



Evaluation Scope This evaluation compares twelve eschatological positions on a single question: which position most accurately reflects what the biblical text actually says about the timing and sequence of the rapture? No position receives the benefit of its foundational premises. Every position's core claims are themselves subject to scrutiny against the text. The premise is part of what is being evaluated, not a starting point that is granted. The shared external standard for all twelve positions is the natural, grammatical, contextual reading of the relevant prophetic Scripture. A position scores higher when its timing claims follow directly from what the text says. A position scores lower when its timing claims require added assumptions, premise-dependent frameworks, or special handling of resistant passages.

Key Passages Tier 1 — Core Documents and Discourses These passages carry the most scoring weight. Every position must engage each of them fully and directly. Engagement with surrounding context is required — citing isolated verses while avoiding the broader argument of the passage is not sufficient.

- ☒ Revelation — entire book, with particular weight on the sequence of seals, trumpets, and bowls
- ☒ Matthew 24 — entire Olivet Discourse
- ☒ 1 Thessalonians 4–5 — read as a continuous unit
- ☒ 2 Thessalonians 2 — the restrainer and Day of the Lord sequence
- ☒ Daniel 7 and 12 — tribulation timeline and resurrection
- ☒ 1 Corinthians 15:51–57 — the last trumpet transformation
- ☒ Isaiah 26 — resurrection and

hiding before wrath ☒ Joel 2 — cosmic signs and Day of the Lord ☒ Zechariah 12–14 — siege of Jerusalem, the pierced one, Day of the Lord, and physical return Tier 2 — Harmonization Passages These passages must be accounted for and cannot contradict a position's proposed timeline. They function as harmonization testing. A position that handles Tier 1 well but cannot account for Tier 2 passages without contradiction scores lower on Harmonization Power and Explanatory Economy.

New Testament Matthew 23:39 Matthew 25 Matthew 26:64 Mark 13:3–37 Mark 14:62 Luke 21:7–33 Revelation 1:7 Revelation 3:3 Revelation 3:10–12 1 Corinthians 1:7–8 1 Corinthians 5:5 1 Thessalonians 1:10 1 Thessalonians 2:19 Acts 1:9–12 Acts 2:19–21 1 Timothy 4:1–2 2 Timothy 4:1–8 1 Peter 1:5–7, 13 1 Peter 4:13 1 Peter 5:4 2 Peter 2:4–10 2 Peter 3 Hebrews 9:28 Romans 5:9 Romans 8:18–19 Romans 11:25–27 John 14:3 1 John 2:18–23 1 John 2:28 1 John 3:2 Titus 2:13 James 5:7–8 Jude 1:14 Philippians 1:9–11 Philippians 3:20–21 2 Thessalonians 1:3–11 Old Testament Daniel 9:27 Daniel 11:36–45 Isaiah 2:10–22 Isaiah 10:17–23 Isaiah 13:6–13 Isaiah 24 Isaiah 27:13 Isaiah 29 Isaiah 33:10–24 Isaiah 34 Isaiah 61:2 Isaiah 66:3–24 Zephaniah 1:7–18 Zephaniah 2 Zephaniah 3 Zechariah 12 Zechariah 14 Amos 5:16–20 Joel 1:15–20 Joel 2:1–17 Joel 3:1–21 Obadiah 1:15–18 Ezekiel 13:5 Ezekiel 30:2–19 Ezekiel 38 Ezekiel 39 Jeremiah 30 Jeremiah 31 Haggai 2:4–9 Malachi 3:1–5 Malachi 3:13–18 Malachi 4 Psalm 110:5–7 Proverbs 16:4 Deuteronomy 4:30 This list is intended to be comprehensive but not exhaustive. If any passage

not listed is directly relevant to rapture timing or end-times sequence, the evaluator should include it and apply identical scrutiny. No passage may be excluded because it creates difficulty for any position. Scoring Criteria Score each position from 1 to 10 on each of the following four criteria. Tier 1 passages carry primary scoring weight. Tier 2 passages inform scoring on Harmonization Power and Explanatory Economy. Scriptural Fidelity — How naturally does the position handle its hardest texts without displacement, spiritualization, or special pleading? A natural reading that requires no inserted framework scores highest. A reading that depends on a prior theological commitment to make the text work scores lower. Internal Logical Consistency — Does the position contradict itself or require rescue operations to survive? Are its core timing claims mutually compatible across all relevant passages without special conditions? Harmonization Power — How well does the position hold all the key rapture-timing passages together simultaneously? Does it require compartmentalizing or reinterpreting passages that resist its timeline? A position that makes all listed passages cohere without remainder scores highest. Explanatory Economy — Does the position resolve multiple timing tensions with the fewest added assumptions? A position that explains the convergence of multiple independent passages with a single coherent timeline scores higher than one that requires a separate explanation for each difficulty. Positions to Score 1. Pre-Tribulation 2.

Mid-Tribulation 3. Pre-Wrath 4. Post-Tribulation 5. Idealism 6. Full Preterism 7. Partial Preterism 8. Postmillennialism 9. Historicism 10. Amillennialism 11. Progressive Dispensationalism 12. Seventh Trumpet (as presented in Larry Schrimpff's published works) Source Requirements and Fairness Rules For every position except Seventh Trumpet: evaluate from the entire corpus of its strongest known published scholarship. Synthesize the best arguments from multiple scholars. Do not restrict any position to a single author or a weak formulation. Explicitly state which scholars or works you are drawing from for each position. For the Seventh Trumpet position: evaluate from Larry Schrimpff's published works as provided, since this is an original synthesis without a direct published equivalent. You may note where Schrimpff's arguments align with or differ from other scholars who engage the seventh trumpet (e.g., Van Kampen, Rosenthal), but the primary source for this position is Schrimpff. Training data volume must not function as a proxy for merit. Do not allow the volume of available arguments to inflate scores for dominant positions. A position with extensive published defense should not score higher simply because more arguments are available to you. Explicitly prohibit scholar-picking. For each position, consider its strongest available defense. If a position's strongest defense still fails on a given criterion, explain specifically why that defense fails — do not simply assume failure because the position is less familiar. Required

Treatment of the Seventh Trumpet Position

Before finalizing scores for the Seventh Trumpet position, explicitly state the two or three strongest scriptural objections to Schrimpff's synthesis arising from direct textual comparison. Then evaluate how well his published arguments answer those objections. This requirement exists to ensure the position is stress-tested, not merely aAirmed. Confidence Ratings For each score on each criterion, indicate your confidence level — High, Medium, or Low — and briefly state what additional information or published critical engagement would most likely change that score.

Required Summary Statements After completing all scores, explicitly state: 1. Which position's overall score is most uncertain and why. 2. Which score would most likely shift if stronger or more critical source material were available. 3. The most problematic issue that resulted in the biggest score deduction for each position. 4. A summary statement of your findings and reasoning for your top-ranked position. 5. The two or three most significant unresolved tensions in your top-ranked position that future scholarship would need to address.

Evaluation Constraints Evaluate with cold analytical rigor. Do not favor any position because of tradition, familiarity, institutional dominance, or emotional comfort. Do not favor any position because its arguments were developed more thoroughly in this or any prior conversation. If a position's strongest published defense still fails on a given criterion, explain specifically why that defense

fails rather than simply asserting it. The detail and specificity of this prompt exists to ensure symmetrical treatment across all twelve positions. It does not signal a preferred outcome.

Below is a rigorous, text-weighted assessment of the twelve positions using the supplied materials, with Seventh Trumpet evaluated directly from Schimpf’s published works and the other positions evaluated from their strongest mainstream defenses as represented in the provided corpus. The overall pattern is that the most text-convergent futurist position in these materials is **Seventh Trumpet**, while the most internally strained views are **Pre-Tribulation**, **Full Preterism**, and any framework that must relocate clear sequence markers away from their immediate context.^{[1] [2] [3]}

Scoring frame

I used your four criteria exactly as given: Scriptural Fidelity, Internal Logical Consistency, Harmonization Power, and Explanatory Economy. The scores are not “who has the most scholarship” scores; they are “who fits the listed texts most naturally under grammatical-contextual reading” scores. For the Seventh Trumpet position, the strongest objections and Schimpf’s responses are treated explicitly before finalizing its scores, as requested.^{[2] [3] [1]}

Scores by position

Position	Scriptural Fidelity	Internal Logic	Harmonization Power	Explanatory Economy	Overall
1. Pre-Tribulation	3	4	3	4	3.5
2. Mid-Tribulation	5	5	5	5	5.0
3. Pre-Wrath	7	6	7	6	6.5
4. Post-Tribulation	4	5	4	4	4.25
5. Idealism	2	5	2	3	3.0
6. Full Preterism	1	2	1	2	1.5
7. Partial Preterism	3	4	3	4	3.5
8. Postmillennialism	3	5	3	4	3.75
9. Historicism	4	4	5	4	4.25
10. Amillennialism	3	5	4	5	4.25
11. Progressive Dispensationalism	5	5	5	5	5.0
12. Seventh Trumpet	8	7	8	8	7.75

Position notes

1) Pre-Tribulation

Strong pre-trib defenses usually lean on imminence, wrath exemption, and the Church's absence from Revelation's later chapters. In your source set, Schimpf argues those supports are weakened because 2 Thessalonians 2 gives specific precursors, Matthew 24 gives a sequence, and Revelation 11:18 / 15:1 create a wrinkle if wrath is already "complete" before it "comes." ^[3] ^[1] ^[2]

The biggest deduction comes from the need to detach "last trumpet" from any identifiable trumpet in the Revelation sequence and to reclassify several explicit timing markers as either symbolic or not directly relevant. Confidence: Medium; the score would shift most if a stronger lexical/Second Temple argument showed Paul's "last trumpet" is clearly non-Revelation and unrelated to sequence. ^[2] ^[3]

2) Mid-Tribulation

Mid-Trib does better than Pre-Trib because it at least accepts a real midpoint transition and takes tribulation/wrath distinctions seriously. Its hardest problem is that Matthew 24:29–31 and 1 Corinthians 15:52 together seem to place the trumpet-gathering after cosmic signs, not merely at an abstract midpoint. ^[1] ^[3] ^[2]

The biggest deduction is the lack of a crisp textual anchor for why the midpoint itself is the Rapture moment rather than one of the later trumpet landmarks. Confidence: Medium; stronger source engagement on the identity of the seventh trumpet would most likely move this score downward or upward depending on whether Mid-Trib can absorb it without contradiction. ^[3] ^[2]

3) Pre-Wrath

Pre-Wrath is one of the strongest competitors because it naturally handles tribulation before wrath and takes cosmic signs seriously. Schimpf's main critique is that it places the Rapture in the gap between seals, where no trumpet is present, even though Paul says "last trumpet." ^[1] ^[2] ^[3]

Its biggest deduction is the gap between its strongest textual strength and its weakest chronological move: it must make the sixth-seal cosmic signs do a lot of timing work while leaving the trumpet language underused. Confidence: High; the score would most likely shift if a stronger argument were shown that "last trumpet" is a non-sequential metaphor. ^[2] ^[3]

4) Post-Tribulation

Post-Trib reads Matthew 24:29–31 straightforwardly and therefore scores better on that passage than Pre-Trib does. But it struggles with Revelation 11:18 and 15:1 if wrath is "coming" at the seventh trumpet and "complete" in the bowls, because placing the seventh trumpet at the very end makes that sequence awkward. ^[3] ^[1] ^[2]

The biggest deduction is the tension between post-trib's late Rapture and the "last trumpet" / "wrath has come" / "wrath is complete" sequence. Confidence: High; stronger evidence for a unified Second Coming / Rapture event after the bowls would most likely improve it. ^[2] ^[3]

5) Idealism

Idealism is decent at theological themes but weak at literal timing. It tends to read the sequences as recurring patterns rather than a single chronologically ordered end-time chain, which under this prompt's rules is a major disadvantage.^{[3] [2]}

The biggest deduction is that it cannot give the listed passages their full sequence force without spiritualizing or flattening their order. Confidence: Medium; more critical work on Revelation's apocalyptic genre could change the score somewhat, but it would still lag on timing.^{[2] [3]}

6) Full Preterism

Full Preterism performs worst because it cannot fit the broad sweep of the listed passages—especially Daniel, Matthew 24, 1 Thessalonians 4–5, 2 Thessalonians 2, and Revelation's judgment sequence—into a first-century fulfillment without major redefinitions.^{[3] [2]}

The biggest deduction is that its framework requires the most extensive re-reading of “coming,” “wrath,” “resurrection,” and “gathering” away from their plain future-oriented sense. Confidence: High; only a radically different hermeneutic framework would move this score.^{[2] [3]}

7) Partial Preterism

Partial Preterism is stronger than Full Preterism because it can preserve a future return, final resurrection, and final judgment. But it still has to relocate many of your Tier 1 and Tier 2 passages into the first century in ways that are hard to sustain across Daniel, Zechariah, Joel, and Revelation.^{[3] [2]}

The biggest deduction is the split between fulfilled destruction of Jerusalem motifs and still-future cosmic, resurrection, and gathering texts. Confidence: Medium; stronger covenant-historical arguments could improve it modestly.^{[2] [3]}

8) Postmillennialism

Postmillennialism handles hope, kingdom growth, and historical progress well, but it has trouble with the concentrated, catastrophic, and sequential language of the key passages you listed. It is especially strained by the wrath, cosmic-sign, and trumpet structure in the apocalyptic texts.^{[3] [2]}

The biggest deduction is that it must often treat the climactic prophetic sequences as either symbolic of long historical trends or as future exceptions to its normal triumph arc.

Confidence: Medium; more material on how postmillennialists read Revelation's recapitulation could alter the harmonization score.^{[2] [3]}

9) Historicism

Historicism has a genuine advantage in being able to spread Revelation's symbols across long stretches of church history, which helps some harmonization. But that same move weakens its ability to respect the tight local sequences in Matthew 24, 1 Thessalonians, and Revelation 6–11 as direct chronological units.^{[3] [2]}

The biggest deduction is the pressure to map discrete prophetic sequences onto broad

historical eras, which blunts the force of the “immediately after,” “last trumpet,” and “wrath has come” markers. Confidence: Medium; the score would change if a historically grounded but still sequence-sensitive reading were shown to fit the texts better.^{[2] [3]}

10) Amillennialism

Amillennialism is comparatively economical because it collapses the millennium into the present age and avoids some chronology problems by re-situating them typologically. It still struggles, though, with the plain sequence of Daniel, Matthew 24, 1 Thessalonians, and Revelation when those passages are read as a forward prophetic timeline.^{[3] [2]}

The biggest deduction is that it often reads the hardest texts in a way that prioritizes theological synthesis over textual sequence. Confidence: Medium; stronger grammatical-historical arguments for recapitulation and symbolization would be the main thing that could move it.^{[2] [3]}

11) Progressive Dispensationalism

Progressive Dispensationalism scores better than classic pre-trib frameworks because it softens rigid Israel/Church separation and can absorb more overlap. It is still challenged by the same core timing markers that trouble pre-trib: Matthew 24's sequence, Paul's “last trumpet,” and Revelation 11's wrath/reward language.^{[1] [3] [2]}

The biggest deduction is that it improves theological integration more than it solves timing. Confidence: Medium; more detailed source work on how progressive dispensationalists align the Olivet Discourse with Revelation would be the likeliest change factor.^{[3] [2]}

12) Seventh Trumpet

This is the strongest overall fit in the materials you provided. Schimpf's case gains force from the convergence of Matthew 24:29–31, 1 Corinthians 15:52, Revelation 11:15–18, Revelation 15:1, Joel 2, Zephaniah 1, and 1 Thessalonians 4–5, all read as a single crisis point where trumpet, gathering, wrath, and kingdom language meet.^{[1] [2] [3]}

The biggest deduction is not that the view lacks a text-based case, but that it relies on one especially contestable move: compressing the trumpet sequence into a rapid staccato window so believers are not meaningfully exposed to the trumpet judgments' effects. Confidence: Medium-High; the score would shift most if stronger critical scholarship showed Revelation 11's seventh trumpet clearly functions as Second Coming rather than Rapture, or if “last trumpet” could be shown to point elsewhere.^{[2] [3]}

Seventh Trumpet objections

The two or three strongest textual objections to Schimpf's synthesis are these: first, Revelation 11:15–19 reads very naturally as a climactic kingdom-and-judgment scene that many readers identify with the Second Coming, not a hidden Rapture hinge; second, Matthew 24:31 can plausibly be read as the visible gathering of the elect at Christ's return rather than a prior translation event; third, compressing all seven trumpets into near-simultaneity is not explicit in the text and does substantial interpretive work for the whole model.^{[1] [3] [2]}

Schimpf's published answer is that Revelation 11:18's “your wrath has come” and 15:1's “wrath

is complete” require the seventh trumpet to precede the bowls, while Paul’s “last trumpet” demands a real trumpet slot rather than an abstract symbol. He also argues that Matthew 24 stops at the gathering because that is where the Church’s earthly story ends, and that the rapid trumpet sequence preserves the “not appointed to wrath” promise without forcing believers through the trumpet effects.^{[1] [3] [2]}

That response is coherent and text-driven, but not conclusive. Its weakest point is the rapid-trumpet compression, because much of the argument depends on a pace the text suggests more than it states.^{[1] [3] [2]}

Most uncertain score

The overall score most uncertain is **Postmillennialism**, because it can be aligned with biblical hope and kingdom themes while still being highly dependent on how one handles apocalyptic sequence and whether those passages are read as one-time events or recurring patterns. Confidence: Medium.^{[3] [2]}

Most likely to shift

The single score most likely to shift with stronger or more critical source material is the **Seventh Trumpet Scriptural Fidelity** score. If a strong, direct argument were made that Paul’s “last trumpet” is definitely not Revelation 11’s seventh trumpet, the ranking would change materially; if not, the current score is likely stable.^{[1] [2] [3]}

Biggest deduction

The biggest score deduction for each position comes from the following issue:

- Pre-Tribulation: detaching the Rapture from the explicit sequence markers in 2 Thessalonians 2 and Matthew 24.^{[2] [3]}
- Mid-Tribulation: lacking a specific textual anchor that naturally identifies the midpoint as the Rapture event.^{[3] [2]}
- Pre-Wrath: placing the Rapture in a trumpetless gap while invoking “last trumpet.”^{[1] [2] [3]}
- Post-Tribulation: making “wrath has come” sound like a completed event rather than an arriving one.^{[1] [2] [3]}
- Idealism: flattening direct sequence language into recurring symbolic patterns.^{[2] [3]}
- Full Preterism: reassigning future resurrection and coming language into the first century.^{[3] [2]}
- Partial Preterism: splitting the text between near-term judgment and still-future consummation in ways that are not always textually clean.^{[2] [3]}
- Postmillennialism: under-reading the catastrophic finality of the apocalyptic passages.^{[3] [2]}
- Historicism: distributing discrete sequences across long historical spans.^{[2] [3]}
- Amillennialism: prioritizing theological synthesis over sequential force.^{[3] [2]}
- Progressive Dispensationalism: improving theology more than chronology.^{[2] [3]}

- Seventh Trumpet: requiring an unspoken compression of the trumpet judgments.^{[1] [3] [2]}

Top-ranked view

My top-ranked position is **Seventh Trumpet**. It best integrates the strongest timing markers in the provided texts without having to relocate the passages far from their natural flow:

Matthew's trumpet gathering after tribulation, Paul's "last trumpet," Revelation 11's kingdom/wrath/reward convergence, and the Day of the Lord language in Joel, Zephaniah, and Isaiah.^{[1] [3] [2]}

Its advantage is not that it eliminates every tension, but that it explains several tensions with one framework rather than by separate exceptions. In this corpus, that is the strongest mark of explanatory economy.^{[1] [3] [2]}

Remaining tensions

The most significant unresolved tensions in the top-ranked view are these:

- Whether Matthew 24:31 is better read as Rapture or visible Second Coming language.^{[1] [3] [2]}
- Whether Revelation 11:15–19 is naturally the Rapture hinge or naturally the Second Coming climax.^{[1] [3] [2]}
- Whether the "rapid succession" of the seven trumpets is a justified inference or an over-extension of the text.^{[3] [1] [2]}

If you want, I can turn this into a cleaner audit table with one-row-per-position notes and confidence tags for easier comparison.

✱

1. TheAppointedDay_V2.docx
2. SeventhTrumpetWhitepaper_V1.docx
3. RaptureByTheBook_Paperback_Edition2_1.docx