CAMBRIDGE
UNIVERSITY PRESS

ARTICLE

Christ Worship in the Neighbourhood: Corinth's *ekklēsia* and its Vicinity (1 Cor 14.22–5)

Richard Last

Ancient Greek and Roman Studies Program, Trent University, Lady Eaton College S118, Peterborough, Canada, K9L 0G2
Email: richardlast@trentu.ca

Abstract

This article defends the salience of situating Christ worship in the context of urban neighbourhoods and identifies some historical problems in conceptualising belonging at that level of society, akin to similar work on other levels of society such as the household and *polis*. An *ekklēsia* or *collegium* is, like all neighbourhood structures, capable of fostering or delimiting social interactions among neighbours who identify differently. A case study of 1 Cor 14.22–5 illustrates how Paul's model *ekklēsia* functioned in the context of the neighbourhood, and considers the impact of adding the *ekklēsia* to the street on which it was located.

Keywords: neighbourhoods; urbanism; 1 Corinthians; Paul; Christ worship; *idiōtai*; *apistoi*

1. The Ancient Urban Neighbourhood

In recent years, the study of Christ worship in the context of urban neighbourhoods has gained momentum.[1] Early advocates of the approach, Andrew Wallace-Hadrill and Stanley Stowers, suggested that the neighbourhood would be a more realistic level of society for placing Christ worship relative to the better explored settings of households and cohesively Christian 'communities' respectively.[2] Despite definitional difficulties, the ancient neighbourhood is indeed a practical category of historical analysis, for it encompasses a social space where much ordinary life occurred.[3] Harriet Flower captures the range of activity in this space with her etymological description of Latin term *vicus*:

---

[1] See especially the articles in *Religion in the Roman Empire* 6.1–2 (2020); and M. B. Kartzow, ed., *The Ambiguous Figure of the Neighbor in Jewish, Christian, and Islamic Texts and Receptions* (London: Routledge, 2021). Earlier studies that focus more or less on the neighbourhood include P. Lampe, *From Paul to Valentinus: Christians at Rome in the First Two Centuries* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2003) 19–66; T. E. Gregory, 'Religion and Society in the Roman Eastern Corinthia', *Corinth in Context: Comparative Studies on Religion and Society* (ed. S. J. Friesen, D. N. Schowalter and J. C. Walters; NovTSup 134; Leiden: Brill, 2010) 433–6; J. L. Rife, 'Religion and Society at Roman Kenchreai', *Corinth in Context*, 391–432; G. H. Snyder, 'A Second-Century Christian Inscription from the Via Latina', *JECS* 19 (2011) 157–95; R. Last, 'The Neighborhood (*vicus*) of the Corinthian *ekklēsia*: Beyond Family-Based Descriptions of the First Urban Christ-Believers', *JSNT* 38 (2016) 399–425; B. W. Longenecker, *The Crosses of Pompeii: Jesus-Devotion in a Vesuvian Town* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2016) 230–5.

[2] A. Wallace-Hadrill, '*Domus* and *insulae* in Rome: Families and Housefuls', *Early Christian Families in Context: An Interdisciplinary Dialogue* (ed. D. L. Balch and C. Osiek; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2003) 3–18, esp. 18; and S. Stowers, 'The Concept of "Community" and the History of Early Christianity', *MTSR* 23 (2011) 238–56, esp. 249.

[3] Terentius Varro (116–27 BCE) classified the Latin term for a neighbourhood, *vicus*, as a derivative of *via* ('street'; *Ling.* 5.145). For ancient definitions, see Varro, *Ling.* 5.159; Verrius Flaccus (55 BCE–20 CE) as preserved

---

> [It] evok[es] both 'house' or 'estate' and 'street' or 'path between the houses,' ... basic-
> ally ... a group of residential buildings around a street, which can be termed a 'neigh-
> bourhood' or (more technically) a 'ward' or 'borough' inside a city ... The whole
> concept of a vicus speaks to a pattern of ancient life in narrow streets, where people
> moved around on foot and met each other face to face in their daily activities or on a
> journey.[4]

Flower is describing the Roman *vicus* specifically; the present study of urban neighbour-
hoods is temporally and geographically broader but restricts itself to sources attesting to
vici, πλατεῖαι, γειτνίασεις, and cognates. With this scope in mind, two relevant classifica-
tions from Gerald Suttles' typology of modern neighbourhoods can be highlighted.[5]

One taxon of ancient neighbourhood is the administrative sub-unit of cities and dis-
tricts, imposed from above in Rome and some other cities.[6] Suttles describes this type
of neighbourhood as 'limited liability'.[7] It is 'designated as a community by outsiders
who have some political or commercial interest in its existence'.[8] The name 'limited liabil-
ity' reflects the external origins of the districts and the potentially weak connection resi-
dents feel towards others in their ward, especially in more modern manifestations which
tend to be larger than Rome's *vici*.

A second neighbourhood concept pertains to social relationships formed among people
living in close proximity to one another (*vicini*, γείτονες) – the area of that 'proximity' is
left open to judgement. This is a neighbourhood concept articulated by David Morris and
Karl Hess as pertaining to 'place and people, with the common sense limit as the area one
can easily walk over',[9] and has been called the 'face-block' type of neighbourhood by
Suttles. In Suttles' description, the face-block includes the residents on a single city
block who use the same shops, restaurants and service buildings.[10] J. Bert Lott, following
especially Suttles' neighbourhood typology, situates Rome's *vici* into this category, though

---

in Festus 502, 508L (2nd cent. CE); and Isodorus, *Etym.* 15.2.22 (7th cent. CE). Contemporary etymological findings
have shown that *vicus* more likely derives from a series of related Indo-European terms (*wik, weik, woik*). For the
relevant bibliography, see M. Tarpin, *Vici et pagi dans l'Occident romain* (Collection de l'École Française de Rome
299; Rome: Ecole Française de Rome, 2002) 7–14. According to Tarpin, *vicus* denotes 'a unit formed of many fam-
ilies' at a level of society between *domus* and *gens* (Tarpin, *Vici*, 11).

[4] H. I. Flower, *The Dancing lares and the Serpent in the Garden: Religion at the Roman Street Corner* (Princeton:
Princeton University Press, 2017) 193.

[5] G. D. Suttles, *The Social Construction of Communities* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1972) 55–64.
On variants of ancient neighbourhoods specifically, see L. A. Curchin, '*Vici* and *pagi* in Roman Spain', *Revue des
Études Anciennes* 87 (1985) 327–43, esp. 329. For caution in combining data from different locales (on the *lares* spe-
cifically), see A. Fraschetti, *Roma e il principe* (Rome and Bari: Laterza, 2005²) 120.

[6] The officers of these wards are known from Rome, several Italian cities such as Spoletium (e.g. *CIL* XI.4798,
4815, 4821), Capua and Minturnae (see Flower, *Dancing lares*, 226–31), Ostia (see J. T. Bakker, *Living and Working
with the Gods: Studies of Evidence for Private Religion and its Material Environment in the City of Ostia (100–500 AD)*
(Dutch Monographs on Ancient History and Archaeology; Amsterdam: J. C. Gieben, 1994) 119–24) and Pompeii
(see R. Laurence, *Roman Pompeii: Space and Society* (London: Routledge, 2007²), 41–2), as well as in six Spanish
towns: *CIL* II.2013 (Singilia Barba, Baetica), 2233 (Cordoba, Baetica), 3113 (Segobriga, Hispania Citerior), 4293
(Terraco, Hispania Citerior), 4297 (Tarraco, Hispania Citerior). They may also be attested in Alexandria (*CIL*
III.12047). See Flower, *Dancing lares*, 226–33 for a fuller range of locations in Italy where *vicomagistri* are attested.
Their presence in Rome dates as early as 195 BCE and probably even before that (Livy 34.7.2–10).

[7] Suttles, *Social Construction*, 57–64. See also D. L. Birch *et al.*, *The Behavioral Foundations of Neighborhood Change*
(Washington, DC: USGPO/HUD, 1979) 35–7; and G. Galster, 'On the Nature of Neighbouhood', *Urban Studies* 38
(2001) 2111–24.

[8] W. G. Flanagan, *Urban Sociology: Images and Structure* (New York: Rowman & Littlefield, 2010⁵) 101.

[9] D. Morris and K. Hess, *Neighborhood Power* (Boston: Beacon, 1975) 6.

[10] See Suttles, *Social Construction*, 55–6.

the administrative purpose of limited liability neighbourhoods also applies to the *vici*.[11] The face-block is the smallest scale possible in Suttles' typology: approximately equivalent to a Roman *insula* and surrounding terrain. The study of Christ worship in the context of urban neighbourhoods might consider each of these neighbourhood classifications depending on the city and question at hand. Proximity is central to both, and in the case of small Roman administrative units (*vici*) there is significant overlap.

The first part of this article identifies historical problems in conceptualising belonging at the neighbourhood level of society, as was done in the past for other levels of society relevant to understanding the expansion of Christ worship, such as households, *collegia*, cities and translocal networks.[12] This part of the article also explores how neighbourhoods might create conditions for generating a stronger sense of loyalty for residents than do their cities. At the same time, we will see that the topography of the ancient neighbourhood strengthened social asymmetry by means of hosting spaces (e.g. clubhouses, baths, temples, domestic architecture) and structures (e.g. festivals, cults, administrative magistracies, *collegia*) designed to include some residents and exclude others. To be sure, these neighbourhood spaces and structures could also create conditions for transculturation among residents of different legal statuses, places of origins and other facets of identity.

The second part of the article situates mid-first century Christ worship in Corinth on the street of the synagogue next to the house of Titius Justus (Acts 18.7), via 1 Cor 14.22–5 especially. Although only a case study, the analysis is meant as a contribution to the broader question of how adding a Pauline *ekklēsia* to a neighbourhood might disrupt residents, relationships and practices there. An *ekklēsia* or *collegium* is, like other neighbourhood structures, prone to foster and/or delimit social interactions among neighbours who identify differently. In recognition of this, Paul's hypothetical scenario in 1 Cor 14.22–5 can be read as evidence of his views on how a model *ekklēsia* should function in the context of its neighbourhood.

2. Loyalty to the Neighbourhood

When countryside Athenians evacuated their demes in 431 BCE and hid inside the long walls during Sparta's first annual raid of Attic farmland, Thucydides observed that these Athenians 'became weighed down and were carrying a difficult burden as they abandoned their houses and temples which were always *patrial* to them down from the constitution in the beginning. They were about to change their way of living, and each was about to become nothing other than a city-deserter' (Thucydides 2.16.2).[13] This sense of belonging to the deme or the neighbourhood – a loyalty that seems mutually exclusive from loyalty to the *polis* ('city-deserter') in Thucydides – can be found also to varying degrees in later Greek and Latin texts.

---

[11] J. B. Lott, *The Neighbourhoods of Augustan Rome* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004) 21.

[12] Including P. Oakes, *Reading Romans in Pompeii: Paul's Letter at Ground Level* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2009); L. Nasrallah, *Christian Responses to Roman Art and Architecture: The Second-Century Church amid the Spaces of Empire* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010); M. Öhler, 'Das ganze Haus: Antike Alltagsreligiosität und die Apostelgeschichte', *ZNW* 102 (2011) 201–34; C. W. Concannon, *Assembling Early Christianity: Trade, Networks, and the Letters of Dionysius of Corinth* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2017); J. S. Kloppenborg, *Christ's Associations: Connecting and Belonging in the Ancient City* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2019).

[13] ἐβαρύνοντο δὲ καὶ χαλεπῶς ἔφερον οἰκίας τε καταλείποντες καὶ ἱερὰ ἃ διὰ παντὸς ἦν αὐτοῖς ἐκ τῆς κατὰ τὸ ἀρχαῖον πολιτείας πάτρια δίαιτάν τε μέλλοντες μεταβάλλειν καὶ οὐδὲν ἄλλο ἢ πόλιν τὴν αὐτοῦ ἀπολείπων ἕκαστος. All translations are my own unless stated otherwise.

In epigraphic texts, individuals commonly self-identify as citizens, parents, children, spouses; civic benefactors; and workers of occupations.[14] Less studied is the phenomenon of self-identification by neighbourhood of residence.[15] The practice of presenting oneself according to neighbourhood of residence can be illustrated by the Roman tomb dedication of a certain Cameria Iarine for several freedmen:

[Camer]ia L(uci) l(iberta) Iarine fecit | [L(ucio) Cam]erio L(ucii) l(iberto) Thrasoni patrono | [et] L(ucio) Camerio L(ucii) l(iberto) Alexandro | patrono eius et | [L(ucio) C]amerio Onesimo lib(erto) et | [vi]ro suo posterisque omnibus [vest]iariis tenuariis de vico Tusc(o).[16]

Cameria Iarine, freedwoman of Lucius, made this for Lucius Camerius Thraso, freedman of Lucius, [her] patron; and for Lucius Camerius Alexander, freedman of Lucius, [Thraso's] patron; and for Lucius Camerius Onesimus freedman and her husband, and for their descendants. All are tailors of high-quality clothing from the Tuscan neighbourhood (*vicus*).

The individuals named in this epitaph probably worked in the same textile workshop and may have been organised as an occupational or neighbourhood *collegium*. Their neighbourhood, Vicus Tuscus, was well known for its *tenuarii* (tailors or dealers of fine textiles) and, as this inscription shows, there was social prestige in carrying out this profession here.[17]

Loyalty to one's *vicus* in Rome is well attested. Another example is a barber who self-identified on his epitaph as

P(ublius) Petronius | P(ubli) l(ibertus) Philomusus | to(n)sor de vico | Scauri in fr (onte) p(edes) XII | in agr(o) p(edes) XVI.[18]

Publius Petronius Philomusus, freedman of Publius, barber of the Scauri *vicus*. This burial plot is 12 feet wide and 14 feet long.

Among the many other expressions of neighbourhood loyalty in ancient cities are two brothers who were dyers in the Lorarus *vicus*,[19] a hairdresser from Vicus Longus[20] and a silversmith from Vicus Cyclopis.[21] While the examples so far come from Rome, loyalty to the neighbourhood is attested elsewhere, too (see below).

---

[14] For studies on these phenomena, see R. Lattimore, *Themes in Greek and Latin Epitaphs* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1962) 266–300; S. R. Joshel, *Work, Identity, and Legal Status at Rome: A Study of the Occupational Inscriptions* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1982); O. M. Van Nijf, *The Civic World of Professional Associations in the Roman East* (Amsterdam: J. C. Gieben, 1997).

[15] See though Lott, *Augustan Rome*; Flower, *Dancing lares*; J. Hartnett, *The Roman Street: Urban Life and Society in Pompeii, Herculaneum, and Rome* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2018); A.-V. Pont, 'Les groupes de voisinage dans les villes d'Asie Mineure occidentale à l'époque impériale', *Groupes et associations dans les cités grecques* (IIIe siècle av. J.-C.–IIe siècle ap. J.-C.). Actes de la table ronde de Paris, INHA, 19-20 juin 2009 (ed. P. Frölich and P. Hamon; Hautes Études du Monde Gréco-Romain 49; Geneva: Librairie Droz, 2013) 129–56; E. Lo Cascio, '*Vici, regiones* e forme di interazione sociale nella Roma imperiale', *Rome des Quartiers: des vici aux rioni. Cadres institutionnels, pratiques sociales, et requalifications entre Antiquité et époque moderne* (ed. M. Royo, E. Hubert and A. Bérenger; Paris: de Boccard, 2008) 65–76.

[16] *CIL* VI.37826 (Rome, Latium; 1st cent. CE).

[17] J. Liu, *Collegia centonariorum: The Guilds of Textile Dealers in the Roman West* (Columbia Studies in the Classical Tradition 34; Leiden: Brill, 2009) 80.

[18] *CIL* VI.9940 (Rome, Latium).

[19] *CIL* VI.9796 (Rome, Latium; undated).

[20] *CIL* VI.37469 (Rome, Latium; 1–30 CE).

[21] *CIL* VI.2226 (Rome, Latium; 1st–2nd CE).

Some urban sociologists find that city-dwellers feel most at home in neighbourhoods, which is akin to Thucydides' own observation. In John Hipp and Andrew Perrin's study of a newly built contemporary neighbourhood of 150 houses in an unidentified American city of 50,000 residents, they compared residents' perceived 'cohesion' at neighbourhood and city levels and found that '*neighbourhood cohesion* [was] generally higher than the level of *community cohesion*'.[22] Hipp and Perrin use a 'perceived cohesion scale' developed by Kenneth Bollen and Rick Hoyle.[23] Bollen and Hoyle in turn follow William McDougall's description of societal cohesion or 'group spirit': 'The development of the group spirit consists in two essential processes, namely, the acquisition of knowledge of the group and the formation of some sentiment of attachment to the group.'[24]

Hipp and Perrin were the first to publish statistics in support of this idea but were not the earliest to make the point. In fact, their study substantiates an earlier proposal by Ade Kearns and Ray Forrest, who suggested that a strong sense of belonging at the neighbourhood level, as well as a positive attitude about the neighbourhood's identity, could lead to a decreased sense of cohesion at other levels of society, such as the city. They elaborate as follows:

> [N]eighbourhoods exist within and must be linked into wider urban areas. But tensions may exist between socially cohesive neighbourhoods and cohesive cities … The point is that social cohesion at the neighbourhood level is by no means unambiguously a good thing … A city of neighbourhoods with a high degree of social cohesion could be a city with a high level of conflict within and between neighbourhoods.[25]

Hipp and Perrin's statistics only support the notion that city residents would feel a stronger sense of belonging in their neighbourhoods than in their cities.

Hipp and Perrin's findings raise questions about how state authorities in antiquity might react negatively to neighbourhood-based collective activity. There were clearly concerns in late Republican and Augustan Rome.[26] In attempts to avoid suspicions of disloyalty to the state, neighbourhood collectives in antiquity often insisted that their interests fully aligned with those of the civic rulers. For instance, a spokesperson for one neighbourhood (γειτνίασις) from Prusias by Hypios made the following dedication on a block of limestone:

Διὸ[ς] | Σωτ[ῆ]|ρος | ὑπὲρ τῆ[ς] || πόλεω[ς] | ἡ γειτγ[ί]|ασι[ς].[27]

For Zeus Soter. The neighbourhood (dedicates this) on behalf of the city.

[22] J. R. Hipp and A. Perrin, 'Nested Loyalties: Local Networks' Effects on Neighbourhood and Community Cohesion', *Urban Studies* 43 (2006) 2503–23, esp. 2511 (emphasis original).

[23] K. A. Bollen and R. H. Hoyle, 'Perceived Cohesion: A Conceptual and Empirical Examination', *Social Forces* 69 (1990) 479–504.

[24] W. McDougall, *The Group Mind: A Sketch of the Principles of Collective Psychology with Some Attempt to Apply them to the Interpretation of National Life and Character* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1920) 86.

[25] A. Kearns and R. Forrest, 'Social Cohesion and Multilevel Urban Governance', *Urban Studies* (2000) 995–1017, esp. 1013. See also B. N. Markovsky and E. J. Lawler, 'A New Theory of Group Solidarity', *Advances in Group Processes* 11 (1994) 113–37; R. Forrest and A. Kearns, 'Social Cohesion, Social Capital and The Neighbourhood', *Urban Studies* 38 (2001) 2125–43; P. Paxton and J. Moody, 'Structure and Sentiment: Explaining Emotional Attachment to Group', *Social Psychology Quarterly* 66 (2003) 34–47; M. A. Hogg, *The Social Psychology of Group Cohesiveness: From Attraction to Social Identity* (New York: New York University Press, 1992).

[26] See now Flower, *Dancing lares*, 234–49, 258–310.

[27] *IPrusiasHyp* 63 (Prusias by Hypios, Bithynia; undated). For dedications to gods whose names are in the nominative, see A. G. Woodhead, *The Study of Greek Inscriptions* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1981) 41.

This dedication to Zeus Soter for the sake of the *polis* is fascinating, for it merges γειτνίασις and *polis* interests, or at least advertises the neighbourhood's contribution to the prosperity of the state, thereby highlighting its own place within the *polis*.[28]

A third-century honorary inscription on a marble base from Ephesus demonstrates well how neighbourhood spokespersons wanted their vicinity-based collectives to be perceived by fellow *polis* inhabitants and authorities. Here, Marcus Fulvius Publicianus Neikephoros, a civic benefactor, is honoured by 'the clothes-dealers who work in the agora, because of his goodwill towards the homeland'.[29] The inscription mentions only Neikephoros' services to the *polis* (funding for the construction of civic buildings), entirely lacking any reference to benefactions shown specifically to the clothes-dealers in this neighbourhood of Ephesus.[30]

Other neighbourhood honorifics for benefactors tended to emphasise an interest in the preservation of the *polis*, as well; overall, the activity of honouring civic benefactors is an especially well attested neighbourhood practice.[31] Neighbours' act of grouping together for dedicatory and honorific activities indicates that some city-dwellers felt a sense of belonging in the immediate vicinity around their urban houses, but were concerned to foreground alignment of neighbourhood and city interests. In fact, spokespersons for the neighbourhood collectives of Asia present these groups in such harmony with state interests that there is modern debate whether they functioned as administrative sub-units of their cities or were formed on private initiative.[32]

If people's loyalties, memberships and social relationships were forged primarily at the neighbourhood level of society, as Thucydides remarked and contemporary sociological data support, then imagining the members of a Pauline *ekklēsia* as residing across an entire city is probably too imprecise, and the household would be practically inseparable from its street network. Loyalty to neighbourhood could occasionally be even stronger than attachments individuals felt to their patrons, and Paul needed to be cognizant of that in order to avoid antagonising the neighbours of those who read his letters.[33] Perhaps this calculation was behind Paul's practice of advising participants in Christ worship to build up the reputation of the *ekklēsiai* in their immediate vicinities (e.g. Rom 14.1–15.6; Phil 2.3–4; 4–5; 1 Cor 5.9–11, 10.27–30, 14.22–5; 1 Thess 4.11–12).

---

[28] Walter Ameling suggests that there may have been a temple devoted to Zeus Soter in this particular neighbourhood. See W. Ameling, *Die Inschriften von Prusias ad Hypium* (IGSK 27; Bonn: Rudolf Habelt, 1985) 64–5.

[29] εἱματιοπῶλαι οἱ ἐν τῇ ἀγορᾷ πραγματ[ευ]όμενοι διὰ τὴν εἰ[ς] τὴν πατρίδα εὔνοιαν (*IEph* 3063, lines 11–14; Ephesus, Ionia; 222/235 CE). Neikephoros was also recognised for providing retail space around the theatre to several occupational guilds in Ephesus (see *IEph* 444–5, 2078–82).

[30] On this stone, see I. Dittmann-Schöne, *Die Berufsvereinen in den Städten des kaiserzeitlichen Kleinasiens* (Geschichte 10; Regensburg: Roderer, 2010²) 135; and A. Royer, 'Associations professionnelles et groupes de gens de métier dans les cités grecques d'Asie Mineure à l'époque impériale (ᴵᵉʳ – ᵛᵉ siècles ap. J.-C.)' (PhD diss.; Université Lumière – Lyon 2, 2006) 142–4, 173–4.

[31] See *IPhrygiaR* 299 = *GRA* ɪɪ.115 (Apameia Kelainai, Phrygia; 69–81 CE); *IDelos* 1709 (Delos, Aegean; 99/98 BCE); *MAMA* ᴠɪ.180 (Apameia Kelainai, Phrygia; 160 CE); *ILindos* 219 (Lindos of Rhodes, Aegean; 150 BCE); *IRhodPC* 19 (Rhodos on Rhodes, Aegean; 3rd cent. BCE); *IRhodJ* 36 (Rhodos on Rhodes, Aegean; undated); *IG* xɪɪ/1.157 = *SIRIS* 177 (Rhodos on Rhodes, Aegean; 1st cent. BCE); *IPergamonSupp AM* 27, 1902, no. 102 = *AGRW* 118 (Pergamon, Mysia and the Troad; after 142 CE); *IRhodPerBlümel* 110 (Rhodian Peraia, Caria; imperial period), with Dürrbach and Radet on the group's self-designator (F. Dürrbach and G. A. Radet, 'Inscriptions de la Pérée rhodienne', *BCH* 10 (1886) 245–69, esp. 263.

[32] See O. Van Nijf, *The Civic World of Professional Associations in the Roman East* (Dutch Monographs on Ancient History and Archaeology 17; Amsterdam: Gieben, 1997) 181–2; and Pont, 'Les groupes de voisinage', 129–56.

[33] An attestation to *vicus* loyalty perhaps stronger even than loyalty to a patron can be found in Appian, *Bel. civ.* 1.26. See the discussion in Flower, *Dancing lares*, 196–7.

In Rome, the slaves and freedpersons greeted in Rom 16.1–16 (e.g. Ampliatus, Hermes, Nereus, Persis, Philologus, Tryphosa, Tryphaena and Junia, among others)[34] probably aspired to the level of prominence made possible through serving as *vicus* officers (*ministri* and *magistri*).[35] The shrines of Rome's *vici* indicate that neighbourhood offices were occupied by slaves and freedmen.[36] Literary references affirm this.[37] Suetonius (*Aug.* 30.2) describes the role of the *magistri* as supervision (*tueri*). This description seemingly encompassed the tending of compital shrines, sacrificial roles during celebrations such as the winter Compitalia festival for neighbourhood *lares* – cheerful protective gods of streets, neighbourhoods and travel – record-keeping and involvement in planning the *ludi*.[38]

The task of *tueri* ('watching over' or 'supervising') a neighbourhood also involved benefactions. For example, the freedman Numerius Lucius Hermeros, along with his two fellow *magistri vici*, donated two sets of scale weights for commerce, and a sanctuary for Hercules in which the scales were stationed, to his neighbourhood in 4/5 CE.[39] The dedicatory inscription describes Hermeros' gift as part of his role in 'watching out' (*tueri*, l. 10) for his neighbourhood (*vicinia*, l. 9). A later addition to this inscription, from 12/13 CE, recognises Hermeros and the other *magistri* from 4/5 CE for getting together with the current *magistri* in order to balance the scales again. This later service was also characterised as 'watching out for the neighbourhood' (*invigulantes pro vicinia*, ll.12–13). For freedmen such as Hermeros, the prestige of being a ward officer (adorned in the *toga praetexta* at the Compitalia) made the office an attractive investment of economic resources and time. Indeed, Hermeros' was given the honorific nickname, Aequitas ('Fairness'), by his neighbours, in recognition of his commitment to ensure that precious metals would be valued fairly in his neighbourhood, a prominent concern in this region of Rome that cut through a commercial district (the Forum Boarium).

These inscriptions highlight how some Romans – specifically here the residents of Hermeros' *vicus* who came together to commend him for enhancing fairness in the commerce of the *vicus*, as well as celebrating Hermeros' goodwill in 'watching out' for his neighbours – foregrounded their experiences in neighbourhood-based economic affairs, social relationships and built environments. The dedicants lived in the city and in houses, but their social worlds were primarily somewhere in between these two levels of society.

---

[34] Stowers recently pointed out that the second-person greetings in Rom. 16.1–16 imply that these people were to be greeted by the letter's addressees and so were not among the addressees themselves. See S. Stowers, 'The Social Formation of Paul and his Romans: Synagogues, Churches, and Ockham's Razor', *A Most Reliable Witness: Essays in Honor of Ross Shepard Kraemer* (ed. S. Ashbrook Harvey et al.; Brown Judaic Studies 358. Providence, RI: Brown University, 2015) 77–87 (esp. 81–2).

[35] See n. 6 on neighbourhood officers in Rome and beyond.

[36] Of the eighty-six officers named in the dedications from Augustan neighbourhoods (all men), a minimum of sixty-seven are from servile origins. The data are presented in a table in Lott, *Augustan Rome*, 92–4. Curiously, none of the wealthiest known freedmen in Rome served as *magistri vicorum*. Flower (*Dancing lares*, 4) summarises the reasons: 'The close association, over time, of traditional Roman *lares* cults with slaves and freedmen can be connected with four interrelated historical factors, each relating to Rome's rapidly expanding empire: the enormous growth of domestic slavery as a result of Rome's victories in war, the Roman habit of freeing slaves …, the practice of absentee farming of estates in Italy …, and the development of kitchens as separate rooms, once the houses of the affluent grew larger and more sophisticated in their layout and design'. For women as neighbourhood officials, our evidence is mostly confined to Minturnae. See Flower, *Dancing lares*, 230–1 with n. 20. For an artistic illustration of a woman sacrificing at a compital altar in Rome (but not named a *magistra* or *ministra*), see Lott, *Augustan Rome*, 218 (no. 66).

[37] Dionysius 4.14.3–4; Livy 34.7.2–10; Suetonius, *Aug.* 30.2; Cassius Dio 55.8.6.

[38] On *vicus* officers, see especially Flower, *Dancing lares*, 160–254.

[39] *CIL* VI.282 (Rome, Latium; 4/5 and 12/13 CE).

3. Idealised Unity and Structures that Divide

Thucydides cannot be treated as a spokesperson for all his contemporaries who lived in countryside demes. Rather, he articulated the experience of some adult male citizens of Athens. There were also women, metics, slaves and children fleeing the countryside in 431 BCE. These neighbours of enfranchised demesmen did not participate in deme assemblies or theatres, and moreover did not enjoy most other advantages tied to citizenship. So the very structures of the deme – its assemblies, theatres, barber shops, festivals – displayed social differences between neighbours.[40] Likewise, the clubhouses, baths, temples, domestic architecture, festivals, cults, administrative magistracies and *collegia* of Roman neighbourhoods were designed to include some residents and exclude others.

Thucydides can generalise about the 'way of life' in the countryside demes because he omits the diverse experiences of non-citizen residents. Epigraphy produced by spokespersons of neighbourhood collectives can be just as misleading. Thucydides' attribution of cohesion to the deme is matched, for instance, in epigraphic attributions of cohesion or agency to entire locales. A famous example of attributed religious coherence for an entire town is in the Orcistus dossier documenting the correspondence between the Orcistan council, Constantine and a regional *vicarius* (*MAMA* VII.305; Phrygia; 331 CE). Specifically, Constantine was apparently persuaded that *omnes ... sectatores sanctissimae religionis* 'all [Orcistans] are adherents of the most holy rite/religion' (ll. 40–2), a statement often taken as a reference to Christian practitioners. It is difficult to believe that any spokespersons' generalisation about the practices of an entire population could be accurate.

With respect to attributions of *agency* to neighbourhoods, some dedications are presented as though they were issued from the whole neighbourhoods (as if the neighbourhood were a metaphorical and cohesive person-agent). A more realistic scenario is that such dedications and honorifics were initiatives of powerful individuals from the neighbourhood who created some level of temporary consent. Neighbourhoods were not as cohesive as Thucydides or Hellenistic and Roman epigraphic texts would have us believe.

Some researchers in the area of cognitive science describe the intuition that groups such as neighbourhoods behave as metaphorical individuals, carrying intentions and the propensity to act autonomously, as a cross-cultural and universal principle of folk sociological explanations of the role of groups in complex societies.[41] This principle is cross-cultural and resonates with anecdotal evidence from Greek and Roman literature.

---

[40] It would appear that thousands of immigrants were enfranchised in Athens after the Persian Wars (Aristotle, *Pol.* 3.1275b, [*Ath. pol.*] 21; cf. C. B. Patterson, *Pericles' citizenship law of 451–450 BC* (New York: Arno, 1981). Pericles' citizenship law of 451/450 BCE specified perhaps for the first time a required lineage for those eligible for enrolment as citizens by demes and phratries (Aristotle, [*Ath. pol.*] 26; Plutarch, *Per.* 37; J. Watson, 'The Origin of Metic Status at Athens', *Cambridge Classical Journal* 56 (2010) 259–78. So citizenship in classical Athens, which determined whether one would be integrated or not into many deme structures, was not fixed according to any single requirements.

[41] See now P. Boyer, *Minds Make Societies: How Cognition Explains the World Humans Create* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2018). Boyer uses the term 'folk sociology' throughout to refer to assumptions and generalisations that individuals make about their surrounding physical and social environments. These assumptions are formed on the basis of the anecdotal social information that the human mind takes in (not by rigorous study). For similar usages of the term, see L. A. Hirschfeld, 'Is the Acquisition of Social Categories Based on Domain-Specific Competence or on Knowledge Transfer?', *Mapping the Mind: Domain-Specificity in Culture and Cognition* (ed. L. A. Hirschfeld and S. A. Gelman; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994) 201–33; L. A. Hirschfeld, 'The Myth of Mentalizing and the Primacy of Folk Sociology', *Navigating the Social World: What Infants, Children, and Other Species Can Teach Us* (ed. M. R. Banaji and S. A. Gelman; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013) 101–6; see also H. W. Odum, 'Folk Sociology as a Subject Field for the Historical Study of Total Human Society and the Empirical Study of Group Behavior', *Social Forces* 31 (1953) 193–223.

These texts attribute agency to groups in ways that will be immediately relatable to today's parlance (e.g. 'Alabama passes a bill that ...'; 'Canada retaliates with tariffs on ...'). One outcome of this language is that the group, whether a *polis*, neighbourhood, company or *collegium*, is made to appear as a unified community – so cohesive in fact that it can itself act in unison.

We should not take literary references or epigraphic statements of neighbourhood unity at face value. It is common to see in ancient literature whole groups described with agency: fearing, desiring, waging war, showing hostility, and so on. Ascribing agency to whole groups (such as neighbourhoods or structures within neighbourhoods including *collegia*) holds useful and efficient explanatory power for quickly understanding conflict and relationships between two or more collectives,[42] more so than would accrediting the motivations and agendas behind these conflicts and relationships to a few individuals whose consensus-building strategies successfully pushed collectives to action. Nonetheless, historians of ancient literature can see that the reality was more nuanced than the texts suggest. Only *some* Spartans feared Athenian aggression (tidier for Thucydides to say they all did (1.23.4–6)), only *some* Greeks were horrified by the destruction of Thebes by Alexander's forces, and the trial-less execution of Callisthenes (more on-message for Arrian and Curtius Rufus to generalise (Arrian, *Anab.* 1.9; Quintus Curtius Rufus 8.22)); only *some* Romans enjoyed chariot racing (more effective rhetorically for Juvenal to generalise about the Roman people as a whole (*Sat.* 10.77–81)). When we find dedications, honorifics and decrees that claim to be completed by a group, it is best to treat them with the same level of scrutiny that the claims by the aforementioned literary writers are given.[43]

4. Christ Worship and the Neighbourhood in 1 Cor 14.22–5

What impact would a Pauline *ekklēsia* have on its vicinity? Would its entrance requirements be so exclusive that the neighbourhood would become (yet more) divided? Or would it function so as to create greater cohesion among residents in the vicinity of its meeting place? For the remainder of the study, I approach these questions – applying the insights above along the way – through a case study of 1 Cor 14.22–5. In this text, Paul puts forward a hypothetical (though seemingly pressing) scenario of passers-by (ἰδιῶται ἢ ἄπιστοι) observing the rituals of Christ worship and entering the meeting place of the *ekklēsia*. The setting of Paul's scenario is not a household, *ekklēsia*, or *polis* but rather everyone living in proximity to (i.e. within short walking distance from) the meeting place of the *ekklēsia*, inclusive of members and non-members alike: the vicinity or neighbourhood.

---

[42] For more on the usefulness – as opposed to accuracy – of the 'groups as agents' principle, see P. E. Tetlock and J. M. Goldgeier, 'Human Nature and World Politics: Cognition, Identity, and Influence', *International Journal of Psychology* 35 (2000) 87–96; R. McDermott, *Political Psychology in International Relations* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2004); S. Carey, *The Origin of Concepts* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009); E. S. Spelke and K D. Kinzler, 'Core Knowledge', *Developmental Science* 10 (2007) 89–96; and L. A. Hirschfeld, 'The Myth of Mentalizing and the Primacy of Folk Sociology', *Navigating the Social World: What Infants and Other Species Can Teach Us* (ed. M. Banaji and S. A. Gelman; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013) 101–6.

[43] It is not difficult to find *collegium* magistrates depicting their association as totally unified during their tenures as presidents – unanimous votes, and 'the *collegium*' decreeing as if there were no individuals behind the scenes manufacturing temporary consent. See now R. Last, 'A Fictive Membership Rush and Curatorial Fraud in the *lex* of the *collegium* of Ivory and Citrus-Wood Merchants (*CIL* VI.33885 = *ILS* 7214)', *CQ* 71 (2021) 347–58. On the issue of voting on proposals: vote counts are often omitted in the epigraphy unless the result is unanimous. For example, in *CIL* XIV.2112, the unanimous vote ([*placu*]*it universis ut ...*) in col. 1, l. 20 can be compared with all the other items voted upon, which seem to have been approved by majorities but not approved by all voters (e.g. *placuit ut ...*, col. 1, l. 21).

The meeting place of the Corinthian *ekklēsia* was probably near most or all members' houses for the same common-sense reason that the grocery stores and parks we visit on foot (if possible) are usually the ones closest to our own houses. Perhaps the group assembled in a member's house, a rented room or open-air space. In a recent article, I proposed that the *ekklēsia* in Corinth was rooted in the city block in which its first members, Stephanas' household, lived (1 Cor 16.15), and that its members were mainly neighbours, though not necessarily all participants in Christ worship.[44] Luke imagines the first members of the Corinthian *ekklēsia* as neighbours: the group was formed on the street of the synagogue next to Titius Justus' house (Acts 18.7), within close proximity to Prisca and Aquila (18.2), who introduced Paul to the neighbourhood, and near the house of Crispus' household, too (18.8).

It is conceivable that when Paul entered a city, he would practise his teaching *vicatim* – that is, 'neighbourhood by neighbourhood'. Grain was distributed *vicatim* by the curule aediles of 203 BCE, Marcus Valerius Falto and Marcus Fabius Buteo (Livy 30.26.5–6). In the *recensus populi* of 46 BCE and around 8 BCE, people were counted *vicatim* (Suetonius, *Caes.* 41.3; Suetonius, *Aug.* 40.2). Around 90 BCE, an unnamed man (perhaps Tiberius Gracchus if the event happened earlier)[45] on trial for a capital offence went around the city *vicatim* appealing for support.[46] Whether or not Paul reached people 'neighbourhood by neighbourhood', it would be a practical approach to covering a city.

4.1 Neighbours to the ekklēsia

The passers-by (ἰδιῶται ἢ ἄπιστοι) who enter the meeting place in Paul's scenario were necessarily on the same street as the *ekklēsia*. The setting, then, is premised on proximity no matter how we understand the specifics. We will see in fact that Paul's use of ἰδιώτης is highly suggestive and metaphoric of neighbours in the literary context of 1 Cor 14.22–5, and that Paul's language here can be added to the observations above on the neighbourhood social basis of the origins of the *ekklēsia*. The full section reads as follows:

> If, therefore, the whole assembly should come together, and all should speak in tongues, and private citizens (ἰδιῶται) who are untrustworthy (ἢ ἄπιστοι) should enter, would they not say that you are mad (μαίνεσθαι)? But, if all should prophecy, and a certain untrustworthy private citizen (ἄπιστος ἢ ἰδιώτης) should enter, they are cross-examined (ἐλέγχεται) and interrogated (ἀνακρίνεται) by all, the secrets (κρυπτά) of their heart become manifest and, in this way, after falling on their face, they will make obeisance towards God, proclaiming that God is truly among you. (1 Cor 14.22–5)[47]

---

[44] Last, 'Neighbourhood', 399–425.

[45] Tarpin, *Vici*, 95.

[46] The fragmentary text is from L. Cornelius Sisenna's now lost histories (Sisenna F 47 Peter = *FRHist* 26 F 21); cf. Flower, *Dancing lares*, 199–200. See also Appian, *Bell. civ.* 1.14.3 for Tiberius's method of recruiting support in his campaign for a second consecutive year as tribune of the plebs: he travelled around the city κατὰ μέρος, which is the equivalent of *vicatim*.

[47] I follow several commentators in taking the phrases ἰδιῶται ἢ ἄπιστοι and ἄπιστος ἢ ἰδιώτης to be hendyadic. See C. K. Barrett, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians* (London: Hendrickson, 1968) 324; H. Conzelmann, *1 Corinthians: A Commentary on the First Epistle to the Corinthians* (Hermeneia; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1975) 243; H. Lietzmann, with W. G. Kummel, *An die Korinther I/II* (Handbuch zum Neuen Testament 9; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1969⁵) 73; G. Fee, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians* (NICNT; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1987) 685. Syntactic explanations for reading the phrases as hendiadyses are sparse in those commentaries; I overview the argument from syntax below.

In Paul's scenario, the *ekklēsia* assembled and members began speaking in tongues when the ἰδιῶται entered.

In approaching the role of the ἰδιῶται in the Corinthian *ekklēsia*, the most precise linguistic and conceptual comparative evidence is Athenian political discourse, for it is here that the role of ἰδιῶται in a (civic) *ekklēsia* setting is explicitly illustrated.[48] The Athenian ἰδιῶται are voting-age male citizens – and so in these respects indistinguishable from Athenians who participate fully in public life, such as the πολιτευόμενοι, ῥήτορες and στρατηγοί, with whom they are contrasted on other grounds (e.g. Demosthenes 25.97 καὶ τῶν ῥητόρων καὶ τῶν ἰδιωτῶν, 52.28 πολιτευομένου καὶ οὐκ ἰδιότου; Aeschines 3.252–3 ἰδιώτης … ῥήτωρ).[49] The contrast, specifically, is that πολιτευόμενοι, ῥήτορες and στρατηγοί participate actively and eagerly in the *ekklēsia* and in public life generally, while ἰδιῶται have limited role in governing institutions and activities. The great Athenian orator Demosthenes can use ἰδιώτης for citizens whose levels of civic engagement range from speaking infrequently at Council meetings (22.37) to holding minor public offices (e.g. market-clerk (ἀγορανόμος), street-inspector (ἀστυνόμος)) filled by lot rather than election (24.112). The ἰδιῶται can be understood as political novices and as lacking experience, basic knowledge or expertise (Demosthenes 19.182, 24.66, 24.112, 34.1, 44.4, cf. Plato, *Apol.* 17c–d).[50] They *might* also be understood as *total* non-participants in public life (e.g. assembly absentees, non-voters, non-office-holders) and, in the valuation of Thucydides' Pericles in the funerary oration, 'useless' (2.40).[51]

Other writers spoke highly of political novices and proposed that the polis would benefit if governing institutions should be given over to unambitious ἰδιῶται, thus depriving self-interested orators from directing policies that suit their own interests (Demosthenes 22.37; cf. Plato, *Resp.* 7.521b; Dio Chrysostom, *Or.* 34.19). Such orators are most vocal in

---

[48] On this, see A. C. Miller, *Corinthian Democracy: Democratic Discourse in 1 Corinthians* (PTMS 220; Eugene, OR: Pickwick Publications, 2015) 166–86. Though Paul's use of ἰδιώτης in 1 Cor 14.22–5 is not scrutinised in detail in Miller's interpretation of the passage, see Miller, *Democratic*, 104–8 for an overview of the word's place in democratic discourse. In the past, starting with Henrich Schlier (*TDNT* 1, 371), the ἰδιῶται of these verses were determined to be 'non-charismatic novices' by virtue of the word's use in Pausanias' description of the legendary hero Amphiaros as an ordinary person (ἰδιώτης) one day and a diviner (μάντις) the next after he spent a night in a sanctuary in Phliasia in the Argolid (2.13.7). Amphiaros' mythology is situated generations prior to the Trojan War. In any case, this text led Schlier to read the situation in 1 Cor 14.24–5 analogously, and to describe the Corinthian ἰδιῶται of 14.23–4 as 'non-charismatic novices'. Many subsequent interpreters have followed Schlier in understanding the Corinthian ἰδιῶται in the way in which Pausanias described Amphiaros before his stay in the sanctuary, with the result that 'non-charismatic novice' is now a common rendering for ἰδιῶται in 14.22–5. Whether this analogy ultimately offers insights into Paul's ἰδιώτης or not, it should not be missed that in Amphiaros' mythology he later becomes king of Argos and so this use of ἰδιώτης marks him as a 'private individual' (rather than 'non-charismatic') before he becomes the head state official (Ps.-Hyginus, *Fabulae* 70; cf. Diodorus 4.65.6). Another interpretation is that the ἰδιῶται of 14.22–5 are complete 'outsiders'. The sources cited to support the 'outsiders' interpretation actually refer to ἰδιῶται as full members of a community. For instance, although *IG* ɪɪ².1361 = *GRA* ɪ.4 (Piraeus, Attica; 330–323 ʙᴄᴇ) tends to be seen as supportive of the outsider rendering, here the word refers to a person without a priestly office who wanted to perform a sacrifice at a public temple. In other epigraphic sources from public temples, ἰδιῶται carries the same sense. For example, at a sanctuary of Asklepios and Apollo (*IErythr.* 1; Ionia; 380–260 ʙᴄᴇ); at a temple of Herakles (*IKhiosMcCabe* 7 = *SIG*³ 1013; Chios, Aegean; undated). For the 'outsider' interpretation, see, *inter alia*, W. Schrage, *Der erste Brief an die Korinther*, vol. ɪɪɪ: *1 Kor 11,17–14,40* (Evangelisch-katholischer Kommentar zum Neuen Testament 7; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener, 1999) ɪɪɪ.410; J. A. Fitzmyer, *First Corinthians* (Anchor Bible Commentary 32; New Haven/London: Yale University Press, 2008) 517, 521–2.

[49] The notion that they are cowardly or useless to the *polis* tends to come from Pericles' funeral oration (especially Thucydides 2.40), which does not use the term ἰδιῶται. But see Demosthenes 10.70 and Aeschines 3.252.

[50] But Aeschines, a leading citizen in fourth-century ʙᴄᴇ Athens, can describe himself as an ἰδιώτης (for rhetorical purposes) in 2.181; cf. Plato, *Resp.* 7.521b and Lysias 17.1.

[51] Thucydides' term for such an individual is ἀπράγμων.

these institutions – the 'talkers', not unlike members of Paul's *ekklēsia* who perform glossolalia in the scenario of 1 Cor 14.22–5. Crucially, despite their quietism, the ἰδιῶται are full members of the Athenian demos and eligible to take part in the *ekklēsia*. This is an important point in interpreting 1 Cor 14.22–5.

The idea of ἰδιῶται being 'cross-examined (ἐλέγχεται) and interrogated (ἀνακρίνεται)' (1 Cor 14.24) is significant too. In Athenian political discourse, one of the main perceived advantages of democracy over oligarchy and tyranny was oversight in that civic officials in democracies open themselves to audit, examination and investigation (Aeschines 3.22). They are thus formally accountable in ways that a tyrant is not; citizens who participated in running the *polis* at the level of holding public offices subjected themselves to formal scrutiny processes and to the possibility of punishment.[52] Participating in the *polis* at the level of an ἰδιώτης or at the somewhat synonymous level of ἀπράγμων, by contrast, relieved the citizen from suffering formal scrutiny procedures. And yet these ἰδιῶται still held influence despite their quietism: they were assembly participants who voted on important issues, and jurors, for instance. They were (to an extent) unaccountable in a way similar to a tyrant.[53]

Paul's selected the metaphor of an ἰδιώτης for a passer-by suggests that the individual is fully enfranchised to take part in the *ekklēsia*, in a way similar to a civic ἰδιώτης who has the invitation to participate in political life by right of their Athenian citizenship but chooses to abstain for the most part. We would expect a *collegium* spokesperson such as Paul to conceptualise passers-by as outsiders or non-members; the ἰδιώτης metaphor blurs the distinction between members and non-members so commonly reified in the documentary evidence of associations.[54]

We know very little about the status of neighbours who declined to join a newly formed neighbourhood-based *collegium*. Actually, when interpreting an inscription produced by a neighbourhood, it is difficult to tell whether we are dealing with a durable *collegium* founded for neighbours or a less formally organised neighbourhood of residents who occasionally undertake collective action. Such collectives are often represented by their spokespersons as 'street' (πλατεῖα) or 'neighbourhood' (e.g. γειτνίασις), in reference to the vicinity of their 'members'' work or residence.[55] Are the activities of such groups open to all who lived or worked in the ward or just to members in a *collegium*? A sample of the evidence can be illustrative of the problems in defining these groups and their boundaries. Neighbourhood magistrates appear in many inscriptions, for instance, but we do not know whom they served. In an inscription on a marble base from Pergamon, 'the inhabitants on Paspareitai street' (οἱ κατοικοῦντες τὴν Πασπαρειτῶν πλατεῖαν) honoured a

---

[52] For office holders, the δοκιμασία procedure began prior to the office term. During a magistracy, the holder could be removed through the process of εἰσαγγελία. After holding the office, the actions of the individual were scrutinised again in the εὐθύνα. See J. T. Roberts, *Accountability in Athenian Government* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1982).

[53] For mostly informal accountability measures that affected such participants in civic life, though, see A. Lanni, 'Spectator Sport or Serious Politics? Οἱ περιεστηκότες and the Athenian Lawcourts', *JHS* 117 (1997) 183–9, esp. 183, 187–8; E. Markovits, *The Politics of Sincerity* (University Park: Pennsylvania State Press, 2008) 54–5, 60–1; and M. Landauer, 'The *idiōtēs* and the Tyrant: Two Faces of Unaccountability in Democratic Athens', *Political Theory* 42 (2014) 139–66.

[54] For the salience of fitting the Corinthian *ekklēsia* in the association category, see now R. Last, *The Pauline Church and the Corinthian Ekklēsia: Greco-Roman Associations in Comparative Context* (SNTSMS 164; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2016); and Kloppenborg, *Christ's Associations*, 84–8, 209–44.

[55] On these group designations, see F. Poland, *Geschichte des griechischen Vereinswesens* (Leipzig: Teubner, 1909) 85; L. Robert, *Études anatoliennes. Recherches sur les inscriptions grecques de l'Asie mineure* (Paris: de Boccard, 1937) 532–8; Van Nijf, *Civic World*, 181–2 ; C. Zimmermann, *Handwerkervereine im griechischen Osten des Imperium Romanum* (RGZM 57; Mainz: Rudolf Habelt, 2002) 34.

322   Richard Last

civic benefactor, L(ucius) Cuspius Pactumeius Rufinus.[56] Supervisors (ἐπιμεληταί) are named – Menandros and Eutaktos – but they may have been transient, merely watching over the construction of the monument named in the inscription. The 'ones from the street' (οἱ ἐκ τῆς πλατείας) in Mylasa dedicated an altar (80 × 55 cm) to an emperor who cannot be identified due to breaks in the stone, and to Zeus Olympios on behalf of an Olympic victor. The altar may have been used to make offerings to the street's protective gods.[57] Does the phrase οἱ ἐκ τῆς πλατείας imply all residents on the street, or just members of an association called a πλατεῖα? A monument set up in honour of a priest of Zeus Polieus ('protector of the city') by a Lindos neighbourhood (διαγωνία) of the Heliotadians of Astykronteians, Stasioneians and Autostheneians was dedicated simply θεοῖς ('to the gods') who may have guarded the neighbourhood.[58] Were all the residents in a neighbourhood involved, or only those who were members of a formal association?

Perhaps Paul's metaphor in 1 Cor 14.22–5 shows that non-participating neighbours living on the street of a neighbourhood *collegium* could occasionally be seen as full members analogously to the relationship of civic ἰδιῶται to their civic governing institutions. If the ἰδιῶται-passers-by were completely outside the social network from which the *ekklēsia* was formed, then Paul could have described them more accurately as μέτοικοι, δουλοῖ and/or ἀσταί. As ἰδιῶται to the *ekklēsia*, they were enfranchised (i.e. openly invited to join the *ekklēsia* or participate actively in it) because, I suggest, of the close proximity of their residences to the street of the synagogue located next door to Justus, where the *ekklēsia* assembled.

Was it somehow in Paul's interest to name any resident in the neighbourhood of the *ekklēsia* with a term such as ἰδιώτης, which implies membership in a community? These ἰδιῶται may well include neighbours with whom *ekklēsia* members associated at temples (1 Cor 8.10), on the street (5.9–10) and at private dinners (10.27–30). Since members of the *ekklēsia* could have felt a greater sense of loyalty to their neighbours than to Paul and this newly founded *collegium*, Paul's inclusive term for such individuals functioned to symbolise openness in a way that we generally do not find in association documents insisting on rigid classifications (e.g. benefactor, official, member, guest, outsider). It is fascinating, moreover, that Paul urged a mode of behaviour, prophecy, that he sees attractive and inviting for the ἰδιῶται. Paul's model or ideal *ekklēsia* then is not a structure designed to divide neighbours (further).

4.2 The Untrustworthy Private Citizen

This brings us to the term ἄπιστοι, very often conceptualised as entirely separate from the ἰδιῶται.[59] But in 1 Cor 14.22–5, Paul uses the particle ἤ in the context of a direct question. When in a question, the particle functions differently differently from the way it does in statements. In Smyth's explanation, in questions, 'ἤ often does not introduce an alternative to a previous question, but substitutes instead another question which is more specific and intended to anticipate the answer to the first'.[60] And so the term after ἤ is adjectival in a sense but also describes the issue with more precision than previously

---

[56] *IPergamonSupp AM* 27, 1902, no. 102 = *AGRW* 118 (Pergamon, Aeolia; after 142 CE). Another local neighbourhood collective ('the residents on the acropolis'/οἱ τὴν ἀκρόπολιν κατοικοῦντες) honoured the same individual in *IPergamon* 434 = *IGRR* IV.424 (Pergamon, Aeolia; after 142 CE).

[57] *IMylasa* 403 (Mylasa, Caria; undated).

[58] *ILindos* 219 (Rhodes, Aegean; 150 BCE).

[59] See now T. J. Lang, 'Trouble with Insiders: The Social Profile of the ἄπιστοι in Paul's Corinthian Correspondence', *JBL* 137 (2018) 981–1001, esp. 993.

[60] H. W. Smyth, *Greek Grammar* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1984) 649.

done with the term appearing prior to the particle.[61] With this in mind, the verses (1 Cor 14.22–5) can be translated again as follows:

> If, therefore, the whole assembly should come together, and all should speak in tongues, and a private citizen should enter, would they not say that you are mad (μαίνεσθαι)? Or rather, more precisely, if untrustworthy individuals should enter, would *they* not say that you are mad? But, if all should prophecy, and a certain untrustworthy private citizen should enter, they are cross-examined and interrogated by all, the secrets of their heart become manifest and, in this way, after falling on their face, they will make obeisance towards God, proclaiming that God is truly among you.

Syntactically, the first mention of the untrustworthy ones (ἄπιστοι) pinpoints a specific characteristic of the ἰδιῶται so as to make the question about behaviour upon entrance of the ἰδιῶται more precise.[62] Later in the passage the adjective essentially modifies the noun (ἰδιῶται ἢ ἄπιστοι) in light of the context in which it appears previously, so that we can now render the individual in question an 'untrustworthy private citizen'. C. K. Barrett and other commentators have proposed the same though without the grammatical explanation.[63] To be sure, these previous interpreters take the ἰδιῶται to be 'outsiders' or 'proselytes'.

 Paul's detail about the secrets of the ἄπιστοι is very interesting. Deploying lies and misdirection was crucial for survival in the context of a *polis* – and even more so in a closely confined neighbourhood where privacy was an unavailable luxury. Various genres of Greek literature depict the *polis* setting as one where the individual was surrounded by suspicious adversaries[64] who spread rumours of personal faults and even small trivial matters that could damage the reputation of a family.[65] Even prior to the *polis*, the cunning of Odysseus, Penelope and Athena in Homer's *Odyssey* served as paradigms. In late republican Rome, Tiberius Gracchus was confronted at the Council of the Plebs in 133 by his rival, Pompeius, who claimed to be Gracchus' neighbour (γειτνιᾶν) and possess knowledge of an unsavoury gift given to him by Eudemus of Pergamum indicative of Gracchus' contemplation of setting himself up as king over Rome (Plutarch, *Tib.* 14.2). So while Paul attributes some level of deception to the ἄπιστοι, this remark did not

---

[61] See for instance Plato, *Apology* 26b.

[62] Teresa Morgan's recent study of the πίστις word group emphasises the relational aspect of πίστις and cognates (T. Morgan, *Roman Faith and Christian Faith:* Pistis *and* Fides *in the Early Roman Empire and Early Churches* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015)). The term generally shows up as a feature of relationships, including those between friends, patrons and clients, and masters and slaves. It involves trust and loyalty towards others, and accompanying practices, as well as reciprocal action by the other party. The propositional-belief aspect (believing or trusting something to be true) remains, but Morgan helpfully de-emphasises it (e.g. Morgan, *Roman*, 30). Morgan understands the individuals whom Paul names οἱ ἄπιστοι in 14.22–4 as 'outsiders' in light of Paul's usage elsewhere of οἱ πιστεύοντες/οἱ πιστοί for assembly members (Morgan, *Roman*, 234–41). While Morgan's other examples in this persuasive section fit that description, the immediate literary context in which the ἄπιστοι appear in 14.22–4 – namely, as ἰδιῶται (metaphorical 'members') – suggests that something else is happening here. Interestingly, Morgan demonstrates that community members are occasionally termed οἱ ἄπιστοι in the Septuagint and Gospel literature (*Roman*, 204, 355–8).

[63] See, as examples, Barrett, *First Epistle*, 324–5; H. Conzelmann, *An Outline of the Theology of the New Testament* (New York: Harper & Row, 1975²) 243; B. S. Billings, 'The *apistoi* and *idiotes* in 1 Corinthians 14:20–25: The Ancient Context and Missiological Meaning', *Expository Times* 127 (2016) 277–85, esp. 281.

[64] For relevant passages from lyric poetry and commentary, see C. Lloyd, 'Polis in Medea: Urban Attitudes and Euripides' Characterization in "Medea" 214–224', *CW* 99 (2006) 115–30, esp. 116–20.

[65] J. J. Winkler, *The Constraints of Desire: The Anthropology of Sex and Gender in Ancient Greece* (New York and Longdon: Routledge, 1990) 133–45.

necessarily hold negative connotations. He is not denigrating non-members for holding secrets; all individuals in a *polis* keep secrets except maybe from their family.[66] When the ἰδιῶται reveal their secrets in front of the *ekklēsia* in Paul's scenario, the procedure is akin to adoption into a family and aligns with Paul's other kinship discourse. The very assumption on Paul's part (an assumption apparently shared by the recipients of the letter) that these passers-by had secrets is difficult to understand unless some prior relationship existed between them and members. So we may have further indication of an ongoing acquaintance, as T. J. Lang has also recently argued on other grounds[67] – I have suggested neighbours and/or co-workers. Certainly, proximity is key in Paul's references to ἄπιστοι as spouses of members (e.g. 1 Cor 7.12 γυναῖκα ἄπιστον, ἄνδρα ἄπιστον) and dinner companions (10.27). Proximity may also be a factor in those 'partnerships' (κοινωνίαι) between ἄπιστοι and members, mentioned in 2 Cor 6.14–15.

Another dimension to Paul's use of ἄπιστοι is elucidated in Teresa Morgan's study of the πίστις word group. In Paul's scenario, the ἰδιῶται ἢ ἄπιστοι do not already worship (προσκυνεῖν) Christ upon entrance to the meeting place. In overviewing the role of πίστις in human–divine relationships, Morgan highlights that humans 'trust/have confidence/place their hope in the gods to be just, to make them well, to support them in many areas of life as long as they themselves [i.e. humans] have *pistis/fides*, and to reward well-performed religious rituals'.[68] The Corinthians who are ἄπιστοι towards Christ, by contrast (and in Paul's argumentation), reject the social significance of Christ and so the value of a reciprocal relationship with Christ (at least to the extent Paul values it). It is uncommon for individuals to characterise themselves as ἄπιστοι towards a god, and certainly 1 Cor 14.22–5 only tells us about Paul's own taxonomy. But if the ἰδιῶται referred to themselves as ἄπιστοι in relation to Christ, it would not be an unattested self-presentation. For instance, a stele from Saittai shows that a certain Claudia Bassa confessed that she did not appeal to the god of a temple concerning her illness for four years because 'I did not trust the god' (μὴ πιστεύουσα τῷ θεῷ) (SEG XXXIII.1012, lines 2–3; Saittai, Lydia, Asia Minor; 252/3 CE).

The act of *proskynēsis* (blowing a kiss and/or bowing or even laying prostrate on the floor before a social superior including a god), with which the ἄπιστοι refused to greet Christ, is entirely about showing loyalty and obedience to the social superior. A famous illustration of this is the refusal of Callisthenes of Olynthus, Aristotle's relative and Alexander the Great's court historian, to give obeisance (*proskynēsis*) to Alexander when the latter introduced it into his Macedonian court in 327 BCE (Arrian, *Anab.* 4.9–12). The sources disagree over precisely how Callisthenes died, but Alexander grouped him with others who had hatched a plan to assassinate the king (4.12–14.3). In other words, Callisthenes' refusal was treated by Alexander as disloyalty, and as treasonous (Justin, *Epitome* 15.3.3–5).

The Callisthenes example can raise questions about why the ἰδιῶται of the Corinthian *ekklēsia* might refuse to give obeisance to Christ. Callisthenes refused to give obeisance to Alexander because he insisted that such honours were for gods alone and should not be given to humans (Arrian, *Anab.* 4.11.2–4). In various Greek texts from the classical period, the act of prostrating oneself in front of a non-god was an affront to one's dignity and seen as slavish (for Greek perspectives on *proskynēsis*, see Aeschylus, *Pers.* 588–9; Herodotus 7.136; Xenophon, *Hell.* 4.1.35). In literature from the Roman period, it became socially acceptable to provide *proskynēsis* to royalty as well as gods, but still not to

---

[66] The metaphor confuses a little since deceit was also typically attributed to expert speakers (e.g. Aristotle, *Rhet.* 1.1.10).

[67] Lang, 'Trouble', 981–1001.

[68] Morgan, *Roman*, 141.

(deceased) ordinary humans.[69] It would seem that the ἄπιστοι fully refused to accept the social significance of Christ or at least refused to see him as a divinity worthy of such a manner of reverence. Perhaps, though enfranchised because they lived on the street of the synagogue next to Justus' house and because the *ekklēsia* was a neighbourhood-based *collegium*, they declined formal membership in the *ekklēsia*. Nonetheless, the line between member and non-member neighbour in a neighbourhood-based *collegium* such as the *ekklēsia* was very fine.

5. Conclusion: The Impact of the ekklēsia on Neighbourhood

The practice of Christ worship in mid-first century Corinth would have been integrated into the activities and relationships of the specific street or neighbourhood where the *ekklēsia* was located. In practice, the *ekklēsia*, as a structure of that neighbourhood, divided neighbours to a degree, even though Paul stopped short of exacerbating the impact. That the addition of the *ekklēsia* to the street on which it was located created new divisions is an unavoidable conclusion from 1 Cor 14.22–5: some fully eligible residents who were part of the (neighbourhood-based) social network from which the *ekklēsia* recruited decided not to join and so these neighbours were (further) alienated from others.

The success of Paul's assemblies probably would depend on members' openness to people living nearby, for whom the gathering places were conveniently located, whether they practised Christ worship or not. Since the ἰδιῶται, that is neighbours, who passed by the assembly in 1 Cor 14.22–5 would be, like the civic ἰδιῶται of classical Athens who had the vote, highly influential on the *ekklēsia* and its members, Paul's general congeniality towards them suggests that Christ worship on this street could co-exist harmoniously, at least in Paul's thought, with the other practices and identities that characterised life in the neighbourhood.

[69] S. Bevan, 'Proskynesis in the Synoptics: A Textual Analysis of προσκυνέω and Jesus', *Studia Antiqua* 14 (2015) 30–43, esp. 34–7.