

Edible Media: The Confluence of Food and Learning in the Ancient Mediterranean*

Steven Muir
Concordia University of Edmonton
Edmonton, Alberta
and
Frederick S. Tappenden
McGill University
Montreal, Quebec

Introduction

The conceptual combination of *food/eating* with *learning* is a commonplace that is both widespread and ancient. In the Hebrew Bible, for instance, the creation narrative of Gen 2–3 likens the *knowledge* of good and evil to the *fruit* of a specific tree in the garden (Gen 2:16–18; 3:1–7). Elsewhere, the Lord’s *decrees* are called sweeter than *honey* (Ps 19:11), and the psalmist invites the reader/hearer to *taste and see* that the Lord is good (Ps. 34:9). In the New Testament, Jesus appeals to Deut 8:3, insisting: “one does not live on bread alone, but on every word from the mouth of God” (Matt 4:4;

*Previous versions of this paper were presented at both the 2016 annual meeting of the Society of Biblical Literature (“Meals in the Greco-Roman World” seminar) and the 2013 annual meeting of the Canadian Society of Biblical Studies (“Information Technologies in Antiquity” seminar). This study benefitted greatly from the feedback received at both those meetings. We wish specifically to thank and to dedicate this article to the late Dietmar Neufeld, who offered a thoughtful and critical response to this paper as part of the 2013 CSBS seminar. We were saddened by Diet’s sudden passing in September 2015, and we offer this piece in his memory.

see also Luke 4:4), and elsewhere Paul characterizes the Corinthians as infants who still require God's *wisdom* to be given as *milk* rather than *solid food* (1 Cor 2:6–3:3). Within contemporary English usage, one might describe a good professor as willing to *stew over* her lecture notes in the hopes that students will find the content *palatable* and *digestible*, thus diminishing the possibility of *regurgitated*, *raw* facts at the final exam. The metaphoricity of these examples demonstrates just how common and familiar is this conceptual mapping.

In this paper we examine how the metaphorical correlation of *food* with *ideas* contributes to the symbolic apparatus of communication and learning in the ancient Mediterranean. We note that the distinctive IDEAS ARE FOOD metaphor is used to describe teaching and learning within a variety of ancient religious contexts. We also note that the metaphor often is used in reference to an actual and significant ritualized meal in those contexts. In light of these observations, we explore how an appreciation for the IDEAS ARE FOOD metaphor yields a richer and more nuanced understanding of how those meals were practiced, conceptualized, and how they functioned within ancient communities.

The paper is broken into two main sections. In part one we explore theoretical contexts drawn from cognitive linguistics and anthropology to make sense of how food and learning correlate with one another. In part two we turn our attention to a selection of concrete examples, focusing specifically on the function of a single, ubiquitous, and basic foodstuff—bread—within a number of ancient texts. Envisioned within the theoretical framework outlined in part one, we highlight some of the diverse ways that antique communities understood bread as a media dynamic.

***Food for Thought:
Exploring the Integration of Cognition and Culture***

It is a striking feature of human language that metaphor pervades discourse, but even more striking that language users are, as Steven Pinker notes, able to “effortlessly transcend the metaphors implicit in their language.” Pinker continues,

This implies that speakers have the means to entertain the underlying concepts: the abstract idea of an approach to a climax, not the concrete idea of the head of a pimple [as in, *coming to a head*]; the

abstract idea of a profusion of problems, not the concrete idea of a can of worms.¹

According to the work of George Lakoff and Mark Johnson,² metaphor is more than mere rhetorical flourish; it is a conceptual phenomenon, one that structures and characterizes the nature of how the human animal experiences, obtains, and makes sense of the world and their presence therein. As a general cognitive capacity, conceptual metaphors arise when one, often more abstract, domain is understood in relation to another, often more concrete, domain. Central to this thesis is the integration of mind and body; patterns of thought are understood to emerge from and be structured by patterns of somatic existence in the world. That is to say, abstract ideas about *learning* and *teaching* (for example) become more comprehensible when they are mapped onto and thus fashioned by concrete, bodily experiences of food being ingested through the mouth and broken down through the body's constituent organs so as to provide social and individual benefit. In this way, recurrent somatic experiences function as the foundation on which human meaning is metaphorically created, elaborated, and shared.³

The metaphorical convergence of *food* and *ideas*—a perceptual correlation that reflects the IDEAS ARE FOOD metaphor⁴—is an example of what cognitive linguistics call an *ontological metaphor* in that the metaphor gives “object [or] substance ... to entities ... that are not physical objects [or] substances.”⁵ The more concrete and somatically familiar source domain of FOOD is cross-mapped with the more abstract and nebulous target domain of IDEAS; some of the relevant features of these two mental spaces are as follows:

| <i>Source Domain: FOOD</i> | <i>Target Domain: IDEAS</i> |
|---|---|
| a ¹ . we cook food | a ² . we think about ideas |
| b ¹ . we taste and smell food | b ² . we test ideas |
| c ¹ . we chew food | c ² . we consider ideas |
| d ¹ . we swallow or spit out food | d ² . we accept or reject ideas |
| e ¹ . the body digests food | e ² . the mind understands ideas |
| f ¹ . digested food provides nourishment | f ² . understanding provides mental well-being |

This table (which is not exhaustive) points to elements that exist within the source (FOOD) and target (IDEAS) domains. In the IDEAS ARE FOOD metaphor, elements are perceptually correlated with one another so as to yield a robust conceptual network of cross-space mappings:

| <i>IDEAS ARE FOOD Mappings</i> | | <i>Examples</i> |
|--------------------------------|---------------------|--|
| a. cooking | → thinking | <i>I'm stewing over your argument</i> |
| b. tasting/ smelling | → testing | <i>Your ideas smell fishy</i> |
| c. chewing | → considering | <i>I've got to chew on this theory for a while</i> |
| d. swallowing | → accepting | <i>That's a hard notion to swallow</i> |
| e. digesting | → understanding | <i>This metaphor is easy to digest</i> |
| f. nourishment | → mental well-being | <i>Your argument nourished my thesis</i> |

It is important to note that these cross-space mappings are not arbitrary. Rather, these correspondences are enabled by recurrent patterns of perception that are inherent to the frame-structures of both the FOOD and IDEAS domains. For each of the examples listed above, the following generic (G) affinities enable the cross-space mappings for elements a–f:

| <i>Generic Space Elements</i> |
|--|
| a ^G . time spent generating food/ideas |
| b ^G . the act of sampling food/ideas |
| c ^G . the act of acquiring or taking in food/ideas |
| d ^G . the act of engaging food/ideas |
| e ^G . the stance of taking food/ideas over into one's body/mind |
| f ^G . the outcome associated with food/ideas |

The metaphoricity of this conceptual mapping is obvious: there is nothing in the act of *understanding* that automatically presumes the act of *digesting*, and so there is a non-objective aspect to the corresponding pairs that comprise the IDEAS ARE FOOD metaphor.⁷

Nevertheless, the target domain IDEAS is *compared to*, *mapped onto*, and *equated with* the source domain FOOD, thus producing an ontological metaphor that gives concrete substance to more abstract notions of teaching, learning, and thinking. But the process does not end there. As we will see below, while it is true that the concrete gives substance to the abstract, the more nebulous target domain also comes to enrich and deepen the common, everyday somatic experiences of the source domain. This is particularly true in instances where the source and target domains become wrapped up with each other in social practices, as is the case with food and learning in the ancient world. Because the acts of both eating and teaching/learning often share a common context in the ancient world—namely, the banquet—there is a dialectical relationship between the two: yes eating (i.e., FOOD) structures the experience of learning (i.e., IDEAS), but learning (i.e., IDEAS) also structures and gives shape to the experience of eating (i.e., FOOD), a process that cognitive linguists call “reverse mapping” or “backward projection.”⁸ Through this mutual shaping of source and target domains, expressions of the IDEAS ARE FOOD metaphor are as wide and varied as the communities that employ it as part of their meaning making apparatus.

These insights from the cognitive sciences help us describe and understand the conceptual correlation of *food* with *ideas*. As noted at the outset, however, our interests relate not only to the metaphoricity of food and learning but also to the question of how the IDEAS ARE FOOD metaphor functions communicatively within ritual contexts. To explore this latter problem, it is fruitful to bring these cognitive insights into conversation with the work of Clifford Geertz.⁹ An initial bridge between these two projects—that is, between Lakoff and Johnson’s embodied mind and Geertz’s symbolist anthropology—can be found in the presumption that ritual can function as a non-verbal communicative medium. Because metaphors are not merely rhetorical but also *conceptual* in nature, they find multimodal expression in various kinds of nonverbal contexts such as body-language, art, music, pictures, and even ritual.¹⁰ For example, much has been done in the field of gesture studies,¹¹ demonstrating that gestures follow the same metaphorical procedure noted above: abstract notions are put into concrete gestural expressions.¹² To this end, conceptual metaphors undergird actions and performance as much as language itself, and this to the extent that gestures are not merely “illustrators of speech ... but intrinsic parts of an utterance... [It is] ‘as if the speech production process is manifested

in two forms of activity simultaneously: in the vocal organs and also in the bodily movement.”¹³

The multimodal nature of conceptual metaphor opens the possibility for alternative, non-verbal expressions of the IDEAS ARE FOOD metaphor, and this has implications for the way we approach the study of ritual and the place of foodstuff therein. Here the work of Geertz comes to the fore. It is well known that Geertz formulates his vision of “the religious perspective” within the context of dichotomous categories: ethos vs. worldview, moral/aesthetic vs. unalterable reality, experiential evidence vs. received beliefs, human actions vs. cosmic order, and factuality vs. conceptions.¹⁴ In so doing he posits an *opposition* of imagined and real such that ritual functions as the efficacious medium through which abstract *thought* and concrete *experience* are reintegrated,¹⁵ so for Geertz,

It is in ritual ... that the moods and motivations [i.e. ethos] which sacred symbols induce in men and the general conceptions of the order of existence [i.e. worldview] which they formulate for men meet and reinforce one another. In a ritual, the world as lived and the world as imagined, fused under the agency of a single set of symbolic forms, turn out to be the same world.¹⁶

On this point Geertz has not gone un-criticized, and there is no need to rehash these critiques here.¹⁷ Instead, from a cognitive perspective, what is compelling in Geertz is the perception of ritual as an embodied activity that expresses—both reflecting and producing—certain conceptual structures.¹⁸ Central to this is Geertz’s notion of religion as a *model of* and *model for* reality. On the one hand, ritual may well function as a fusion-point of real and imagined within the symbol-systems of a given people, community, or tradition.¹⁹ On the other hand, Geertz rightly stresses that ritual can function as the concrete expression of the abstract.

More precisely, the relationship between Geertz’s ethos/worldview (*off/for*) dialectic might be viewed as a space marked by concrete grounding: the abstract is *metaphorically elaborated from* the concrete, which is to say that the concrete gives the abstract both gestalt structure and perceptual grounding so as to enable the construction of meaning. Conversely, once the abstract is conventionalized within a community’s symbol system, the abstract itself both re-defines and

revises the concrete.²⁰ The target domain is structured by the source domain, yes, but the source domain is redefined also by the target domain. Accordingly, the process of metaphorization is such that *ideas* are understood as *food*, but *food* can also be understood as *ideas*.

Here, then, Geertz's *model offor* dialectic is brought into coordination with the cognitive linguistic insight that nonverbal expressions such as *gesture* and *ritual* have the potential to function as communicative mediums that convey conceptual metaphors. *Ideas* are fashioned on notions of *food*, while at the same time *food* becomes a site in which *ideas* are grasped and engaged. Embodying the communicative dimension is important; the body both *produces* and *actualizes* the abstract, thus enabling the transmission and coherence of meaning from one subject to the next. By linking the performance of a ritual to the language that accompanies the rite's action, ritual performance becomes a communicative medium through which concepts and ideas are performatively conveyed.²¹ The embodied act of ritual can be a metaphorical gesture—or, gesture of metaphor—in which abstract ideals are transmitted from and obtained within the concrete.

***Thought for Food:
Bread as both Consumptive and Communicative Medium***

The foregoing has outlined a theoretical framework for thinking about the *process* of learning; we have sought to illuminate some of the ways that teaching and learning are commonly conceptualized vis-à-vis the human body. In the remainder of this paper we discuss the *content* of various learning processes in the ancient Mediterranean. In anticipation of this discussion, two inter-related points are worth noting. First, many of the Biblical accounts of bread and its consumption, and many Greco-Roman meal practices, draw on the broader Mediterranean frame structure, the BANQUET OF THE HOST.²² Lavish meals given by a host were common in the ancient world, including Persian banquets and Greco-Roman symposia. Through participation in the meal (consumption of “bread” in its broadest sense), the guests learn two things.²³ First, they learn relationship with the host. He provides the food, they accept the food; he nourishes them, they are nourished; he gives to them, they are in a state of dependence and reciprocate honor to him. The paradigm of a good host is one who provides generously to his/her guests (e.g.,

Abraham in Gen 18:7–9; the father in Jesus’s parable about the wayward son, Luke 15). In the meal, people also learn relationship to the other guests at the banquet. They experience and thus learn answers to such questions as, “What do we have in common?” and, “What unites us as a community?”

This leads to the second and related point: many bread accounts in the Jewish scriptures and New Testament are not only connected through the general frame BANQUET OF THE HOST but also are linked to ritualized meals within Jewish or early Christian communities, which have themselves taken shape within the BANQUET OF THE HOST frame structure. For Jews, this worship meal is the Passover. In Hebrew scripture, banquet narratives or discussions of bread connect to the Passover theme and comment on it, expand upon it, or offer variations on its theme. For example, the Exodus narrative of Manna in the Wilderness both anticipates Passover and offers commentary on it. Similarly, for Christ-devotees, the New Testament accounts of Jesus’s last supper with his disciples provide an archetype which links together other New Testament accounts of bread, meal, and encounters with Jesus. Our attention below is directed specifically to the theme of bread in the Gospel of John. We contrast the textual analysis above with a consideration of archaeological evidence from the Roman imperial period. In that context, we also see a similar issue: relation to the group leader (Emperor) and relation to group members (subjects in the Empire) enacted in the consumption of bread at certain festival feasts sponsored by the Emperor.

Manna from Heaven (Exodus)

It is useful to analyse the issue of manna in the book of Exodus by placing it in relation to Passover. Manna in the wilderness is portrayed as an archetypal precursor to the unleavened bread of Passover.²⁴ This bread-like substance, and its communal consumption, clearly evokes the sharing of unleavened bread during Passover. Further, the period of wandering in the wilderness is portrayed as a time of liminality during the transition from Egypt to the Promised Land of Israel. The story suggests that the Israelites are undergoing a rite of passage, transitioning from one corporate identity (slaves in a foreign land) to a new corporate identity (a free, settled people in the land of Israel). Considered within this narrative pattern, manna is a sort of transitional bread. Manna weans the Israelites off the bread of Egypt and moves them towards the bread of the land of Israel,²⁵ in particular the

commemorative bread of the Festival of Unleavened Bread (Passover). From an aetiological perspective, one might infer that manna is a mythic component of the Passover festival, and that the substance of manna conceptually mirrors the substance of unleavened bread.

Although manna is described as a unique, unusual, and miraculous substance, we are nonetheless meant to infer that it is bread-like or serves as a replacement for bread. God (the host of the wilderness banquet) supplies it as a result of the Israelites grumbling over the loss of the bread of Egypt.²⁶ In response, Yahweh says that he will “rain bread from heaven” (Exod 16:4).²⁷ Moses calls the manna substance “bread” (Exod 16:8, 29, 32), “the bread that Yahweh has given . . . to eat” (Exod 16:15), and he suggests that it is somehow baked or boiled prior to consumption.²⁸ Editorial statements in the text also call the manna “bread” (Exod 16:22) and make references to baking or boiling the substance. While the supply of manna lasts the duration of forty years (that is, the time of wandering in the wilderness), it stops when the Israelites enter and occupy the land of Israel.²⁹ The link between this manna-“bread” and Passover bread is evident. Thus, texts which teach about manna are also teaching about Passover.

The connotations between *food* (*qua* manna) and *learning* are also noteworthy. Exodus 16:6–7 suggests that manna will help the Israelites “know” (יָדַע [yda]) Yahweh’s action of deliverance and “see” (רָאָה [raha]) the glory of Yahweh.³⁰ By eating it, they will learn to honour the host of the banquet, the supplier of the feast. The fact that manna is depicted as a new, unique substance gives it a mysterious aspect when the Israelites first encounter it—in other words, they also need to *learn* about it.³¹ They need to ask “what is it?,” because “they did not know what it was;” to this, Moses replies that it is bread *from Yahweh*.³² In what becomes a popular proverb, Deut 8:3 makes an important connection between manna, eating, learning, and the Word of God:

And he humbled you and let you hunger and fed you with manna, which you did not know, nor did your fathers know; that he might make you know that man does not live by bread alone, but that man lives by every word that proceeds out of the mouth of the LORD [RSV trans.].

Here, those who eat the bread learn to recognize their dependence upon the host of the feast. The phrase “from heaven” mentioned above as applied to manna speaks of its miraculous origin, but as we will see, it will also prove useful to rabbis when they compare manna to another “gift from heaven,” Torah. What we see is an incredibly fluid exchange between IDEAS and FOOD. The conceptual domains blend with one another in such a way that readers come to view the two—manna and word-of-God—interchangeably.

Also of interest in the Exodus narrative is the distribution of the manna. God (the host) arranges the manna to appear miraculously in precise amounts of daily portions for each household (Exod 16:16–18), and he causes the ungathered portions to melt in the sun (Exod 16:21) and the hoarded portions to spoil (Exod 16:19–21). On the day before the Sabbath, the portion is doubled so that Israelites do not have to gather food. There is no distribution of manna during the Sabbath, and the saved allotment is viable during the Sabbath (Exod 16:23–30). Rabbinic commentaries develop a teaching motif in each of these aspects. First, the daily portion of manna is discussed as a means of encouraging the Israelites to turn to God daily and to learn to trust in him constantly.³³ Second, the special treatment of pre-Sabbath manna is identified as a way to encourage Israelites to develop the ritualized avoidance of work during Sabbath and the use of that time to study Torah.³⁴ Again, we see the twin emphases of learning about the host and learning about the community of guests. For the rabbis, these passages in Exodus suggest the connection between FOOD (*manna*, God’s physical sustenance) and IDEAS (Torah, God’s spiritual sustenance). The following rabbinical sayings demonstrate well the blending of these two domains; the transition between FOOD and IDEAS is effortless and quite natural.

R. Simon b. Johai used to say . . . Only to those who have manna to eat is it given to study the Torah. For behold, how can a man be sitting and studying when he does not know where his food and drink will come from, nor where he can get his clothes and coverings? Hence, only to those who have manna to eat is it given to study the Torah.³⁵

[What was manna like?] R. Eleazar of Modi'im says, It was like the word of *Haggadah* which attracts the heart of man.³⁶

The Bread of Life (John 6)

The dialectic of IDEAS being understood as FOOD and FOOD as IDEAS finds articulation in the Fourth Gospel, especially chapter 6, where the Johannine evangelist has a special interest in the bread theme as a communicative and didactic medium. For John, those who have been drawn to Jesus are those who will be “taught (διδάκτοϛ [didaktos]) by God”; those who have “heard (ἀκούω [akouō]) from the father and learned (μανθάνω [manthanō])” (6.45, the former echoes Isa 54.13). This instructional bent is consonant with the sapiential notes that ring through John’s text,³⁷ evident most clearly in Jesus’s status as the divine Word (e.g. John 1.1–18) and his identification as Rabbi/teacher (ῥαββί / διδάσκαλος [rabbi/didaskalos]; e.g. John 1.38). Whatever else Jesus does in the Fourth Gospel, he is one who illuminates the truth of God and whose teaching produces true life—eternal life—within those who have been given to him.

But what is it, and how is it, that Jesus comes to teach? As with other thematics in John’s gospel, notions of *eating* relate to notions of *abiding*, what John Painter calls the “mutual abiding of the Father and the Son, of Jesus and the believer, of the believer and God’s/Jesus’ word, and of the Spirit that makes clear its importance.”³⁸ Here we approach the teaching that Rabbi Jesus imparts, a message which, in John 6, is inextricable with the medium through which it is expressed; set within the BREAD frame, Jesus stresses the “mutual abiding of eater and eaten.”³⁹

In Geertzian fashion, this multiplicity of meaning points toward the integration of one meaning with the others; the common and everyday experiences of the Johannine community (their *ethos*) link-up with their ideals (or *worldview*) in such a way that the motif of bread in John’s gospel functions as both *model of* and *for* reality. In John 6, for instance, bread functions as a communicative medium through which Jesus is both the one who *gives bread to* and *is bread for* believers.⁴⁰ Thus John 6.51:

I am the living bread that came down from heaven. Whoever eats of this bread will live forever; and *the bread that I will give* for the life of the world is my flesh.” (John 6.51 NRSV, emphasis added)

This tensive interplay between Jesus as both mythical foodstuff and everyday ration characterizes the final form of the fourth Gospel. For the *hungry* reader, feeding and drinking function not as ends in themselves but rather as the frames in which the teachings of the heavenly Word are embodied. The experiences of consumption, ingestion, and reclining serve as the metaphor in which the ongoing abiding of Jesus and his word is conceptualized.

Pointing to a specific meal in the Johannine context is a difficult task. The fourth evangelist notably does not narrate the last supper (contra. the Synoptics), and there is no indication that the “bread of life” discourse is to be confined to a Eucharistic context.⁴¹ The focus remains very much on the teachability of the hearer; as noted above, the *hungry* reader is one for whom the common and everyday experience of eating (their *ethos*) comes to frame and make accessible their ideals (or *worldview*). Certainly within later Christian reflection and reception, Jesus’s identification as the “bread of life” was integrated into broader Eucharistic theologies, thus intensifying the themes of eating and abiding for later readers. But within the context of the fourth Gospel, connections to the ritual meal are not explicit.

For this reason, though Jesus’s teaching on himself as “living bread” (John 6.51–58) might offer an implicit commentary on the last supper,⁴² the relation of the Bread from Heaven discourse to the Johannine community’s presumed Eucharistic practices is somewhat secondary. In some ways, the regular ingestion of food within a cultic or even communal context matters less than the metaphorization of familiar embodied experiences—chewing/biting (τρώγω [*trōgō*], 6.58), swallowing, ingesting, etc.—so as to create a mythical space in which the teachings of this divine Word function as a *model for* those who abide in Christ/God, a space that is always built upon their experience of consuming food.

Roman Bread Cakes

So far, we have considered literary and textual evidence stemming from ancient Jewish and Christ-believing communities. We have seen the IDEAS ARE FOOD metaphor is operative in these documentary contexts. The texts themselves only refer indirectly to the ritualized meals, but these indirect references have the effect of commenting on, teaching about, and/or enriching such meals. We turn our attention now to archaeological evidence from the Roman period dealing explicitly with bread in a ritualized meal context. Here too, we will see the same

issues we have encountered previously: the IDEAS ARE FOOD metaphor, and the BANQUET OF THE HOST frame structure. This data set provides interesting points of comparison with the textual evidence we have discussed. A number of points need to be established before we consider the evidence.

The first is propaganda and its use in the Roman Empire. In Evans's definition, we note the interesting categorization of the function of propaganda for education or learning:

I may define propaganda as the educational efforts or information used by an organized group that is made available to a selected audience, for the specific purpose of making the audience take a particular course of action or conform to a certain attitude desired by the organized group.⁴³

An important theorist on propaganda is Jacques Ellul. One of the categories of propaganda noted by Ellul is that of Integration.⁴⁴ Evans uses Ellul's analysis and applies it to ancient Rome. Her comments are noteworthy:

... propaganda of integration ... can easily apply to the ancient Romans. This propaganda provokes conformity and stability and aims to make "the individual participate in his society in every way." Though not entirely confined to the political sphere, it may be most apparent there as governments seek to unify their subject people behind the ruler(s). Religious organizations may do the same, but the basic goal is societal stability.⁴⁵

Propaganda was prevalent in the Roman Empire. It was deliberate and the intent behind it was to induce obedience to the emperor and cohesion among the subjects of the empire. The use of images in the ends of propaganda was widespread. Since propaganda contains ideas, let us imagine ideas captured in images which are consumed! That is precisely what we see—images of the emperor stamped on bread cakes which were distributed at religious festivals. The value in considering propaganda in the data is that the use of images and ideas there is deliberate. If ideas are conveyed through food and its consumption, then our point is well established.

We need to consider why images were of particular utility for purposes of propaganda in the Roman Empire. The population had varying levels of literacy. Images were effective ways to spread ideas. Evans notes the use of visual propaganda in ancient Rome to reach the illiterate masses: spectacles (games and processions) which featured impressive groups in costume, architecture, statues, frescoes, and coins.⁴⁶ Zanker demonstrates that Augustus, as first emperor, started the practice of using images of himself to promote his authority: coins, statues, and ancestor masks were commissioned, displayed, and strategically deployed throughout the empire.⁴⁷ This dissemination of imperial images became standard operating procedure for subsequent emperors.⁴⁸ The following writer from antiquity has captured very well the issue at stake:

Since an emperor cannot be present to all persons, it is necessary to set up the statue of the emperor in law courts, market places, public assemblies, and theatres. In every place, in fact, where an official acts, the imperial effigy must be present, so that the emperor may thus confirm what takes place. For the emperor is only a human being, and cannot be present everywhere.⁴⁹

The recognition that coins in the Roman Empire served as the earliest form of mass media to convey images and texts of a political and propagandistic nature has become a commonplace in ancient Mediterranean scholarship. For example, note the following:

Under the emperors of Rome, coins were issued regularly by a single authority, with a single purpose, and a very thoughtful iconographic program. The message was usually brief, but it was clear and powerful. Practically every Roman Imperial coin reverse has some propagandistic element in its design... designed to enhance the image of state and of its administrators.⁵⁰

Having established the function of one form of stamped image (coins), let us consider another form (bread stamped with images). While this medium may not be as durable as metal coins, it comes with special

benefit—it is food. It is eaten for nourishment. It is a desirable object in and of itself. As the saying goes, “you can’t eat money.”

There are two inter-related elements in the Roman period which we need to consider, both of which relate to the BANQUET OF THE HOST frame discussed above. The first is the role of the Emperor as the sponsor or patron of the bread dole in Rome. The distribution of bread or grain to the *plebs* (the non-elite occupants of Rome) began in the Republican period. Magistrates organized *ad hoc* allotments of grain to receive popular support and relieve urban poverty. In the later Republic, the tribune Gaius Sempronius Gracchus instituted a law guaranteeing adult male urban citizens a supply of grain at a subsidized price (123 BCE). In 58 BCE the subsidy turned into a dole, that is, a free entitlement. With Augustus (2 BCE), the list of those receiving the bread dole or grain allocation (Annona) was standardized, along with the storage and distribution system. Entitled recipients were called the *plebs frumentaria* and numbered around 200,000. In the 270’s under the emperor Aurelian, the grain distribution was replaced with a daily bread ration.⁵¹ Sayles notes that the grain generosity of emperors was a regular feature of the imperial propaganda found on coin images.⁵² Annona (personified as a goddess holding grain) on the *obverse* and the Emperor’s head on the *reverse* is the typical pattern. The point to be made is that the emperor was known in his role as “host” of this feast, and he promoted that role through propaganda images.

One must also consider cases of bread with imperial images on it. We know that bread cakes (*crustulum*, ‘cookie’) were regularly distributed at festivals and public sacrifices.⁵³ Bread cakes often had decorations or stamps. Here, the standard work is Alföldi 1938.⁵⁴ He categorizes four types of image:

- a) Representations of the emperor and his family
- b) Other references or insignia relating to the emperor
- c) Religious images (related to the divinity of the festival).⁵⁵
- d) ‘Trivia’ (often the insignia of the bakery)

The following passage describes the context of the distribution and consumption of these bread cakes:

The welfare and prosperity of all the citizens of the empire depended on the emperor; therefore, in the first days of the year, on the high feasts of the emperor, communal prayer was offered for his health, welfare and salvation. At these occasions games were organized in the circus and amphitheater and it

was also customary to distribute honey cakes among the people. The cakes were poured into molds which represented the emperor, members of the imperial family, a triumphal procession, symbols of opulence and plenty, Fortuna, Mercury and others.⁵⁶

George Boon draws an interesting analogy to a mid-20th century practice in the UK—another case of a ruler’s use of images for propaganda:

Like their modern counterparts, the chocolate medallions on sale at jubilee- or coronation-time, cakes from groups (a) and (b) were prepared for particular occasions of public festivity, such as the celebration of imperial *vota*, or victories.⁵⁷

One cake mold from Pannonia bears the following inscription: “If the emperor is safe, we are entering the Golden Age.”⁵⁸ Here, the propagation is an IDEA that is written and which the people soon will eat as FOOD.

What sort of images do we find on these bread molds? Generally, propagandistic images of the Emperor as patron, military victor, and statesman: a *salutatio imperatoria* with Marcus Aurelius, Aurelius on horseback springing over fallen barbarians, emperors shaking hands with the inscription *CONCO[rdiae] AVGV[strom]*.⁵⁹ We also find images of the Emperor offering sacrifices. This was a stock image in the Imperial period—the emperor as *pontifex maximus*, who acts as the mediating priest between the people of Rome and the gods.⁶⁰ Of particular import is the connotation of this sacrificial role—it ties into a larger set of ideas, that of the emperor as generous host and patron. Gordon argues this point forcefully:

The sacrificial role of the *princeps* is not, of course, to be understood in isolation: it is inextricably linked with his *philanthropia* (benevolence), his *libertas* (generosity) and so with his accumulation of symbolic capital.⁶¹

Thus we see the IDEA of the emperor as host conveyed in the FOOD itself, which he provides. Those who consume the food are his subjects, and they learn through the act of eating.⁶² Gordon captures the ‘flavor’

of the scene, though we might argue with his choice of adjective ('banal').

To think of the participants at festivals as far from Rome as Britain or Pannonia nibbling the head of the sacrificant emperor on their way home suggests a quite extraordinary degree of banalization of what in the time of Augustus had been a solemn, original and difficult motif [the emperor at sacrifice], mediating the centre and periphery of the Roman world through the image of the emperor engaged in an (erstwhile) peculiarly Roman ritual: what had been a new image of domination is here seen not only as accepted, but also as banal.⁶³

Conclusions

The textual and archaeological examples discussed above point to the variety and widespread functionality of bread within a number of antique traditions and people groups. In these many instances, bread is regarded not simply as a source of nourishment, but rather it is imbued with symbolic meaning such that the ideals of these various peoples are made manifest in everyday foodstuff. This is particularly true of the ideal of *learning*, whereby bread comes to serve many didactic functions. This is particularly expressed through varied adaptations and manifestations of the IDEAS ARE FOOD conceptual metaphor. Across antique communities, more abstract and divine ideals (what Geertz calls one's *worldview*) are crystallized, actualised, and thus embodied within common, everyday foodstuff such as bread (what Geertz calls one's *ethos*). The abstract and the concrete coalesce with one another. The concrete gives substance to the abstract, while the abstract gives profundity to the concrete. The two go hand in hand, and the act of *consumption* becomes a recurrent and familiar medium that enables a variety of ancient discourses about *teaching and learning*. To these ends, the metaphorical correlation of *food* with *ideas* contributes to the symbolic apparatus of communication and learning in the ancient Mediterranean.

ENDNOTES

¹ Steven Pinker, *The Stuff of Thought: Language as a Window into Human Nature* (New York: Viking, 2007), 248.

² See esp. George Lakoff and Mark Johnson, *Metaphors We Live By* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1980); George Lakoff and Mark Johnson, *Philosophy in the Flesh: The Embodied Mind and its Challenge to Western Thought* (New York: Basic Books, 1999); and Mark Johnson, *The Body in the Mind: The Bodily Basis of Meaning, Imagination, and Reason* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1987).

³ Accordingly, the cognitive view of metaphor concerns, as Zoltán Kövecses notes, the whole system of human embodiment: “language, culture, body, mind, and brain all come together and play an equally crucial role in our metaphorical competence” (*Metaphor: A Practical Introduction*, 2nd ed. [Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010], 321).

⁴ Following Lakoff and Johnson, *Metaphors We Live By*, we articulate conceptual metaphors via the small-caps formula A IS B (or A AS B), where A and B refer to the conceptual domains being cross-mapped. This stylistic notation should not be understood as an indicative statement (as if ideas *really are* food), but rather as a symbolic description of cross-domain mappings: the target domain (IDEAS) is mapped to the source domain (FOOD), with the mapping represented by the copula (ARE). See further Lakoff and Johnson, *Philosophy in the Flesh*, 58.

⁵ Kövecses, *Metaphor*, 83. Though the perceptual affinity of corresponding pairs is non-objective (in the sense that there is nothing in the act of *understanding* that automatically presumes the act of *digesting*), we can point to one important way in which the IDEAS ARE FOOD metaphor is grounded in patterns of human embodiment. This relates specifically to the perception of the human body as a container into which certain things *enter* (food, water) and other things *exit* (excrement, blood, sweat). This somatic functionality, which is a product of human evolution, creates the conditions from which the primary metaphor BODY IS CONTAINER emerges naturally. In the FOOD frame, food is, of course, gathered and prepared *outside* of one’s body and then *ingested* through the mouth and *into* the stomach. In the IDEAS frame, though the acquisition of knowledge is less tangible, ideas

are often conceptualized as objects that can be moved in and out of one's knowing faculty (in the NT, for example, the author of Colossians speaks of the knowledge of God's will as something that can *fill* [πληρώω {*plēroō*}] Christ-believers [Col 1:9], and the Pastor assures Timothy that the Lord will “*give him understanding* in all things” [2 Tim 2.7]). This idea is further bolstered by the notion that the center of human intelligence—the soul, *nous*, or some physical organ—is located *within* the human body itself (a view that was shared throughout the ancient Mediterranean; cf. David Aune, “Human Nature and Ethics in Hellenistic Philosophical Traditions and Paul: Some Issues and Problems,” in *Paul in His Hellenistic Context.*, ed. Troels Engberg-Pedersen [Minneapolis: Fortress, 1995], 291-312; Walter Burkert, “Towards Plato and Paul: The ‘Inner’ Human Being,” in *Ancient and Modern Perspectives on the Bible and Culture: Essays in Honor of Hans Dieter Betz*, ed. Adela Yarbro Collins [Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1998], 59-82 and more generally in the Western tradition, Charles Taylor, *Sources of the Self: The Making of the Modern Identity* [Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1989], 111–207). We need the full bibliographic info on these sources. Here, *the body* functions as the container *in* which the mind/knowing faculty exists, thus allowing ideas to move *in and out*. Accordingly, the body coupled with a certain set of anthropological assumptions enables metaphorical connections between *ingestion* and *learning*, between *food* and *ideas*. (Of further note, the IDEAS ARE FOOD metaphor is not the only way human beings structure their understanding of ideas (see further Lakoff and Johnson, *Philosophy in the Flesh*, 235–66; Lakoff and Johnson, *Metaphors we Live By*, 46–51).

⁶ This has been adapted from Kövecses, *Metaphor*, 83 and Lakoff and Johnson, *Philosophy in the Flesh*, 241.

⁷ The IDEAS ARE FOOD metaphor is *non-objective* in the sense that there are no obvious or inherent links between experiences of *food* and *ideas* that result in the IDEAS ARE FOOD metaphor. This stands in contrast to other metaphors, such as the MORE IS UP/LESS IS DOWN conceptual metaphor (cf. Lakoff and Johnson, *Metaphors we Live By*, 14–21, esp. 15–16). Correlations between *quantity* and *verticality* are perceived when (for example) an individual looks at a glass of water and observes—better, experiences—that a *higher* level of water corresponds to *more* water being in the glass. In this instance, there is an “objective” correlation between quantity and verticality, in as much as that “objectivity” is a product of how containers and liquids function

within the physical strictures of the world. In this sense, then, objectivity is neither propositional nor *a priori*, but rather possesses an everydayness; objectivity relates to consistent, recurrent patterns of human embodiment that exist as part of the world in which we live.

⁸ See, e.g., Gilles Fauconnier and Mark Turner, *The Way We Think: Conceptual Blending and the Mind's Hidden Complexities* (New York: Basic Books, 2002), 43–44, 49.

⁹ We primarily engage Geertz's essays "Religion as a Cultural System" and "Ethos, World View, and the Analysis of Sacred Symbols," both of which can be found in Clifford Geertz, *The Interpretation of Cultures: Selected Essays* (New York: Basic Books, 1973), 87–125 and 126–41 respectively. On the theoretical tension that exists between Geertz and a cognitive approach to anthropology, see Claudia Strauss and Naomi Quinn, *A Cognitive Theory of Cultural Meaning*, PSPA 9 (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 1997), 13 and Bradd Shore, *Culture In Mind: Cognition, Culture, and the Problem of Meaning* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996), 35. More recently, Armin Geertz has sought to find convergence between Geertz and a cognitive framework ("The Meaningful Brain: Clifford Geertz and the Cognitive Science of Culture," in *Mental Culture: Classical Social Theory and the Cognitive Science of Religion*, ed. Dimitris Xygalatas and William W. McCorkle, Jr. [Durham, UK: Acumen, 2013], 176–96).

¹⁰ See esp. Alan Cienki and Cornelia Müller, "Metaphor, Gesture, and Thought," in *The Cambridge Handbook of Metaphor and Thought*, ed. Raymond W. Gibbs (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008), 483–501. Charles Forceville. "Metaphor in Pictures and Multimodal Representations," in *The Cambridge Handbook of Metaphor and Thought*, ed. Raymond W. Gibbs (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008), 462–82; John M. Kennedy, "Metaphor and Art," in *The Cambridge Handbook of Metaphor and Thought*, ed. Raymond W. Gibbs (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008), 447–61; Lawrence M. Zbikowski, "Metaphor and Music," Pages 502–524 in *The Cambridge Handbook of Metaphor and Thought*, ed. Raymond W. Gibbs (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008), 502–24.

¹¹ See esp. Alan Cienki and Cornelia Müller, "Metaphor, Gesture, and Thought," in *The Cambridge Handbook of Metaphor and Thought*, ed. Raymond W. Gibbs (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008), 483–501; David McNeill, *Hand and Mind: What*

Gestures Reveal about Thought (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1992); David McNeill, *Language and Gesture*, LangCultCog 2 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000); and David McNeill, *Gesture and Thought* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2005).

¹² For example, while speaking of the pace at which a visiting lecturer presented his argument, a colleague once motioned her hands rapidly as if she were shoveling food into her mouth; “there was no time to chew, let alone digest, his thesis,” she said in frustration! In this instance, the gesture enacts the IDEAS ARE FOOD conceptual metaphor. For other cases of gestural and conceptual congruence, see Cienki and Müller, “Metaphor, Gesture, and Thought.”

¹³ Cienki and Müller, “Metaphor, Gesture, and Thought,” 486; here, Cienki and Müller cite A. Kendon, “Gesticulation and Speech: Two Aspects of the Process of Utterance,” in *Nonverbal Communication and Language*, ed. M. Ritchie Key (The Hague: Mouton, 1980), 207–27.

¹⁴ These oppositions are all used by Geertz in *Interpretation of Cultures*, 89–90.

¹⁵ This is noted by Catherine M. Bell (*Ritual Theory, Ritual Practice* [New York: Oxford University Press, 1992], 25–29), who develops the point in critique of Geertz.

¹⁶ Geertz, *Interpretation of Cultures*, 112.

¹⁷ See Bell, *Ritual Theory*, 25–29

¹⁸ It should be noted that holding onto this aspect of Geertz does not require one to maintain the notion of ritual as an escape from the world (see Geertz, *Interpretation of Cultures*, 121–23).

¹⁹ This has nothing to do with objective, ontological division of *real* and *imagined*, but rather has everything to do with how a given community makes sense of the world and their place therein

²⁰ As noted above, cognitive linguists refer to this process of modification as either “reverse mapping” or “backward projection” (see Fauconnier and Turner, *The Way We Think*, 43–44, 49).

²¹ This is not to suggest that myth and ritual need always coalesce with one another, nor that they are always mutually dependent and/or supportive. A century of ritual studies has rightly discredited the notion that myth is merely the text of a ritual, and ritual the enactment of the text (cf. Robert A. Segal, “Myth and Ritual,” in *Theorizing Rituals: Issues, Topics, Approaches, Concepts*, eds. Jens Kreinath, Jan Snoek and Michael Stausberg; NBS:SHR 114.1 [Leiden: Brill, 2006], 101–21). Nonetheless, Robert Segal is right to note that,

in many cases, myth and ritual do work tightly together in such a way that “myth . . . becomes part of the ritual itself” (“Myth and Ritual,” 120); Segal cites Gregory Nagy on this point, who argues for a notion of myth-performance: “once myth is taken as performance, ‘we can see that myth itself is a form of ritual: rather than think of myth and ritual separately and contrastively, we can see them as a continuum in which myth is a verbal aspect of ritual while ritual is a nonverbal aspect of myth’” (Segal, “Myth and Ritual,” 121; citing Gregory Nagy, “Can Myth be Saved?,” in *Myth: A New Symposium*, eds. G. Schrempf and W. Hansen [Bloomington, Ind.: Indiana University Press, 2002], 240–48).

²² Here, we draw upon the work of Dennis Smith, who proposes a pan-Mediterranean banquet tradition, and that various particular meals drew upon the customs and ideology within that tradition. Ideals of this tradition include generosity and joy, social bonding, and the balancing of equality with social order; each of which were enacted within meals. See Dennis Smith, *From Symposium to Eucharist: The Banquet in the Early Christian World* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2003). See also Dennis Smith and Hal Taussig, eds., *Meals in The Early Christian World: Social Formation, Experimentation and Conflict at the Table* (New York: Palgrave, 2012).

²³ Here, the insight of Mary Douglas is helpful. She writes, “If food is treated as a code, the message it encodes will be found in the pattern of social relations being expressed. The message is about different degrees of hierarchy, inclusion and exclusion, boundaries and transactions across the boundaries” (“Deciphering a Meal,” in *Implicit Meanings* [London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1975], 249–275, here 249).

²⁴ In the Exodus narrative, the Passover event is instituted in Egypt (ch 12:1-28) and the annual festival of Unleavened Bread is predicted (ch 13:3-10). The manna account is in ch. 16.

²⁵ The Israelites had been complaining – they missed having the bread of Egypt (Ex 16:3). See below.

²⁶ Exod 16:3 and Num 21:5. Compare with Num 11:4–5 which has no mention of bread, rather meat is the grumbled-about item.

²⁷ Ps 78:24 repeats the “rain from heaven” phrase and also calls manna the “grain of heaven.” See also Ps 105:40, “bread from heaven.”

²⁸ Typical actions for dough, Exod 16:23. Compare with Num 11:7, which speaks of a milling process followed by boiling. One gets the impression of something like dumplings, or bagels!

²⁹ Exod 16:35, see also Josh 5:12.

³⁰ Here, the implication is that the appearance of manna will lead to understanding. “Knowing” related to manna is restated in Exod 16:12, but here it seems that it is the eating and digestion of the food that will lead to understanding. The verb ראה (*r’h*) is often used in parallel with ידע (*’d*) and, when used in the *qal* (as in 16:7), denotes either “seeing” or “understanding”; such usage likely reflects the conceptual metaphor SEEING IS UNDERSTANDING (cf. Lakoff and Johnson, *Metaphors We Live By*, 48).

³¹ See also Deut 8:16.

³² Exod 16:15 “what is it?” (מָה הוּא). The etymology of the word *manna* is traced to this question, Ex. 16:31. Moses’s reply, Exod 16:15.

³³ *Babylonian Talmud: Yoma* 76a; Lauterbach 1933 *Mek.* v.2 (pp. 103–104).

³⁴ *Mek.* v.2 (pp. 119–120).

³⁵ *Mek.* v.2 (p. 104). See also p. 126, where the prophet Jeremiah says something similar.

³⁶ *Mek.* v.2 (p. 123).

³⁷ See, e.g., Petrus Maritz and Gilbert Van Belle, “The Imagery of Eating and Drinking in John 6:35,” in *Imagery in the Gospel of John: Terms, Forms, Themes, and Theology of Johannine Figurative Language*, ed. Jörg Frey, Jan G. van der Watt, and Ruben Zimmermann; WUNT 200 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2006), 333–52 (esp. pp. 345–49).

³⁸ Painter, “Signs of the Messiah and the Quest for Eternal Life,” in *What we have heard from the beginning: the past, present, and future of Johannine studies*, ed. Tom Thatcher (Waco: Baylor Univ Press, 2007), 251.

³⁹ Harold W. Attridge, “From Discord Rises Meaning: Resurrection Motifs in the Fourth Gospel,” in *The Resurrection of Jesus in the Gospel of John*, ed. Craig R. Koester and R. Bieringer; WUNT 222 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008), 1–20 (here p. 8).

⁴⁰ See further, Jane Webster, who identifies the dialectical tension implicit in this medium of didactic communication (esp. in John 6:60; Jane S. Webster, *Ingesting Jesus: Eating and Drinking in the Gospel of John* [Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2003], 85).

⁴¹ See recently, Meredith J. C. Warren, *My Flesh is Meat Indeed: A Non-Sacramental Reading of John 6:51–58* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2015).

⁴² See the extended discussion of this topic in Webster, *Ingesting Jesus*.

⁴³ Jane DeRose Evans, *The Art of Persuasion: Political Propaganda from Aeneas to Brutus* (Ann Arbor, MI.: University of Michigan Press, 1992), 1. Evans draws on Jacques Ellul, *Propaganda: The Formation of Men's Attitudes*. Trans. Konrad Kellen and Jean Lerner (New York: Vintage Books Edition, 1973), 75. Pace Ellul, who estimates that Integration propaganda is entirely a 20th century phenomenon. On propaganda in ancient Rome, also see Wayne G. Sayles, *Ancient Coin Collecting III: The Roman World – Politics and Propaganda* (Iola, WI.: Krause Publications, 2007), 217.

⁴⁴ Ellul, *Propaganda: The Formation of Men's Attitudes*, 74-77.

⁴⁵ Evans, *The Art of Persuasion*, 2.

⁴⁶ Evans, *The Art of Persuasion*, 4, 7, 19.

⁴⁷ Paul Zanker, *The Power of Images in the Age of Augustus*. Trans. Alan Shapiro (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1988). See also J. Bert Lott, *The Neighborhoods of Augustan Rome*. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004), 117-127.

⁴⁸ On propaganda in Rome, see also Richard Gordon, “The Veil of Power: Emperors, Sacrificers, and Benefactors,” in *Pagan Priests: Religion and Power in the Ancient World*. Ed. Mary Beard and John North (Ithaca, NY.: Cornell University Press, 1990), 206-208, 215.

⁴⁹ Severian of Gabala (4th century bishop), cited in Jás Elsner 1995:54

⁵⁰ Sayles 2007:217. Cf. Gordon, “The Veil of Power: Emperors, Sacrificers, and Benefactors,” 215.

⁵¹ See John Roberts “Food Supply: Roman,” *The Oxford Dictionary of the Classical World*, ed. J. Roberts (Oxford: University, 2005), 292; Emin Tengström, *Bread for the People: Studies of the Corn-supply of Rome during the late Empire*. Stockholm: Paul Åströms Förlag, 197; Paul Veyne, *Bread and Circuses: Historical Sociology and Political Pluralism*. Trans. Brian Pearce, Abr. Oswyn Murray. (London: Penguin Books, 1992), 236-245; Boudewijn Sirks *Food for Rome: The Legal Structure of the Transportation and Processing of Supplies for the Imperial Distributions in Rome and*

Constantinople. Trans. Enid Perlin-West (Amsterdam: J.C. Gieben, 1992), 10-15.

⁵² Sayles 2007: 218.

⁵³ Varro, *On the Latin Language* V.107, *On Agriculture* II.8.1.

⁵⁴ Andreas Alföldi, "Tonmodel und Reliefmedaillons aus den Donauländern," in *Laureae Aquincenses memoriae Valentini Kuzsinsky dicatae*. Dissertationes Pannonicae, Series 2. (Budapest: Budapest Inst. Für Münzkunde und Archaeologie d. Univ.), 1938. Pages 329-331 and Plates XLVIII-XLIX.

⁵⁵ See George Galavaris, *Bread and Liturgy: The Symbolism of Early Christian and Byzantine Bread Stamps* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1970), 22-25, who notes that the shapes and designs on the breads were intended to remind (and we might say teach) the celebrants of various elements of the mythic elements observed in the festival.

⁵⁶ A. Lengyel and G. T. B. Radan, *The Archaeology of Roman Pannonia* (Lexington: The University Press of Kentucky, 1980), 184.

⁵⁷ George Boon, "Notes: A Roman pastry cook's mould from Silchester," *The Antiquaries Journal* 1958 (38): 237.

⁵⁸ Lengyel and Radan, *The Archaeology of Roman Pannonia*, 369. *Salvo Augusto] aurea s[a]jacula videmus.*

⁵⁹ George C. Boon "Notes: A Roman pastry cook's mould from Silchester," 238 citing Andreas Alföldi, "Tonmodel und Reliefmedaillons aus den Donauländern."

⁶⁰ Mary Beard, John North and Simon Price *Religions of Rome, volume 1 History* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998), 350. Cf. Boon "Notes: A Roman pastry cook's mould from Silchester," 237-240.

⁶¹ Richard Gordon "The Veil of Power: Emperors, Sacrificers, and Benefactors," 219. Gordon makes the same claim for the emperor's role as sacrificiant being linked to his role as benefactor or *euergete* (Ibid, 201). So also Veyne *Bread and Circuses*, 292-294; 386-392. Cf. Luke 22:25 Jesus' comment during the Last Supper (where he is acting as host) on the role of benefactors in the Roman empire.

⁶² We saw a similar motif in the Exodus account of manna.

⁶³ Gordon, "The Veil of Power: Emperors, Sacrificers, and Benefactors," 218-219. Perhaps we see an unfortunate use of the word "banal" here – mundane or quotidian would be better. See Gordon's discussion on bread cakes (Ibid., 217-219).