PREFACE

In the series Studia ad Corpus Hellenisticum Novi Testamenti, four volumes have been published. Each volume has a very different mode of presentation. G. Petzke, in his book *Die Traditionen über Apollonius von Tyana und das Neue Testament* (1970), first gives a survey of the *traditionsgeschichtliche* and *formgeschichtliche* parallels between the writings and traditions on Apollonius, on the one hand, and, on the other hand, the N.T., especially the Gospels. Then he gives a survey of the *religionsgeschichtliche* parallels between life, works and words, of Apollonius and the N.T., especially the life, works and words, of Jesus. The main emphasis lies on the comparison of the historical Apollonius and Jesus, and the traditions about them. A quite different plan is found in G. Mussies' *Dio Chrysostom and the New Testament* (1972). Here we find a *seriatim* presentation of all kinds of parallels from Dio Chrysostom to passages from the N.T. So the book starts with parallels to Matt. I and ends with parallels to Apoc. XXII. Both the (Greek) text of the relevant passages from the N.T. and the text of the parallels from Dio Chrysostom are always fully quoted, though mostly without commentary, just as in the old Wettstein. Again, a wholly different plan is found in the third and fourth volumes by a team of American scholars, directed by H.-D. Betz, *Plutarch's Theological Writings and Early Christian Literature* (1975) and *Plutarch's Ethical Writings and Early Christian Literature* (1978). Here the text of Plutarch is taken as a starting-point. That is to say, from every treatise those passages are pointed out (in the order of Plutarch's text) to which parallels from the N.T. and other early Christian literature (from the second century) can be found. Neither the passages from Plutarch nor those from the Christian authors are quoted fully, but the parallels are provided with succinct comments.

Each one of these three methods has its own advantages and disadvantages. Petzke’s method results in the most readable book; it is a continuous text about Apollonius’ life and works, with constant reference to comparable phenomena in the N.T. The reader is not irritated by an excess of untranslated Greek. This approach however, makes it impossible to adopt materials from the traditions...
about Apollonius that are not important from the point of view of Traditions-, Form- and Religionsgeschichte. E.g. stylistic and grammatical parallels fall outside the scope of this book. Mussies' book is the most conveniently arranged: without effort the reader can find the required materials, and neither an edition of the N.T. nor one of Dio Chrysostom is needed in order either to read or, rather, to use this book. Everything can be found in the book itself, according to the method of Wettstein and other authors of Observationes. But its use will probably be restricted because of the great amount of Greek (the book consists for 90% in Greek quotations). The approach of Betz has the advantage that the reader is enabled to study the parallels in the framework of the treatises from which they come, so that they do not appear out of context. This method, too, ensures that parallels of all kinds can be indicated (as is the case with Mussies). But in order to consult the book, the reader must have both a text of Plutarch and of the N.T. as well as other early Christian writers to hand; otherwise it cannot be followed. Moreover, the accumulation of abbreviations and references makes hard reading. And this is more a collection of parallels from early Christian literature to Plutarch than from Plutarch to the Christian authors.

In view of the advantages and disadvantages of each of these three approaches, it was difficult in this case to find a method of presenting the materials. With some hesitation, a method has been chosen which closely resembles the one used by Mussies. The reasons for this are as follows. The materials worked through, i.e. 57 orations, do not offer the possibility of following the descriptive approach of Petzke. Moreover, if this method could have been used in this case, many of the parallels which have been incorporated in the text could not have been adopted. The method of Betz has not been followed because it cannot reasonably be expected that every N.T. scholar has an edition of the complete works of Aristides in his own library. For the sake of surveyability I have chosen the traditional seriatim presentation, in which the passages from Aristides are always quoted in full. But, unlike Mussies, the Greek text of the N.T. is quoted only if it was necessary to make clear to which part or which motif of the verse concerned the passage from Aristides is a parallel. This has the additional advantage that the book contains less Greek and becomes less voluminous.
I fully realize that the result of this method of listing parallels can be a serious misuse of the materials presented. Attention is only drawn to points where there seems to be a certain agreement or similarity, whereas it may rather be the absence of parallels that is very significant. The reader should continually keep this in mind and protect himself against over-estimating the parallel materials. The evaluation of these materials should be left open until more work in this field has been done and one can better identify those passages and concepts in the N.T. for which no parallels are to be found. Bearing in mind that only a small area has yet been studied in this way, it will not be surprising to find that in the long run a number of the parallels adduced by me turn out to be no parallels at all or to have little bearing upon problems of N.T. interpretation.
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[The fifth volume in this series, W. C. Grese's Corpus Hermeticum XIII and Early Christian Literature, Leiden 1979, was published too late to be included in the discussion in this Preface.]