophischem Traktat, in: Dynamiken des Wissens, edited by KLAUS W. HEMPFER/ANITA TRANINGER, Freiburg im Breisgau 2007, pp. 25-42.
- JENSEN, JÜRGEN, Formen von Austausch, Tauschmittel und Tauschratenbildung in interethnischen Beziehungen und Fernkontakte – die interkul-

- turelle Variationsbreite einiger wirtschaftlicher Kontaktphänomene, in: Studien zur altägyptischen Kultur 26 (1998), pp. 51-68.
- KITCHEN, KENNETH A., *Interrelations of Egypt and Syria*, in: *La Siria nel tardo bronzo (Orientis antiqui collectio 9)*, edited by MARIO LIVERANI, Rome 1969, pp. 77-95.
- KREBERNIK, MANFRED, *Götter und Mythen des Alten Orients*, Munich 2012.
- LIVERANI, MARIO, *Ramesside Egypt in a Changing World. An Institutional Approach*, in: *L'impero ramesside, convegno internazionale in onore di Sergio Donadoni (Vicino oriente, Quaderno 1)*, Rome 1997, pp. 101-115.
- ID., *International Relations in the Ancient Near East, 1690-1100 BC*, *Studies in Diplomacy*, 2nd edition, Basingstoke 2001.
- ID., *Antico oriente: storia, società, economia*, Bari 2006.
- MEAD, GEORG H., *Geist, Identität und Gesellschaft aus der Sicht des Sozialbehaviorismus*, edited by CHARLES W. MORRIS, translated by ULF PACHER, 1st edition (Reprint), Frankfurt am Main 2010.
- MÜLLER, MATTHIAS, *Levantinische Beschwörungen in ägyptischer Übersetzung*, in: *Omina, Orakel, Rituale und Beschwörungen (Texte aus der Umwelt des Alten Testaments, Neue Folgen 4)*, edited by BERND JANOWSKI et al., Gütersloh 2008, pp. 275-293.
- NORTH, MICHAEL, *Kultureller Austausch in der frühen Neuzeit. Eine Einleitung*, in: *Kultureller Austausch. Bilanz und Perspektiven der Frühneuzeitforschung*, edited by MICHAEL NORTH, Cologne 2009, pp. 1-7.
- DEL OLMO LETE, GREGORIO/SANMARTÍN, JOAQUÍN, *A Dictionary of the Ugaritic Language in the Alphabetic Tradition, I-II (Handbuch der Orientalistik I 67.1-2)*, Leiden 2003.
- PARKER, SIMON B. et al. (eds.), *Ugaritic Narrative Poetry (SBL Writing from the Ancient World 9)*, Atlanta 1997.
- PARSONS, TALCOTT, *Essays in Sociological Theory*, 2nd edition, Glencoe 1958.
- ROTH, SILKE, *Internationale Diplomatie am Hof Ramses. II.*, in: *Der ägyptische Hof des Neuen Reichs. Seine Gesellschaft und Kultur im Spannungsfeld zwischen Innen- und Außenpolitik im 2. Jahrtausend v. Chr. (Königtum, Staat und Gesellschaft früher Hochkulturen 2)*, edited by ROLF GUNDLACH/ANDREA KLUG, Wiesbaden 2006, pp. 90-118.
- REICHE, CHRISTINA, *Zur Anwendung von Netzwerkkonzept, Strukturtheorie und Semiotik bei der Erforschung von Gesellschaft und Kultur Ägyptens im inner- und interkulturellen Kontaktraum*, in: *Das ägyptische Königtum*

- im Spannungsfeld zwischen Innen- und Außenpolitik im 2. Jahrtausend v. Chr. (Königtum, Staat und Gesellschaft früher Hochkulturen 1), edited by ROLF GUNDLACH/ANDREA KLUG, Wiesbaden 2004, pp. 35-69.
- RÖMER, MALTE, Der Handel und die Kaufleute im Alten Ägypten, in: Studien zur altägyptischen Kultur 19 (1992), pp. 257-284.
- RYLE, GILBERT, The Concept of Mind, 3rd edition, Harmondsworth 1990.
- SCHNEIDER, THOMAS, Akkulturation – Identität – Elitekultur. Eine Positionsbestimmung zur Frage der Existenz und des Status von Ausländern in der Elite des Neuen Reiches, in: Der ägyptische Hof des Neuen Reichs. Seine Gesellschaft und Kultur im Spannungsfeld zwischen Innen- und Außenpolitik im 2. Jahrtausend v. Chr. (Königtum, Staat und Gesellschaft früher Hochkulturen 2), edited by ROLF GUNDLACH/ANDREA KLUG, Wiesbaden 2006, pp. 202-216.
- ID., Foreigners in Egypt: Archaeological Evidence and Cultural Context, in: Egyptian Archaeology, edited by WILLEMINA Z. WENDRICH, Oxford 2010, pp. 143-163.
- ID., Three Histories of Translation. Translating in Egypt, Translating Egypt, Translating Egyptian, in: Complicating the History of Western Translation: The Ancient Mediterranean in Perspective, edited by SIOHBÁN MCEL-DUFF/ENRICA SCIARRINO, Manchester 2011, pp. 176-189.
- SCHRADER, FRED E., Kulturtransfer zwischen sich überschneidenden Zivilisationen: Europa und Ostasien, in: Comparativ 9.4 (1999), pp. 101-106.
- SEGLER, TILMAN, Die Evolution von Organisationen. Ein evolutionstheoretischer Ansatz zur Erklärung der Entstehung und des Wandels von Organisationsformen, Frankfurt am Main 1985.
- SKOCPOL, THEDA/SOMERS, MARGARETE, The Uses of Comparative History in Macrosocial Inquiry, in: Comparative Studies in Society and History 22 (1980), pp. 174-197.
- SONIK, KAREN, Mesopotamian Conception of Supernatural: A Taxonomy of *Zwischenwesen*, in: Archiv für Religionsgeschichte 14.1 (2013), pp. 103-116.
- STEUER, PHILIPP, Bedingungen, Möglichkeiten und Barrieren des Wissenstransfers zwischen sozialwissenschaftlicher Begleitforschung und ihren Praxispartnern: Ergebnisse einer transferwissenschaftlichen Begleitstudie, in: Wissenstransfer – Erfolgskontrolle und Rückmeldungen aus der Praxis (Transferwissenschaften 5), edited by SIGUR WICHTER/ALBERT BUSCH, Frankfurt am Main 2006, pp. 295-330.

- TENBRUCK, FRIEDRICH H., Was war der Kulturvergleich, ehe es den Kulturvergleich gab? in: Soziale Welt, Sonderband, edited by JOACHIM MATTHES, Göttingen 1992, pp. 13-35.
- THIEL, MICHAEL, Organisation und Implementierung des Wissenstransfers. Effizienz durch Wiederverwendung von Wissen und Best Practices, PhD dissertation, Munich 2001.
- ULF, CHRISTOPH, Rethinking Cultural Contacts, in: Kulturkontakte in antiken Welten: vom Denkmodell zum Fallbeispiel (Colloquia antiqua 10), edited by ROBERT ROLLINGER/KORDULA SCHNEGG, Leuven 2014, pp. 507-564.
- WATANABE, KAZUKO, Die literarische Überlieferung eines babylonisch-assyrischen Fluchthemas mit Anrufung des Mondgottes Šin, in: Acta Sumerologica Japonica 6 (1984), pp. 99-119.
- WERNER, MICHAEL, Zum theoretischen Rahmen und historischen Ort der Kulturtransferforschung, in: Kultureller Austausch. Bilanz und Perspektiven der Frühneuzeitforschung, edited by MICHAEL NORTH, Cologne 2009, pp. 15-23.
- WINNICKI, JAN K., Late Egypt and Her Neighbours. Foreign Population in Egypt in the First Millennium BC (The Journal of Juristic Papyrology Suppl. 12), Warsaw 2009.