3200AD0EF30 A32 I-A\10\9 Le Royaume et l'Eschatologie

[One page on back of p. 2 of A31 (Eglise). All in BLss hand. This may well belong with A31, i.e., may not be a separate item.]

Le Royaume et l'Eschatologie

a No doubt that eschatological stage is the ultimate goal of Xtianity. Question is whether it is the only stage. When Xt speaks of imminence of Kingdom does he mean end of world and of a kingdom whose conditions differ from present?

According to Schürer Loisy etc - messianism as understood by Jews was purely & simply règne final & définitif de Dieu. Messianic age quite different from conditions of this life, preluded by end of world, era of pur bonheur et justice parfaite. Further, Jesus could think only in terms of contemporary notions; ergo.

This theory of contemporary Jewish thought has been peremptorily refuted by Lagrange - Le messianisme chez les Juifs - Paris 1908.

Dist. apocalyptique & rabbinical literature - former stress eschatological idea - neither identify règne messianique and règne final & définitif de Dieu Règne de Dieu = monde à venir; retribution of just & sinners Règne messianique = l'avenir d'Israel en ce monde parmi les conditions de la vie présente

Difference between apocalyptic & rabbinical on religious value of messianism Apocalyptic: no particular relation between Messias & spiritual salvation Rabbinical: quite the contrary

Hence: regne de Dieu eschatological in apocalyptic; in rabbinical it is first messianique then eschatological.

→ Hence: royaume de Dieu not used exclusively of future stage [rabbinical] and messianic Kingdom understood only of this world [rabbinical & apocalyptic]. Did Jesus correct this notion & make règne de Dieu exclusively eschatological? cf. Frey on Messianisme

b Arguments

c Historicity of texts. Eschatologists maintain there is an irreducible contradiction. Hence necessary to separate authentic from added texts. Texts on Parousia are

authentic because they would not be added after being falsified by event e.g. Mt 10.23 16.28 23.36,39 24.34 26.29,64 & parallel passages. A risky procedure such as this division of such authenticated & clear-headed products of history as Gospels (contemporary) is the last step allowable, cannot be attempted if there is any plausible explanation.