

Hidden Truth in the Body of Euclia: Page duBois' *Torture and Truth and Acts of Andrew*

Christy Cobb
Wingate University, USA
c.cobb@wingate.edu

Abstract

This essay explores the representation of Euclia, a female slave whose story is found within the narrative of *Acts of Andrew*. I read this early Christian text alongside Page duBois' *Torture and Truth and Slaves and Other Objects* and, through a focus on Euclia's story, analyze the relationship among slavery, gender, torture, and truth as represented in this text. In order to explore these issues, I compare the representations of the bodies of Euclia, the slave, with Maximilla, the free elite woman. In doing so I argue that Maximilla's body is undeniably "untouchable" while Euclia's body is vulnerable to sexual abuse and torture. Additionally, I track the "truth" within the narrative as presented by various characters in the text; I argue that both the gender and status of the character shape the view of "truth" found in each characterization. Through this reading I suggest that truth is hidden within the female body of the slave, Euclia. This application of duBois' scholarship to an early Christian narrative illuminates the intricate relationship between slavery and gender as well as torture and truth.

Keywords

Acts of Andrew – torture – slavery – gender – ancient fiction – truth

The tragic story of Euclia, a female slave tortured and killed, is part of an early Christian text called the *Acts of Andrew*.¹ Caught in the middle of a dramatic

1 I cite the text from Dennis Ronald MacDonald, *The Acts of Andrew and the Acts of Andrew and Matthias in the City of the Cannibals* (SBLTT 33; Atlanta: Scholars, 1990); the chapter and verse references used in this essay are from this translation, and also the one by Dennis Ronald

triangle among a Christian wife (Maximilla), pagan husband (Aegeates), and Christian apostle (Andrew), Euclia is used by all three characters to suit their needs. Portrayed in the text as a stereotypical “bad” slave, Euclia aids in the deception of Aegeates by masquerading as her owner, Maximilla; the goal of this charade is to allow Maximilla to be chaste and avoid sexual intercourse with her husband so that she can spend more time with the apostle Andrew. In this narrative, truth is an active participant, and various characters verify “truth” in different ways, depending on their status, gender, and participation in the Christian community. Euclia’s story offers a fruitful narrative space in which to explore the contributions of Page duBois’ scholarship on slavery, gender, truth, and torture.

In this essay, I read the *Acts of Andrew* alongside duBois’ *Torture and Truth* and *Slaves and Other Objects*.² Focusing specifically on Euclia’s characterization in the narrative, I follow the “truth” within the actions of characters, including Euclia, Iphidama, Maximilla, and a group of male slaves. I suggest that Euclia is specifically tortured as a result of her gender, while the male slaves are not; in this story the male slaves provide the truth to Aegeates without the necessity of torture. When Euclia is tortured, then, it is to discover the motivation behind her deception, or, the full truth. In this way, Euclia becomes a site of hidden truth, truth that must be extracted. Moreover, Iphidama, another female slave in this household, clearly knows about the trick, yet she is never tortured or punished in pursuit of truth. Maximilla, the slave owner of these two female slaves, is constantly portrayed as virtuous, yet is the coordinator of this whole charade.

Jennifer Glancy has effectively shown that the *Acts of Andrew* perpetuates and supports the institution of slavery through its portrayal of the corporal punishment, torture, and sexual use of slaves.³ I agree with Glancy that the ideology of slavery permeates the text of the *Acts of Andrew*; this is exemplified quite clearly in the narrative involving Euclia and Maximilla. Using Glancy’s work as a premise for this essay, I engage in a comparison of the textual representation of the bodies of Euclia and Maximilla. Ultimately, Euclia’s slave body is vulnerable, able to be touched, used, and abused while Maximilla’s free body

MacDonald, “The Passion of Andrew,” in idem, *The Acts of Andrew* (Early Christian Apocrypha 1; Santa Rosa, CA: Polebridge, 2005), pp. 77-112.

2 Page duBois, *Torture and Truth* (New York: Routledge, 1991); eadem, *Slaves and Other Objects* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2003).

3 Jennifer A. Glancy, *Slavery in Early Christianity* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2002), pp. 22, 156; eadem, *Corporal Knowledge: Early Christian Bodies* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2010), p. 67.

is unquestionably “untouchable.” The “touchability” versus “untouchability” of these two female bodies juxtaposes the two characters in distinct ways: namely, slave/free and non-Christian/Christian.⁴ When Maximilla’s other slave, Iphidama, is similarly compared, it seems that her status as a member of the religious community indicates that her body is similarly untouchable, even though she is also enslaved. While the male slaves are ultimately killed because of their knowledge, Euclia’s torture and death include humiliation and mutilation, both of which provide further evidence of the extraction of truth. Ultimately, this examination exemplifies the theories proposed by duBois and solidifies the integral relationship between slavery and gender.⁵

Slavery, Torture, and Truth

DuBois’ *Torture and Truth* explores the integral relationship between truth in the ancient world and the practice of torture, specifically as practiced on slave bodies. While this view of truth/torture finds its roots in antiquity, it remains a “part of our legacy from the Greeks” and thus impacts understandings of truth and torture today.⁶ Referencing Greek texts, law, poetry, and theater, duBois outlines the philological development of the Greek word for torture, *basanos*, and its intricate connections to the Greek understanding of truth. In order to do this, she points to a common practice in ancient Greece – the practice of torturing slaves in order to procure the truth. In the Greek world, the testimony of a slave under torture was always believed to be true, even when up against a free man’s testimony; however, a slave was assumed to be lying when testifying without torture.⁷ DuBois explains:

The truth is generated by torture from the speech of the slave; the sounds of the slave on the rack must by definition contain truth, which the torture produces. And when set against other testimony in a court case, that necessary truth, like a touchstone itself, will show up the truth or falsity of the testimony The *basanos* assumes first that the slave always lies,

4 I am indebted to an anonymous reviewer of this manuscript for the suggestion of this argument concerning the “touchability” versus “untouchability” of the female bodies in *Acts of Andrew*.

5 This relationship is thoroughly outlined by Sheila Briggs in her essay, “Engaging the Work of Keith Bradley,” *BibInt* 21(2013), pp. 515-23.

6 duBois, *Torture and Truth*, p. 5.

7 duBois, *Torture and Truth*, p. 36.

then that torture makes him or her always tell the truth, then that truth produced through torture will always expose the truth or falsehood of the free man's evidence.⁸

Thus, the body of the slave is a site calling for torture, and through torture the slave's body becomes a site of truth – truth that is believed even over a citizen's word. Evidence of this practice can be found in texts throughout antiquity.⁹ For instance, duBois describes a scene from the play *Frogs* by Aristophanes where “mock” torture is being enacted not only to add humor within the play but also to prove a point. She writes, “The scene of mock torture, of the beating of Dionysos and his slave, not only sets up the chorus's appeal to the audience's sense of traditional hierarchy; it also shows how commonplace is the language of testing and torture in the ancient city.”¹⁰ As we can see, the audience reading (or in this case, watching) *Frogs* is familiar with the violence of torture within the context of slavery.

Slaves were not only susceptible to torture but also corporally punished. As duBois writes, “The slave body was, for one thing, described frequently as fettered, bound, beaten, always vulnerable to beatings and to whipping, with refinements.”¹¹ Indeed, slaves were viewed as bodies and thus did not possess reason. Even the words used to refer to slaves are indicative of this ideology. In Greek, the word slave (*doulos*) was often interchanged with the word “body” (*soma*); slaves were often called “boy” (Greek *pais*; Latin *puer*), regardless of their age.¹² Additionally, both male and female slaves were viewed as sexual objects, susceptible to their owner's advances. These ideas fill the texts of antiquity, as will be seen through the subsequent reading of *Acts of Andrew*.

Additionally, ideas of slavery are directly connected to conceptions of gender; in fact, any discussion of slavery incorporates notions of gender, whether it is outwardly identified or not. Sheila Briggs observes this tendency at work;

8 Ibid.

9 See also Gerhard Thur, “The Role of the Witness in Athenian Law,” in Michael Gagarin and David Cohen (eds.), *The Cambridge Companion to Ancient Greek Law* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005), p. 149; Elisabeth Meier Tetlow, *Women, Crime and Punishment in Ancient Law and Society, Volume 2: Ancient Greece* (London: Continuum, 2005), p. 97.

10 duBois, *Torture and Truth*, p. 33.

11 duBois, *Slaves and Other Objects*, p. 103.

12 For a longer discussion on the Greek words for slave, see Moses I. Finley, “Was Greek Civilization Based on Slave Labour?,” in idem (ed.), *Slavery in Classical Antiquity: Views and Controversies* (Cambridge: Heffer, 1968), p. 54. See also Mark Golden, “Pais, ‘Child’ and ‘Slave,’” *L'Antiquite Classique* 54 (1985), pp. 91-104.

she writes, “Always lurking behind modern debates about ancient slavery and early Christianity are contemporary politics of gender and the ontological presuppositions on which they are based.”¹³ The connection between slavery and gender can be seen through the relationship between slavery and truth. For example, in duBois’ reading of the *Odyssey*, she describes the journey of Odysseus into the underworld, an in-between space where truth can be found. She compares the underworld to the interior of the female body to suggest that this space *is* woman. With this in mind, duBois notes that many people in antiquity found truth within the words of the female oracle, the Pythia, located in Delphi, Greece. In this way, truth was sought in the body and words of a woman.¹⁴ It is precisely this occurrence, as outlined by the work of duBois, that I expose in my reading of *Acts of Andrew*, as the body of Euclia, the female slave, becomes a place of torture and sexual abuse, yet is also a site of truth. As duBois elegantly writes, “The truth is thus always elsewhere, always outside the realm of ordinary human experience, of everyday life, secreted in the earth, in the gods, in the woman, in the slave.”¹⁵

A vast amount of ancient literature, including the New Testament and other early Christian writings, not only mentions slaves but also identifies them as characters by name. In recent years, biblical scholarship has turned toward a greater awareness of how the ubiquity of slaves and slavery in ancient society shapes the thinking of early Christian literary culture in the same way as classical culture. As J. Albert Harrill writes, “[T]he early Christian writings reflect, participate in, and promote the literary imagination about slaves and the ideology of mastery widely diffuse in the ancient Mediterranean.”¹⁶ The present study, however, focuses more on a slave character who holds a minor role rather than those in the major scenes of narratives. This approach promises a new perspective on the exegesis of the parabolic material attributed to Jesus and the New Testament household duty codes, for example. My goal is to push the boundaries of biblical interpretation into a more expansive view of the evidence that includes attention to the Apocryphal Acts and the Greco-Roman novels. Consideration of the full range of ancient narrative is important, because the scenes of slavery, torture, and truth in these often relegated texts

13 Sheila Briggs, “Slavery and Gender,” in Jane Schaberg, Alice Back, and Ester Fuchs (eds.), *On the Cutting Edge: The Study of Women in Biblical Worlds: Essays in Honor of Elisabeth Schüssler Fiorenza*, (New York: Continuum, 2003), p. 171.

14 duBois, *Torture and Truth*, pp. 82-83.

15 duBois, *Torture and Truth*, pp. 105-106.

16 J. Albert Harrill, *Slaves in the New Testament: Literary, Social, and Moral Dimensions* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2006), p. 2.

provide helpful insights into ancient literature and culture through their apt descriptions of not only slaves but also free people masquerading as slaves (or faux slaves, a title coined by Glancy).¹⁷ In ancient narrative, even minor slave characters play parts vital to the plot, for their interactions with the main characters (who are free) drive the narrative in certain directions. Slaves appear as all kinds of characters, to be sure. Yet these texts were written by members of the elite class who were most likely also slaveholders. Keith Bradley explains the exegetical difficulty as follows: “All historians are the victims of their sources. But the historian of Roman slavery is at a special disadvantage, for although a great volume of information is on hand it is all subject to the fundamental flaw that there is no surviving record, if indeed any ever existed, of what life in slavery was like from a slave’s point of view.”¹⁸ While not providing a portrait of slavery from the view of the enslaved, the representations of slaves found in narratives offer some insight into how ancient masters imagined the lives of slaves in antiquity. As Tim Whitmarsh observes, “[T]he novels take us on a tour of the social underclass, allowing us to witness suffering and oppression through the eyes of those who, we know, will inevitably reclaim their high-status positions within society.”¹⁹ For this reason I turn to an apocryphal Christian text, *Acts of Andrew*, written near the end of the second century or the beginning of the third century, to offer a useful case study for exegesis and biblical interpretation generally and to explore further the relationship that duBois has established between slavery, gender, torture, and truth.²⁰

Euclia’s Story: Torture and Truth in *Acts of Andrew*

Acts of Andrew is a novelistic account of the travel, missionary activity, and death of the apostle Andrew.²¹ In the section that ultimately describes the

17 Jennifer Glancy (*Slavery in Early Christianity*, p. 7) notes: “The slaves who excite the greatest sympathy in romances and dramas are faux slaves, who have been reduced to bondage under false pretenses; romances and dramas predictably hinge on the restoration of these faux slaves to their rightful positions as prominent freeborn citizens.”

18 Keith Bradley, *Slavery and Society at Rome* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994), p. 7.

19 Tim Whitmarsh, “Class,” in idem (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to the Greek and Roman Novel* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008), p. 86.

20 Hans-Josef Klauck, *The Apocryphal Acts of the Apostles: An Introduction* (Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2008), p. 3.

21 It is thought that *Acts of Andrew* originally contained two sections, one on the travels of Andrew and one including the martyrdom of the apostle. Today the extant text is in three

death of Andrew, “The Passion of Andrew,” several stories take place, one including a trope that is common to the Apocryphal Acts – an elite married woman (Maximilla) meets the apostle (Andrew), converts, and becomes a close follower amidst the disapproval of her husband (Aegeates). After listening to Andrew’s teaching, Maximilla decides to become celibate and cease having sexual intercourse with her husband, instead spending her days and nights with Andrew.²² Maximilla prays, “Rescue me at last from Aegeates’ filthy intercourse and keep me pure and chaste, giving service only to you, my God” (14:7). However, instead of telling Aegeates this directly, Maximilla concocts a scheme to simultaneously trick Aegeates and keep her chastity. She calls her slave Euclia, whose name means “of good report,”²³ but who is introduced in the text as a “shapely, exceedingly wanton servant-girl” (17:1). Maximilla instructs Euclia to impersonate her in the bedroom so that Aegeates will have sex with Euclia. As a result, Maximilla will retain her chastity.²⁴ Euclia agrees and Maximilla dresses her slave in her own clothes and sends her into her husband’s bedroom.²⁵ In this way, Maximilla “uses her slave Euclia

parts from different sources: “Acts of Andrew and Matthias in the city of the Cannibals”; Gregory’s “Epitome” and “Parallels”; and “Passion of Andrew.” This essay will be exploring sections found in “Passion of Andrew.”

- 22 Saundra Schwartz’s discussion of this narrative segment shows the erotic elements and the ways in which readers would perceive Maximilla’s actions as typical of adultery. Concerning the scene where Maximilla takes Andrew into a bedroom, Schwartz writes, “Maximilla’s gesture, with its hand-holding and attendant entry into a bedroom, resonates with the entry of the bride and groom to the nuptial chamber or, given the absence of a man of the house, the entrance of an adulterous couple into the husband’s bedroom, a scenario fraught with resonance in the popular culture of the Mediterranean world” (Saundra Schwartz, “From Bedroom to Courtroom: The Adultery Type-Scene and the Acts of Andrew,” in Todd C. Penner and Caroline Vander Stichele [eds.], *Mapping Gender in Ancient Religious Discourses* [BibIn 84; Leiden: Brill, 2007], p. 297).
- 23 H.G. Liddell and Robert Scott (eds.), *An Intermediate Greek-English Lexicon: Founded upon the Seventh Edition of Liddell and Scott’s Greek-English Lexicon* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1945), p. 326.
- 24 For a thorough discussion of the role chastity plays in the independence of the female protagonists in the Apocryphal Acts, see Virginia Burrus, *Chastity as Autonomy: Women in the Stories of the Apocryphal Acts* (Studies in Women and Religion 23; Lewiston, NY: Mellen, 1987). See also Virginia Burrus, “Mimicking Virgins: Colonial Ambivalence and the Ancient Romance,” *Arethusa* 38 (2005), pp. 49-88.
- 25 Jennifer Glancy connects the story of Euclia and Maximilla to that of Hagar and Sarah. She writes, “[T]he story of Maximilla and Euclia echoes, in a disturbing way, the story of Sarah and Hagar. Sarah arranged for her husband to have sex with her slave in order to reproduce. Maximilla arranged for her husband to have sex with her slave so that she, Maximilla, could avoid having sex. In both instances, the Christians who relayed these

as an erotic body double” to avoid Aegeates’ sexual advances, as Glancy suggests.²⁶

In order to convince her of this subterfuge and to secure her silence in the matter, Maximilla promises Euclia that she will act as a benefactor (*euergētēs*) for Euclia if she helps her in this scheme (17:2). Perhaps Euclia understood this statement from her master as a hint that she would be freed if she agreed. Indeed, the availability of manumission in the ancient world is another way in which owners retained power over slaves.²⁷ Moses Finley notes, “Graeco-Roman manumission ... reveals in the sharpest way the ambiguity inherent in slavery, in the reduction of human beings to the category of property. It also reveals, through the variations, the dialectics of that ambiguity.”²⁸ While Maximilla does not directly state a promise of freedom, Euclia eventually realizes the potential of her situation and, according to the text, begins to make demands that Maximilla grant her freedom in addition to other items, including money and clothing, all of which Maximilla gave to her “without hesitation” (18:1-3).

It is already clear that Maximilla instigated this deception in order to trick her husband Aegeates. However, the text provides justification for this ruse: Maximilla’s chastity. As Glancy illustrates, the text hints at no indication that Maximilla’s strategy is unethical: “The *Acts of Andrew* seems to exempt Maximilla of any moral culpability in the subterfuge, implying that Euclia’s actions are completely explicable in the context of her nature, depicted as both lascivious and greedy.”²⁹ This representation of Euclia is included for two reasons. First, as already mentioned, *Acts of Andrew* perpetuates the ideology of slavery in which slaves are understood to be bodies that can be used as needed. This is to say, Maximilla is treating Euclia in a way that readers would expect of her and not find to be unethical or against her religious beliefs. Second, this is also because of the negative portrayal of Euclia as a “bad” slave.³⁰ As we recall, the

stories were more concerned by the slave’s purported misbehavior than the gross sexual exploitation of a female slave by a female slaveholder” (Glancy, *Corporal Knowledge*, p. 68).

26 Glancy, *Slavery in Early Christianity*, p. 22.

27 For more on the process of manumission, see J. Albert Harrill, *The Manumission of Slaves in Early Christianity* (Tubingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1995); Susan Treggiari, “Freedmen and Freedwomen,” in Michael Gagarin (ed.), *The Oxford Encyclopedia of Ancient Greece and Rome* (Oxford; New York: Oxford University Press, 2010), vol. 1, pp. 227-30.

28 Moses I. Finley, *Ancient Slavery and Modern Ideology* (New York: Viking, 1980), p. 97.

29 Glancy, *Slavery in Early Christianity*, p. 22.

30 A concise description of the stereotypes of “good” and “bad” slaves can be found in Sandra R. Joshel, “Slavery and Roman Literary Culture,” in Keith Bradley and Paul Cartledge

text initially describes her as a “shapely, exceedingly wanton servant-girl” (17:1).³¹ In this way the text presents Euclia as one who desires sex. Yet, *Acts of Andrew* uplifts sexual purity and valorizes chastity. Therefore, when Maximilla protects her own purity, which is to be prioritized, by using a slave, the text presents her actions as valid. Maximilla’s chastity is juxtaposed with Euclia’s sexuality; these are also connected to each woman’s status. Maximilla’s free elite status allows her the freedom to protect her body in her newfound chastity, while Euclia’s enslaved status indicates that her body is not her own.

Yet Euclia is not the only female slave mentioned in *Acts of Andrew* who was owned by Maximilla. Prior to the introduction of Euclia, Maximilla’s main female domestic slave is Iphidama, a faithful servant in the household.³² This female slave was originally sent to hear the words of Andrew and report back to Maximilla. Additionally, when Maximilla became ill, Iphidama was sent to call for Andrew in order that she might be healed. In “Passion of Andrew,” Iphidama is often named alongside Maximilla and is portrayed by the text as a devoted slave as well as a believer in Andrew’s message.³³ In fact, Iphidama is listed as one of the “believers” who were “worthy of the Lord’s seal” (10:4) and Maximilla even calls her “sister” (27:6). When juxtaposed with the presentation of Euclia in the text, it seems that Iphidama is included in the circle of believers, even though she is enslaved, while Euclia is not included as one of the followers of Andrew.

Thus, when Maximilla dresses Euclia like herself and sends her into Aegeates’ room at night so that he will have sex with her, the exploitation of Euclia is justified in three ways. First, Euclia is a slave, able to be used by her owner. Second, Euclia is described sexually in the text, unlike Iphidama. In this way, the text portrays Euclia as an eager participant in Maximilla’s plan. Third, Euclia is not portrayed as a believer, especially in contrast to both Iphidama and Maximilla. In this way, Maximilla is able to spend more time with Andrew, as Euclia replaces her when needed in the bedroom.³⁴ According to the text,

(eds.), *The Cambridge World History of Slavery, Volume 1: The Ancient Mediterranean World* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011), pp. 216-23.

31 Glancy (*Slavery in Early Christianity*, p. 22) writes, “Her own curves indict her.”

32 Iphidama is introduced in a separate narrative, Gregory’s “Epitome,” 30:4.

33 For instance, in 2:7, Iphidama calms Stratocles, Aegeates’ brother, when he is distraught. In 4:1, Iphidama is named along with Maximilla and they are both “elated” to discover that Andrew has arrived at the house. Later in the narrative, a male slave in the house reports to Aegeates that Maximilla was introduced to Andrew through Iphidama (25:4).

34 Saundra Schwartz (“From Bedroom to Courtroom,” p. 301) dubs this scheme a “bedtrick,” a term used in the work of Wendy Doniger, *The Bedtrick: Tales of Sex and Masquerade* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2000), p. 1.

Maximilla “escaped detection” (17:6) for eight months (18:1), and Aegeates did not discover this scheme. Apparently, Euclia was able to “pass” as Maximilla, at least to the oblivious Aegeates. In antiquity, slave status was slippery, as a slave was not identified by a certain race. In *Acts of Andrew*, Maximilla dresses Euclia as she would dress herself, and it is assumed that in other ways the two women looked alike. Sandra Schwartz argues that the “text reflects an aristocratic bias by making Euclia’s masquerade as a mistress seem ridiculous.”³⁵ While the text certainly reflects an aristocratic bias, as Schwartz shows, Euclia’s masquerade is not a part of this bias. In fact, it is a common trope in ancient narratives for slaves to masquerade as free people (and vice versa). When this occurred, the deception was typically unnoticed. The novel by Achilles Tatius, *Leucippe and Clitophon*, provides an example of this motif.³⁶ In this narrative the reader discovers that Leucippe, the freeborn heroine, has been mistakenly sold into slavery. She is given the name Lakaina and is presented as a faux slave. Her lover, Clitophon, travels to Ephesus and encounters her there, but does not even recognize her because of the drastic change in her appearance. In *Acts of Andrew*, Aegeates is not portrayed positively, especially in comparison to Andrew; this particular part of the plot does not so much add to the negative presentation of Aegeates as it supports the motivation of Maximilla to be chaste. Moreover, Sandra Joshel argues that slaves are treated and portrayed as “fungible” in Roman literary culture. Because slaves are viewed as objects, slaves could be used in numerous ways to meet the needs of the master; Joshel writes, “The slave was exchangeable, replaceable, substitutable.”³⁷ In this case, Maximilla uses Euclia as her personal substitute in order to solidify her chastity.

As mentioned, this subterfuge continues for eight months when Euclia demands her freedom, which Maximilla grants her (18:1). Then, Euclia requests money and gifts such as “clothing, fine linen, and headbands” (18:3), which Maximilla also provides. Here, the text again portrays Euclia negatively, as she greedily desires more gifts and then brags about her privilege to other household slaves (18:5). The timing of eight months is curious, as both Schwartz and Anna Rebecca Solevåg suggest; this is enough time for Euclia to become pregnant and be far along in her pregnancy, perhaps to the point of showing it or

35 Schwartz, “From Bedroom to Courtroom,” p. 305.

36 Achilles Tatius, “Leucippe and Clitophon,” in John J. Winkler (trans.), *Collected Ancient Greek Novels* (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1989), pp. 170-284.

37 Joshel, “Slavery and Roman Literary Culture,” p. 215.

even to be close to giving birth.³⁸ While the narrative does not indicate why Euclia asked for her freedom, it is possible that Euclia has become pregnant as a result of this impersonation and needs out of the situation swiftly so that she and Maximilla are not discovered. Whatever the reason, Maximilla agrees to Euclia's wish, making the slave a freedwoman and also giving her the money and gifts she requests. As the narrator tells the story, Euclia is given everything she asks for by Maximilla; yet this does not satisfy her, whom we recall is labeled "wanton." Furthermore, Euclia uses her prominence in the household against other slaves, "mocking" them with the gifts she received from Maximilla (18:5). Apparently, though, the other slaves did not fully believe her story about sleeping with Aegeates in place of Maximilla. In order to prove this, Euclia waited until Aegeates was drunk and then placed two slaves by his bed while she snuck in late at night. When Aegeates called her "Maximilla," the slaves believed her story (18:7).

I read this portrayal of Euclia "with suspicion" as it is clear that the narrative is centrally framed to highlight the slave owner, not the story of the enslaved.³⁹

38 Schwartz suggests that the detail of the number of months could have been inserted by the author to lend authenticity to the story, but that it is more likely that the author intended for the astute reader to think that Euclia is pregnant, as "eight months was a highly inauspicious time in the beginning of a sexual relationship between a man and a woman" (Schwartz, "From Bedroom to Courtroom," p. 305). This suggestion has also been mentioned by Anna Rebecca Solevåg, who links this to several other childbirth metaphors present in *Acts of Andrew*, such as the metaphorical childbirth scene which functions to represent the conversion of Stratocles and in which Andrew acts as the midwife. Additionally, Solevåg suggests that if Euclia was indeed pregnant, this would ultimately punish Aegeates even further as he would be "deprived of both Platonic forms of immortality – immortality through offspring and immortality of soul" (Anna Rebecca Solevåg, *Birthing Salvation: Gender and Class in Early Christian Childbearing Discourse* [BibInt 121; Leiden: Brill, 2013], p. 191).

39 Elisabeth Schüssler Fiorenza describes the practice of reading through a hermeneutic of suspicion within feminist biblical studies; she writes, "A critical feminist rhetoric of inquiry does not only recognize that the ethos and methods of biblical studies are ideologically scripted. It also underscores that wo/men, like men, are linguistic and historical subjects who can subvert and alter the cultural script of the elite male/father/master domination (patri-kyriarchy). To that end, feminist readers must cultivate the habit of suspicion, especially when reading sacred kyriocentric (elite male, master-centered) texts. Such a hermeneutics of suspicion requires that feminist readers learn how to recognize and analyze biblical texts as rhetorical symbol systems" (Elisabeth Schüssler Fiorenza, *Rhetoric and Ethic: The Politics of Biblical Studies* [Minneapolis: Fortress, 1999], p. 92). While *Acts of Andrew* is a certainly a kyriarchal text, its kyriocentric nature lies in the power differential a free woman exercises over an enslaved woman. *Acts of Andrew* as a whole, though, is also patriarchal and Maximilla's role can be to function between the

Reading in this light, we recall that Maximilla first offered to be Euclia's benefactor in exchange for this very risky assignment. Yet when Euclia begins requesting this promised payment, she is portrayed as greedy and a braggart. Additionally, other slaves have seen the attention that Euclia is receiving and are jealous; thus Euclia becomes the enemy to all. Meanwhile, Maximilla's lies and deception to her husband are not noted by the narrator, nor is her mistreatment of Euclia. When tracking the "truth" in the narrative, it is clear that Maximilla is the one who is deceptive while Euclia follows orders. Yet, because of Euclia's slave status in addition to the high view of chastity, this deception is justified by the text. Schwartz, as she explores the role of truth in this "bedtrick," states, "Early Christians, seeking to propagate their vision of the truth, would use this ready-made motif as a matrix within which to set their own belief in absolute spiritual truth against the potential for falsehood inherent in the bodily function of sexuality."⁴⁰

The text is certainly on the side of Maximilla, as it portrays Euclia as an enemy to Maximilla's dedication to Christianity. In order to assure that the reader blames Euclia for this situation, the narrator adds a sentence indicating Maximilla's misplaced trust in her slave: "Maximilla no doubt supposed that Euclia was true to her word, and to be trusted because of the gifts given to her; and at night she took her rest with Andrew, along with Stratocles and all her fellow believers" (19:1). In this narrative, Euclia, the female slave, was *assumed* to be "true to her word"; this is not typical for slaves in antiquity. DuBois' analysis of Aristotle's words on slavery confirm this:

The master possesses reason, *logos*. When giving evidence in court, he knows the difference between truth and falsehood, he can reason and produce true speech, *logos*, and he can reason about the consequences of falsehood, the deprivation of his rights as a citizen. The slave, on the other hand, possessing not reason but rather a body strong for service (*iskhura pros tēn anagkaian khrēsin*), must be forced to utter truth, which he can apprehend, although not possessing reason as such.⁴¹

two men, Aegates and Andrew (Kate Cooper, *The Virgin and the Bride: Idealized Womanhood in Late Antiquity* [Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1996], pp. 43-56). Here, though, I focus on the character of Euclia, as she is a marginalized and oppressed character in this narrative scene.

40 Schwartz, "From Bedroom to Courtroom," p. 302.

41 duBois, *Torture and Truth*, pp. 65-66.

Interestingly, in ancient novels, slaves are sometimes depicted as confidants and trusted advisors to their masters. This trope, however, functions to further perpetuate the ideology of slavery. In fact, novelists seem to present slaves as trustworthy in order to *enhance* the disloyalty that follows when a trusted slave lies or betrays the trust of her owner. This can be seen through the loyalty of Iphidama in contrast to the disloyalty of Euclia. Here, Maximilla fits squarely into the literary motif of a slave owner who trusts her slave to obey and keep her word; this functions to make Euclia's "deception" look that much worse. As Whitmarsh reminds us concerning novels in the Greco-Roman world, "In general the novelists do privilege the top-down perspective of their protagonists: it is rare to find any challenge to the truisms that bandits and pirates are bad, slaves [turn out to be] deceitful and manipulative, nurses are untrustworthy."⁴² Indeed, Euclia is depicted in this narrative as deceitful and manipulative, and Maximilla's trust of her heightens this portrayal.

In addition to the juxtapositions of the motivation of these two characters, the narrative also distinguishes between the bodies of Maximilla and of Euclia. Maximilla's body is "untouchable" in terms of corporal punishment as well as sexual advances, while Euclia's body is vulnerable and thus "touchable." In fact, when Aegeates discovers the deception, he turns his anger in the form of physical violence upon the slaves, not his wife. Moreover, even after he discovers the trick, he does not touch Maximilla sexually. As the text states, "He did not dare commit any impropriety against the blessed woman" (24:1). On the other hand, Euclia's body is susceptible not only to the sexual use by Aegeates but also to torture and mutilation. In this way, Euclia becomes a reminder of the pervasiveness of the sexual use of slaves in antiquity, even in early Christian texts such as this one. As duBois reminds us, "The slave body was sexually available, especially to males of the master class."⁴³ Through the sexual use of Euclia, the difference between her body, the slave body, and Maximilla's body, a free person's body, is exemplified. Above all, Maximilla's chastity must be preserved. In fact, the way that Euclia is introduced, as a "shapely, exceedingly wanton female slave," suggests that Euclia is sexually inviting, clearly a foreshadowing by the author. Yet, Maximilla's body must remain pure, as Maximilla believes and Andrew confirms that sex with Aegeates is a "heinous and despicable act" (21:5). Again, Maximilla's reputation must also be preserved. Thus, Euclia's body is an ever-present reminder of the free status of Maximilla, as Maximilla is able to arrange a way to escape unwanted sexual attention, but Euclia does not have that power.

42 Whitmarsh, "Class," p. 85; Harrill, *Slaves in the New Testament*, p. 25.

43 duBois, *Slaves and Other Objects*, p. 104.

The slippage between a free and enslaved person is interesting here, as Maximilla, who is free, feels that she cannot simply deny her husband intercourse. Instead, she must trick him into thinking that he is still having sex with her – a plan that ultimately is deceptive, risky, and financially costly. Glancy notes, “Maximilla relies on an enslaved body to secure the freedom of her own body.”⁴⁴ Certainly, in the texts of early Christianity, sexual purity is vital. In fact, Euclia’s sexuality is juxtaposed against Maximilla’s purity in this scene; as Solevåg writes, “Euclia is presented as the opposite of Maximilla, as she supposedly takes delight in her sexual encounters with Aegeates.”⁴⁵ Euclia is described in sexual terms from the first time she is introduced to the reader, and Maximilla is certainly portrayed as striving for purity in every way. As many feminist scholars have pointed out, seeking an ascetic life was, for many early Christian women, a doorway to independence as well as, perhaps, an escape from the confines of marriage and motherhood.⁴⁶ Many early Christian narratives portray elite women pursuing sexual asceticism through a variety of ways, but none so brutal as Maximilla’s use of Euclia here in *Acts of Andrew*. Drawing the connection between the desire for sexual purity and the use of slaves in antiquity, Glancy writes:

The violent reaction of ascetic Christians against the sexual use of their bodies demarcated the voluntary character of the servility of the ascetic body. Ascetics, unlike slaves, could say “no” to the sexual use of their bodies. In fact, the utter refusal of ascetic Christians to participate in any sexual activities reinforces the horror of a central facet of slave life while it reinscribes the place of the slave outside the circle of honorable persons. Perhaps nowhere is this clearer than in the tale of Maximilla from the *Acts of Andrew*.⁴⁷

44 Glancy, *Slavery in Early Christianity*, p. 156.

45 Solevåg, Anna Rebecca, “Adam, Eve, and the Serpent in the Acts of Andrew,” in Caroline Vander Stichele and Susanne Scholz (eds.), *Hidden Truths from Eden: Esoteric Readings of Genesis 1-3* (SemeiaSt, 76; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature Press, 2014), p. 15.

46 Much has been published on this subject, especially by feminist scholars. For several of the groundbreaking works arguing for the empowerment women found through virginity/chastity, see: Elizabeth A. Clark, “Ascetic Renunciation and Feminine Advancement: A Paradox of Late Ancient Christianity,” *ATR* 63 (1981), pp. 240-57; Burrus, *Chastity as Autonomy*; Joyce E. Salisbury, *Church Fathers, Independent Virgins* (London: Verso, 1991); Burrus, “Mimicking Virgins.”

47 Glancy, *Slavery in Early Christianity*, p. 156.

As Glancy shows, Euclia would not have been able to say “no” to Maximilla’s request, even if she did not want to participate. Maximilla’s position as the owner of Euclia solidifies that.

Furthermore, Maximilla goes to great lengths in her attempt to keep the scheme hidden from Aegeates. After word spreads among the other household slaves, several of them decide to confront Maximilla with their knowledge, “looking for some payoff” (21:1). After consulting with Iphidama, Maximilla acquiesces and pays each slave 1,000 denarii in exchange for their silence (21:3). Yet, “at the instigation of their father the devil,” the slaves decide to tell Aegeates of Maximilla’s deceit (21:4). Three of these slaves, apparently male, take the money they received from Maximilla and approach their master with this knowledge, including Euclia’s role, in the scheme. Aegeates believes the word of these slaves and does not torture them. Yet Aegeates immediately interrogates and tortures (*basanizō*) Euclia. This is a curious part of the narrative, as it seems Aegeates has already learned (and believed) the truth from the other slaves, whom he does not torture. Yet he tortures Euclia in order to ascertain the “motivation” behind her actions (22:2). From this brief section of the text it appears that Euclia did not immediately share Maximilla’s involvement in the masquerade with Aegeates. After torture, though, Euclia “confessed to all the payoffs she had received from her lady for keeping quiet” (22:2). Thus, through torture, Euclia ultimately tells Aegeates the whole truth by confessing to the money and gifts that Maximilla gave her in exchange for her part in the plan as well as her silence.

It is interesting to note that Aegeates resorts to torture in the case of Euclia, but not when the three male slaves come to him with their knowledge. Again, the theory of duBois illuminates this aspect of the story when the narrative is read with attention to sexual difference. In *Torture and Truth*, duBois writes, “I want to articulate the gender marking of the term *alētheia* and its relationship to the *basanos* that reveals truth.”⁴⁸ In this way, truth must be sought from the interior of the earth, represented by the interior space of the woman’s body.⁴⁹ As mentioned, duBois references again the journey of Odysseus to the underworld as a female space of hidden truth. She writes, “As such, she is like the slave under torture, the physical space, unknowable, inaccessible to the real subject of truth, yet through which the knower must pass in order to acquire truth, like the slave whose body bears a message that the slave is unable to see,

48 duBois, *Torture and Truth*, p. 76.

49 See also Page duBois, *Sowing the Body: Psychoanalysis and Ancient Representations of Women* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1988).

let alone read.”⁵⁰ It seems that Aegeates must also pass through Euclia’s body to find and believe the full truth behind his wife’s deception.

Scenes such as this one, including the torture of slaves in order to obtain truth, belong to a trope that can be seen in other ancient narratives as well. For instance, Chariton’s first-century novel, *Chaereas and Callirhoe*, includes the torture of a female slave by a male slave owner, so he can discover the truth. In this story, Callirhoe, a beautiful young woman from a very important family, leaves her house for the first time in order to worship the goddess Aphrodite. On her way there she sees Chaereas, walking home from the gymnasium, and the two bump into each other and immediately are “smitten with love” (1.1).⁵¹ They marry. Yet, as in most of the ancient novels, this is only the beginning of their trials. Because of the jealousy of other suitors, several men join together to attempt to ruin the marriage of Callirhoe and Chaereas. These men come up with several plans, one of which includes a young man who proceeds to pursue “Callirhoe’s personal maid [*therapaina*], the most prized of her servants, and gain her love” (1.4). Here we find the manipulation of a female slave in a scene similar to that of Euclia in *Acts of Andrew*. Then, surreptitiously, another friend tells Chaereas that Callirhoe is being unfaithful and suggests that he pretend to go away on a trip in order to watch the house, so that he can see the lover sneak into his home. Chaereas, distraught with this knowledge, does as the man suggests and hides to watch as “the man who had seduced Callirhoe’s maid dart[ed] into the lane” (1.4). The man approaches the door, sneakily, and “the maid, who was very frightened herself, quietly opened the door a few inches, took his hand, and drew him in” (1.4). Chaereas, full of anger, bursts into the room while Callirhoe, sitting quietly missing her lover, runs to meet him. As she runs, Chaereas kicks her and hits her diaphragm, causing Callirhoe to stop breathing. As she falls, her slaves pick her up and lay her on the bed, assuming Callirhoe to be dead. Chaereas is filled with sorrow and guilt.

Following the incident, Chaereas wants to discover the truth, and so he questions the domestic slaves by torturing (*basanizō*) them, especially Callirhoe’s favored female slave (*therapaina*). The narrator reports: “It was while they were undergoing fire and torture [*basanizō*], that he learned the truth” (1.5). Here, Chariton’s *Callirhoe* provides a similar fictionalized example of slaves being tortured in order to obtain truth. Additionally, the female slave, the narrator notes, is specifically targeted. Only through “fire and torture” did Callirhoe’s slave tell the truth, and Chaereas did not question her version of the

50 duBois, *Torture and Truth*, pp. 82-83.

51 English translation of Chariton’s “Chaereas and Callirhoe” is taken from B.P. Reardon (ed.), *Collected Ancient Greek Novels* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1989), pp. 21-124.

story after her physical torment. This narrative supports the ambivalent relationship between truth and torture, especially as related to the female slave. Truth is buried in the body of the female slave and the free male searches for it through physical torture.

In *Acts of Andrew*, even the torture of Euclia is not enough for Aegeates, who “wanted the matter hushed up, since he was still affectionate for his spouse” (22:4). Therefore he decides to punish Euclia brutally. First, he cuts out her tongue (*glōssotomaō*, 22:4); this suggests his desire to silence her and simultaneously humiliate her. Then, Aegeates mutilates (*akrōtēriazō*) Euclia; the Greek word suggesting that her body is cut in numerous places (22:4). This word also has sexual connotations, implying that Aegeates also mutilated the slave’s genitals.⁵² Finally, Aegeates has Euclia’s tortured body thrown outside. The text then states, “She stayed there without food for several days before she became food for the dogs” (22:5). Apparently, even after the removal of her tongue and her mutilation she is still alive for several days. This detail serves to punish Euclia further as the reader pictures her dying a slow and degrading death. Moreover, the suggestion that Euclia was left outside to be food for the dogs connects her to another memorable (and often depicted as evil) biblical character, that of Jezebel, as observed by Solevåg.⁵³

Thus, Aegeates discovers, through torture (*basanizō*), further details concerning the truth of the deception – Euclia was a part of a scheme orchestrated by his wife, Maximilla. As a result of this truth, Euclia is brutally tortured and eventually killed. While the torture Aegeates put Euclia under is not described in detail, the ancient audience knew the types of torture that were usually inflicted on slaves. DuBois describes the various ways of torture through a reading of the play *Frogs* by Aristophanes: “The catalogue of torture devices here is most instructive. We find binding to the ladder (*klimaki*; later a rhetorical term); the whip (*hustrikhis*) routinely used for punishing slaves, the name of which is derived from the word for hedgehog or porcupine, and which suggests sharp spines; flaying; stretching on the rack (*streblōn*).”⁵⁴ In *Acts of Andrew*, it is only Euclia who is subjected to torture such as this, not to mention her mutilation and subsequent death. As for the other slaves who knew the details of Maximilla’s deception, the text indicates: “the rest of the servants who had told

52 Liddell and Scott (eds.), *An Intermediate Greek-English Lexicon*, p. 31.

53 Solevåg, *Birthing Salvation*, p. 194. For the biblical reference, see 2 Kgs 9:36. Additionally, a paraphrase of this text by Evodius of Uzala similarly connects Euclia to Jezebel by making the scene of Maximilla putting makeup on Euclia read like what one finds in 2 Kgs 9:30 (MacDonald, *Acts of Andrew and Matthias*, p. 347 n. 16).

54 duBois, *Torture and Truth*, pp. 30-31.

their story to him [Aegeates] – there were three of them – he crucified (*stauroō*)” (22:6). The motivation behind these deaths was so that the story was “hushed up since he was still affectionate for his spouse” (22:4). To a modern audience this torture, mutilation, and death seem brutal and inhumane. In the world of antiquity, however, this brutality towards slaves was culturally invisible (i.e., unrecognizable as violence); it was part of everyday life as well as portrayed in plays and novels. Slaves were treated as objects and their bodies were regularly used and abused by owners.

In addition to being accustomed to this type of brutality inflicted on slaves, an ancient audience might also read the torture scene in *Acts of Andrew* as humorous, while simultaneously retaining the seriousness of torture. This type of humor is exemplified in Aristophanes’ play, *Frogs*. DuBois shows how *Frogs* portrays the carnivalesque elements of torture scenes common to the genre in this period. She writes, “The comic beating is quite hilarious, of course. But it does not put into question the reality of torture. The exchange has a carnival quality, Dionysos masquerading as slave, slave masquerading as Dionysos masquerading as Herakles, the god beaten like a common slave. The slave remains uppity and insolent, the god cowardly and ridiculous.”⁵⁵ Similarly, ancient readers might have found humor in the torture and humiliation of Euclia, especially as she is presented negatively – in opposition to Maximilla’s chastity – within the text.

Aegeates is included in several comedic scenes, made especially comedic when he is juxtaposed against the apostle Andrew. For instance, in one scene, Maximilla and other believers are listening to Andrew speak in the room of Aegeates when Aegeates comes home. Before Aegeates can discover them in his own private room, Andrew prays for a distraction and Aegeates is hit with an “urge for a bowel movement, asked for a chamber pot, and spent a long time sitting, attending to himself” (“Passion of Andrew,” 13.7). However, it is somewhat typical of the texts of the Apocryphal Acts to characterize male householders negatively. Kate Cooper highlights the ways the plots of the Apocryphal Acts revolve around a contest between men – that of the apostle and the male householder.⁵⁶ In *Acts of Andrew*, Aegeates and Andrew are certainly pitted

55 Ibid., p. 33.

56 Cooper argues this in her discussion of the Apocryphal Acts: “The challenge by the apostle to the householder is the urgent message of these narratives, and it is essentially a conflict *between men*. The challenge posed here by Christianity is not really about women, or even about sexual continence, but about authority and the social order. In this way, tales of continence use the narrative momentum of romance, and the enticement of the romantic heroine, to mask a contest for authority, encoded in the contest between two pretend-ers to the heroine’s allegiance” (Cooper, *The Virgin and the Bride*, p. 55).

against one another, as are Maximilla and Euclia. As duBois writes, “Comedy allows the fictional depiction of the unspeakable, the representation of the lowly slave, the allusion to ordinary cruelty.”⁵⁷

Conclusion: Euclia’s Tortured Body

This gender analysis of *Acts of Andrew* focuses on the characterization of Euclia as a female slave. Through a comparison of Euclia’s body to Maximilla’s body, we have seen that the body of the slave is vulnerable to abuse while the body of the free woman is ultimately “untouchable.” Yet, when the “truth” is followed throughout this narrative, it can be seen that truth must be proven differently according to the gender, status, and religious belief of the character. Because Euclia is a female slave who is not a believer, she is not given a chance to speak, but rather the truth is extracted from her by Aegeates, a free male slave owner. While not depicted as believers, the words of the male slaves are believed without torture. Iphidama, on the other hand, is portrayed as faithful, her body almost as “untouchable” as that of Maximilla’s. Concerning Maximilla, even though she deceives her husband within the text, she is portrayed positively. In this way, the protection of her chastity justifies all of her lies and deception.

Acts of Andrew solidifies the view that, in the end, slaves are still objects, even within the texts from early Christianity. As duBois has shown so clearly, “The slave is a sort of uncanny object, standing at a blind spot of modernity where the place of the subject and that of the object intersect. The slave is *a-topic*, eccentric, out of place, unnervingly both ubiquitous and invisible. And as such, the slave can and should destabilize, undo, unnerve the certainties of our knowledges about the ancient world.”⁵⁸ Locating truth in Euclia’s textual body functions to “unnerve” the reader, just as tracking the truth of the narrative reveals that Maximilla, the ascetic Christian protagonist in the story, disrupts the presentation of truth.

This reading of Euclia contributes to current conversations concerning the representations of slaves in early Christian and Jewish texts. Scholars such as Bernadette Brooten, Jennifer Glancy, Callie Callon, and Gail Labovitz are turning to texts outside the canon in order to reevaluate the status of slavery in antiquity and also to observe the intersectional impact these texts have upon readers, especially relating to issues of gender and sexuality. Callon, for

57 duBois, *Torture and Truth*, p. 33.

58 duBois, *Slaves and Other Objects*, p. 30.

instance, turns to *Acts of Peter* in order to recontextualize narratives in light of ideologies of slavery in antiquity, a strategy that sheds new light on the presentations of central figures in the narrative, including Peter.⁵⁹ Callon's reading modifies Peter's character in *Acts of Peter* in a similar way that reading *Acts of Andrew* with a focus on Euclia alters Maximilla's representation in the narrative.

Additionally, these scholars link the construction of slavery in these ancient texts to current views of gender, sexuality, and slavery. For instance, Labovitz focuses on representations of slavery in rabbinic texts as they intersect with the construction of female sexuality. In doing so, she makes connections to discussions of Jewish sexual ethics today, suggesting that "ancient ideas about bodies, honor, chastity, and the like – ideas derived in no small measure from the influence of actual slavery and a legal/literary corpus that presumes a slave society – can continue to impact Jewish communities."⁶⁰ In a similar way, Glancy argues that early Christian sexual ethics, which relied upon the ideology of slavery, profoundly affects sexual ethics in Christianity today.⁶¹ Brooten calls for readers of *Beyond Slavery* to "contribute something to freedom each day, in memory of those who lived in slavery all the days of their lives and in compassion with those who are living in slavery now."⁶² This reading stands alongside the work of these scholars, as Euclia, the female character presented negatively through sexual connotations, is the location of hidden truth in the narrative. Euclia's tortured body represents other tortured female bodies today, bodies that are often ignored or disregarded. Again, duBois' words provide insight into this conversation as she reminds us of the persistence of ancient understandings of slavery: "Our readings of history, especially of the Greek and Roman past, can never exhaust the richness of its legacies, for good and ill. Antiquity changes as the present changes, can never be caught in its entirety, made to surrender up its truths; it is not a dead past, but an ever-changing past that teaches us about the present and the future as much as about the remote past."⁶³

59 Callie Callon, "Secondary Characters Furthering Characterization: The Depiction of Slaves in the Acts of Peter," *JBL* 131(2012), pp.797-818.

60 Gail Labovitz, "More Slave Women, More Lewdness: Freedom and Honor in Rabbinic Constructions of Female Sexuality," *JFSR* 28 (2012), pp. 69-87 (87).

61 Jennifer Glancy, "Early Christianity, Slavery, and Women's Bodies," in Bernadette J. Brooten (ed.), *Beyond Slavery: Overcoming Its Religious and Sexual Legacies* (New York: Palgrave MacMillan, 2010), p. 156.

62 Bernadette Brooten, "Introduction," in eadem (ed.), *Beyond Slavery*, p. 21.

63 Page duBois, *Slavery: Antiquity and Its Legacy* (Ancients and Moderns; London: I.B. Tauris, 2010), p. 143.