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CHAPTER TWENTY-ONE

A history of donkeys, wild asses and mules in Africa

Roger M. Blench

1. Introduction

While it is probably poor practice to award regions of the world marks for originating domesticates it is worth noting that Africa is responsible for four species of domestic animal in common use today, the donkey, the cat, the guinea-fowl and (probably) cattle. Of these, only cattle have attracted substantial attention from archaeozoologists, although the Near East lens through which much of their work is viewed has probably acted to obscure as much as to illuminate. To fill at least one of these lacunae, this paper focuses on reconstructing the history of the domestication of the donkey.¹

Although donkeys are both widespread and economically important to their owners, they are rarely studied and are not usually subject to any improvement, development or loan schemes (Svendsen 1996). Donkeys are not conventional sows or steers of meat, and their uses for packing and traction do not fit within the stereotyped perspectives of livestock agencies. None the less, they are essential to the subsistence strategies of many communities in semi-arid regions, relieving families of repetitive and energy-consuming tasks (Fielding & Pearson 1991). Moreover, they stay healthy on a varied and often poor-quality diet and require little management.

The early history of the donkey in Africa is also notable for a near-absence of substantive archaeological data. The use of the domestic donkey is well documented in Egyptian wall-paintings and other iconography. Elsewhere in the continent although there are representations of wild asses in rock art, the domestic donkey is remarkable chiefly for its absence. Historical references to the donkey in the West African Sahel are collected together by Lewicki (1974:88–9) and Levitzon & Hopkins (1981).

One strategy to fill this lacuna is the use of linguistics. Terms for donkeys and asses have been recorded in numerous African and Near eastern languages. Compiling these terms and tracing the links between them makes it possible to extend some hypotheses both about the process of domestication and the routes along which the donkey spread. Combined judiciously with modern ethnoarchaeological data this can be used to partially reconstruct the prehistory of the donkey in Africa.
The wild ass, *Equus asinus africanus*, is indigenous to the African continent and is usually divided into a chain of races of subspecies spreading from the Atlas mountains southwards to Nubia, down the Red Sea and probably as far as the border of present-day northern Kenya (Groves 1966, 1986, Halténorth & Diller 1980:109). The extent to which the wild ass penetrated the interior of Africa is controversial, but it is generally considered unlikely that it ever occurred in sub-Saharan regions. Groves (1986) argues that the wild ass extended into the Near East in ancient times and co-existed with the onager, *E. hemionus*.

Figure 21.1 shows the actual range of the wild ass in the 1990s (Kingdon 1997) superimposed on the hypothetical former distribution prior to Roman depredations in North Africa. Four main races, *atlanticus*, *africanus*, *tenebrius* and *somaliensis*, are located on the map approximately where they are shown in earlier studies (e.g. Halténorth & Diller 1980). However, two of these, *atlanticus* and *tenebrius* have been rejected more recently and indeed the proposed *atlanticus* race turns out to have been based on misidentified zebra bones (Kingdon 1997:311).

The main features differentiating races of wild ass are the amount and type of stripes and the shoulder crosses. However, their characterization may be somewhat blurred, since populations that survived into historical times have almost certainly crossed with feral donkeys, leading to a merger of characteristics. Groves (1986) presents arguments for making further differentiation within these groups.

Of these races, the wild ass of the Atlas mountains became extinct by AD 300 and is known only through depictions (Halténorth & Diller 1980:109). Civil war in both Somalia and Eritrea may mean that the fragile populations marked have disappeared or are severely threatened. There are two doubtful populations of wild ass near Siwa oasis in Egypt and further south towards the Sahara proper. There are breeding animals conserved today in the Dole zoo and the Haf Bar Reserve in the Negev desert, and these may well be the last remaining genetically pure populations. Ethnographic reports cited by Groves (1986:34) appear to suggest the presence of wild asses in the Tihisbi and Ahaggar. These may well be feral donkeys or populations substantially interbred with the domestic donkey. The populations on the island of Socota are certainly feral donkeys (Halténorth & Diller 1980). The wild ass is limited to the semi-arid regions through its susceptibility to humidity, but the southern range of the domesticated donkey can be extended by careful management.

The original motive for domesticating the donkey is unknown, and it is not certain that it would necessarily reflect its common usage today, as transport for people and goods. It may have been domesticated for its meat or milk, with its use for portage a later development. Groves (1966, 1986) set out the possible ancestors of the donkey and pointed out that present-day wild populations are no longer sufficiently homogenous to resolve the question unambiguously. Groves argues that we cannot exclude the Middle East as the original focus of domestication, although there is no positive evidence in favour of this. The Nubian wild ass is cited in many textbooks and other races may also have contributed to the gene-pool (Eiselen 1984:174). Bokényi (1991) argued that domestication took place in Egypt and Clutton-Brock (1992) notes that the skeletons of three
Donkeys have been found in an Egyptian tomb dated to 4500–4000 BC.

There are comparable early skeletons in the Near East but whether these are domestic Equus 

uncertain (Eisenmann 1993:11).

Haitamneth & Diller (1980) describe the characteristics of the African races of 

wild ass and it does seem that there is some correspondence between local 

classification. The donkey and the phenotypes of the wild ass race. For example, 

Equus somaliensis is notable for the leg rings, on both fore and hind legs. The Somali donkey 

is described as having "zebra markings" on the legs (Mason & Maxie 1966:14). 

In contrast, West African donkeys usually have distinct shoulder crossings (shown in 

representations of the wild ass) but rarely any leg markings.

Earlier writers considered that the Asiatic onager may have played some part in 

the descent of the African donkey, and one remarkable wall-painting from Thebes 

dated to the 16th Dynasty does show some onagers apparently carrying a chariot 

(Epinson 1971:1:397). However, it is generally considered unlikely that the 

was more than an exotic curiosity, especially as onager x ass crosses are sterile.

3. Donkeys in use

Donkeys are kept in Africa for four reasons: (a) as work animals; (b) for breed- 

ing; (c) for milking; (d) to eat.

Of these, work is by far the most important. Donkeys are used mainly as pack 

animals, either for carrying loads or for treading grass. Less commonly, they are used in 

trials, for example, pulling carts or ploughs, although in sub-Saharan Africa 

several of these are post European introductions (Feldman 1976). In Ancient Egypt, asses 

were used both for treading seed into the furrow and for threshing, but there seem to 

be no modern reports of these practices. A review of some of the existing 

literature is given in Clutton-Brock (1992) although this focuses principally on 

horses.

Breding donkeys can be a profitable business in certain regions of the Sahel. 

In the region, the donkey provides one of the most easily available 

and, owing to humidity-related infections, it is therefore more practical for donkey-

users to buy animals from further north and replace them at the end of their working 

life. Sahelian countries such as Niger and Mali have a considerable trade selling 

donkeys, usually male, in communities further south.

Although asse's milk has an important symbolic value due to its prominence in 
certain Near Eastern texts, the milking of donkeys in Africa is rare and of little 

economic importance. The western Maasaï are reported to milk donkeys (Epinson 

1971i:386) and donkeys' milk is used in medicinal remedies in parts of West Africa.

The main reason for this is probably the low-maintenance system that obtained 

until recently; donkeys were not milked because of the labour of catching them regularly.

The extent to which donkeys are eaten is probably greatly underestimated, since 

this is something of a taboo area for many observers. Note the less, the wild ass 
hunts have been hunted so near-extinction for its meat and eating 1936 is common in

many East African pastoral systems. In West Africa, the trade in donkeys for meat is 

essentially old, sick or exhausted animals that have been used as work animals 
in the villages of the semi-arid zone. Because of its ambiguous status, the trade in 

donkeys remains poorly documented.

Islam prohibits the consumption of donkey meat and many Christian and 

traditionalist groups also refuse to eat it. Ibn Battuta, travelling in the Empire of 

Mali in 1352 noted with disaide the consumption of donkey meat (Ibn Battuta 1953: 

1920:4523-4 also see Leventis & Leventis 1981:297). Tewolde (1939:76) describes 

the Barhe nomads of Mauretania as eating donkeys in the early sixteenth century.

Donkey meat was still eaten in the Mafa Gourma at the turn of the century 

(Desplagnes 1907:228).

Further south, in the more humid regions of west-central Africa, the donkey is 

an exotic to which no culinary taboos attach. In Nigeria there is a thriving trade in 

donkeys rearing in southern markets and this is probably replicated along the west 

African coast (TIM 1992). Formerly much of the trade had been in smoked meat, 

as donkeys bought in intermediate markets were slaughtered and skinned and the meat 

then prepared by drying and smoking. This practice seems to have largely dis-

appeared, and the trade is confined to live donkeys. The meat is sold as donkey meat 

tenderly, but is sometimes passed off as the more expensive beef outside the town.

In East Africa there are also reports of eating donkeys. The Karo people in Kenya 

are recorded as frequently feeding donkeys for consumption and some of the other 
cultivators close to the Maasaï may also eat donkeys (Epinson 1971i:387).

4. Productivity of donkeys under traditional management

Fielding (1988) has reviewed existing productivity data for female donkeys 

worldwide. Studies on the productivity of donkeys under traditional management 
in sub-Saharan Africa are sparse, contrasting principally with Wilson (1980) for two 
different systems in Mali, Wilson et al. (1984) for the Twa pastoral herds of 

Niger and west (1992) for northern Nigeria. The latter study has the most compre-

hensive data and the largest sample size; its findings are therefore quoted here as 

indicative (Table 21.1).

The mean age at first foaling, 56.9 months, is substantially higher than in 
temperate countries where about three years is considered usual (Fielding 1988:163).

Table 21.1 General reproductive parameters of donkeys in Nigeria.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean age of breeding female</td>
<td>03.3</td>
<td>29.0</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean age at first foaling</td>
<td>36.9</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foaling interval</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most number of previous parities</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DONKEYS in Nigeria are allowed to mate freely when bred, but restrictions on access to males when jennies are used for work can mean that oestrus is over ‘cooled’. Estimates from the literature suggest that the length of the oestrous cycle is about 24 days and the length of the oestrus itself 6–7 days. Donkeys are usually seasonal breeders in temperate regions but in the tropics they come into oestrus throughout the year. Variations in the annual pattern of foaling are most likely to reflect nutritional differences. Donkeys have a gestation period of almost precisely a year (374 days in the estimates quoted in Fielding 1988). The body condition of breeding females never deteriorates so far as to inhibit fertility, and so even conception pattern reflects their ability to thrive on the poorest of dons (Borwick 1970).

These figures provide numerical confirmation of many generalizations about donkeys, both in terms of their hardiness and productivity. However, they should be used with caution as they represent the system in one specific region of Sahelian Africa. The degree of variation within Africa as a whole may be considerable.

5. Archaeology, history and ethnography

Osteological records of domestic donkeys begin in Egypt in the fourth millennium BC from the site of Maadi (Midant-Reynes 1992). There are clear representations of working donkeys by the middle of the next millennium (Einstein 1971:392; Brew et al. 1994-96). At about the same period there are textual records of large herds of donkeys, many of which were used for portage. Under the Pharaoh Pepi II (c. 2270 BC) trading expeditions to Punt (Ethiopia) consisted of caravans with pack donkeys (Kidder 1993). The extent to which the donkey departs from its wild relative can be traced through Egyptian wall-paintings, where the dark shoulder-stripe of the ass gradually disappears from the donkeys as the Old Kingdom gives way to the Middle Kingdom (Brewer et al. 1994:100). Donkeys from the second millennium BC occur at Saqqara in the Butana grasslands of Sudan (Petrie 1991). The historical and archaeological evidence for domestic donkeys in the Maghreb is reviewed by Camps (1988). Donkeys were found in the funerary assemblages at Carthage in the Roman period (first to fourth centuries AD; Levine 1994). Kauche (1996) reviews the evidence for donkeys in Morocco; there are possible finds of ass bones at the ‘neolithic’ sites of Da-es-Soltane and Tangier but no certain representations in rock art.

5.1. Wild asses and donkeys in rock art

Donkeys can only be distinguished from wild asses if they are shown in use; representations are not therefore evidence of domestication but only of presence. Representations of asses or donkeys are sparse outside of a few scattered petroglyphs in the Saharan Atlas and the Mathendous (southern Libya). A recent review of west-central Saharan rock art suggests that there are virtually no representations of wild asses or domestic donkeys (Muzzolini 1995). Similarly, and perhaps more surprisingly, there appear to be no representations of asses or donkeys in the Horn of Africa (Phillipson 1993:330). Only further research will show if the intention was to depict donkeys. As usual, dating rock art is highly problematic; the following occurrences are given as a basis for further biographical and archaeological studies.

5.1.1. Algeria. Cadereous (1995, Fig. 4.3) depicts a very clear head of an ass in the Ksour mountains of the Sahara Atlas. Muzzolini (1995, Fig. 436) illustrates a female ass with her young in a rock engraving at El Richa, Saharan Atlas, assigned to the Bubaline school (c. 5000–2000 BC).

5.1.2. Libya At Messak in southern Libya, a rock engraving (post 1500 BC?) shows a donkey with pointed legs (Lutz & Lutz 1995, Fig. 6). The ritual importance of the wild ass is well-illustrated in a Bubaline period engraving from Mathendous, Tassili in Aijer (southern Libya) given by Muzzolini (1995, Fig. 436) which shows two men wearing asses’ heads masks apparently committing sodomy.

5.1.3. Egypt. Winkler (1938–39) identified wild asses in rock art of the Eastern Desert.

5.2. Archaeology

Archaeologically, there are few certain records of domestic donkeys in sub-Saharan Africa. The earliest record of a donkey in West Africa is at Situert in Senegambia (MacDonald & MacDonald Ch. 10 in this volume). The stratigraphy of this site appears to be reliable and the donkey bone is dated to AD 0–250. After this, the next donkey bones occur at Askum in Mali with a date of AD about 600. However, these are extremely rare, even in sites such as Tagharet, where there have been extensive finds of other domestic species. Bearing this in mind, it is curious that bones identified as Equus asinus at MK40 in Mali are dismissed by Gaulther (1991) as “intrusive”.

The picture for eastern Africa is much richer. Marshall (Ch. 10 in this volume) summarizes the evidence which suggests that there were domestic donkeys near the Nile confluence as early as the fourth millennium BC. A site in northern Ethiopia without radiocarbon dates has been assigned a comparative antiquity. The scarcity in West Africa may relate to a problem of identification. There is considerable evidence for the widespread use of ponies in west-central Africa, a cultural pattern that evolved from the adaptation of North African horses to the ecology of the sub-Saharan region (Blench 1993). West African ponies are extremely small and it remains to be demonstrated that they have been reliably distinguished from donkeys and mules. Eisenmann (1986) has published extensively on the distinction between horses, asses, mules and donkeys but not all archaeozoologists working on Africa have made use of the criteria she has established.

Equid teeth have been recovered from excavations in central Nigeria from rock shelters at Kaya Wuro (Allsworth-Jones 1982) and Rop. The Rop tooth, in particular, which are dated to the first millennium BC, have been identified as those of a wild ass or donkey ( Sutton 1985). This seems unlikely, unless either the stratigraphy at Rop is misleading or these are in fact pony teeth.
Historical sources on the spread of the donkey are extant. The Arabic sources for west-central Africa mention donkeys several times (all references from Levitz von Hopkins 1891. Al-Bakri’s (p. 81) noted the use of donkeys to carry salt in the Kingdom of Ghana and Al-Sulami (p. 563) commented on their small size in the Empire of Mali. However, donkeys were not mentioned in Ethiopian historical chronicles (Paulkurt 1960). When European trading voyages began there were a few scattered references. Donkeys and mules from Persia were apparently first landed at the Cape by the Dutch East India Company in 1689 (Boequet 1958). Little is known of their subsequent history, but it seemed likely that the Boer farmers were the initial agents of their spread into the interior.

The few rock art depictions and the literary references to donkey-yoss in textual records presumably relate to their low status. Rock art in the Sahara focused on the high prestige horse and later the camel. However, it may also be that the spread of donkeys was at first slow and scattered and its importance developed with the evolution of long-distance trade.

6. Linguistic evidence

Another way of approaching the history of the donkey is through vernacular names in the languages of sub-Saharan Africa. Two authors, Skinner, S. I. (1977) and Bender (1988) have looked at the potential for reconstruction in specific language groups. They have found that the name for donkey in “Africena Censale” as part of an investigation of the antiquity of the pony in this region, Brelscho (1995) is an exploration of the ethnomorphology for donkeys in the Lake Chad area. This section attempts to identify some of the principal roots for “young donkey” in African languages and advances some hypotheses about the implications to be drawn from this data. Donkeys may be represented by a ramified terminology; there can be separate terms for wild ass, jenny, young donkey, etc. These are often quite obscure and lexicographers not specialized in isolate languages do not always record them. Further research may thus reveal connections and confirmations of root forms not at present apparent.

The principal base forms identified are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Base Word</th>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ṣebe</td>
<td>Widespread in Africa</td>
<td>Ethiopian languages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ṣabitha</td>
<td>Cushitic</td>
<td>Berber</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Bender (1988:152) reconstructed proto-Omotic *ṣəb for ass, although to judge by some Omotic citations this probably had a long vowel. Words of this general.

---

### Table 21.2: Family Branch Language Form

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phylogram</th>
<th>Family</th>
<th>Branch</th>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Afroasiatic</td>
<td>Omotic</td>
<td>Gimir</td>
<td>_BC</td>
<td>Ṣebe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mino</td>
<td>_BC</td>
<td>Ṣabitha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cushitic</td>
<td>Southern</td>
<td>_BC</td>
<td>Ṣebe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>East</td>
<td>_BC</td>
<td>Ṣebe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chadic</td>
<td>West</td>
<td>_BC</td>
<td>Ṣebe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Central</td>
<td>_BC</td>
<td>Ṣebe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>East</td>
<td>_BC</td>
<td>Ṣebe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nilo-Saharan</td>
<td>C. Sudanic</td>
<td>_BC</td>
<td>Ṣebe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sahara</td>
<td>_BC</td>
<td>Ṣebe</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The term *ḥarrə* is probably originally a word for zebra in Lowland Omotic and was transferred to donkey once it was fully domesticated. The term *ḥarrə* then became the “donkey of the plains.” Formations such as *Kōna ḥarrə-ẹrọ* for “zebra” would be calques of the Boraan expression, already using the borrowed "young donkey."
word for donkey. The development of the donkey as pack animal is probably reflected in the Beja ḥarrī “anything ridden, from a camel to a train”. In the Horn of Africa, an old root for the wild ass shur- was largely displaced by ḥarrī when the domesticated donkey developed economic significance. The term ḥarrī was probably borrowed from terms in lowland Oromoi, originally applied to “zebra”.

\[\text{ḥār'-r} \]

Surprisingly, the Agaw terms and those in West Rift (Southern Cushitic) seem to be related despite their considerable geographical separation. The DV-initial syllable is not a prefix in either group and the words look too similar for this to be merely coincidence.

### Table 21.3 - ḥār-root.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Family</th>
<th>Branch</th>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cushitic</td>
<td>Agaw</td>
<td>Bilin</td>
<td>ḥār-<em>a</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>West Rift</td>
<td>Ṭaraw</td>
<td>ḥāra</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It has been suggested that this form is derived from southern Cushitic “zebra”, for example, Ṭaraw ḥār-eret, but this is not very convincing.

#### 6.1. Ancient Egyptian

The principal form recorded for Ancient Egyptian, ḥr, is too reduced to be certain of its affinities. It may be related to either of the Semitic roots set out below.

#### 6.2. Semitic

There are two widespread base forms in Semitic, ḥār-r and ḥār-m-ṣ. These may ultimately be related, but both are attested synchronically in many languages. Table 21.4 and Table 21.5 show a short series of witnesses for these base forms; these widespread roots suggest that wild ass was familiar to proto-Semitic speakers and that it was transferred early to the donkey.

### Table 21.4 - ḥār-r base form.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Branch</th>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Canaanite</td>
<td>Ugaritic</td>
<td>ḥār</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Classical</td>
<td>ḥār</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arabic</td>
<td>Mehri</td>
<td>ḥār</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Arabian</td>
<td>Classical Arabic</td>
<td>ḥār</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethio-Semitic</td>
<td>Amharic</td>
<td>ḥāyər</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Branch</th>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arabic</td>
<td>Ugaritic</td>
<td>ḥār</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Classical</td>
<td>ḥār</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Arabian</td>
<td>Classical Arabic</td>
<td>ḥār</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethio-Semitic</td>
<td>Amharic</td>
<td>ḥəyər</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 6.3. Berber

There are two principal Berber roots, ḥaww and ḡaww. Neither of these have any known connection with any other Afroasiatic terms and probably represent an ancient name for the North African wild ass transferred to the donkey at an unknown period.

#### 6.4. Summary

The linguistic evidence suggests that individual branches of the Afroasiatic language family seem all to have quite distinctive lexical items for wild ass/donkey. In most cases, the speakers would have been familiar with the wild ass, and so this root is widespread in Central Africa and seems to have been carried from the Cushitic-speaking regions in the Horn of Africa to the Lake Chad region (hence the loan-speaking regions in the Horn of Africa to the Lake Chad region). This is consonant with the hypothesis that the donkey was taken into domestication several times around the fringes of the Sahara.

#### 7. Patterns of spread of the domestic donkey

The spread of the domestic donkey can be divided into two major phases: the introduction of domestic donkeys prior to European contact and the subsequent era. These two eras are not as clear, distinguished by the historical record. For example, in regions where the domestic donkey is well known, such as the Sahara, it was taken into domestication several times. Each of these eras will be considered in turn.

#### 7.1. Documentation

By and large there are no records describing the spread of the donkey in the pre-European contact period. Later texts in European languages refers to the donkey as already domesticated. Later texts in European languages usually refer to the presence of the donkey, not to its introduction.

#### 7.2. Land or sea routes

The diffusion of the donkey in pre-European contact times, seems to have been strictly via land, most notably across the Sahara, but usually simply spreading.
gradually from area to area. However, once the donkey became seen as a productive animal for all of semi-arid Africa, it seems to have been brought to southern Africa in ships, hence its disjunct distribution.

There is a reference to so-called "Muscat" donkeys in Tanzania in the 1930s (Mason & Mauje 1960:16). These were light-coloured donkeys associated with the Arabs and may thus have been brought from the Gulf region or from Egypt where they have a long tradition of use.

7.3. Informal versus formal diffusion

In the past, donkeys diffused principally from farmer to farmer or were sold by occupationally specialized pastoralists, as in West Africa. However, they have been spread in the present century as part of broad agricultural strategies associated either with the nation-state or with aid agencies. Most importantly, they have been recommended for traction in regions with light, sandy soils and the industrial manufacture of axm for donkey-carts has also given their diffusion among farmers considerable stimulus. In the light of this, it is ironic in many ways that in southern Africa today they are seen by the authorities principally as a pest (Starkey 1995).

The informal diffusion of donkeys continues even today; the clearing of savanna forest south of the Sahel and the consequent decline in trans-Saharan trade has permitted donkeys to spread southwards. Donkeys can survive on an unimproved diet and can find food in the peri-urban wastelands surrounding many African towns. Similarly, deforestation and land degradation lead to decreased biodiversity; donkeys can fend on the blocks that persist under these conditions.

The use of donkeys is closely related to road infrastructure and the price of rural transport. In Nigeria, for example, the oil boom era led to massive importation of small pickups and these came to be the preferred means of transporting farm produce to market. Inland prices of both vehicles and fuel were so low that many farmers sold their donkeys and breeders in the semi-arid region turned to other enterprises. However, once the recession set in at the end of the 1980s, the economics of mechanized rural transport became more doubtful and farmers became anxious to acquire donkeys again. Having receded in Nigeria, the donkey is once again spreading (Ism 1992)).

8. Mules and hinnies

If the history of the donkey is known only very partially, the history of mules is almost completely invisible. Mules are the F1 cross between a horse and a donkey and are usually sterile. Mules are usually and are valued for their hybrid vigour, but are generally infertile. Mules are usually and are used in the Eastern Mediterranean and are very much associated with Arab culture and the reconstruction of "male" in West-Semitic languages suggest that they represent an ancient practice in the Near East.
Mules are difficult to detect archaeologically (i.e. their bones can often not be reliably distinguished from donkeys and horses). Although techniques are available (see Eisenmann 1986), it is safe to say that these have rarely been applied in Africa. In the light of this, only linguistics and ethnography have some potential for recovering their history.

A unique Egyptian wall-painting from the New Kingdom (c. 1570 bc) appears to represent a pair of mules pulling a chariot (Breuer et al. 1994: Fig. 8.3). However, they are almost unknown in the rest of the continent. Doutreouville (1947:264) notes that there are male races in Senegambia and Guinea, apparently brought from Algeria. Further east, in Niger and Nigeria, mules are not bred, apparently because it is thought to be unnatural to intentionally produce a sterile animal (Kim 1992). Where the donkey still represents a valuable possession, this is a rational strategy.

9. Conclusions and further research

The donkey certainly originated with the African wild ass, although it may have been domesticated several times in regions of its former range no longer represented by its present-day distribution. This appears to be confirmed by studies of donkeys in various African language families. Egypt remains the most likely centre for its early development for agricultural work, although without further archaeological data from outside the Nile Valley this is uncertain.

Although at least one archaeological site appears to confirm the donkey crossed the Sahara some 2,000 years ago, it may have been as a rare exotic, since both bones and rock-paintings are otherwise scarce. It is probable that donkey use only took off in West Africa with the rise of the long-distance caravan trade. However, there appears to be strong evidence for an east-west link suggesting that donkeys could have reached Lake Chad across the Sahara. Given the early dates for donkeys in the Ethiopia-Sudan region this would be quite reasonable.

To understand the broader parameters of donkey use and its role in the economic system of its owners, studies of productivity under traditional management such as those reported in §4 need to be replicated in other parts of the continent and stratified both according to ecological zone and production strategy. To understand the past we need to know considerably more about the donkey in the present.

Notes

1. I would like to thank Paul Starkey for general discussions as well as assistance with updating the map art references as well as contributing on the whole paper and Stephen Hall pointed me in the direction of the special issues of Ethnologie africaine. Catherine Berain kindly sent me an advance copy of her paper "L'âne, ou mal aimé" presented at the Mougla-Tchal Conference, Oranienburg, October 1997.

2. I am grateful to Juliet Clutton-Brock for the stimulus to pursue this line of research. A date of 1658 is given by Joubert (1985) but without supporting evidence.