

THE INFLUENCE OF DANIEL UPON THE STRUCTURE AND THEOLOGY OF JOHN'S APOCALYPSE

G. K. Beale*

There have been various proposals that the scheme of the Apocalypse is based on early liturgical tradition¹ or on certain OT books. A. Vanhoye has suggested that Ezekiel is a dominant influence,² and Austin Farrer,³ and more recently John Sweet,⁴ have proposed in a general way that Daniel is the essential key to an understanding of the Apocalypse. Since neither Farrer nor Sweet intended to demonstrate their ideas in detail, however, it is the purpose of this study to show more thoroughly—from different data than they considered—the basic correctness of the direction in which they have pointed us. In particular the possibility will be explored that the book of Daniel may be more determinative on the overall theology and structure of the Apocalypse than any other traditional or OT source. That such an in-depth study has not already been made is perhaps somewhat surprising in the light of H. B. Swete's observation in the early part of this century that "in proportion to its length the Book of Daniel yields by far the greatest number" of allusions in the Apocalypse of any OT book.⁵

I. THE COMMON THEMES OF DANIEL AND THE APOCALYPSE

The book of Daniel has the following three dominant themes: (1) historical and cosmic eschatological judgment of evil nations and consequent establishment of God's historical reign or of the divine eternal kingdom;⁶ (2) God's absolute sovereignty and kingdom, which controls all earthly rulers and uses their own rebellious actions to accomplish his own purposes;⁷ (3) the saints living under an

*G. K. Beale is assistant professor of New Testament at Gordon-Conwell Theological Seminary in South Hamilton, Massachusetts.

¹Cf. M. H. Shepherd, *The Paschal Liturgy and the Apocalypse* (London: Lutterworth, 1960) 75-97; E. Lohse, *Die Offenbarung des Johannes* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1960) 48-49; see also D. R. Carnegie, "The Hymns in Revelation: Their Origin and Function" (unpublished doctoral dissertation for the British Council for National Academic Awards, 1978).

²A. Vanhoye, "L'utilisation du livre d'Ezechiel dans l'Apocalypse," *Bib* 43 (1962) 436-476.

³A. Farrer, *The Revelation of St. John the Divine* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1964) 7, 23.

⁴J. Sweet, *Revelation* (London: SCM, 1979) 17-21.

⁵H. B. Swete, *Commentary on Revelation* (London: Macmillan, 1911) clii.

⁶Daniel 2; 7; 12.

⁷Daniel 4-6.

ungodly earthly rule and undergoing trials through being tempted to compromise with the religious practices of pagan society.⁸ This third idea links the first two in that when the faithful do not compromise they are oppressed and apparently defeated; but when all appears lost, God intervenes by delivering his people, vindicating them, promoting them to a glorious position and establishing his kingdom rule.⁹ Thus, ironically, it is through apparent defeat that victory is gained. These three dominant ideas can be seen as forming one leitmotiv in the book, which is set primarily within a prophetic framework but is also found in historical contexts.

The same three themes also appear as most pervasive in the Apocalypse as well as also occurring in both prophetic and historical contexts. Again, believers are portrayed as living under hostile world monarchs and in the midst of a pagan society that continually tempts them to compromise their faith, with the threat of persecution if they do not.¹⁰ When they suffer tribulation for their faith and are apparently vanquished, they are seen ironically as gaining a spiritual victory over their foes.¹¹ Through their faith God progressively, though imperceptibly, establishes his kingdom until the historical climax of his universal reign,¹² when the saints are finally delivered and vindicated through the Lamb. The saints' deliverance is based on the Lamb's victory, which was accomplished through the defeat of the cross.

The observation of this Danielic leitmotiv in Revelation can be made regardless of one's overall interpretative approach to the book—i.e., whether the approach is preterist, historicist, futurist or idealist. The idea of cosmic, eschatological judgment is not a major theme of any of the OT books except Daniel. Whereas the land of Israel and Jerusalem are the focus of most of the OT, in Daniel the emphasis is placed on the rise and fall of evil world kingdoms, their eventual judgment and the subsequent eternal kingdom set up by God. Hence the same kind of overriding universal concern for the overturning of corrupt world kingdoms and the installment of God as eschatological King in Revelation is best paralleled in Daniel.

Furthermore, throughout both Daniel and Revelation the conflict between the world and the saints is seen as an earthly expression of a spiritual conflict among heavenly opponents. The glorious kingdoms of Daniel 2 are interpreted in Daniel 7 as having an evil, beastly nature, the fourth of which is judged by God. The height of the "horn's" persecuting activities in Daniel 8 is described as a heavenly battle in which this end-time fiend attempts to make himself equal to

⁸Daniel 1; 3; 6-8; 11:29-39.

⁹Daniel 2-3; 6-7; 11:29-12:3. For a good overview of these predominant themes in Daniel see D. Ford, *Daniel* (Nashville: Southern Publishing Association, 1978) 25-29.

¹⁰Revelation 2; 11:1-13; 12:10-17; 13:5-18.

¹¹Rev 1:9, 18; 2; 5:5-9; 11:1-13; 12:11-17; 20:4-10.

¹²E.g. Rev 1:6, 9; 2:7, 10, 13, 16, 26-27; 3:11, 21; 5:10; 20:4-6.

the "Prince of princes."¹³ The opposition in 9:25-26 is directed apparently against the same heavenly figure. The heavenly battle among good and evil "princes" is clearly referred to in 10:20-21, where it is evident that earthly nations are represented by heavenly forces. It is one such heavenly power, "Michael, the great prince," who delivers earthly Israel whom he represents (12:1).

Likewise, in Revelation there is heavenly activity and conflict involving angelic representatives of earthly peoples, which manifests itself in the earthly sphere (e.g. deliverance, judgment and persecution).¹⁴ One thinks immediately of the seven angels representing the seven churches (Revelation 1-3), the earthly plagues initiated by angelic activity (6:1 ff.; 9:1 ff.; 16:1 ff.), the angelic battle between Michael's forces and those of the dragon (12:7-9), the confrontation between Christ and Satan (12:1-6; 17:14), the binding of the dragon and his release (20:1-10), etc.

Such thematic affinities appear to point to a general theological dependence of the Apocalypse upon Daniel, even though some of these themes can also be found in other Biblical and extra-Biblical literature. That in fact Daniel is the predominant OT influence may become clear from a consideration of the following textual evidence.

II. THE POSSIBLE STRUCTURAL SIGNIFICANCE OF DANIELIC ALLUSIONS IN THE APOCALYPSE

1. *The significance of Dan 2:28-29, 45.* It would appear not to be from mere accidental placement that John introduces the book and three subsequent major sections in Revelation with an allusion to Dan 2:28-29, 45 (cf. Rev 1:1; 1:19; 4:1; 22:6).

The introduction—probably even the title—to the book in Rev 1:1 alludes to Dan 2:28-29, 45:¹⁵ *deixai . . . ha dei genesthai* ("to show . . . what things must take place"). This phrase is followed directly by the words *en tachei* ("quickly"). The latter phrase likely represents a change in the words immediately after the initial phrase in Dan 2:28-29, 45 (*edēlōse . . . ha dei genesthai ep' eschatōn tōn hēmērōn*, "he showed . . . what things must take place in the latter days"¹⁶). The phrase *en tachei* is sometimes understood to designate the speedy manner in which the Daniel 2 prophecy will be fulfilled rather than the imminent time of its fulfill-

¹³Many commentators understand this phrase to be identified with vv 10-11, where it is clearly discussing angelic warfare in heaven. Some also see the same kind of heavenly warfare in Dan 7:21-26—i.e., the "saints" are viewed as angelic beings and the "son of man" their heavenly leader (e.g. J. J. Collins, "The Son of Man and the Saints of the Most High in the Book of Daniel," *JBL* 93 [1974] 50-66; L. Dequecker, "The 'Saints of the Most High' in Qumran and Daniel," *OTS* 18 [1973] 108-187).

¹⁴Cf. Rev 6:1-8; 7:1-11; 8:1-10-11; 12:1-14:20; 15:5-16:21; 18:1-24; 20:1-2, 7-10.

¹⁵Cf. both the LXX and Theodotion.

¹⁶This is specifically the wording of Dan 2:28 (LXX), although Theodotion is virtually identical except for the change in the initial verb. Almost identical also is Dan 2:45 (LXX). Cf. further Dan 2:29, 45 in Theodotion. It is noteworthy that these verses in Daniel 2 use *apokalypō* repeatedly (cf. Theodotion) and *sēmainō* (cf. LXX), thus exhibiting further affinity with Rev 1:1.

ment.¹⁷ The phrase appears, however, to denote fulfillment in the imminent future, which perhaps has already begun in the present. This may be evident from recognizing that *en tachei* is substituted for Daniel's *ep' eschatōn tōn hēmerōn*, which in Daniel 2 must be understood as referring only to the temporal aspect of the prophecy's fulfillment—not the manner in which it was to be fulfilled.¹⁸ The change of phraseology implies that what Daniel expected to occur distantly "in the latter days"—the defeat of cosmic evil and the ushering in of the divine kingdom—John expects to begin in his own generation, if it has not already started to happen.¹⁹

Therefore if this allusion in Rev 1:1 is understood by John in the light of the eschatological context of Daniel 2—and there is good reason to believe this is the case—then he may be asserting that the following contents of the whole book are to be conceived of ultimately within the thematic framework of Daniel 2 (and probably its parallel apocalyptic chapters). Indeed, the following references to the kingdom (vv 6, 9) together with the following "Son of Man" reference (1:7) and vision (vv 13-15) point strongly to the presence of this Danielic frame of reference with vv 6, 9 and vv 13-15 indicating initial prophetic fulfillment in the present.

In fact, John's "realized" eschatological view of Daniel 2 would appear to become clearer in Rev 1:3 through the phrase *ho gar kairos engys* ("for the time is near"), an exaggerated expression of imminence that may literally denote present time. The statement has a striking figurative parallel in Mark 1:15: *peplērōtai ho kairos kai engiken hē basileia tou theou* ("the time is fulfilled, and the kingdom of God has drawn near"). It is apparent through the synonymous parallelism of Mark 1 that the second phrase concerning the "nearness of the kingdom"²⁰ prophesied in the OT is but a sharpening of what is stated in the first phrase about "fulfillment in present time." The same present aspect appears relevant for the Rev 1:3b clause, and the very least that can be said is that the wording refers to the immediate future. The probability is that John views the death and resurrection of Christ as inaugurating the long-awaited kingdom of the end times that Daniel had predicted and that will continue to exist throughout the Church age.²¹ And it is within the "realized eschatological" framework of

¹⁷See R. H. Mounce, *The Book of Revelation* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1977) 64-65, for a discussion of the various options concerning the phrase.

¹⁸Cf. M. Wilcock, *I Saw Heaven Opened* (Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 1975) 32-33, who seems to have come close to making the same observation in Rev 1:1.

¹⁹If John understood Daniel 2 as having already begun fulfillment, it would not be unique in the NT since Luke 20:18 (Matt 21:44) identifies the "stone" of Dan 2:34-35 with Christ and understands the Daniel 2 prophecy as having begun realization in his earthly ministry. The same "realized eschatological" view of Dan 2:35 is probably also apparent in Rev 12:8.

²⁰It is significant that this second phrase in Mark 1:15 may be an echo of the prophecy in Dan 7:22 (so e.g. F. F. Bruce, *New Testament Development of Old Testament Themes* [Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1970] 23-30; C. H. Dodd, *According to the Scriptures* [New York: Scribner, 1953] 69—although see *contra* R. T. France, *Jesus and the Old Testament* [Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 1971] 139).

²¹Cf. Rev 1:5-6, 9, 13-18, which views the promised kingdom as beginning its fulfillment in the present. It is also quite possible that Rev 1:3 is an allusion to Luke 21:8, where *ho kairos engiken* also has the

vv 3b, 6, 9 and vv 13-15 that the phrase in v 1 is to be understood. Perhaps, as seems to be apparent in v 3b, the clause in v 1 may even be a figurative expression denoting fulfillment already in the present and not merely in the imminent future.

The conclusion of the Revelation 1 vision comes in vv 19-20, which could also serve as a reintroduction to the book. The complete threefold phrase of v 19 may represent a further adaptation of v 8b (cf. v 18b) or a commonly used phrase like it.²² The third part of the formula in v 19 reflects the wording of v 1 and has been composed primarily of terminology from Dan 2:28-29a, 45-47 (cf. LXX, Theodotion): *ha mellei genesthai meta tauta*.²³ Although *mellei* replaces Daniel's *dei*, *dei* is attested in the textual tradition of v 19.²⁴ Since the Daniel 2 references seem to interchange synonymously *eschatōn tōn hēmerōn* and *meta tauta*,²⁵ John may well be using the phrase in an eschatological sense²⁶—i.e., for both Daniel and Revelation the *meta tauta* phrase appears to have been eschatological in nature.

That Dan 2:29a, 45 is uppermost in mind in Rev 1:19b may be confirmed by the following phrase *to mystērion* in v 20, which is also found appended in Dan 2:29, 45.²⁷ Further, as in Daniel 2, *mystērion* is clearly used in an eschatological context and in close association with the idea of "interpretation," since the Revelation 1 vision concerns the inaugurated fulfillment of the office of the "son of man" as messianic king, and the "mystery" concerns the eschatological kingdom whose beginning fulfillment is interpreted as the Church, saints and guardian angels (cf. also vv 6, 9).²⁸

Therefore in v 19 it is apparent that the introduction of Rev 1:1 is expanded in that John is explicitly commanded to write in a book the Danielic vision he has

significance of "fulfillment in the present" (for the allusive possibility see L. A. Vos, *The Synoptic Tradition in the Apocalypse* [Kampen: J. H. Kok, 1965] 178-181, who presents a very cogent case). Accordingly both Mark 1:15 and Luke 21:8 may be in mind and at least are representative uses parallel with Rev 1:3b.

²²See W. C. van Unnik, "A Formula Describing Prophecy," *NTS* 9 (1962-63) 86-94.

²³The wording most resembles Dan 2:45 (Theodotion).

²⁴Cf. Aleph* (*dei mellein*), C 169 *vid.* (*dei mellei*), 200 (*dē mellei*), 143 2050 *latt* (*dei*). Note also Josephus, *Ant.* 10.210.

²⁵The LXX of Dan 2:29, 45 has *ep' eschatōn tōn hēmerōn*, while Theodotion reads *meta tauta*, both of which are apparently synonymous renderings of MT 'ahārè dēnā. These renderings in Theodotion itself appear to be references back to the phrase *ep' eschatōn tōn hēmerōn* in 2:28 (cf. C. F. Keil, *Biblical Commentary on the Book of Daniel* [Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1971] 111).

²⁶The same kind of phenomenon is found in Acts 2:17, where Peter renders *meta tauta* (MT 'ahārè-kēn) of Joel 3:1 by *en tais eschatais hēmerais*.

²⁷The word *mystērion* occurs in the OT only in Daniel, and there it has an eschatological nuance (it appears in the Apocrypha but without such a nuance). Cf. *mystēria* and *to mystērion* following *ha dei genesthai* in Dan 2:28-30, but *mystēria* precedes the same phrase in 2:28a.

²⁸For perhaps the fullest explanation of v 19 as a chronological outline for the Apocalypse see R. Thomas, "John's Apocalyptic Outline," *BSac* 123 (1966) 334-341. In addition to the above discussion, the improbability that v 19 is a chronological outline for the book is also evident from the observation of numerous commentators that elements of past, present and future are found together in the supposedly

seen and to send it to the seven churches. Verse 19 then stands as a reaffirmation of the Danielic nature of the whole Apocalypse, functioning both as a conclusion of chap. 1 and as an introduction of at least the following two chapters and perhaps a reintroduction of the whole book (cf. 1:11).

The semantic equivalence of *meta tauta* with a "latter days" eschatological idea has significance for previous views of v 19. Some futurists have proposed that v 19 serves as a chronological outline of the book so that (1) "the things that you have seen" refer to John's visionary experience in 1:9-20, (2) "the things that are" pertain to the situation of the first-century churches in the letters of chaps. 2-3, and (3) "the things that shall take place after these things" (*meta tauta*) concerns the distant future tribulation leading up to the *parousia* (4:1 ff.). However, if *meta tauta* refers generally only to the eschatological age—which John sees already being inaugurated—then v 19 cannot be seen to express such a tidy chronological formula. Accordingly, the third clause in v 19 would be referring to the eschatological period that includes inauguration in the past and the present as well as reference to the future. This conclusion will be developed in our following discussion of 4:1.

In the light of the Daniel 2 allusions observed in Revelation 1, it would seem to be significant that the introduction of the next major section in the book at 4:1 also contains the same allusion.²⁹ Not only does the wording again reflect Dan 2:28-29, 45³⁰ but also the allusion is apparently used in the same way as in 1:1; 1:19: *deixō soi ha dei genesthai meta tauta* ("I will show you what must come to pass after these things"). As in 1:19, *meta tauta* is probably synonymous with Daniel's *eschatōn tōn hēmerōn*, so that the following vision is eschatological in scope. The observation that technical eschatological terminology elsewhere in the NT is predominantly used in an "inaugurated" manner points to a similar usage in Rev 4:1 as well as in 1:1; 1:19 (e.g. Mark 1:15; Acts 2:17; Gal 4:4; 1 Cor 10:11; 2 Cor 6:2; 1 Tim 4:1; 2 Tim 3:1; 1 Pet 1:20; 2 Pet 3:3; Heb 1:2; 9:26; Jas 5:3; 1 John 2:18; Jude 18). Again, if our inference concerning the *meta tauta* phrase in Rev 4:1b is correct, then this text cannot be taken to indicate that all of the visions after Revelation 4 refer to a future time period subject to the time scope of chaps. 1-3 but only that they are further visions concerned with an

distinct temporal sections of chaps. 1; 2-3; 4-21. See also van Unnik, "Formula," who makes a proposal different from but seemingly supplementary to our above suggestion concerning Rev 1:19. He finds the threefold phrase of v 19 to have been a stock prophetic formula in extra-Biblical literature, which did not have primary reference to distinct segments of historical time but expressed not only "eternal duration . . . but something that surpasses the merely temporal aspect, the mystery of existence, of history in its totality" (p. 93). This nuance of the formula would indicate that John's vision is a heavenly interpretation of reality as a whole, from his time and forward (cf. especially van Unnik's citation of the Gnostic *Apocryphon of John*). The One who transcends time (cf. Rev 1:4, 8) is the revealer of this temporally transcendent vision. Hence van Unnik sees the phrase as connoting the totality of reality, a view that perhaps comes close to our above understanding of Rev 1:19c—i.e., a revelation of the *mysterion* concerning the totality of the eschatological age from the cross to the final consummation.

²⁹Most commentators see 4:1 as an introduction to a new section in the book, others see it as beginning a segment that ends with chap. 20, and still others view it as part of a section ending earlier (e.g. chaps. 4-7 are commonly viewed as a subunit of the book).

³⁰It resembles most closely Dan 2:29, 45 (Theodotion), although it could be a composite of all the similar Daniel 2 phrases.

explanation of the "latter days"—both in a "realized" (past and present) and "unrealized" (future) aspect. Interestingly, the vast majority of futurist commentators have taken Rev 4:1 as one of the most obvious indicators of their position. However, our discussion indicates that the *meta tauta* clause is a general eschatological reference to past, present and future events along the continuum of NT redemptive history. Therefore if our discussion concerning Rev 4:1 is valid, then this text perhaps should not be seen as asserting that all of the visions after 4:1 refer exclusively to the future.

Through this third repetition of the Daniel 1 allusion at the beginning of another major segment, a pattern may be emerging whereby it is discernible that John is employing the same allusion as a literary device to give structure to his whole book. That this conclusion may not be too speculative is borne out by another reappearance of the same Danielic allusion in Rev 22:6, which introduces the final section of the book.

The allusive formula from Daniel is used lastly in Rev 22:6b to introduce the concluding section of exhortations and possibly at the same time serves as a conclusion to the preceding section (cf. similarly 1:19 *supra*). The precise form of the phrase uniquely corresponds with the wording of the opening statement in 1:1 (22:6b reads *deixai tois doulois autou ha dei genesthai en tachei*). It is likely that the phrase again is used similarly as in 1:1.

If indeed John is consciously introducing major sections of his book by the Daniel 2 allusion—which in view of the above discussion seems to be the case—a further conclusion possibly can be drawn with respect to the significance of the allusion in 4:1. Although it is no doubt legitimate to divide 4:1-22:5 into various subsections, John also may have conceived of it as a broad unity. This unity is evident by observing that "the visions of destruction (6-20) are bracketed by the overarching vision of God the Creator and Redeemer" in Revelation 4-5 and 21:1-22:5.³¹ According to the Daniel 2 markers, the broad structure of Revelation could be viewed in the following way: (1) 1:1-18 (introduction); (2) 1:19-3:22; (3) 4:1-22:5; (4) 22:6-21 (conclusion).

This structural scheme could receive further corroboration from noting that the phrases in Dan 2:28-29 introduce the vision proper in the Daniel 2 account (2:31-45a) and the same phrase in 2:45b is part of the formal conclusion of the narrated vision. Likewise, the same phrases from Daniel introduce and conclude the vision proper in Rev 4:1-22:6 (or even 1:1-22:6; cf. the parallel wording of the two verses), thus indicating dependence perhaps even upon the structure of Daniel 2. The concluding function of the phrase in Rev 22:6b is highlighted by the

³¹Sweet, *Revelation* 47. I have attempted to demonstrate in some detail that Daniel 7 is the *Vorbild* for Revelation 4-5 (see G. K. Beale, *The Use of Daniel in Jewish Apocalyptic Literature and in the Revelation of St. John*, a forthcoming publication by University Press of America, based on my 1981 doctoral dissertation at the University of Cambridge). If this is so, then it may show that the Daniel 7 vision stands in the background of John's thought throughout chaps. 6-20, since Revelation 4-5 is the "fulcrum" of the book from which "the remaining visions flow" (so G. R. Beasley-Murray, *The Book of Revelation* [Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1981] 25-26; cf. similarly M. C. Tenney, *Interpreting Revelation* [Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1980] 70-71). More recently A. Geyser has also suggested that "Dan. 7 presents an 'open heavens' scene, which, as an apocalyptic device, was seminal for Rev. 4.1 to 19.10" ("The Twelve Tribes in Revelation: Judean and Judeo-Christian Apocalypticism," *NTS* 28 [1982] 393). If this idea is correct, then the theme of Daniel 7 is combined with that of Daniel 2, a natural combination.

initial phrase affirming that the visions of all the previous chapters are "faithful and true" (*pistoi kai alēthinoi*), a phrase apparently also based on the conclusion of the Daniel 2 vision.³²

If it can be concluded that these Daniel 2 allusions in Revelation are intentional and draw with them the contextual idea of Daniel 2,³³ then there is a basis for proposing that this idea provides the framework of thought for the whole of the Apocalypse—i.e., eschatological judgment of cosmic evil and consequent establishment of the eternal kingdom. Indeed, this conclusion is supported by our own initial observation of major themes shared uniquely by Daniel and Revelation.

2. *The significance of the overall structure of Daniel.* In addition to the tracing of major themes shared by Daniel and Revelation as well as recognizing the influence of Daniel 2, it may be possible to discern a broader influence from the whole book of Daniel, especially the apocalyptic visions (Daniel 2; 7; 8; 9; 10-12).

The unique feature of these five visions is that they cover the same general time period of the eschatological future. Daniel 2 and 7 both prophesy the rise and fall of four world kingdoms, the last of which is destroyed by God's judgment and replaced by the divine kingdom. The primary difference between the two chapters is that the latter pictures the evil spiritual nature of these beastly kingdoms and reveals the necessity of the saints' suffering and defeat before their kingdom reign. Daniel 8 concerns the same time period and subject, although it omits mention of the first kingdom and the final divine kingdom. Chapter 9 includes the time of the second to the fourth empires but explicitly mentions only the fourth and its demise. The final vision covers the same ground as chap. 8, but in greater detail. This vision is unique in its concluding comment about a final resurrection and mention of the saints' eternal reign through metaphors of light.³⁴

Likewise, Revelation also contains a series of visions, although commentators differ about the exact divisions of the book. Some have concluded that these visions are grouped basically according to a fairly strict chronological arrangement,³⁵ while others argue that many of these visions are temporally parallel.³⁶

³²Cf. Dan 2:45b Theodotion (*alēthinon to enygnion kai pistē hē synkrisis autou*). The presence of this phrase in conjunction with the *ha dei genesthai* phrase (cf. Dan 2:45a Theodotion) points strongly to an allusive link with Dan 2:45 in Rev 22:6.

³³See L. Goppelt, *Typus* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1982) 197, who is the only one who seems to have come close to our conclusion reached here. His comment, however, is found only in a footnote where he suggests that Dan 2:28 is "the guiding principle" of Revelation because of its strategic occurrence in Rev 1:1; 1:19; 4:1; 22:6.

³⁴For a good summary of the parallel nature of the visions in Daniel see Ford, *Daniel* 286-287.

³⁵E.g. R. H. Charles, *The Revelation of St. John I* (Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1963) 1-1v. See various forms of the chronological approach by other "literal" interpreters in J. D. Pentecost, *Things To Come* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1969) 187-188.

³⁶E.g. W. Hendriksen, *More Than Conquerors* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1980) 32-48; L. Morris, *The Revelation of St. John* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1980) 41. The majority of commentators would hold a mediating position between the "chronological" and "parallelism" views.

Against the background of the general Danielic themes and specific Daniel 2 allusions already observed in Revelation, is it too speculative to suggest that the latter viewpoint is preferable, since all of Daniel's five visions reflect a basic synchronous parallelism? Here we especially have in mind the visions of seals, trumpets and bowls, as well as also the intervening sections and chaps. 4-5, 17-20.³⁷ Furthermore, perhaps it can also be said that the time scope of these generally parallel visions is to be understood in an "already and not yet" sense³⁸ rather than merely within a futurist framework,³⁹ since the repeated Daniel 2 allusions—which dominate the book's structure⁴⁰—also appear to have such a dual eschatological sense.⁴¹

III. THE USE OF A DANIELIC MIDRASH IN THE ESCHATOLOGICAL DISCOURSE OF THE SYNOPTICS AND ITS RELATION TO REVELATION

The above lines of argument may be corroborated by recent discussions concerning the use of Daniel in the synoptics and its use in Revelation via the synoptics. Lars Hartman has proposed that Mark 13 is a midrash based on Daniel.⁴² He sees "that the main part of the eschatological discourse [in Mark 13 and Matthew 24] is based on a coherent exposition of or meditation on" texts from Daniel 7-9; 11-12.⁴³ Hartman also asserts that there are significant eschatological parallels between Mark 13 and the Thessalonian epistles, which point to the probability of Paul's acquaintance with the Daniel midrash in Mark.⁴⁴ He suggests the same thing for the Johannine epistles⁴⁵ and states that there may also be fruitful com-

³⁷Cf. Beasley-Murray, *Revelation* 30-31, 238-240, who sees the seals, trumpets and bowls visions as temporally parallel (especially the latter two).

³⁸E.g. see Hendriksen, *More Than Conquerors* 32-48; Morris, *Revelation passim*; Sweet, *Revelation* 34-35 and *passim*; G. B. Caird, *A Commentary on the Revelation of St. John the Divine* (New York: Harper, 1966) *passim*.

³⁹Usually this view understands chaps. 4-21 as yet future; e.g. see G. E. Ladd, *A Commentary on the Revelation of St. John* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1979) 12-14 and *passim*; J. F. Walvoord, *The Revelation of Jesus Christ* (Chicago: Moody, 1966) *passim*; Beasley-Murray, *Revelation* 27, who sees the seals, trumpets and bowls as futuristic.

⁴⁰Interestingly, Tenney structures Revelation primarily according to the four repeated expressions of John's rapture in the Spirit in 1:10; 4:2; 17:3; 21:10 and sees other repeated phrases as secondarily significant (*Interpreting Revelation* 32-34).

⁴¹In the "realized eschatological" sense is included the first coming of Christ and the course of the Church age, while in the "unrealized" meaning is included the final *parousia* and events immediately preceding it.

⁴²L. Hartman, *Prophecy Interpreted* (Lund: Gleerup, 1966) 207. See also D. Ford, *The Abomination of Desolation in Biblical Eschatology* (Washington: University Press of America, 1982) 111-140.

⁴³*Ibid.*, p. 158.

⁴⁴*Ibid.*, pp. 178-205.

⁴⁵*Ibid.*, pp. 237-238.

parisons with Revelation (especially Revelation 13).⁴⁶ There is not space to summarize the details of his exegesis, but we think that his conclusions for the most part are convincing.⁴⁷

Austin Farrer and John Sweet have also discussed the use of Daniel in Mark 13, although not to the extent of Hartman. Their primary purpose is to point out that the material and ideas from Daniel in Mark 13 have been reused in Revelation. Farrer sees the influence in Mark essentially in terms of Daniel's eschatological time scheme, which is taken up again by the author of Revelation as a dominating motif throughout the book. For Farrer, Revelation has been generally patterned after the form of Daniel's eschatological half-week.⁴⁸ According to Sweet, Mark 13 mainly represents what purports to be Christ's own use of Daniel, which has been reshaped by Matthew and Luke. He also understands John's Apocalypse as an "updating" of Christ's own supposed use of Daniel in the Marcan apocalypse.⁴⁹ While not accepting these arguments in their entirety, we feel that in the main they are fairly persuasive. These two proposals of Daniel's dominant influence in Revelation have been given further detailed support from more recent exegesis of various chapters of the book, which show that they have been individually structured according to a Danielic *Vorbild*.⁵⁰

The primary argument of this study concerning the paradigmatic relationship of Daniel to Revelation becomes more plausible in the light of the previous studies of Hartman, Farrer and Sweet.

IV. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

If this study is basically correct, then John can be seen to have used the Daniel 2 allusions as signposts that represent the larger OT text plot from which they have been drawn.⁵¹ Although it may be clear that other allusions in the book

⁴⁶Ibid., p. 250.

⁴⁷For Hartman's complete discussion see *ibid.*, pp. 145-152. Cf. the varying critical evaluations of M. Hooker, *JTS* 19 (1968) 263-265; J. Lambrecht, *Bib* 49 (1968) 254-270; T. Holtz, *TLZ* 92 (1967) cols. 910-912.

⁴⁸Farrer, *Revelation* 6-13.

⁴⁹Sweet, *Revelation* 19-21. Cf. also Beasley-Murray, *Revelation* 41-42; P. Carrington, *The Meaning of Revelation* (London: SPCK, 1931) 54-56. See especially D. Ford, *Crisis* I (New Castle: Desmond Ford Publications, 1982) 88-93, who sees the OT book of Daniel together with its later use in Mark 13 as the primary thematic influences in Revelation that provide the framework for understanding the book. Cf. also W. G. Moorehead, *Studies in the Book of Revelation* (Pittsburgh: United Presbyterian Board, 1908) 18-19.

⁵⁰See discussion of Revelation 1; 4-5; 13; 17 in my forthcoming *Daniel in Jewish Apocalyptic and Revelation*; cf. D. Ford, *Abomination* 243-306, who traces the significant influence of Daniel's "abomination of desolation" idea (Dan 8:13; 9:27; 11:31) throughout Revelation. See also A. Feuillet, *L'Apocalypse* (Paris: Desclée de Brouder, 1962) 65, who calls John's Apocalypse "le livre de Daniel du christianisme." Cf. generally the most recent book on this subject by A. B. Mickelsen, *Daniel and Revelation* (Nashville: Thomas Nelson, 1984), although its relevance to the present discussion is minimal.

⁵¹Cf. C. H. Dodd, *According to the Scriptures* 61, 126, who sees this as a common method that NT authors used in citing OT references.

are not used against their larger OT backgrounds and that many had merely become part of the author's stock theological vocabulary, it does not seem to be the case with the Daniel 2 references.

The first indication of this is the repeated introductory function of the allusions at the beginning of major divisions of the book, so that they seem to be employed in an intentional manner. Furthermore, that John's use of Daniel 2 betrays an awareness of the broad contextual idea of Daniel, especially the apocalyptic chapters, is likely because of (1) the presence of unique themes from Daniel throughout Revelation, (2) the presence of Danielic models in individual chapters, (3) the large percentage of other Danielic allusions in comparison with other OT allusions, and (4) the relationship to Revelation of the Daniel midrash in the synoptic apocalypse.

The results of the study indicate the probability that Daniel is the most formative influence on the thought and structure of Revelation. Therefore these two crucial ideas throughout Revelation should probably be seen much more—if not almost exclusively—within the conceptual framework of the apocalyptic chapters of Daniel than heretofore: (1) the suffering, eschatological victory and kingdom reign of Christ and the saints; (2) the conflict with Satan and his forces and their eschatological judgment. These Johannine ideas are described as at least beginning fulfillments of Daniel's prophecy. As is the case in Daniel 7, John identifies the victory and reign of Christ—the "son of man"—with that of the saints (cf. Rev 1:5-7, 9, 13-16; 5:7-13; 17:14), yet he still maintains the individuality of the former. Correspondingly Christ, again as "son of man," is also associated with the suffering saints (cf. 1:9, 18; 5:6; 17:6), a relation that some do not see as evident in Daniel 7 itself.

Thus the Daniel 7 prophecy of the reign of the "son of man" and of the saints has its initial fulfillment in the overcoming of both through suffering and apparent defeat. In the case of Christ, this begins at the cross and resurrection; for the saints, it occurs throughout the Church age until the victory is finally completed.