

Irenaeus On The Timing of the Rapture

Joel Richardson

Few debates in eschatology today are as heated as the question of whether the early church fathers taught a pretribulational rapture. In recent years, teachers such as Lee Brainard and Mike Golay have made the audacious claim that Irenaeus, one of the most significant second-century fathers, supported a pretribulational view. Does the evidence support this?

The answer is clear: no. Both the academic consensus and Irenaeus' own words demonstrate that he expected the church to face the Antichrist and the tribulation before being gathered to Christ. Attempts to portray him as pretribulational are either careless or deliberately misleading.

1. The Academic Consensus

Scholars across the spectrum—whether premillennial, amillennial, or dispensational, agree that the early church fathers, including Irenaeus, did not teach a pretribulational rapture.

- *“The Church Fathers believed that the Church would be on earth during the tribulation period. This is seen in the earliest writers and there is nothing in the other writers to contradict this.”*
—Charles August Hauser, Jr., *The Eschatology of the Early Church Fathers*
- *“...the early fathers largely held to a period of persecution that would be ongoing when the return of the Lord takes place and most would see the church suffering through some portion of the tribulation period.”*
—James Stitzinger, *The Rapture in Twenty Centuries of Biblical Interpretation*
- *“The preponderance of evidence seems to support the concept that the early church did not clearly hold to a rapture as preceding the endtime tribulation period... the early church fathers ... should be classified as posttribulational.”*
—John F. Walvoord, *The Blessed Hope and the Tribulation*
- *“One of [the early Church’s] distinctive features is that it places the Rapture of the Church at the end of the Tribulation, combining it with the Second Coming as one event.”*
—David Reagan, *Wrath and Glory*

Even dispensationalist historian and director of the Pretribulational Research Center, Dr. Tommy Ice concedes:

“When taken within the context of all of Irenaeus’ writings, it appears that he was not teaching pretribulationism.”

Let us turn to Irenaeus himself.

2. Irenaeus’ Testimony

a. The Church will be persecuted by the Antichrist:

“And the ten horns which thou sawest are ten kings... And they shall lay Babylon waste, and burn her with fire, and shall give their kingdom to the beast, and put the Church to flight. After that they shall be destroyed by the coming of our Lord.”
(*Against Heresies* V, 26, 1)

b. Believers must be prepared to identify the Antichrist:

“...so that when this man comes WE may avoid him, being aware who he is.”
(*Against Heresies* V, 30, 3–4)

c. The rapture and resurrection of the just happens after the Antichrist:

“...the resurrection of the just... takes place after the coming of Antichrist, and the destruction of all nations under his rule.”
(*Against Heresies* V, 35, 1)

d. The Church’s final trial is the tribulation:

“When in the end the Church shall be suddenly caught up from this, it is said, ‘There shall be tribulation such as has not been since the beginning, neither shall be.’ For this is the last contest of the righteous, in which, when they overcome they are crowned with incorruption.”
(*Against Heresies* V, 29, 1)

Far from describing a pretrib rapture, Irenaeus connects the catching up of the Church with the last and greatest tribulation—the climactic trial in which the righteous overcome.

3. Michael Svigel’s Analysis

The most academically qualified and nuanced interpreter of Irenaeus today who has weighed in on this topic is Michael J. Svigel, Ph.D. He rejects the extremes of both “maximalists” (who try to find a fully formed modern pretribulation rapture in Irenaeus) and

“minimalists” (who deny any rapture-like concept at all). Instead, Svigel suggests that Irenaeus may have envisioned something like a “partial pretribulation rapture.”

- He argues that when Irenaeus speaks of the Church being “suddenly caught up” (*Against Heresies* 5.29.1), he may have meant that the truly “spiritual” Christians, those living faithfully like Enoch and Elijah, would be taken before the tribulation.
- Meanwhile, the “carnal” or “unprepared” Christians would remain and endure the persecutions of Antichrist, being purified through that ordeal.
- Svigel grounds this reading in Irenaeus’ pre-Augustinian soteriology (salvation as a process) and in parallels with *The Shepherd of Hermas*, which also depicts some escaping tribulation while others are tested.

In this way, Svigel tries to reconcile Irenaeus’ seemingly contradictory statements: one passage possibly suggesting the Church being caught up before the tribulation, and another showing the Church facing Antichrist, and yet another showing survivors entering the kingdom.

4. Cons for the Partial Rapture Theory

While Svigel’s approach is far more sophisticated than Brainard’s or Golay’s, it still strains against the plain reading of Irenaeus’ words, as we summarized above. Again, briefly:

1. Irenaeus makes multiple explicit Post-Trib statements:
 - He says the resurrection of the just occurs after the Antichrist (5.35.1). Since Paul unites resurrection and rapture (1 Thess 4:16–17), this is decisively post-trib.
 - He warns believers to recognize the Antichrist (5.30.3–4). This only makes sense if they are present during his rise.
 - He states that the Antichrist will “put the Church to flight” (5.26.1), which contradicts any safe removal beforehand.
2. One can also argue that even the “Caught Up” passage itself (5.29.1) points to a post-tribulational scenario. Irenaeus explicitly connects the Church’s assumption with “the last contest of the righteous”—a climactic trial to be endured, not an escape to be avoided.
3. The “partial rapture” theory, proposed as a solution, while interesting and possible, is not actually found in Irenaeus’ words. Irenaeus doesn’t divide believers into two classes with separate destinies.

4. Scholarly consensus remains to view Irenaeus as posttribulational. Even Svigel concedes that Irenaeus cannot be straightforwardly claimed for pretribulationism. At most, he sees ambiguity. The broader scholarly consensus, from Hauser, Stitzinger, Walvoord, and Ice, still classifies Irenaeus as post-trib.

5. Addressing Pretrib Misrepresentation

Lee Brainard attempts to neutralize Irenaeus' explicit language by reinterpreting "church" generically, but his claim collapses under scrutiny. Irenaeus refers to the Church nearly two hundred times throughout *Against Heresies*, and in every single instance he means the body of Christ, not Israel. To suggest otherwise is only an attempt to blunt the obvious force of his words. Brainard misrepresents Irenaeus' consistent testimony.

6. The Integrity of Irenaeus

To suggest that Irenaeus contradicted himself, teaching both pretrib and posttrib in different passages, makes him incoherent. A far better solution is to take him at his word:

- The Church will face the Antichrist.
- Believers must be prepared to recognize him.
- The resurrection and rapture occur after his destruction.
- The gathering of the Church is one climactic event at Christ's return.

This interpretation is consistent across his writings and with the broader early church tradition.

Conclusion

Michael Svigel's nuanced proposal of a partial pretrib view deserves a hearing because it is careful and well-informed. But when weighed against Irenaeus' other explicit statements, it is still less convincing than the straightforward posttrib reading.

The attempt to enlist Irenaeus as a pretribulational witness is simply not supported by any authentic scholarship. Together his testimony and the academic consensus affirm that Irenaeus expected the Church to endure the tribulation and to be gathered to Christ after the Antichrist's reign, at the Second Coming.

