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This essay is not about early Christianity first of all, but rather about the relations between Greek-speaking Jews and Gentiles outside the Holy Land. It is included for three reasons. For most scholars, understanding those Jewish-Gentile relations is important first of all because of what that will reveal about the expansion of early Christianity among those Jews and Gentiles. In addition, recent archaeological discoveries at two sites in western Asia Minor (modern Turkey) have raised the "relationships" question again in important new ways. Finally, a new understanding of Saint Paul is emerging, one which Goodenough would have warmly welcomed.

The new archaeological evidence comes in the main from Sardis and Aphrodisias. The excavation of the Sardis synagogue has revealed a Diaspora Jewish community of political power and social status, architectural and iconographic creativity, and a genuine self-confidence over against its Gentile neighbors. Goodenough knew of the initial Sardis discoveries, and they excited him greatly. He managed to insert a reference to them, with illustrations, toward the end of the last volume of the Symbols to come from his hand, see Symbols 12:191-95. In particular Sardis provided a precise response to the "two insuperable difficulties" which had been raised by Schürer (JQR, page 225 below): the most important Sardis inscription, squarely in the center of the floor of the
main hall, mentioned a "teacher of wisdom" named Samoe, who was also a priest. And the main furnishing of the building, the lectern which was the focus of worship, was embellished at each end with a huge eagle in high relief. (Generally on Sardis: Hanfmann 1983.)


The new understanding of Paul focusses on the social context for Paul's statements about Judaism, the Law and the Gentiles. It attempts to dispel the historical distortions which arose when Paul was seen through the eyes of the Protestant reformers. Watson calls this new view "delutheranizing Paul" (Watson 1987:18), the "Lutheran" view being represented in recent times pre-eminently by Rudolf Bultmann and Ernst Käsemann. The result is also a more accurate picture of the Jews and the Gentiles with whom Paul was concerned.

In a 1947 letter about the years spent on Jewish Symbols in the Greco-Roman Period, Goodenough wrote, "with the completion of this work [the Symbols] I shall at last be ready to begin the work I have all my life [been] preparing to do, namely to write an equally extensive study of the origin of Christianity in view of all the new material I shall have presented on its Jewish and symbolic background" (Eccles 1985:85). His point is obvious: the Christians and Jews of the Greco-Roman world can only be understood mutually. Misinterpreting one side inevitably blurs our picture of the other. When Paul is seen as a timeless theological figure, that conveys a biased and inadequate picture of the Jewish communities out of which he came and with which he remained involved. In the last sentence of this essay, Goodenough insists: "We must inevitably come to recognize that hellenized Judaism was still a true Judaism." Without that recognition, there will also be gaps and limitations in any historical reconstruction of the early Christian communities with which these "hellenized" Jews interacted.
The fifteen illustrations to this article were printed more satisfactorily in volumes 3, 7 or 8 of the Symbols, and are not reproduced here. The numbers of the illustrations are listed below, with the volume and illustration number in the Symbols to which they correspond.
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Erwin R. Goodenough, *Jewish Quarterly Review* 47 (1956-7): 221-244

The famous study of Emil Schürer on the Θεός Ὕψιστος inscriptions in the Bosporus\(^1\) made one of those solid contributions whose findings have not been challenged for nearly sixty years. Two of the inscriptions,\(^2\) from Panticapaeum, record that Jews manumitted a slave or slaves by committing them to their God at their προσευχή, or synagogue building. The only requirement was that the slaves thereafter be regular attendants at the synagogue, and the group, the συναγωγή, a Jewish counterpart of διάσος, were to keep watch that they did so. The slaves were presumably pagans, since Jewish slaves would have been freed in the Jewish way. Their standing with the Jews of the synagogue after they were freed is not hinted.\(^3\) The two inscriptions seem about contemporary, and one is dated at 81 CE.

Schürer demonstrated that the method of manumission was taken directly from pagan usage, where slaves were freed by consigning them to some deity at a temple. The inscriptions say directly that "Jews" were the actors in this transaction, so that their existence in the region is definitely established. Clearly, also, the Jews were so much influenced by gentile ways that this, and presumably other, legal procedures were adapted to the synagogue.

A third inscription, from Gorgippia in the Bosporus,\(^4\) dated 41 CE, gave more trouble. It is also a document of manumission, dedicated to

---


\(^2\)They are to be found also in J.B. Frey, *Corpus Inscriptionum Iudaicarum*, I, nos. 683 f. (hereafter CIJ).

\(^3\)Schürer and others thought the freedmen became "God-fearers," but some have read the Greek as a prohibition against their even entering the synagogue. For a guide to this debate, as well as bibliography of the process of manumission, see Frey's note to his inscription 683.

\(^4\)Schürer, *op. cit.*, 204.
the "Most High God, Almighty and Blessed," and frees a slave in the same way with reference to the synagogue, but here the phrase is added that the act is done ὑπὸ Δία, Γῆ, Ἡλίου, "under Zeus, Ge, Helios." Schürer shows that the opening address of this inscription is even more Jewish than the others, for while God is called Almighty a great many times in the Septuagint, apocrypha, the New Testament, and early Christian literature, the term has never once been found in a pagan setting. Actually "Almighty" appears as an epithet of Hermes on one inscription, but Schürer's judgment is still sound that it should ordinarily be taken to indicate Judaism. To address God as "Blessed" likewise recalls Judaism, since God is rarely mentioned in Jewish writings without "Blessed be he" being added. The inscription, then, must be taken as an address to the Jewish God. But Zeus, Ge, and Helios cancelled all this for Schürer and his successors. "Anyone who could use this formula, even only as a formula and quite carelessly, was no Jew."

Subsequently discovered papyrological evidence, however, quite changes the picture. We now know that in documents of manumission of slaves the formula "Zeus, Ge, Helios" was so established that it seems legally to have been quite de rigueur. Granfell and Hunt printed the names in Greek as a single word, and translated: "She is set at liberty under..." That is, they did not translate the names at all because a literal translation would for modern age be a mistranslation, as, I am convinced, it was for Schürer. Clearly this phrase was expected in, and probably legitimized, such documents in what may be called the Greek common law of the regions under the Diadochs. It carried no implication of the person's belief, but was introduced into this Jewish document to make the manumission legal in pagan eyes, and involved no threat to the monotheism of the Jew who used it. If it does imply a bit of elasticity in the Jews of the region, it goes no further than does a modern Jew who takes his oath in court upon a Bible containing the

---

5G. Kaibel, Epigrammata Graeca, 1878, no. 815. From Crete.
6See the two Greek inscriptions found in a temple of Pan in Edfu, Egypt: "The blessing of God (ὁ θεὸς εὐλογία). Theodotus the Jew, son of Dorian, was saved from the sea," Frey, ClJ, II, no. 1537; "Ptolemaios the Jew, son of Dionysius, blesses God (εὐλογεῖ τὸν θεόν)," ibid., no. 1538.
8Frey recognized this also, though on other grounds: see his ClJ, I, notes to no. 690.
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New Testament. Actually the Judaism of this inscription is strong and unbroken.\(^9\)

From this inscription we learn that Jews in the region called their God the Most High. Similarly an inscription from Athribis, Egypt, tells how a prefect of the guard, along with the Jews of the place, dedicated a synagogue (\(\pi\rho\sigma\sigma\epsilon\upsilon\chi\pi\gamma\)) in the Most High God.\(^10\) The Most High appears also in four votive inscriptions\(^11\) and two inscriptions of curses\(^12\) from the synagogue at Delos. Josephus quotes a decree of Augustus in which John Hyrcanus is called "Chief Priest of God Most High."\(^13\) Schürer was convinced that the term came from paganism.\(^14\) We need not repeat the elaborate documentation by which he demonstrated that in paganism it began as "Most High Zeus," then was used sometimes absolutely, the "Most High," but more often as the "Most High God," all in pagan environments. Its use seems a part of the tendency toward monotheism that characterized later antiquity. Jews, however, did not have to adopt the phrase from paganism. As \(\pi\upsilon\gamma\upsilon\) or \(\gamma\upsilon\) it was often used in their Bible, and was translated in the LXX as \(\upsilon\phi\sigma\sigma\tau\omega\sigma\).

From these inscriptions Schürer went on to a group of twenty-one others\(^15\) which commemorate the setting up of little groups of "newly received brethren" (\(\epsilon\iota\sigma\sigma\sigma\iota\eta\tau\omicron\iota\delta\epsilon\epsilon\lambda\phi\omicron\omicron\)) who were worshiping God Most High. The group was a \(\sigma\nu\omicron\omicron\delta\omicron\omicron\), or \(\sigma\nu\omicron\alpha\gamma\omicron\omega\gamma\eta\)\(^16\) its members

---

\(^9\) S. Lieberman and A.D. Nock have both recognized that this phrase was within the scope of legitimate Jewish elasticity at the time: see Lieberman, \textit{Hellenism in Jewish Palestine}, 1950, 214. But note that the use of the formula on such inscriptions is not an oath. It is a declaration that the slave is freed "under the subjection, control, dependence" of the three divinities: see Liddell-Scott-Jones, s.v. \(\upsilon\mu\alpha\), C, II. Philo allows Jews to swear by many personal and cosmic entities, including the sun, but never by such pagan divinities as Zeus, Ge, Helios: see my \textit{Jewish Jurisprudence}, 43 f.; Lieberman, \textit{Greek in Jewish Palestine}, 1942, 124 f., 138. There seems a real distinction between calling on a god in oath to witness an act or statement, which no Jew that I know ever allowed, and repeating an accepted formula that an act was done "under such and such names" to legitimize the legal act in gentile eyes. For a Jew had not emancipated his slave in gentile society at all if he did not validate the transaction in gentile terms.

\(^10\) Schürer, \textit{op. cit.}, 216; \textit{CII}, II, no. 1445.

\(^11\) \textit{CII}, I, nos. 727-730.

\(^12\) \textit{ibid.}, nos. 725 a, b.

\(^13\) \textit{Antt.}, XVI, 163 (vi, 2).


\(^16\) \textit{CII}, p. lxx, n. 3, says that at Rome "synagogue" is always the congregation, \textit{proseuche} the building. But since he has only one reference to the building from Rome, such a generalization is dangerous. On the Bosporus inscriptions,
diaosrhai, so that the group must also have been called a diaosos. They were enrolled under one or more presbyters, and their names followed, as well as the names of various officials, including a "priest," a "father of the group" (πατὴρ συνόδου), an "officer for physical exercise" (γυμνασιάρχης) and a "supervisor of the youth" (νεανισκάρχης). The groups were apparently quite small, since at most only forty names were listed for each, and several of the inscriptions were set up at about the same time in a single place.

In these inscriptions, Jewish as they appear, Schürer found two insuperable difficulties to calling them such. The first is that they had a "priest," which to him implied sacrifices. The second is that five of the stones, perhaps more if the stones were complete, had eagles at the top, and these, he thought, could never have been acceptable to Jews. A third objection might be raised, the fact that we have at the beginning of the stones the phrase "to (or for) good luck" (διάδει τίχη). To speak of this last at once, the phrase seems quite without reference to the goddess Tyche. It was widely used as a sort of talismanic formula on documents, and Liddell-Scott-Jones furnish a great number of parallels, all of which they properly spell with the small letter. The phrase does not appear on Jewish tombstones, or any of our other inscriptions, but "luck" appears frequently in the writings of Philo as a causative factor in human events. It seems not at all to imply polytheism in the ordinary sense of the term or to go beyond the good luck most earnest Christians and Jews customarily wish their sons as they go off to war. Indeed Schürer felt the reference to luck so unimportant that he did not mention it at all, and we can safely disregard it as a bar to the Judaism of the inscriptions. The two objections he did raise, however, must be examined.

First that these thiasoi or synagogoi used "priests" among their officials seemed to Schürer to mark them as non-Jewish, because to him lepeus meant one who offered sacrifices, a function so far as we know never performed in the synagogues. Dr. D.D. Fearer of Yale hopes shortly to publish in the Yale Classical Studies a paper in which he shows that the meaning of the term was by no means thus limited even among the Greeks. Still more directly important for our question is the evidence of inscriptions published since Schürer wrote. For we now know

---

the distinction is usually kept, and probably would be when the two conceptions appear together, but it is by no means generally observed: see e.g., CIJ, I, 720, 722 f.

17 The title πατὴρ συναγωγῆς appears clearly seven times in CIJ, I: see nos. 88, 93, 319, 509 f., 537, 694, and in other inscriptions, as 645 f., it is a probable restoration.
that at Rome two Jews on their tombstone are called "priest," two "chief priest," one "priestess." A synagogue inscription in Greek from Jerusalem before its fall shows that the synagogue was built by Theodotus, Priest and Archisynagogus, son and grandson of an Archisynagogus. It may be that the priesthood of Theodotus' father and grandfather was implied since he himself was a priest, but it is not so stated. Presumably it was an office he held like that of archisynagogus. The synagogue of Dura was built, according to an inscription, in 244/5 CE during the eldership of Samuel the "priest." There is plenty of evidence, accordingly, to show that the term "priest" was a living one in Jewish synagogues in those early years.

The Dead Sea Manual of Discipline, if we may take it as genuine, has of course freshly emphasized the importance of the priest in that Jewish Sect. There the "priests and Levites" have special blessings and curses to pronounce. These two have to lead the others in what appears to be a procession into the "Covenant," though it is priests and elders who lead in another passage. The priests have authoritative judgment in matters of property, and special penalties are prescribed for their misdemeanors; they are especially to be "weighed according to their spirit" whatever this form of judgment may prove to mean. Who were these priests? They are commonly called in the Manual the sons of Zadok or of Aaron, and this has been taken literally by commentators, so far as I can learn. But the admitted sons of Zadok were a small and select group, while those called by this title were indeed common in the little sects. Any cell of the group, if I may use the term, had to have ten members and a priest, while the "Council of the Community," whatever its jurisdiction, consisted of

---

18 CIJ, I, nos. 346 f.
19 Ibid., no. 405, cf. no. 355. Frey dismisses the difficulty by changing χρόνοις into χρόνοις, but the photograph of no. 405 which he publishes makes this quite impossible.
20 Ibid., no. 315: λέιψα.
21 Ibid., II, 828, a, b; see J. Obermann in the Yale preliminary report of Excavations in Dura Europos, VI, 390.
23 Ibid., II, 20.
24 Ibid., VI, 8.
25 Ibid., VI, 19; IX, 7.
26 Ibid., VII, 3.
27 Ibid., IX, 14.
28 Ibid., V, 6, 9, 21.
29 Ibid., VI, 3.
twelve laymen and three priests. That the Sect could get such a steady supply of literal sons of Zadok is quite possible, of course. But "the men of the Community shall be set apart as a house of holiness for Aaron," and the Council itself seems to have become a most holy abode or institution for Aaron, with eternal knowledge to enact laws and to offer up an agreeable odor, the Council that is of the laymen and the priests. The sacrificial term "odor" is clearly not a reference to the sacrifices in the Temple, and the priests as lawmakers are the lawmakers of the code of the Manual itself. An entirely new light is thrown on the priesthood when it appears that their special function was to bless the bread and wine at the communal meals. We are getting very close indeed to the transition from the priestly function of the sons of Zadok in the Temple to the function of future Christian priests. When all this is put together, it seems to me quite possible that the priesthood of Zadok in the Sect was a title or office, not a sign of literal descent from Zadok, and that it is precisely here that we have the beginnings of the transition to the Christian priesthood. I strongly suspect that it was because only the priest could consecrate the bread and wine for these people that every cell of ten men had to have a priest. Be that as it may, even without the evidence of the Discipline there is ample precedence for the office of priest in Jewish communities outside the Temple, and the presence of such an official or such a title in the Bosporus communities is far from estranging them from Judaism.

A final objection seemed to Schürer also insuperable, that eagles were carved on five of the twenty-one stones, and, from the fragmentary condition of the stones, might well have stood on others. But even if they originally appeared on only this one quarter of the stones, it is clear that the groups countenanced them freely. Since no other such figures are on the stones except the eagles, one would at once conclude in any other religion that the eagle has special symbolic importance in the group. It will be well to examine the five stones as reproduced by Stephani years ago. In fig. 1 the eagle is so drawn that it looks like an owl, but the half-spread position of the wings shows that it is the eagle used throughout the Near East, as the other stones indicate. The

---

30Ibid., VIII, 1.
31Ibid., IX, 6.
32Ibid., VIII, 6-9.
33See also similar passages in the Genizah Fragments (ed. R.H. Charles, Apocrypha and Pseudoepigrapha, II, 799-834), I, 5; VI, 1; VII, 6; VIII, 11; X, 7-9; XI, 1 f.; XV, 1-6; XVII, 1 f. It is worth recalling that the title of the Hasmonean priest-kings was "chief priest of the Most High God."
round decoration within the gable is what I call a "round object," and was a favorite symbol in Jewish use. Fig. 3 shows at the top the same eagle, but with head turned. What was on either side of it would be dangerous to say, but, in view of the garland held by the eagles below, it is worth suggesting that the upper corners may have contained garlands also, since there is room for nothing but the end of a garland in those lost parts of the gable. The eagles below look back over their shoulders to hold the garland. A garland was simply an untied wreath, and had exactly the same symbolism. The anthemion at the top of the gable would at a glance seem to be only decoration, but will appear an integral part of the design. In fig. 5 the eagles face a central wreath, to which they bring palm branches. Palm branches are another alternative for the wreath: both mean victory, of course, but in religious art they can mean, as they still do, the crown or victory of achieving life, in Paul's terms, or of the vision of God in Philo's mystical language. In fig. 4 what the eagles face between them is entirely lost. Fig. 8 gives us simply a pair of eagles in the usual form.

In Schürer's opinion these eagles showed that "the cult of the θεός υψιστός, in spite of all Jewish influences, still continued attached to Zeus." 35 He took comfort in the nine stones out of the twenty-one so complete that such ornament could not possibly have appeared on them, and also in the appearance of pairs of eagles. Zeus had a single eagle, he argued, and when one could put two or three together they had obviously become ornamental, and hence, while a definite reminiscence of Zeus, were so far removed from the actual eagle of Zeus that the God being worshiped was still closer to Yahweh than to Zeus. Even so, he thought, Jews could not have carved them there.

Without going into the highly complicated problem of the meaning of the eagle in the ancient Near East, 36 we can at once dissipate the notion that Jews of this period so much disliked the eagle that its appearance on the inscriptions makes it impossible to ascribe the stones to Jews. The eagle actually has been identified many times as a device on the synagogues of Palestine. From the synagogue of Capernaum alone six stones show eagles, or traces of them, for they were often savagely hacked away by later Jewish reformers. On only one piece could recognizable eagles from Capernaum be photographed but that is very important, fig. 6, 37 since here is carved a pair of eagles holding a

---

36 This subject, the eagle on the Temple of Herod, and the eagle in Jewish and Christian tradition, is to be discussed in a chapter on the eagle in Vol. VIII of my Jewish Symbols in the Greco-Roman Period.
37 See my Jewish Symbols in the Greco-Roman Period, III, fig. 475.
garland between them exactly as on the inscription. It is also to be noticed that the anthemion was at the left beside them, something I can hardly regard as a matter of chance. On another, fig. 9,38 the eagles are chipped away, but the archaeologists who inspected the stone assure us that the stone originally had a pair of eagles beneath the wreath holding its tie strings in their beaks. Fig. 739 shows an eagle with garlands and wreaths from a lintel on the door of the synagogue at el-Jish, and fig. 240 the undoubted remains of an eagle in what we now recognize as its stereotype position from the synagogue at Umm el-Kanatir. Fig. 1141 shows a drawing of the design on what was taken to be the lintel stone of a synagogue at Khirbet Dubil: here again are the eagle and the wreath. But if one is looking for unorthodoxy in eagles, fig. 14,42 a mosaic in the synagogue at Yafa, shows an eagle over a female head. In fig. 10,43 also a lintel from Yafa, two eagles, each holding a wreath, flank a central wreath. Lest we go too far with this material, and conclude that the eagle in these positions was a distinctive mark of Judaism, let me show you fig. 12,44 the lintel from a temple of the Sun God at Hatra, where identical eagles, bearing little wreaths, confront the central figure of the rayed sun god. The Jewish pattern we now see is a deliberate adoption, and the wreath has taken the place of the pagan god to make it conform to Jewish notions. The God, now that he has become Yahweh, still has eagles as his attributes, as did the sun god of Hatra, fig. 13.45

The eagle was also a funerary device for Jews in Palestine. Three occurrences of them have recently been found at Sheikh Ibreiq, or Beth Shéarim. One, Avigad wrote me, is so lightly incised in the wall that it cannot be photographed, though it is certainly there. Another he has just published. It shows an eagle in the familiar half-spread form, dominating an animal frieze which, as he says, strongly recalls the carving of the synagogue at Capernaum.46 But of the third he sent me a photograph, from a sarcophagus end, fig. 15. Avigad wrote that he had

---

38Ibid., fig. 465.
39Ibid., fig. 522.
40Ibid., fig. 531.
41Ibid., fig. 598.
42Ibid., fig. 993.
43Ibid., fig. 569.
45From *ibid.*, plate VI, 2. I do not bring in as evidence the eagle on the coin of Herod I, because his use of eagles has been so much misinterpreted by the misunderstanding of his putting the eagle on the Temple. I shall discuss this at length in my study of the eagle in Vol. VIII of my *Symbols*.
46*Archaeology*, VIII (1955), 240. It is from the Mausoleum of Catacomb no. 11.
found the sarcophagus there last summer, and said: "On either of the
two long sides are carved two lions flanking a bull's head. On one of the
short sides is carved a bull's head, on the other an eagle whose
photograph I send you. Two similar eagles are carved on the front side
of the lid, and on either of the latter's sides is carved a bull's head."

It is natural to assume that for pagans the eagle was at once the god
and the agent or attribute of god, who brought men god's mercy and
salvation, and, in other representations, carried the souls of men back to
god. All of this can be elaborately illustrated. How deeply such an
eagle could be taken into Judaism appears in the book, The Rest of the
Words of Baruch, a slightly Christianized version of a Jewish original,
where, after the eagle does many wonderful things, including restoring
a man to life, the people exclaim: "Is not this the God who was
manifest to our fathers in the wilderness through the instrumentality
of Moses, and who has made himself into the form of an eagle, and
appeared to us by means of this great eagle?" But we are not concerned
with the eagle directly, only with Schürer's argument that the eagles
on the stones in Bosporus were the eagles of the Greek Zeus, and that
the stones must accordingly be classed as pagan. Quite the contrary, the
use of the eagles on these inscriptions, and the way the eagles are used,
show that they are the eagles of the solar deities of the East, and that
they were used to show the mercy and power of θεός ὕπιστος in a way
completely acceptable to Jews.

What, then, were these little communities? Were they made up of
Jews or gentiles?

After having said all this about the harmony of everything with
Judaism I still hesitate to conclude definitely that the groups were
made up of native Jews. They may well have been converts. That they
are called "God-worshipers" by no means leads me to this opinion, for
certainly no Jew would feel himself belittled by so honorable a title.
But Schürer has shown that the inscriptions seem to set up distinct
little groups of "newly received brethren," five groups in the same city
within a short while, and this looks like a rapidly growing community.
There was no reason why new generations of Jews should not join their
parents' groups, so that the new thiasoi seem to reflect converts, rather
than that large immigrations of Jews were coming to this little city in
the third century. I have no proof that the groups were not made up
strictly of new Jewish arrivals. But I should take the inscriptions to
witness the appeal of Judaism at the time to gentiles who became fully
Jewish in their point of view. The new converts may or may not have
been circumcised. One always must recall Philo's remark that

47James R. Harris, The Rest of the Words of Baruch, VII, 18.
uncircumcised gentiles who accepted the worship of the Jewish God were often a far nobler progeny of Abraham than some of the circumcised.\textsuperscript{48} Such may have been the members of these thiasoi. But the movement itself to worship the Most High God in thiasoi and to symbolize their worship by eagles, seems to be a product of hellenized Jews. For if the people named in these inscriptions were not native Jews, there is nothing in the inscriptions alien to what we know of the practices of loyal Jews of the period. We must inevitably come to recognize that hellenized Judaism was still a true Judaism.

\textsuperscript{48}See my \textit{Introduction to Philo Judaeus}, 1940, 53, 173, 207; \textit{By Light, Light}, 1935, 115. \textit{QE II}, 2: "For the proselyte is one not who has circumcised his foreskin, but one who has circumcised the pleasures and desires and other passions of his soul...The attitude of mind (\delta\psi\alpha\nu\omega\varsigma) of the proselyte is alienation from polytheistic opinion, and attraction to the honor to the One and Father of all things." Cf. Philo's remarks on nobility, in \textit{Virt.}, 187-227.