

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 NTlichen 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 (Ὀριγενιστοί 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” φησὶν ὁ προφήτης. ἵνα δὲ καὶ τὰ ὑπὸ τοῦ Ἰεζεκιὴλ τοῦ προφήτου ἐν τῷ ἰδίῳ ἀποκρύφῳ ῥηθέντα περὶ ἀναστάσεως μὴ παρασιωπήσω, καὶ αὐτὰ ἐν ταῦθα παραθήσομαι. αἰνιγματωδῶς γὰρ διηγούμενος λέγει περὶ τῆς δικαίας κρίσεως, ἣ κοινῶν ψυχῆ καὶ σῶμα, ὅτι βασιλεὺς τις ἐν τῇ αὐτοῦ βασιλείᾳ πάντας εἶχεν ἐστρατευμένους, παγανὸν δὲ οὐκ εἶχεν ἀλλ’ ἢ μόνον δύο, ἓνα χωλὸν καὶ ἓνα τυφλόν, καὶ ἕκαστος κατ’ ἰδίαν ἐκαθέζετο καὶ κατ’ ἰδίαν ᾤκει. γάμους δὲ ποιήσας ὁ βασιλεὺς τῷ ἰδίῳ νιῷ ἐκάλεσε πάντας τοὺς ἐν τῇ αὐτοῦ βασιλείᾳ, περιεφρόνησε δὲ τῶν δύο παγανῶν, τοῦ τε χωλοῦ καὶ τοῦ τυφλοῦ. οἱ δὲ ἠγανάκτησαν ἐν ἑαυτοῖς καὶ ἐπιβουλήν ἐργάσασθαι τῷ βασιλεῖ ἐπειούουν. παραδείσον δὲ εἶχεν ὁ βασιλεὺς, καὶ ἀπὸ μηκόθεν ὁ τυφλὸς ἐλάλει τῷ χωλῷ λέγων “πόσον ἦν ἡμῶν τὸ κλάσμα τοῦ ἄρτου μετὰ τῶν ὄχλων τῶν βληθέντων (ῥ κληθέντων) εἰς τὴν εὐφρασίαν; δεῦρο τοῖνον, καθὼς ἐποίησεν ἡμῖν, ἀμυνώμεθα αὐτόν”. ὁ δὲ ἕτερος ἠρώτα “ποῖω τρόπῳ;” ὁ δὲ εἶπεν “ἀπέλθωμεν εἰς τὸν παράδεισον αὐτοῦ καὶ ἀφανίσωμεν ἐκεῖ τὰ τοῦ παραδείσου”. ὁ δὲ εἶπεν “καὶ πῶς δύναμαι, χωλὸς ὢν, μὴ δυνάμενος ἐπιβαίνειν;” ὁ δὲ τυφλὸς ἔφη “αὐτὸς ἐγὼ δύναμαι, τι πράττειν μὴ ὄρων ποῦ ἀπέρχομαι; ἀλλὰ τεχνασώμεθα”. (τότε ὁ χωλὸς) τίλας χορτὸν τὸν πλησίον καὶ πλέξας σχοινίον ἠκόνησε τῷ τυφλῷ καὶ εἶπεν “κράτει, καὶ δεῦρο πρὸς τὸ σχοινίον πρὸς με”. ὡς δὲ ἐποίησεν ὁ προετράπη, ὅτε ἔφθασε, λέγει “δεῦρο μοι γενοῦ πόδες καὶ βάστασόν με, καὶ γίνομαί σοι ὀφθαλμοὶ ἄνωθεν ὁδηγῶν σε δεξιὰ καὶ

εὐώνυμα". τοῦτο δὲ ποιήσαντες κατέβησαν εἰς τὸν παράδεισον. εἶτα λοιπὸν, εἴτε ἠδίκησαν εἴτε οὐκ ἠδίκησαν, ὁμῶς τὰ ἴχνη πέφηνεν ἐν τῷ παραδείσῳ. καταλύσαντες δὲ ἐκ τῶν γάμων οἱ εὐφρανθέντες, κατὰβαντες εἰς τὸν παράδεισον ἐξεπλάγησαν τὰ ἴχνη εὐρόντες ἐν τῷ παραδείσῳ, καὶ ταῦτα ἀνήγγειλαν τῷ βασιλεῖ, λέγοντες "ἅπαντες στρατιῶται ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ σου, καὶ οὐδεὶς ἐστὶ παγανός. πόθεν τοίνυν ἴχνη παγανῶν ἐν τῷ παραδείσῳ;" ὁ δὲ ἐθαύμασε· καὶ ὡς μὲν ἢ παραβολὴ—δῆλον ὅτι τοῦ ἀποκρύφου—λέγει, ὡς πρὸς τὸν ἀνθρωπὸν αἰνίττεται, ὁ θεὸς δὲ οὐδὲν ἀγνοεῖ. ἢ δὲ διήγησις λέγει ὡς μετεστείλατο τὸν χωλὸν καὶ τὸν τυφλόν, καὶ ἠρώτησε τὸν τυφλόν "μὴ σὺ κατῆλθες εἰς τὸν παράδεισον;" ὁ δὲ ἔφη "οἴμοι, κύριε· ὄρᾳς ἡμῶν τὴν ἀδυναμίαν· οἶδας ὅτι οὐχ ὄρῳ ποῦ βαδίζω". εἶτα ἔλθων ἐπὶ τὸν χωλόν, καὶ αὐτὸν ἠρώτα "σὺ κατῆλθες εἰς τὸν παράδεισόν μου;" ὁ δὲ ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπεν "ὦ κύριε, πικρᾶναι μου τὴν ψυχὴν ἐν τῷ μέρει τῆς ἀδυναμίας βούλει;" καὶ λοιπὸν ἢ κρίσις ἀργεῖ. τί οὖν ποιεῖ ὁ κριτῆς ὁ δίκαιος; ἀναγνοὺς ποίῳ τρόπῳ ἀμφοτέροι ἐξεύχθησαν, ἐπιτίθησι τὸν χωλὸν τῷ πηρῷ καὶ τοὺς ἀμφοτέρους ἐτάζει μάλιστα, καὶ οὐ δύνανται ἀρνήσασθαι. ἕκάτεροι ἀλλήλους ἐλέγχουσιν, ὁ μὲν χωλὸς λέγων τῷ τυφλῷ "οὐ σὺ με ἐβάστασας καὶ ἀπήνεγκας;" καὶ ὁ τυφλὸς τῷ χωλῷ "οὐκ αὐτὸς ὀφθαλμοί μου γέγονας;" οὕτω τὸ σῶμα τῇ ψυχῇ καὶ ἡ ψυχὴ τῷ σώματι εἰς ἔλεγχον τῆς κοινῆς ἐργασίας συνάπτεται, καὶ ἢ κρίσις τελεία γίνεται παρὰ ἀμφοτέρων, σώματός τε καὶ ψυχῆς, τῶν ἔργων τῶν γεγεννημένων μῆτε (? εἴτε) ἀγαθῶν μῆτε (? εἴτε) φαυλῶν.

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 *τίλας*.

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 κοινῶν σῶμα ψυχῇ ἐν πολιτείαις, ἐν ἀγνείᾳ, ἐν νηστείᾳ καὶ ταῖς ἄλλαις ἀρεταῖς, οὐκ ἄδικος ὁ θεὸς ἀποστερεῖν τὸν κάματον τοῦ κεκμηκότος καὶ μὴ ἀποτίσαι τὴν μισθαποδοσίαν τῷ ἅμα τῇ ψυχῇ κεκμηκότῳ σώματι. εὐθὺς γὰρ εὐρεθήσεται ἀργὴ ἢ κρίσις· εἰ γὰρ ἢ ψυχὴ μονοτάτῃ εὐρεθήσεται, ἀντιλέξειεν κρινομένη ὅτι οὐκ ἀπ' ἐμοῦ τὸ αἴτιον τῆς ἁμαρτίας, ἀλλὰ ἀπ' ἐκείνου τοῦ φθαρτοῦ καὶ γήϊνου σώματος, τὸ πορνεύει, τὸ μοιχεύει, τὸ ἀσελγαίνει. ἐξότε γὰρ ἀπ' ἐμοῦ ἀπέστη, οὐδὲν μοι τούτων πέπρακται· καὶ ἔσται εὐαπολόγητος καὶ παραλύουσα τὴν τοῦ θεοῦ κρίσιν. εἰ δὲ καὶ τὸ σῶμα καθ' ἑαυτὸ ἀγάγοι ὁ θεός· δύναται γάρ, ὡς καὶ ἄνω μοι διὰ τοῦ Ἰεζεκιὴλ δεδήλωται, εἰ καὶ διὰ παραβολῆς τὸ ἔργον γεγένηται, ἀλλὰ τὸ εἶδος εἰς ἀλληγορίαν τῆς τότε παραβολευθείσης ἀληθείας ἐτελειώθη, ὡς συνήχθη ὁστέον πρὸς ὁστέον κτλ. . . . ἀλλ' οὐ δυνήσεται σῶμα ἄνευ ψυχῆς κριθῆναι· ἀντιλέξειε γὰρ καὶ αὐτό, λέγον ὅτι οὐκ ἐγὼ ἤμαρτον, ἀλλὰ ἢ ψυχὴ· μὴ, ἐξότε ἀπεκριθῆ ἀπ' ἐμοῦ, ἐμοίχευσα; μὴ ἐπόρνευσα; μὴ εἰδωλολάτρησα; καὶ ἔσται ἀντιλέγον τὸ σῶμα τῇ τοῦ θεοῦ

δικαιοκρισία, καὶ εὐλόγως ἀντιλέγον· τούτου ἕνεκα τοίνυν . . . ὁ θεὸς . . . τὰ τεθνεῶτα ἡμῶν σώματα καὶ τὰς ψυχὰς εἰς παλιγγενεσίαν φέρει κτλ.

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 à *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 *ἐξότε γὰρ ἀπ' ἐμοῦ ἀπέστη*—*ἐξότε ἀπεκρίθη ἀπ' ἐμοῦ*, 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?¹ 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 ἰδίῳ υἱῷ ἐκάλεσε πάντας κτλ.*—and which recalls Mt. xxii 2, 3: compare also *τί οὖν ποιεῖ ὁ κριτής* with *τί οὖν ποιήσει . . . ὁ κύριος* Lc. xx 15. There are others less striking; *τὸ κλάσμα τοῦ ἄρτου* and *ἡ κρίσις ἀργεῖ* (cf. 2 Pet. ii 3 *οἷς τὸ κρίμα ἔκκαλοι οὐκ ἀργεῖ*). 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 11–13). A couplet familiar to schoolboys may be quoted from that attributed to Plato 'ὁ νεώτερος'.

*Ἄνερα τις λιπόγυιον ὑπὲρ νότιοιο λιπανγῆς
ἦγε, πόδας χρήσας, ὄμματα χρησάμενος.*

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 *ἀπόκρυφον* 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: 'Legimus quidem apud Ezechielem de vacca illa quae peperit et non peperit; sed videte ne vos iam tunc prouidens spiritus sanctus notari hac voce, disceptaturos super uterum Mariae.'

b. Epiph. *Haer.* xxx 30 (ii 127 Dindorf) "ἰδοὺ" φησὶν "ἡ παρθένος ἐν γαστρὶ ἔξει καὶ τέξεται υἱόν". καὶ οὐκ εἶπεν "ἰδοὺ ἡ γυνή". καὶ πάλιν ἐν ἑτέρῳ τόπῳ λέγει "καὶ τέξεται ἡ δάμαλις, καὶ ἐροῦσιν, οὐ τέτοκεν". ἐπειδὴ γὰρ τινες τῶν Μανιχαίων καὶ Μαρκιωνιστῶν λέγουσιν 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" φησὶν ἡ γραφή.

e. Greg. Nyssen. *adv. Iud.* 3 καὶ πάλιν "Ἴδοὺ ἡ δάμαλις τέτοκε καὶ οὐ τέτοκε". This is placed between quotations from Isa. ix and Isa. vii.

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 βοῦς αὐτῶν οὐκ ἀμοτόρησε 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 ᾧ εἶρω σε, ἐν αὐτῷ (τούτῳ) καὶ κρινῶ 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 quacunq̄ue 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 quacunq̄ue die peccator conversus ingemuerit salvus erit', and in *de vera et falsa poenit.* 33 'Quacunq̄ue 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-Athanasian Synopsis) thus: Βαρούχ, Ἀμβακούμ, Ἰεζεκιήλ καὶ Δανιήλ 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 chronographer George Cedrenus (*Migne P. L.* cxxi 225), who tells it immediately after the story of Tobit.

Ἐπὶ τούτου (sc. Ἰεζεκίου) καὶ ἀνθρωπός τις ἐγνωρίζετο ἐν τῷ Ἰσραὴλ πλούσιος καὶ ἀνελεήμων, ὃς ἐλθὼν πρὸς τινὰ τῶν διδασκάλων, καὶ ἀναπτύξας τὴν σοφίαν Σολομῶντος εὗρεν εὐθύς· “Ὁ ἐλεῶν πτωχὸν δανείζει τῷ θεῷ” καὶ εἰς ἑαυτὸν γενόμενος καὶ κατανυγείς ἀπελθὼν πέπρακε πάντα καὶ διένειμε πτωχοῖς (cf. Mt. xix 21, &c.), μηδὲν ἑαυτῷ καταλείψας πλὴν νομισμάτων δύο. καὶ πτωχεύσας πάνυ, καὶ ὑπὸ μηδενὸς ἐκ θείας δοκιμασίας ἐλεούμενος, ὕστερον ἐν ἑαυτῷ λέγει μικροψυχῆσας· “Ἀπελεύσομαι ἐν Ἱερουσαλὴμ καὶ διακρινοῦμαι τῷ θεῷ μου ὅτι ἐπλάνησέ με διασκορπίσαι τὰ ὑπάρχοντά μου.” πορευομένου δὲ αὐτοῦ εἶδεν ἄνδρας δύο μαχομένους πρὸς ἀλλήλους, εὐρόντας λίθον τίμιον, καὶ φησὶ πρὸς αὐτούς· “Ἴνα τί, ἀδελφοί, μάχεσθε; δότε μοι αὐτὸν καὶ λάβετε νομίσματα δύο.” τῶν δὲ μετὰ χαρᾶς τούτων παρασχόντων (οὗ γὰρ ἤδεδαν τοῦ λίθου τὸ ὑπερτίμιον) ἀπῆλθεν εἰς Ἱερουσαλὴμ τὸν λίθον ἐπιφερόμενος. καὶ δεῖξας αὐτὸν χρυσοχῶ, παραχρήμα τὸν λίθον ἐκείνος ἰδὼν ἀναστὰς προσεκύνησε, καὶ ἔκθαμβος γενόμενος ἐπυνθάνετο “Ποῦ τὸν πολυτίμιον”, λέγων, “καὶ θεῖον λίθον τούτον εὔρες; ἰδοὺ γὰρ ἔτη τρία σήμερον Ἱερουσαλὴμ δονεῖται καὶ ἀκαταστατεῖ διὰ τὸν περιβόητον λίθον τούτον. καὶ ἀπελθὼν δὸς αὐτὸν τῷ ἀρχιερεῖ, καὶ σφόδρα πλουτήσεις”. τοῦ δὲ ἀπερχομένου ἄγγελος Κυρίου εἶπε πρὸς τὸν ἀρχιερέα “Νῦν ἐλεύσεται ἄνθρωπος πρὸς σε τὸν ἀπολεσθέντα πολυθρύλητον λίθον ἐκ τῆς διπλοῖδος Ἰαδάρων τοῦ

ἀρχιερέως ἔχων. λαβὼν αὐτὸν δὸς τῷ ἐνέγκαντι αὐτὸν χρυσίον πολὺ καὶ ἀργύριον ἅμα δὲ καὶ ῥαπίσας μετρίως εἰπέ Μη δίσταζε ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ σου, μηδὲ ἀπίστει τῷ διὰ τῆς γραφῆς λέγοντι ‘Ὁ ἐλεῶν πτωχὸν δανεῖζει θεῶ’ . Ἰδοὺ γὰρ ἐν τῷ νῦν αἰῶνι ἐξεπλήρωσά σοι πολλαπλασίονα ὑπὲρ ὧν ἐδάνεισάς μοι; καὶ εἰ πιστεύεις, λήψη καὶ ἐν τῷ μέλλοντι πλοῦτον ἀνυπέβλητον.” καὶ ὁ μὲν ἀρχιερεὺς τὰ διατεταγμένα πάντα πεποιήκε πρὸς τὸν ἄνθρωπον καὶ λελάληκεν ὁ δὲ ἀκούσας καὶ ἔντρομος γενόμενος πάντα ἔασας ἐν τῷ ναῶ ἐξῆλθεν, εὐχαριστῶν καὶ πιστεύων Κυρίῳ καὶ πάντα τὰ ἐν τῇ θείᾳ γραφῇ διηγορευμένα.

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 Kewestōs 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 ἴδιον 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 ὡς τὴν μετάνοιαν” προστιθεὶς καὶ γνώμην ἀγαθὴν “Μετανοήσατε, οἶκος Ἰσραὴλ, ἀπὸ τῆς ἀνομίας ὑμῶν εἶπον τοῖς υἱοῖς τοῦ λαοῦ μου. Ἐὰν ᾧσιν αἱ ἀμαρτίαι ὑμῶν ἀπὸ τῆς γῆς ἕως τοῦ οὐρανοῦ, καὶ ἔαν ᾧσιν πυρρότεραι κόκκου καὶ μελανώτεραι σάκκου, καὶ ἐπιστραφήτε πρὸς με ἐξ ὅλης τῆς καρδίας καὶ εἶπητε, Πάτερ, ἐπακούσομαι ὑμῶν ὡς λαοῦ ἀγίου.”

Clement of Alexandria attributes the last clause Ἐὰν . . . ἐπιστραφήτε 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 (ἁρμονίαν) 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) ἄκουε πάλιν προφήτου λέγοντος : "ἐκλείψει μὲν ὁ ἥλιος, καὶ ὁ οὐρανὸς σκοτισθήσεται, λάμψει δὲ ὁ παντοκράτωρ εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα, καὶ (αἱ) δυνάμεις τῶν οὐρανῶν σαλευθήσονται, καὶ οἱ οὐρανοὶ εἰλιγῆσονται ὡς ἔρρις ἐκτεινόμενοι καὶ συστελλόμενοι" (αὐταὶ γὰρ αἱ προφητικά) "καὶ ἡ γῆ φεύζεται ἀπὸ προσώπου Κυρίου".

Resch would further attribute to the Pseudo-Ezekiel the passage about the δάψυχοι which is quoted in 1 Clem. 23 and 2 Clem. 11, and other prophetic 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-Epiphanian *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.