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Abstract

In this contribution Plutarch’s views on donkeys are analysed. On the basis of his texts on the matter, it is shown that he was influenced by Egyptian, Jewish and Greek traditions. Having recourse to the so-called allegoresis, Plutarch’s opinion on donkeys is presented as the result of his eclectic perspective in the frame of Platonic philosophy.
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This article aims to present Plutarch’s views on donkeys. After drafting briefly the traditions on which Plutarch appears to build (the Egyptian tradition playing so important a role in his work De Iside et Osiride, and the Jewish tradition), I will illustrate the Greek background influencing Plutarch’s own opinion. An analysis of Plutarch’s most significant texts on this topics follows. Lastly, a little excursus on allegoresis will help us to understand in which sense Plutarch’s views on donkeys can be read in (Middle)-Platonic terms.

1. A fascinating animal with contradictory characteristics

Of all animals, there is none to which one can associate as many different meanings as the donkey. This is due, basically, to its peculiarities: Less speedy than a horse but sturdier,
a donkey is cheaper to maintain, has good resistance and can move easily on rough grounds. For this reason, from the beginning of history onwards donkeys have been used in Europe and in Western Asia for transporting loads and people or for drawing carts. Today, they continue to play a very important role in some developing countries. In the second millennium BC, epithets like ‘donkey driver’ seem to have accompanied even rulers’ names. But on the other hand, precisely because of their hard life, their humble appearance and their vocal expression so dissimilar to the noble neigh of a horse, donkeys were and are regarded as stupid, inferior animals. The word ‘donkey’ used as a personal address is a synonym of intellectual weakness.

Essential for work but detested for their ugliness, admired for their resistance and strength but disregarded as pack animals, donkeys enjoyed both consideration and contempt. As two examples of extremely different views on donkeys, I would like to show the Jewish and the Egyptian cultures. Both are evident in Plutarch’s account.

2. The Jewish tradition and its influence on Christianity

In the Old Testament there are numerous references to donkeys as an inherent element of Jewish culture. They generally appear as a reflection of the natural environment of Israel and as an aspect of its agricultural economy. In his interesting book Jahwes Aufstieg, M. Vogel explains how, among the Jews, divinity came to be identified with a donkey. The appellation ‘Hebrew’ itself infers ‘ass nomads’, ‘donkey-men’ and therefore, if God made man in his own image, in his likeness, one can easily understand why the Jews imagined their God as a donkey and thought of donkeys in terms of animals to be adored.

However, the representation of Jesus in Christianity was also affected by this opinion. That the animal on which Jesus triumphantly entered Jerusalem was a donkey is indisputable. The donkey was in fact, on the basis of Gen. 49.11 and Zech. 9.9, the Messianic mount. In the nativity scene, donkey and ox were associated with Jesus’ birth on the basis of Isaiah 1.3.

3 See above all pp. 27-9; 113-4.
4 Although the Greek word used in Mark 11.1-10 is πῶλος ‘foal’, H.-W. KUHN, ‘Das Reittier Jesu...’, 83-91 conclusively demonstrates that it indicates a donkey.
3. Egyptian characterization

The Ancient Egyptians considered animals as holy beings because they saw in them the presence of the Divine. They adored all animals, with the exception of donkeys. Furthermore, although donkeys must originally have been used in Ancient Egypt as plodders and pack animals, the Egyptians even hated them because of their association with the cruel god Set. This divinity, better known in Greek as Typhon, was Osiris’s and Isis’s envious younger brother. He killed and dismembered Osiris unleashing a long battle with Osiris’s son Horus. Plutarch’s De Iside et Osiride, the main source for this myth, tells us that because of Typhon’s ability to impede the course of progress towards good, the Egyptians assigned to him the most stupid of all domesticated animals, the ass, and the most savage of all wild animals, the crocodile and the hippopotamus.

4. The donkey in the Greek world

The Greek ὀνος is a foreign word of unknown origin. Donkeys came to Greece and Italy from Asia Minor and were utilized in work or as domestic animals. Under the influence of the Egyptians, the Ancient Greeks linked the donkey with Typhon. However, in Greek reception, the figure of the donkey appears to maintain a certain ambiguity. While it is on the one hand Dionysus’ animal because of its phallic strength, on the other hand, the Greeks also spoke of donkey hybrids’ sterility.

The same can be said about the connection between donkeys and music. Donkeys were regarded as gross and unmelodious animals. According to the followers of Pythagoras, the donkey is the only animal not born in tune and therefore completely deaf to the sound of the lyre; hence the expression ὄνος λύρας ἀκούων ‘a lyre-hearing donkey’ used to indicate someone who has no ear for...
music. Greek mythology also recounts the story of King Midas who judged against Apollo during a musical contest and subsequently had his ears changed to those of a donkey as punishment for his musical incompetence. According to another legend, Midas was given donkey’s ears because he was initiated into the rites of Dionysus. In addition, some attributed to donkeys a fine sense of hearing\textsuperscript{13} and the origins of Greek music can be sought in mythological figures that had to do with donkeys, such as satyrs and silens, the Centaurs and Midas himself\textsuperscript{14}. If the epithet ‘donkey’ used as an address was a curse that denoted stupidity, awkwardness, stolidity, indolence and ugliness\textsuperscript{15}, we should not forget that ‘donkeys’ were also seen as the initiated in some Orphic rituals\textsuperscript{16} relating to the Dionysian cult\textsuperscript{17}.

In any case, a Homeric passage would seem to summarize the Greek opinion on donkeys. In \textit{Il.} 11.558-65 Ajax is compared to a donkey. If, on the one hand, the simile indicates that Ajax has been ‘mishandled’ as a donkey by his enemies, on the other hand its intention is to underline the hero’s enormous strength\textsuperscript{18}.

5. \textit{Plutarch’s account}

a) The donkey and Typhon

In \textit{De Iside et Osiride}, Plutarch records the Egyptian tradition according to which donkeys were associated with Typhon. Due to their resemblance to the cruel god in terms color, stupidity, lasciviousness and obstructing power\textsuperscript{19}, donkeys were maltreated and humiliated in many rituals. In \textit{De Iside et Osiride} 30, 362 F, for example, Plutarch refers to certain festivals in Kopto during which an ass was thrown over the edge of a precipice\textsuperscript{20}.

The habitants of Kopto were not alone in their hatred of donkeys because of the association with Typhon. In Busiris and Lycopolis, no trumpets were used because these made a sound...
like an ass, an animal that was regarded as unclean and as a bearer of obscure powers. That is why in the month of Payni and Phaophi the device of an ass tied by a rope (31, 362 F-363 A\textsuperscript{21}) was imprinted upon sacrificial cakes.

As the donkey was associated with Typhon, the Egyptians also gave abominable persons this nickname. This is so in the case of Artaxerxes III, the most hated of all Persians kings, who was called ‘the Ass’\textsuperscript{22}.

b) The sacredness of donkeys

Immediately after reporting Artaxerxes III’s nickname, Plutarch\textsuperscript{23} adds (De Iside et Osiride 31, 363 C\textsuperscript{24}):

> But those who relate that Typhon’s flight from the battle was made on the back of an ass

and lasted for seven days, and that after he had made his escape, he became the father of sons, Hierosolynimus and Judaeus, are manifestly, as the very names show, attempting to drag Jewish traditions into the legend\textsuperscript{25}.

Thus the De Iside et Osiride offers an example of the fact that Plutarch was aware both of the Egyptian tradition and of the Jewish tradition. In Quaest. Conv. iv. 5. 3, 670 E he also relates that the Jews prized the donkey highly and also abstained from the hare because of its resemblance to a donkey\textsuperscript{26}.

The sacredness of donkeys is also evident in the passages in which Plutarch presents the donkey as a bearer of omens. An example is to be found in the Life of Caius Marius, 38. 6\textsuperscript{27}:

\textsuperscript{21} Βουσιρῖται δὲ καὶ Λυκοπολῖται σάλπιγξιν οὐ χρῶνται τὸ παράπαν ὡς ὄνῳ φθεγγομέναις ἐμφερές. καὶ ὅλως τὸ ὄνον οὐ καθαρὸν ἀλλὰ δαιμονικὸν ἡγοῦνται ζῷον εἶναι διὰ τὴν πρὸς ἐκεῖνον ὁμοιότητα καὶ πόρπα ποιοῦντες ἐν θυσίαις τοῦ Παilliseconds καὶ τοῦ Φαωφὶ μηνὸς ἐπιπλάττουσι παράσημον ὄνον δεδεμένον.

\textsuperscript{22} De Iside et Osiride 31, 363 C: ἀπολαύειν δὲ καὶ τὸ ὄνον, ὡς ἐἴρηται [362 F], τῆς ὁμοιότητος διὰ τὴν ἀμαθίαν καὶ τὴν ὁμολογίαν ὃς ἄθικτος ἄλλοι ὁμοιότητα καὶ ἀπαντάντες ἐν θυσίαις τοῦ Παilliseconds καὶ τοῦ Φαωφὶ μηνὸς ἐπιπλάττουσι παράσημον ὄνον δεδεμένον.

\textsuperscript{23} English translations of Greek passages are taken from the Loeb editions, unless otherwise stated.

\textsuperscript{24} οἱ δὲ λέγοντες ἐκ τῆς μάχης ἐπὶ ὄνου τῷ Τυφῶνι τὴν φυγὴν ἑπτὰ ἡμέρας γενέσθαι καὶ σωθέντα γεννῆσαι Ῥιερολυμίον καὶ Ἰουδαίον, αὐτόθεν εἰσὶ κατάδηλοι τὰ Ἰουδαϊκὰ παρέλκοντες ἐις τὸν μῦθον.

\textsuperscript{25} Cf. Tacitus, Histories 5. 2.

\textsuperscript{26} Quaest. Conv. iv. 5. 3, 670 E: 'Οὐ δ<ἡτ>' εἶπεν> ὁ Λαμπρίας ὡπολ<ἀβων> 'ἄλλα τοῦ μὲν λαγου<ο>ν <φείδουν> ται διὰ τὴν πρὸς τὸν μένον ὑπ’ αὐτῶν μι...τα θηρίων ἐμφερέστατον.

\textsuperscript{27} ως ἐγόμενος πρὸς τῇ οἰκίᾳ τῆς Φαννίας ἑγέρνει, τῶν θυρίων ἄνοιγματος ὄνος ἔνδοθαι ἐχώριει δρόμῳ, πιόμενος ἀπὸ κρήνης ἐγγὺς ἀπορροεύσει προσβλέψας δὲ τῷ Μαρίῳ
When, as he was led along, he had come to the house of Fannia, the door flew open and an ass ran out, in order to get a drink at a spring that flowed hard by; with a saucy and exultant look at Marius the animal at first stopped in front of him, and then, giving a magnificent bray, went frisking past him triumphantly. From this Marius drew an omen and concluded that the Deity was indicating a way of escape for him by sea rather than by land; for the ass made no account of its dry fodder, but turned from that to the water.

In the Life of Alexander 73. 3, a tame donkey kills a magnificent lion as a sign that Alexander should keep away from Babylon. In fr. 182 Sandbach, Tiberius receives a prediction of his future throne from a donkey which emits many large sparks while being groomed.

c) The donkey as a curse, a symbol of a very hard life

While Plutarch on the one hand describes the donkey as a ‘holy’ animal capable of bringing omens, on the other hand he also shares the Greek communis opinio whereby the donkey was looked upon as a pack animal with a very hard life. According to this view, those who are compared with donkeys also have a miserable, not enviable life. To be associated with a donkey is, in any case, not a compliment as the donkey is, after all, the most stupid of all domesticated

λαμυρόν τι καὶ γεγηθός, ἐστι πρῶτον ἐναντίον, εἶτα φωνῆς φωνὴν ἀφῆκε λαμπρὰν καὶ παρεσκίρτησε παρ᾽ αὐτὸν ὑπὸ γαυρότητος. ἐξ οὗ συμβαλὼν ὁ Μάριος ἔφασκεν, ὡς διὰ θαλάσσης αὐτῷ ὑπὸ γαυρότητος ἐξ οὗ συμβαλὼν ὁ Μάριος ἔφασκεν, ὡς διὰ θαλάσσης αὐτῷ μᾶλλον ἢ διὰ γῆς ὑποδείκνυσι σωτηρίαν τὸ δαιμόνιον · τὸν γὰρ ὄνον οὐ προσέχοντα τῇ ξηρᾷ τροφῇ πρὸς τὸ ὕδωρ ἀπ’ αὐτοῦ τραπέσθαι.

28 ἡνώχλει δ’ αὐτὸν <καὶ άλλα> σημεῖα πολλά. καὶ γὰρ λέοντα τῶν τρεφομένων μέγιστον καὶ κάλλιστον ἥμερος ἐπελθὼν καὶ λακτίσας ἀνεῖλεν.

29 Τούτου (sc. Σεβήρου) ὁ ὄνος ὡς Πλούταρχος ὁ Χαιρωνεύς φησιν, ἕτι μειρακίῳ ὄντι καὶ ἐν Ῥόδῳ ἐπὶ λόγους ῥητορικοὺς διατρίβοντι τὴν βασιλείαν διὰ τοῦ αὐτοῦ παθήματος προεμήνυσεν.

30 Cf. Aet. Rom. 48, 276 C: ‘Διὰ τι τῇ τῶν Κωνσυαλίων ἑορτῇ καὶ τοὺς ἱπποὺς καὶ τοὺς ὄνους στεφανοῦσι καὶ σχολάζειν ἐῶσι;’ πότερον ὅτι Ποσειδῶνι μὲν ἄγουσιν Ἵππείῳ τὴν ἑορτὴν ὁ δ’ ὄνος τῷ ἱππῷ συναπολαύει καὶ συμμετέχει τῆς ἀδείας; ἢ ὅτι ναυτιλίας φανείσης καὶ κομιδῆς κατὰ θάλασσαν ὑπῆρξε τὶς ἀμοιβὴς ῥατστόνη καὶ ἀνάπαυσις τοῖς ὑποζυγίοις;

31 Cf. De cupiditate divitiarum 5, 525 E: ‘σὺ δὲ τοσαῦτα πράγματα συγχεῖς καὶ ταράττεις καὶ στροβεῖς σεαυτόν, κοχλίου βίον ζῶν διὰ τὴν μικρολογίαν, καὶ τὰ δυσχερὰ πάνθ᾽ ύπομένεις οὐδὲν εἰ πάσχων, όπερν ὃνος βαλανέως ξύλα καὶ φρύγανα κατακομίζων, ἐκι πανού καὶ τέφρας ἀναπεπλάμμενος λοιποῦ δὲ μη μετέχων μηδ’ ἄλεας μηδὲ καθαρεύουσας;

32 Cf. De liberis educandis 14, 10 C: “Ὀρ’,” ἔφησε, “καὶ εἰ μ’ ὄνος ἐλάκτισεν, ἀντιλακτίσαι τούτον ἡξώσατ’ ἄν;”
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animals\(^{33}\). Plutarch shows nonetheless some compassion towards donkeys. In quoting Aeschylus in fr. 193, l. 33-5 Sandbach, he confirms his generally benevolent attitude towards animals in disagreement with their abuse by men.

d) The donkey and Platonism. The role played by allegoresis

The influence of the Platonic tradition is first manifest in records relating to the link between the donkey and music. Plutarch is aware that donkeys were considered as unmelodious, but that, despite this fact, flutes were made from the bones of donkeys, as he reports in Sept. sap. conv. 5, 150 F\(^{34}\). After a lyric quotation from Cleobulina ‘Full on my ear with a horn-bearing shin did a dead donkey smite me’, he writes:

So we may well be astonished that the ass, which otherwise is most gross and unmelodious, yet provides us with a bone which is most fine and melodious. ‘That, without question’, said Neiloxe-
nus, ‘is the reason for the complaint which the people of Busiris make against us of Naucratis; for we are already using asses’ bones for our flutes. But for them even to hear a trumpet is a sin, because they think it sounds like the bray of an ass; and you know, of course, that an ass is treated with contumely by the Egyptians on account of Typhon.

But the influence of Platonic philosophy is, in my opinion, most evident in fr. 107 Sandbach (= Fr. cclxx. 1-6 Marzillo) where the donkey, because of its resemblance to Typhon, is seen as a creature symbolizing all that is earthly. Here Proclus – whence the fragment is taken – by explaining Hesiod’s Works and Days 791, seeks to point out that mules are associated with the moon and recalls to Plutarch’s association of the donkey with Typhon\(^{35}\):

’Laborious mules upon the twelfth’: They associate mules with the moon; hence some say that she rides in a mule cart. The

---

\(^{33}\) Cf. De Iside et Osiride 50, 371 C.

\(^{34}\) ὡστε θαυμάζειν τὸν ὄνον εἰ παχύτατος καὶ ἀμουσότατος ὡστὶ τῶλα λεπτότατος καὶ ἀμουσότατος ὡστὶ παρέχεται. Καὶ ὁ Νειλόξενος ὁ οὐκ ἀμέλει ταῦτα, ἐφη, “καὶ ἡμῖν τοῖς Ναυκρατίταις ἐγκαλοῦσι Βουσιρῖται· γὰρ ἡμῖν ἐν τοῖς ὀνείοις εἰς τὸν αὐλόν. ἐκείνοις δὲ καὶ σάλπιγγος ἀκούειν ἀθέμιτον, ὡς ὀνῳ φθεγγομένης ὡμοίοιο ὄνον δ᾿ ὑπ᾿ Αἰγυπτίων ἵστε δήπου διὰ Τυφῶνα προπηλακιζόμενον”.

\(^{35}\) οὐ ρ ἡ ας δὲ δὲ δὺ ωδὲ κατη τὰ λα ἐρ γο υς· τας ἡμίνονοις οἰκειοῦσι τῇ σελήνη· διὸ καὶ τινες αὐτήν φασιν ἐφ’ ἡμίνονον ὀχεῖςα. καὶ γὰρ ὁ μὲν ἢπος ἢλαικόν ἐστι ξύον ὡς εὐδρομον, <ὁ δ’ οἶνος> χλόνου ὡς Τυφῶνι φίλον καὶ συνουσιαστικόν· ἡ δὲ σελήνη μέσῃ ἁμφοῖον, γῆς μὲν ἔχουσα τὸ σκοτίζεσθαι, ἡλίου δὲ τὸ οἰκεῖον εἰληχέναι φῶς, διὰ τούτο μὲν οὐν ὀκείοιται πρὸς αὐτήν ἡ ἡμίνονος.
reason is that the horse is a solar animal, as being a swift runner, whereas the donkey belongs to the earth, as being dear to Typhon and given to copulation; the moon, however, is intermediate between sun and earth, having the earth’s characteristic of being darkened, and the sun’s of having its own light; so there is a natural association between the moon and the mule”.

The word ‘donkey’ in the Greek text was integrated by H. Schultz36 on the grounds of the passages from *De Iside et Osiride* discussed above. Although the *allegoresis* present in this explanation is a clear element of Proclus’s exegetical method, the fragment can be led back to Plutarch since allegorical interpretation was already present in Middle Platonism, as W. Bernard has shown37. *Allegoresis*, i.e. the allegorical interpretation of verse texts that were not necessarily intended to be interpreted in this way, was not a new phenomenon. However it acquired a new dimension from the Middle-Platonists onwards. Bernard distinguishes two types of *allegoresis*: ‘substitutive Allegorese’, typical of the Stoics, consisting in replacing a mythological word or story in the exegesis with other terms (for example: the goddess Hera is not the traditional figure we know from the epics, but a substitutive noun for ‘air’); on the other hand, ‘dihairetische Allegorese’, that moves wholly in the frame of Platonic dialectic. Innovation of this last kind of *allegoresis*, whose highest expression is to be found in the commentaries of the Neoplatonists, consists in retaining both the literal and the allegorical meaning. Abiding by the example mentioned above, Hera is in this case the air, while remaining nevertheless the goddess, understood as a ‘person’ in the Neoplatonic sense, in charge for all the forces relating to air38. Through a detailed analysis of *De Iside et Osiride*39, Bernard sets out to demonstrate that by interpreting the Egyptian myth, Plutarch refuses the explanations derived from both the Stoic and Ancient Egyptian wisdom in order to present his version of the legend in ‘dihairetical’, Platonic terms40. According to chapters 45-57 *Isis, Osiris, Horus* and Typhon are understood as personal divinities operating in different fields. Typhon

---

36 H. SCHULTZ, “Die handschriftliche Überlieferung...”, 68.
38 For this second type of *allegoresis*, I would prefer the definition ‘komplementäre Allegorese’, cf. P. MARZILLO (forthcoming).
himself is seen as all that is harmful and destructive and as its cause, incorporating all that in fire, drought or sea is immoderate and disordered by reason of excesses or defects. The same point of view is also presented in *De Iside et Osiride* 49, 371 B.

But Typhon is that part of the soul which is impressionable, impulsive, irrational and truculent, and of the bodily part the destructible, diseased and disorderly as evidenced by abnormal seasons and temperatures, and by obscurations of the sun and disappearances of the moon, outbursts, as it were, and unruly actions of the part of Typhon.

In addition, the apotropaic role of cultic rattles in scaring and rejecting Typhon during the worship of Isis is linked to the symbolism Plutarch sees in the Egyptian myth. Here, the rite refers to Typhon’s destruction powers. On the upper part of the rattle, whose shape is circular, is represented the sublunary sphere which is subject to reproduction and destruction.

If animals are for Plutarch in the exegesis of the Egyptian myth a “miroir naturel permettant de penser ce qui demeure purement intelligible”, the earthly donkey was the sole means of visualizing Typhon.

6. Final considerations

In the light of the passages examined here, it can be said that Plutarch in his own reports on the donkey has integrated the different traditions he had at his disposal – the Jewish, the Ancient Egyptian and the Greek traditions – and revised them from his own eclectic perspective. In my view this can be attributed to the fact that he was a Platonist. In his time, Platonism came to consist in syncretistic tendencies combining Plato’s thinking with other cultures and doctrines. Not by chance did the most important exponents of so-called Middle Platonism, Philo (20 BC- AD 50) and Apuleius (123/125- c. 180) attempt a profound reassessment of Jewish wisdom and the religious beliefs of Ancient Egypt in Platonic terms. And Plutarch did the same. The

---

41 *De Iside et Osiride* 45, 368 A.
42 *De Iside et Osiride* 64, 376 F-377 A: οὐδὲ πῦρ Τυφῶνα πάλιν οὐδ’ αὐχμὸν οὐδὲ θάλατταν, ἀλλ’ ἀπλῶς ὅσον ἐστὶν ἐν τούτοις ἀμέτρον καὶ ἀτακτον ὑπερβολαῖς ἢ ἐνδείαις Τυφῶνι προσνέμοντες.
43 Τυφῶν δὲ τῆς ψυχῆς τὸ παθητικὸν καὶ τιτανικὸν καὶ ἀλογὸν καὶ ἐμπλήκτον, τοῦ δὲ σωματικοῦ τὸ ἐπίκηρον καὶ νοσῶδες καὶ ταρακτικὸν ἀσφαλίας καὶ δυσκρασίας καὶ κρύψεως ἥλιου καὶ ἀφανισμοῖς σελήνης ὡν ἐκδρομαὶ καὶ ἀφηνιασμοὶ καὶ Τυφῶνος.
44 Cf. *De Iside et Osiride* 63, 376 CD.
sacredness of the donkey drawn from the Jewish tradition eased Plutarch’s acceptance of Ancient Egypt’s identification of the donkey with Typhon. Through Plutarch’s allegorical exegetical method, Typhon/donkey became a symbol of all that had to do with the ‘qualitatively bad’ world of generation.
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