THE APOCRYPHAL EZEKIEL.

I

ENOUGH remains of this book to excite a very lively curiosity as to what the complete document can have been: yet, so far, little time has been spent on it by any scholar. Resch in the 1906 edition of his Agrapha pp. 305, 322 sqq., 381 has accorded to it the fullest treatment it has hitherto met with. Having just encountered an interesting parallel to the most important fragment of it in the recent book of Fiebig on the Parables (Die Gleichnisreden Jesu im Lichte der Rabbinischen Gleichnisse des NTlachen Zeitalters), I am tempted to lay a few notes on this lost apocryphon before the readers of this JOURNAL.

The important fragment to which I have alluded is to be found in Epiphanius Haer. lxiv (Ωριγενιαν Β’ 70, ii p. 683 Dindorf). In discussing the resurrection of the body he says:

"Ἀναστήσονται γὰρ οἱ νεκροὶ καὶ ἐγερθήσονται οἱ ἐν τοῖς μνημείοις" φησίν ὁ προφήτης. ἦν δὲ καὶ τὰ ὑπὸ τοῦ Ἰεσοῦ τῆς προφήτου ἐν τῷ ἱδίῳ ἀποκρύφῳ ἐπήρετα περὶ ἀναστάσεως μὴ παρασημότησα, καὶ αὐτὰ ἐνταῦθα παραβάλλει. αὐτοὶ γιαμπαοδός γὰρ δυγογούμενοι λέξει περὶ τῆς δικαιας κράτεως, ἦς κοινωεὶ ψυχή καὶ σῶμα, ὅτι βασιλεύς τις ἐν τῇ αὐτὸς βασιλείᾳ πάντας εἶχεν ἑστρατευμένοις, παγιάνω δὲ οὐκ εἶχεν ἀλλὰ ἡ μόνον δύο, ἕνα χωλόν καὶ ἕνα τυφλόν, καὶ ἐκαστὸς κατ᾿ ἱδίαν ἐκαθέζετο καὶ κατ᾿ ἱδίαν ὠκεῖ. γάμους δὲ ποιήσας ὁ βασιλεὺς τῷ ἱδίῳ νῦν ἐκάλεσε πάντας τοὺς ἐν τῇ αὐτὸς βασιλείᾳ, περιεφόρησε δὲ τῶν δύο παγιάνω, τοῦ τε χωλοῦ καὶ τοῦ τυφλοῦ. οἱ δὲ γεγανάκτησαν ἐν ἑαυτοῖς καὶ ἐπιβουλὴν ἐργάσασθαι τῷ βασιλείᾳ ἐπενόντως. παράδεισον δὲ εἶχεν ὁ βασιλεὺς, καὶ ἀπὸ μηκόθεν ὁ τυφλὸς ἑλάλει τῷ χωλῷ λέγων "πόσον ἦν ἡμῶν τὸ κλάσμα τοῦ ἄρτου μετὰ τῶν ἤχλων τῶν βληθέντων (ὁ κληθέντων) εἰς τὴν εὐφρασίαν; δεῦρο τοῖς, καθὼς ἐποίησεν ἡμῖν, ἀμυνόμεθα αὐτὸν". ὁ δὲ ἔτερος ἤρωτα "ποιώ τρόπῳ," ὁ δὲ εἶπεν "ἀπέκλεψαν εἰς τὸν παράδεισον αὐτοῦ καὶ ἀφαινότατα ἐκεῖ τὸ τοῦ παραδείσου". ὁ δὲ εἶπεν "καὶ πῶς δύναμαι, χωλὸς ἢν, μὴ δυνάμενος ἐπιβαίνειν"; ὁ δὲ τυφλὸς ἔφη "αὐτὸς ἐγὼ δύναμαι τι πράττειν μὴ ὄρον τοῦ ἀπέρχομαι; ἅλα τεχνασώμεθα". (τότε ὁ χωλός) τιλας χορτὸν τῶν πλησίον καὶ πλέξας σχοινίον ἡκόντως τῷ τυφλῷ καὶ εἶπεν "κράτει, καὶ δεῦρο πρὸς τὸ σχοινίον πρὸς με". ὃς δὲ ἐποίησεν ὁ προετράπη, ὅτε ἐφθασε, λέγει "δεῦρο μοι γενοῦ πόδες καὶ βάστασόν με, καὶ γίνομαι σοι ὁ φθαλμὸς ἀνωθεν ὀδηγῶν σε δεξιά καὶ
There is at least one obvious blemish in the text, which I have tried to remedy. It is plain that it was the lame man (the soul) who contrived the plan of weaving a rope and throwing it to the blind man. Some words have dropped out before ΤΠΑΑΑΛ."}

I see nothing, in the pages which immediately follow, to indicate that Epiphanius is still using the apocryphal Ezekiel; but on p. 687 he comes near it again.

Εἰ δ᾿ ἄρα κοινωνεῖ σῶμα ψυχῆς ἐν πολιτείαις, ἐν ἀγνείᾳ, ἐν νηστείᾳ καὶ ταῖς ἄλλαις ἀρεταῖς, οὐκ ἄδικος ὁ θεὸς ἀποστερεῖ τὸν κάματον τοῦ κεκηκότος καὶ μὴ ἀποτίσαι τὴν μοχθανοδοσίαν τῷ ἁμίᾳ τῇ ψυχῇ κεκηκότι σώματι. εἰδίκεις γὰρ εὑρεθήσεται ἄργη ἡ κρίσις· εἰ γὰρ ἡ ψυχὴ μονωτάτη εὑρεθήσεται, ἀντιλεξεὶς κρυμομένη ὅτι οὐκ ἂν ἐμοῖ ἄνω τῆς ἄμαρτίας, ἀλλὰ ἂν ἓκεινον τοῦ φθαρτοῦ καὶ γηνίν σώματος, τὸ πορνείον, τὸ μοιχείον, τὸ ἀσελγείον. ξέστε γὰρ ἂν ἐμοὶ ἀπέστη, οὐδὲν μοι τούτων πέτρακαί ἔσται ἔκτοπος καὶ παραλύσατα τὴν τοῦ θεοῦ κρίσιν. εἰ δὲ καὶ τὸ σῶμα καθ’ ἐαυτὸ ἀνάγουν ὁ θεὸς δύναται γὰρ, ὡς καὶ ἄνω μοι διὰ τοῦ Ἱεροσολύμων ἤδηθησα, εἰ καὶ διὰ παραβάλης τὸ ἐργον γεγένηται, ἀλλὰ τὸ εἴδος ἐς ἀλληγορίαν τῆς τότε παραβολευθείσης ἀληθείας ἐτελείωθη, ὡς συνήθη ὑπόν τοῖς ὕπόν τελ. ἀλλ’ οὐ δυνάται σῶμα ἄνων ψυχῆς κρίθηση. ἀντιλεξεὶς γὰρ καὶ αὐτί, λέγων ὅτι οὐκ ἐγὼ ἡμαρτων, ἀλλὰ ἡ ψυχή μή, ξέστε ἀπεκρίθη ἂν ἐμοι, ἐμοίχευσα; μὴ ἐπόρυσα; μὴ εἰδωλολάτρησα; καὶ ἐσται ἀντιλέγον τὸ σῶμα τῆς τοῦ θεοῦ.
It may be just worth while to remark that in this passage the reference to Ezekiel is a reference to the vision of the dry bones in the canonical book, and not to the apocryphal one; I quote the passage because it is at least an amplification of the moral of the apocryphal parable, and probably contains some fragments of the interpretation of it.

The Rabbinic parallel, which is to be found in Fiebig's book (p. 73), is ascribed to Rabbi Ishmael (cir. 130 A.D.), and is quoted a propos of Lev. iv 2 'If a soul shall sin through ignorance', &c.

'The matter is like a king who had a garden, and had therein choice early fruits. And the king set guardians in it, one lame and the other blind, and said to them "Be careful of these choice fruits." After some days the lame man said to the blind "I see beautiful fruits in the garden". Said the blind, "Come on, let us eat them". The lame man answered, "Can I walk?" and the blind replied, "Can I see?" Then the lame man mounted on the blind man's back, and they went and ate the early fruits and returned and sat each in his place.

'After certain days the king went into that garden, and said to them, "Where are they, the choice early fruits?" The blind man answered him, "My lord king, am I able to see anything?" and the lame, "My lord king, am I able to walk?" Now what did that king, who was a clever man, do? He made the lame man ride on the blind, and they began to walk. Then said he to them, "This is the way you have contrived it, and have eaten the early fruits".

'So also in the next world the Holy One, blessed be He, saith to the soul, "Why hast thou sinned before Me?" The soul saith, "Lord of the world, I have not sinned; it is the body that hath sinned. Since I came out from it, I have been like a pure bird that flies in the air. How have I sinned before Thee?" He saith to the body, "Why hast thou sinned before Me?" It saith, "Lord of the world, I have not sinned; it is the soul that hath sinned. Since it went forth from me I have been cast down like a stone that is thrown on the ground. Have I sinned before Thee?" What doth the Holy One, blessed be He? He brings the soul and puts it into the body, and judges both of them together, as it is said (Ps. 14) "He calleth to the Heaven above (to bring the soul), and to the earth beneath (to give up the body) that He may judge them."

Two other versions of the Parable are given by Fiebig, both said to have been related by R. Jehuda (cir. 200 A.D.) in answer to a question of Antoninos. The differences which they (or rather one of them—the other is incomplete) present are not important for our purpose.
The Rabbinic form of the parable will be allowed to be somewhat unsatisfactory: we cannot regard it as probable that the king would have picked out a lame and a blind man as caretakers. It is not, I think, unreasonable to suppose that we have here a form of the story in which everything but the main point has been discarded. The Ezekiel-form is—if not necessarily more original—far more plausible. It supplies a good reason for the action of the two culprits; and the episode of their judgement and confession runs on all fours with the interpretation. It is important to notice how the Rabbinic comment and that of Epiphanius coincide in the phrase €τορ€ yap ακ' εμων ἀπέστη—€ζότε ἀπεκρίθη ἀπ' εμω, and 'since I came out from it'—'since it went forth from me'. It seems very much as if Epiphanius were here quoting the exposition of the parable as given in the apocryphal book.

Is it possible to determine whether the fragment is Jewish or Christian?  We do not know to what extent Epiphanius is preserving the language of the book; but there is one phrase which seems likely to be original—γάμους ποιήσας ὁ βασιλεὺς τῷ ἑδών υἱῷ ἐκάλεσε πάντας κτλ.—and which recalls Mt. xxii 2, 3: compare also τι οὖν ποιεῖ ὁ κρίτης with τι οὖν ποιήσα . . . . ὁ κύριος Ἰ. c. xx i5. There are others less striking; τὸ κλάσμα τοῦ ἄρτου and ἦ κρίσις ἄργει (cf. 2 Pet. ii 3 οῖς τὸ κρίμα ἐκπαλαί οὖκ ἄργει). But we shall gather more from the other relics of the book.

The salient image, of the lame man mounted on the blind, will be recollected as the theme of epigrams in the Palatine Anthology ix ii–i3). A couplet familiar to schoolboys may be quoted from that attributed to Plato 'ὁ νεώτερος'.

Ἀνέρα τις λεπόγων ὑπὲρ νώτου λεπανγής
γὰς, τόδας χρήσας, δηματα χρησάμηνος.

There is nothing in the other epigrams to warrant our bringing them into connexion with the parable.

As to the form of the Ezekiel-book we learn from the introductory words of Epiphanius that it was an ἀπόκριψιν under the name of Ezekiel, and that the prophet was represented as telling the story to illustrate God's method of judging the body and soul. The phrase τὰ ὑπὸ τοῦ Ἰεζεκιήλ . . . ῥηθέντα περὶ ἀναστάσεως seems to me to shew that the parable had definite reference to the Final Judgement and resurrection of the body: the last a theme of which Ezekiel seemed an appropriate expositor in virtue of the vision of the dry bones.

II

The other fragments of the book are very meagre. The most significant is one which is quoted by several early writers:—

1 Resch (p. 331) says—I cannot imagine why—that the Parable must be considered as a late addition to the apocryphal Ezekiel.
a. Tertullian *de carne Christi* 23 is the only one who gives the source of the words: 'Legimis quidem apud Ezechielem de vacca illa quae peperit et non peperit; sed videte ne vos iam tunc prouidens spiritus sanctus notarit hac voce, disceptaturos super uterum Mariae.'

b. Epiph. *Haer.* xxx 30 (i 127 Dindorf) "iovi" φησιν "ἡ παρθένος ἐν γαστρὶ ἐξει καὶ τέξεται υἱὸν", καὶ οὗκ εἶπεν "iovi ἡ γυνή". καὶ πάλιν ἐν ἐτέρῳ τῶπῳ λέγει "καὶ τέξεται ἡ δάμαλις, καὶ ἐροῦσιν, οὐ τέτοκεν". ἐπειδὴ γὰρ τινὲς τῶν Μανιγαίων καὶ Μαρκιωνιστῶν λέγοντων αὐτὸν μὴ τετέχθαι, διὰ τοῦτο "τέξεται, καὶ ἐροῦσιν, οὐ τέτοκεν". The name of the prophet is not given for either quotation.

c. Actus Petri cum Simone 24. Here several prophecies are quoted, including one from the Ascension of Isaiah. Among them is this: et iterum dicit 'Peperit et non peperit'.

d. Clem. Alex. *Strom.* vii 16 (p. 66 Stähelin) "τέτοκεν καὶ οὐ τέτοκεν" φησιν ἡ γραφή.


Were it not for the express mention of Ezekiel by Tertullian, which we have no reason to discredit, one would be inclined to guess from the collocation of the passage in *b, c, e* that it was one fathered upon Isaiah.

An allusion to Job xxi 10 ἡ βοῶς αὐτῶν ὅσοι ὡμοτόχοις κτλ., has been supposed to underlie the words, but with little probability.

Tertullian writes as if he were alluding to a narrative, and the perfect tense τέτοκε, peperit, in three of the other citations fits with this. The future, τέξεται, of Epiphanius, if not wholly irreconcilable, constitutes a difficulty, which, however, might very probably disappear if we had the whole passage. There can be little doubt here, at any rate, that the source was Christian or Christianized, and that an allusion to the Virgin-birth was intended by the writer of the words.

The 'Logion' ἐν δὲ εἰρω σε, ἐν αὐτῷ (τοῦτο) καὶ κρυφῶ σε is attributed to Ezekiel by the *Vita S. Antonii*, and to a prophet by Elias Cretensis. It has been fully dealt with in Resch's *Agrapha*, and, even supposing it to have occurred in the apocryphal Ezekiel, I cannot deduce anything from it as to the character or form of the book.

Another saying 'In quacunque hora ingemuerit peccator, salvus erit' is said by Fabricius (Cod. Pseud. V. T. i 1119) to be quoted from Ezekiel by Lucifer of Cagliari 'and others'; and he gives a reference to a work of Richard Simon which I have been unable to trace. I do not find the words in Lucifer, but only a similar sentiment from Isa. xxx 15 'Cum conversus ingemueris, tunc salvus eris et scies ubi fueris' (p. 63 Vienna ed.). Something nearer is in Ps.-Aug. *de conflictu vit. et virt.* 15 'In quacunque die peccator conversus ingemuerit salus erit', and in *de vera et falsa poenit.* 33 'Quacunque hora peccator ingemuerit et
conversus fuerit vita vivet’. It is also used by such late writers as Petrus Comestor, Rob. Pullus, and Walter Map. It may be regarded as a loose quotation of Ezek. xxxiii 11, perhaps conflated with the old Latin of Isa. xxx 15.

The supposed allusion to the existence of a second book of Ezekiel by Josephus Ant. x 6 may probably be dismissed. The apocryphal Ezekiel is, however, certainly mentioned in the stichometry of Nicephorus (in the Pseudo-Athanasiyan Synopsis) thus: Ἄρμβακούμ, Ἰεζεκήλ καὶ Δανίηλ ψευδεπίγραφα without note of length. The group forms the last item in the list of O. T. apocrypha.

There are, then, only two fragments which throw any real light upon the apocryphal Ezekiel. The fragment in Epiphanius suggests that the prophet who dealt so largely in parables was selected as the ostensible author of a further series of them, and that one of these, also current in Jewish circles, dealt with the Final Judgement. The words of Tertullian may allude to another parable of distinctly Christian character.

A third parabolic narrative has survived without any note of provenance, which may possibly, I think, have found a place in this same book. It is preserved by the Byzantine chronicographer George Cedrenus (Migne P. L. cxxi 225), who tells it immediately after the story of Tobit.

Ἐπὶ τοῦτον (sc. Ἰεζεκίου) καὶ ἀνθρωπὸς τὸς ἐγνωρίζετο ἐν τῷ Ἰσραήλ πλούσιος καὶ ἀνελήμνων, ὁ ἐλθὼν πρὸς τινὰ τῶν διδασκάλων, καὶ ἀναπτύξας τὴν σοφίαν Σολομώντος εἶφην εὐθὺς: "Ὁ ἐλεών πτωχὸν δανείζει τῷ θεῷ καὶ εἰς ἐαυτὸν γενόμενος καὶ κατανυγεῖς ἀπελθὼν πέτρακε πάντα καὶ διέμει στοχοὺς (cf. Mt. xix 21, &c.), μηδὲν ἐαυτῷ καταλείψασθαι πλὴν νομισμάτων δύο. καὶ πτωχεύσας πάνω, καὶ ὅπως μοθενὸς ἐκ θεᾶς δοκιμασία ἔλεομένως, ὤστεν εἰς ἐαυτῷ λέγει μικροφυσίστας: "Ἀπελεύσομαι εἰς Ἰερουσαλήμ καὶ διακρινοῦμαι τῷ θεῷ μου ὅτι ἐπλάνητε με διασκορπίσαι τὰ ὅπαρχοντα μου." πορευομένου δὲ αὐτοῦ εἰδὲν ἄνδρας δύο μαχομένους πρὸς ἄλληλους, εὑρότας λίθον τίμιον, καὶ φησὶ πρὸς αὐτούς: "Ἰνα τί, ἄδελφοι, μάχεσθε; δότε μοι αὐτὸν καὶ λάβετε νομίσματα δύο." τῶν δὲ μετὰ χαρᾶς τοῦτον παρασχύτων (οὐ γὰρ ἦδεν τοῦ λίθου τὸ ὑπερτίμιον) ἀπήλθεν εἰς Ἰερουσαλήμ τὸν λίθον ἐπιφερόμενος. καὶ δείξας αὐτὸν χρυσοχόῳ, παραχρήμα τὸν λίθον ἐκείνος ἰδὼν ἀναστάς προσκύνησεν, καὶ ἐκθαμβώς γενόμενος ἐπινοθάνετο "Ποῦ τὸν πολυ­­­tιμίον," λέγων, "καὶ θεόν λίθον τούτον εὑρής; ἵδιον γὰρ τρία σήμερον Ἰερουσαλήμ δονεῖται καὶ ἀκαταστατεὶ διὰ τὸν περιβότον λίθον τούτον. καὶ ἀπελθὼν δὸς αὐτὸν τῷ ἄρχωρει, καὶ σφόδρα πλουτήσετε". τοῦ δὲ ἀπερχο­­­­μένου ἄγγελος Κυρίων ἐπέ πρὸς τὸν ἄρχωρεα "Νῦν ἐλευθεράται ἀνθρώπος πρὸς σὲ τὸν ἀπολεσθέντα πολυβρύλητον λίθον ἐκ τῆς διπλόδοσ Ἀαρών τοῦ

VOL. XV. R
I have only met this story elsewhere in the Ethiopic History of Peter (Budge Contendings of the Apostles ii 8–18), where it is told at great length of Kewestos the father of Clement of Rome.

It is of course a matter of pure conjecture that the apocryphal Ezekiel may have been the source of this tale. I am led to make the suggestion because (a) it seems clear that we have here a bit of an apocryphon of some kind which was current in Greek, and of which Cedrenus had access at least to an excerpt; (b) because Cedrenus places it in connexion with the story of Tobit, and thereby indicates that it came to him with some sort of ‘Biblical’ sanction; (c) because I cannot recall, in the whole body of apocryphal literature any book save that of Ezekiel in which such a story could find a place; and, to my thinking, it resembles in character the extract which Epiphanius has preserved for us out of that very book. However, whether the suggestion commends itself to others or not, I think it worth while to call attention to the story, in hopes that further parallels to it may be forthcoming, and especially Rabbinic parallels.

It has been suggested that the apocryphal Ezekiel had no proper separate existence, and that it consisted of Christian additions to the canonical book resembling the Jewish additions to Esther and Daniel. The Epiphanian passage with its definite mention of the διόν ἀπόκρυφον of Ezekiel contravenes this idea: but there may have been such Christian additions to the canonical text as well. Two passages are in my mind, both of which resemble Ezekiel in language, but are not in our texts:

a. Clem. Rom. ad Cor. viii "Ζῶ γὰρ ἐγώ, λέγει Κύριος, οὐ βούλομαι τὸν θάνατον τοῦ ἀμαρτωλοῦ ὃς τὴν μετάνοιαν προστεθεῖς καὶ γνώμην ἀγαθὴν "Μετανοήσατε, οἶκος Ἰσραήλ, ἀπὸ τῆς ἀνομίας ὑμῶν ἐπί τῶν νυστῶν τοῦ λαοῦ μου. Ἐὰν δὲν αἱ ἀμαρτίαι ὑμῶν ἀπὸ τῆς γῆς ἑως τοῦ οὐρανοῦ, καὶ ἐὰν δὲν πυρρότερα κόκκοι καὶ μελανώτεραι σάκκους, καὶ ἑως τοῦ ἱλίου πρὸς μὲ ἐξ ὅλης τῆς καρδίας καὶ ἐπίτητε, Πάτερ, ἑπακούσωμαι ὑμῶν ὑπὲρ ἑαυτοῦ."
Clement of Alexandria attributes the last clause 'Εαυ... ἡπιστραφήτε κτλ. to Ezekiel in Paedag. i 10, and has a somewhat expanded form of the first part of the passage, without name of author, in Q. D. S. 39.

b. Tertullian de Resurr. Carn. 32 'Sed ne solummodo eorum corporum resurrectio videatur quae sepulcris demandantur, habes scriptum: Et mandabo piscibus maris et eructabunt ossa quae sunt comesta, et faciam compaginem (ἀμονίαν) ad compaginem et os ad os'.

To these passages, both of which might well be amplifications of Ezekiel (though it is not difficult to suggest other possible sources for the second), may perhaps be added:

c. Clem. Alex. Protr. viii (p. 62 Stähelin) ἀκονε πάλιν προφήτου λέγοντος: "ἐκλέψει μὲν ὃ ἡλίους, καὶ ὁ οὐρανὸς σκοτισθήσεται, λάμψει δὲ ὁ παντοκράτωρ εἰς τὸν αἴωνα, καὶ (αἰ) δυνάμει τῶν οὐρανῶν σαλευθήσονται, καὶ οἱ οὐρανοί εἰλιγήσονται ὡς δέορρες ἐκτενώμενοι καὶ αὐστηλλόμενοι" (αιται γάρ αἱ προφητικαὶ) "καὶ ἡ γῆ φεύγεται ἀπὸ προσώπων Κυρίου".

Resch would further attribute to the Pseudo-Ezekiel the passage about the δάφνιοι which is quoted in 1 Clem. 23 and 2 Clem. 11, and other prophetical quotations in 1 Clem. (29. 3, 50. 4) and Baruch (16. 6).

I am not prepared to suggest that the legends concerning Ezekiel in the Pseudo-Epiphanean Vitae Prophetarum are derived from the lost book: I agree with Fabricius that they were probably drawn 'e Iudaeorum traditione'. But it is possible that a martyrdom of Ezekiel may have been narrated in it. The Vita simply says that the prophet was slain by a wicked ruler; but there is a Christian tradition, occurring in the Syriac Acts of Philip and the Apocalypse of Paul, that he was dragged by his feet upon the mountains until his brains were dashed out. Is it not quite likely that, as in the case of Isaiah (in the Ascension of Isaiah) and Jeremiah (in the Rest of the Words of Baruch), the utterance of a prophecy (a Christian prophecy, I imagine) provoked the unbelieving people to this act of violence?

I hope that these notes and guesses may at least have the effect of directing attention to the Epiphanian parable, which, I am sure, will be recognized as a very notable fragment of early Christian (?) literature.

M. R. James.