

THE BEAST IN THE BOOK OF REVELATION is the same as  
THE 4<sup>TH</sup> BEAST IN THE BOOK OF DANIEL

BOBBY HARRINGTON PAPER, March 1991

Introduction

We are first introduced to the character of the beast in Rev. 11:7. This character is then discussed in more detail in chapters 13 and 17, and it is again mentioned in chapters 15, 16, 19, and 20. The beast plays a very Pivotal role in the drama of the entire book. Several questions naturally arise in this regard. Specifically: What background does John draw from to Come up with the figure of the beast? Does John draw from the book of Daniel, and if so, how? Where did Daniel get this imagery, and what is its significance in his book? Who or what is John's beast? What is the relationship between the fourth beast in Daniel 7 and the beast in the book of Revelation?

In an attempt to answer these questions, I will engage in a five-fold inquiry. First, I will consider the beasts of Daniel 7, giving special attention to the identity of these beasts because they are doubtlessly related to the identity of the beast in Revelation. Second, I will examine other possible backgrounds to John's use of the beast imagery in relevant Jewish sources. Third, I will discuss Roman backgrounds in the book of Revelation in an attempt to understand to whom or to what John is referring. Fourth, I will look more closely at the relationship between the fourth beast of Daniel and the beast of the book of Revelation. Then, lastly, I will summarize the relevant conclusions that can be drawn from this investigation.

The Beast of Daniel 7

The book of Daniel appears to provide the most immediate and direct background for John's beast imagery. In chapter 7 Daniel recounts a vision in which four beasts arise from the sea (7:3). These beasts stand for four world empires. In this seminal work on the relationship between the Daniel, apocalyptic literature, and Revelation, Gregory Beale points out that two-thirds of all the O.T. references in Rev. 13 and one-half of all the O.T. references in chapter 17 come from Daniel, and most of them are from Dan.7.<sup>1</sup> In fact, Beale argues that Dan. 7, itself, is the controlling pattern for the structure of Rev. 13.

---

<sup>1</sup> Gregory K. Beale, *The Use of Daniel in Jewish Apocalyptic Literature and in the Revelation of St. John* (London: University Press of America, 1984). This work is a revision of the author's 1980 Ph. D. dissertation at Cambridge. Beale addresses an important aspect that has been largely ignored by scholars.

Daniel's beast imagery, itself, is likely derived from even more ancient sources. For many years scholars argued that Babylonian or Persian sources provided this background.<sup>2</sup> In recent times, however, capable scholars have pointed to other ancient matrixes for this imagery: Mesopotamia,<sup>3</sup> Assyria,<sup>4</sup> and the Ugaritic myths of Leviathan and Rahab<sup>5</sup>.

With rare exception,<sup>6</sup> there have been two accepted interpretations of the four beasts. Following ancient Jewish tradition (Josephus, Antiquities. X.276f; 4 Ezra 12:12; Apoc. Bar. 39:3-7) most early Christian and contemporary conservative commentators have interpreted the four beasts as representing (in order) Babylon, Medo-Persia, Greece, and lastly, Rome.<sup>7</sup>

Critical scholars, on the other hand, following a position that dates from the work of the anti-Christian philosopher Porphyry<sup>8</sup> and, perhaps, an even older Syrian viewpoint,<sup>9</sup> interpret the four kingdoms as representing (in order) Babylon, Media, Persia, and, lastly, Greece. The fundamental difference between the two points of view is the division of the Median empire from the Persian empire, so that they are represented as two distinct beasts in the view of critical scholarship.<sup>10</sup>

---

<sup>2</sup> See David Flusser, "The Four Empires in the Fourth Sibyl and in the Book of Daniel," Israel Oriental Studies 2 (1972): 148-75.

<sup>3</sup> Ernest C. Lucas, "The Origin of Daniel's Four Empire Scheme Reexamined," Tyndale Bulletin 40 (1989): 185-202.

<sup>4</sup> Helge S. Kvanvig, "Akkadian Vision as Background for Daniel 7," Studia Theologica 35 (1981): 85-89.

<sup>5</sup> See John J. Collins, The Apocalyptic Vision of the Book of Daniel (Missoula, Montana: Scholars Press, 1977); G.R. Beasley-Murray, "The Interpretation of Daniel 7," Catholic Biblical Quarterly 45 (1983): 44-58; and F.M. Cross, Canaanite Myth and Hebrew Epic (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1973).

<sup>6</sup> Karen Hanhart is one of a handful who have advocated an alternative system, see, "The Four Beasts of Daniel's Vision in the Night in the Light of Rev. 13:2," New Testament Studies 27 (1981): 576-83.

<sup>7</sup> For example, see Joyce Baldwin, Daniel, Tyndale Old Testament Commentaries (Downers Grove, Illinois: InterVarsity Press, 1978); Edward J. Young, The Prophecy of Daniel (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Wm. B. Eerdmans Pub. Co., 1949); and Edwin M. Yamauchi, "Hermeneutical Issues in the Book of Daniel," Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society 23 (March 1980): 13-21.

<sup>8</sup> Maurice Casey, "Porphyry and Syrian Exegesis of the Book of Daniel," Zeitschrift Fur Die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft 81 (1990): 139-42.

<sup>9</sup> Maurice Casey, Son of Man: The Interpretation and Influence of Daniel (London: SPCK, 1979), which is a revision of the author's Ph. D. dissertation at Durham in 1977.

<sup>10</sup> For example, see H.H. Rowley, Darius the Mede and the Four World Empires (Cardiff: University of Wales, 1935); John J. Collins, Daniel, The Forms of the Old Testament Literature (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1984); Helge Kvanvig, "The Relevance of the Biblical Visions of the End Time: Hermeneutical Guidelines to the Apocalyptic Literature," Horizons in Biblical Theology 11 (June 1989): 35-58.

Though there have been good arguments advanced in favor of this critical viewpoint, the conservative viewpoint, with the last beast representing Rome, is clearly superior. Four lines of reasoning support this contention.

First, elsewhere in the book of Daniel the Medes and Persians are represented as being one kingdom. Dan. 5:38 states that the kingdom of Belshazzar (the Babylonian ruler) was going to be taken from him and given to the Medes and Persians. This prophecy indicates that in the view of Daniel the two empires together were to form the kingdom that would replace the Babylonian empire. This is also supported in 8:3 where Daniel describes a kingdom represented by the animal imagery of a two-horned ram. He goes on to interpret this ram as representing the kings of Media and Persia in 8:20. The Medes and Persians, then, are represented together as inheriting the Babylonian kingdom, and then they are also represented as a single animal, which implicitly points to a single empire. Thus, independent internal testimony from Daniel points to the fact that the Medes and Persians were to be considered as the single empire that took over after Babylon.

Second, the beast imagery in Chapter 7 fits better if the Medes and Persians are combined to form the second beast. The bear imagery suits Medo-Persia in that it was a bearlike empire: strong and plodding in its movement. The fact that the bear is raised on one side seems to point to the fact that the Persian division was of greater importance than the Median. Not only that, but the command to “arise, devour much flesh” points in the direction of Medo-Persia acquiring an extensive domain.<sup>11</sup> On the other hand, as Young pointed out, “Media alone cannot rightly be represented as an empire whose principal characteristic was that it conquered territory.”<sup>12</sup>

Third, and most importantly, the conservative viewpoint which combines the Medes and the Persians into one empire which follows the Babylonian empire is the historically accurate viewpoint. The critical viewpoint is based on the belief that Daniel was in error about the separate identity of the Kingdoms of the Medes and Persians.<sup>13</sup> As Young<sup>14</sup> pointed out, “scholars who adopt this view are well aware that after the downfall of Babylon there never was an independently existing Median Kingdom.” The fact of the matter is that “Cyrus king of Persia conquered the Medes in 550 B.C., and the Medes *in conjunction with* the Persians overthrew Babylonian 539 B.C.”<sup>15</sup> The whole schemata of critical scholars, then, is based on the assumption that Daniel was historically inaccurate.

---

<sup>11</sup> See Leon J. Wood, Daniel, Bible Study Commentary (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Zondervan Publishing Company, 1975), p. 93.

<sup>12</sup> E.J. Young, Daniel, p.286.

<sup>13</sup> For a very good conservative response to the problems critical scholars raise about Daniel, see D.J. Wiseman, T.C. Mitchell, R. Joyce, W.J. Martin, and K.A. Kitchen, Notes on Some Problems in the Book of Daniel (London: Tyndale, 1965) and R.K. Harrison, Introduction to the Old Testament. (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Wm. B. Eerdmans Pub. Company, 1969).

<sup>14</sup> E.J. Young Daniel, p. 280.

<sup>15</sup> Bruce K. Waltke, “The Date of the Book of Daniel,” Bibliotheca Sacra 133 (1976): 325.

In short, the conservative schemata (Babylon, Medo-Persia, Greece, and then Rome) is superior: it is consistent with the way that the Medes and Persians are represented in other parts of the book of Daniel, it is more in keeping with the beast imagery of Daniel 7, and it sustains Daniel's accuracy and historical integrity.

This point is very important because many expositors maintain that the beast in the book of Revelation is the Roman empire. If I am right that the fourth beast in Daniel 7 is also the Roman empire, then this, coupled with the literary and structured dependence of John's description of the beast in Rev. 13 and 17 upon Daniel 7 seem to point conclusively to the fact that the two beasts are symbolic ways of referring to the same entity.

### Other Jewish Backgrounds

Daniel is not the only source that Biblical scholars point to as being behind the beast imagery in the book of Revelation. There are two other sources that are often mentioned in this regard: firstly, the mythic tradition concerning Leviathan and Behemoth and, secondly, what D.S. Russell calls, the "antichrist" motif in apocalyptic literature.<sup>16</sup>

According to Adela Yarboro Collins the two beasts of Rev. 13 (one from the sea and one from the land) may have been derived from a long mythic tradition concerning Leviathan and Behemoth.<sup>17</sup> These two characters are often mentioned in Biblical literature and they also appear in Ugaritic myths. In Job 40-41 they are referred to as creatures who can only be handled and defeated by God – they terrify mankind. According to Collins, Job is referring to an ancient combat myth that runs throughout the Bible. This myth, which often centers on the battle between God and the forces of chaos in creation often shifts to a cosmic battle at the end of time. The shift is displayed in passages such as Isa. 27:1 where Isaiah says that the Lord will punish Leviathan and slay the dragon that is in the sea.

This battle-myth also appears in Jewish apocalyptic literature. In 1 Enoch 60:7-8, when relating a scene of future punishment, Enoch says that, "on that day two monsters will be parted – one monster, female named Leviathan, in order to dwell in the abyss of the ocean over the fountains of water; and (the other), a male called Behemoth, which holds his chest in an invisible desert..." In 4 Ezra 6:49-52 we find the two monsters again in a discussion of God's work in creation: Leviathan who was assigned to the sea and Behemoth who was assigned to the dry land. And then, in 2 Apoc. Bar 29:4 we find that both monsters are to arise when the messiah comes – "Behemoth will reveal itself from its place and Leviathan will come from the sea."

Secondly, the "antichrist" motif that Russell points to in apocalyptic literature is real, but it has been poorly named. None of the sources that are pointed to use the term "anti-Christ" and

---

<sup>16</sup>

<sup>17</sup>

none of them are directly related to Christianity. Scholars often speak of the antichrist figure in apocalyptic literature as being related to the beast in the book of Revelation, but I can find no explicit reference to the beast imagery in a Jewish Apocalyptic literature, nor in Qumran sources. The direct links are weak.

These works do speak, however, of cosmic battles at the end time. In the Assumption of Moses 10: 1ff there is a great battle where God defeats and slays the devil in the last days. In the Testament of Isa. 6:1 we are told that many will forsake God and will cleave unto Beliar, but he will be defeated and “cast into the fire forever” (Test. Of Jud. 25:3; Sib. Or. III. 63). We also read of great kings who rule with great power (ss. Of Moses 8:1), and of generals described as dragons who will be put to death by the Messiah (2 Apoc. Bar. 40: 1ff).

The imagery of Leviathan and Behemoth, as well as the imagery of the cosmic battle between God and Satan (and his related beings) at the end of time in apocalyptic literature are definitely part of the thought world that lies behind the description of the beast in the book of Revelation. But it is also important to note that there are no explicit lines from these images to the beast in Revelation. They are part of the apocalyptic *zietgiest*, but they do not provide the direct or immediate background of the beast in Revelation. The imagery of Daniel 7 is far more prominent and centrally related to John’s beast.

### The Roman Background

Many commentators adopt the view that the beast in Rev. 13 and 17 is the Rome Empire.<sup>18</sup> Unfortunately, however, this identity is usually assumed with little or no argumentation. At the same time, there is also a significant body of scholars who take the viewpoint that the beast is not referring to Rome. For example, Walvoord<sup>19</sup> (as well as his student, Hal Lindsey<sup>20</sup>) believes that the beast represents an “end-time” antichrist empire; Morris<sup>21</sup>, Ladd<sup>22</sup>, and to a lesser degree, Mounce<sup>23</sup> believe that the beast is representative of both an end-time political empire and, at the same time, it is representative of the Roman empire of the first century. Hendrickson believes that the beast, “symbolizes the persecuting power of Satan embodied in all the nations and governments of the world throughout all history.”<sup>24</sup> A commentator should not just assume a position without good reason. Argumentation is necessary at this point and I

---

<sup>18</sup> For example, see R.H. Charles, A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Revelation of St. John, International Critical Commentary (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1920).

<sup>19</sup> John Walvoord, The Revelation of Jesus Christ (Chicago: Moody Press, 1966).

<sup>20</sup> Lindsey’s book was the biggest non-fiction seller in the 1970’s. See the Late Great Planet Earth (Toronto: Bantam Books, 1970).

<sup>21</sup> Leon Morris, The Revelation of John, Tyndale New Testament Commentaries (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1969).

<sup>22</sup> George Eldon Ladd, A Commentary on the Revelation of John (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Wm. B. Eerdmans, Pub. Co., 1972).

<sup>23</sup> Robert H. Mounce, The Book of Revelation, The New International Commentary on the New Testament (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1977).

<sup>24</sup> William Hendriksen, More Than Conquerors (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Baker Book House, 1940).

maintain that the evidence supports the view that the beast is the Roman empire of the first century. There are four lines of reasoning that support this contention. First, the book of Revelation was primarily addressed to the needs of early Christians living in Asia, and conflict with the first century Roman empire best fits the imagery and the *Sitz im Leben* of the original recipients of the book. The color and conflict of the whole work points to Rome. As John makes clear in the first three chapters, the first readers were locked in a conflict with the powers of the day.

In recent times there has been a considerable debate<sup>25</sup> as to the degree of actual persecution that the Christians in Asia experienced, but no one doubts the fact that, at a minimum, there was tremendous social and psychological conflict with the Roman empire. This conflict shows up in many ways. For example, Dieter Georgi has pointed out how John sees himself in a dramatic competition with Horace, Virgil, and the other prophets of the Caesar religion, and that John deliberately adopts language and themes of cosmic proportion as a counterfoil to the claims of these opponents.<sup>26</sup> In a similar way, David Aune has demonstrated that the heavenly liturgy depicted throughout the book has been significantly influenced in its conceptualization by popular images of Roman imperial court ceremonials, and that these images are adapted by John, then they are heightened, expanded, and given even greater cosmic significance. John then transferred them to the worship of God, so that Roman imperial court ceremonies become only pale and diabolical imitations.<sup>27</sup> In short, opposition to the first century Roman empire forms an underlying fabric to the entire book.

Second, for first century readers the automatic references of the beast imagery would have pointed straight to the Roman empire. Steven J. Scherrer is one of the few commentators that I could find who presented specific arguments in favor of the beast being the first century Roman empire.<sup>28</sup> His main arguments can be summarized thusly: 1) Rome, like the beast, had near universal authority and dominion over the kings of the earth (13:2,3,7,8); 2) Rome, like the beast, had leaders who were universally worshipped and who laid claims to divinity (13:4,5,12,15); and 3) Rome, like the beast, was a persecutor of the saints (13:7,15). To these arguments we can also add the relationship of the beast to Babylon. In the book of Revelation, Babylon is the first century City of Rome,<sup>29</sup> which was well known in the ancient world as the city on seven hills (17:9,10). The first century city of Rome, as the Harlot, is dependent on the beast (17:3,7,16). The first century city of Rome (Babylon) could only be dependent upon the

---

<sup>25</sup> See Adela Yarboro Collins, Crisis and Catharsis: The Power of the Apocalypse (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1984); Colin J. Hemer, The Letters to the Seven Churches of Asia in Their Local Setting, Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series 11 (Sheffield, England: JOST Press, 1968); and Leonard Thompson, The Book of Revelation (New York: Oxford University Press, 1990) for the latest discussion on this topic.

<sup>26</sup> Dieter Georgi, "Who is the True Prophet," Harvard Theological Review 79 (1986): 100-26.

<sup>27</sup> David E. Aune, "The Influence of Roman Imperial Court Ceremonial on the Apocalypse of John," Biblical Research 28 (1983):5-26.

<sup>28</sup> Steven Joseph Scherrer, "Revelation 13 as an Historical Source for the Imperial Cult Under Domitian," (Th. D. Dissertation, Harvard University, 1979).

<sup>29</sup> See Jim McGuiggan, The Book of Revelation (Lubbock, Texas: Montex Publishing Company, 1976), p. 236.

first century Roman Empire and/or its immediate historical descendants. Thus, many of the references to the beast point naturally to Rome.

Third, the religious devotion given to the beast in the book of Revelation closely matches the religious devotion given to the imperial cult in Asia. This correlation has led many<sup>30</sup> including Price, an authority on the Roman Imperial cult, to the following conclusion:

The beast from the sea clearly represents the power of Rome, and the second beast symbolizes a local authority concerned with the worship of the beast from the sea...Many attempts that have been made to explain the significance of the beast are based upon an adequate conception of contemporary paganism...The obvious candidate is the priesthood of the imperial cult, particularly, in the context of this text, of the province of Asia. This would add force to the imagery of the beast coming from the land. The second beast is said to compel all to erect and worship the image of the first beast. If one accepts the conventional Domitian date for Revelation, it is tempting to think that the establishment of the provincial cult of Domitian at Ephesus, with its colossal cult statue, is what lies behind our text. Indeed, I have seen no other interpretation which fits the known geographical and temporal contexts.<sup>31</sup>

Scherrer's Harvard dissertation on Revelation 13 and the Imperial Cult under Domitian draws a similar conclusion:

Although using mythological and theological language, John in Rev. 13 is speaking of the actual historical institution of the imperial cult of his own day. The beast is identified with the Roman princeps in chap. 13, and with the city of Rome in chap. 17...John saw the forced imperial cult and religious persecution of his time as the beginning of the final apocalyptic struggle, and as a participation already in it...Much of the information in Rev. 13 can be directly correlated with events connected with Domitian's principate. Domitian introduced a striking and shocking new title for himself (dominus et deus noster), and Rev. 13 speaks of his blasphemous name (13:1) and blasphemous words (13:5). Domitian carried out a religious persecution (Dio Cass. 67. 14. 1-2), and Rev. 13 speaks of a persecution of the saints (13:5,7). Domitian insisted on worship of his image (Pliny, Panegyricus 52:7), and Rev. 13 speaks of forced worship of his image (13:15). These correlations inspire confidence in using Rev. 13 as an historical source for the other information it contains, for which direct correlation is more difficult.<sup>32</sup>

Thus, it is difficult to question the fact that the first readers of Revelation would have seen the religious devotion demanded by the beast as representing that demanded by the Roman empire.

---

<sup>30</sup> See William Barclay, "Great Themes of the New Testament: V. Revelation 13, "Expository Times" 70 (1958): 292-96, and John M. Court, Myth and History in the Book of Revelation (London: SPCK, 1979).

31. S.R.F. Price, Ritual and Power: The Roman Imperial Cult in Asia Minor (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1984), p. 197.

<sup>32</sup> Scherrer, "Imperial Cult," summary pages 1-2.

The fourth and last piece of evidence relating the beast of Revelation with the Roman empire is John's use of the Nero *Redivivus Myth*. Though some deny that John uses this myth<sup>33</sup>, the evidence is very strong that he does and that it lies behind John's imagery of the wounded head (13:3,12,14, etc.).

The myth was well known in the Greco/Roman world and it is even mentioned in the Jewish Sibylline tradition (5:367-69). In 67 and 68 A.D. Nero's unpopularity with Roman citizens reached astounding levels. Soon there were open revolts in Gaul and Spain, followed by repudiation from the Senate and the praetorian guard. Nero fled from the city to a friend's suburban villa, where he committed suicide with a sword shortly after hearing that he was about to be captured by a group of Roman soldiers. After his death a rumor circulated that he had not really died, but that he had escaped to the Parthians, and that he would one day return. John appears to have used this myth by relating Nero, who had persecuted the Christians, with the appearance of Domitian, who was like Nero in many ways. John developed the myth by implying that Domitian, in a sense, was the resurrected Nero.

Adela Yarboro Collins summarizes the myth and its relation to the beast imagery:

Thus, the beast in Rev. 13:1-10 is best understood as the fourth kingdom of Daniel, reinterpreted to refer to Rome, and the wounded head as Nero. There is, as was noted above, a certain fluidity in the imagery, whereby the beast and the wounded head are conflated. The Roman empire is suggested to the reader at the outset, then attention is called to the wounded head, which brings Nero to mind. Finally, references to the beast which was wounded and yet lived lead the reader to take the beast as the returned Nero. Since the Nero legend is also reflected in chap. 17, the eighth king is best understood as the returning Nero.<sup>34</sup>

It is reasonable to assume, then, that this myth lies behind the wounded head of the beast; and if it does, then it could only refer to first century Roman sources.

In sum, that the beast in Rev. 13 and 17 is a reference to the Roman empire is proved by the fact that opposition to the Roman Empire forms an underlying fabric of the entire book, that the references to the beast in Revelation naturally point to situations and events in the Roman Empire of the first century, that the religious devotion given to the beast closely matches that given to the imperial cult, and that the Nero *Redivivus* myth lies behind the imagery of the restored wounded head.<sup>35</sup>

---

<sup>33</sup> Paul S. Minear, "The Wounded Beast," Journal of Biblical Literature 72 (1953): 93-101.

<sup>34</sup> Collins, Combat Myth, p. 175.

<sup>35</sup> It is also in keeping with the statement in Rev. 1:3 that implies that the events referred to are ones that are at hand, in the time of John.



## The Beast of Daniel and the Beast of Revelation

If my reasoning has been correct to this point, then the fourth beast in Daniel 7 and the beast in Revelation both refer to the Roman empire. While it is important not to interpret both texts as if they constituted a single text, and it is important to recognize the ways in which they are different, as well as their independence from one another,<sup>36</sup> it is also significant that they refer to the same entity.

The closeness of the two beasts is also supported by other similarities that go beyond the fact that they are both references to Rome.

### Daniel

Ten Horns (Dan. 7:10,20)  
Ten Horns (Dan. 7:24).  
World Domination (Dan. 7:23).  
Destroyed and Thrown in Fire (Dan. 7:11).  
  
Persecutes the Saints (Dan. 7:21,25)  
Saints obtain Kingdom (Dan. 7:22).  
Boastful Speaking (Dan. 7:20,25).  
Slander of God

### Revelation

Ten Horns (Rev. 13:1; 17:8,16)  
Ten Kings (Rev. 17:12)  
World Domination (Rev. 13:6)  
Destroyed and Thrown in Fire  
(Rev. 14:10,11;19:20; 20:10)  
Persecutes the Saints (Rev. 13:7,15,17:14).  
Saints obtain Kingdom (Rev. 21:1-3)  
Boastful Speaking (Rev. 13:5; 17:13)  
Slander of God (Rev. 13:6)

The closeness of these details adds further significance to the relationship between the two beasts. While pointing this out, I am also aware of the differences and the enigmas that are involved (the little horn, miraculous signs, etc.), but these do not need to detract from the similarities.

The exact meaning of these details needs further investigation. For example, who are the ten kings? Is ten just a symbolic number as Baldwin, Roberts, and Beasley-Murry advocate?<sup>37</sup> Or, are the ten kings' real historical people in the Roman empire as McGuiggan, Butterworth, and Shavers indicate?<sup>38</sup> These are important questions that should be given in-depth attention by capable commentators.<sup>39</sup>

---

<sup>36</sup> Adela Yarboro Collins discusses how Pre-millennialists do this to their own peril. See her excellent discussion and guidelines in this regard, "Reading the Book of Revelation in the Twentieth Century," Interpretation XL (July 1986): 229-42.

<sup>37</sup>Joyce Baldwin, Daniel, p. 141.; J.W. Roberts, The Revelation of John, Living Word Commentary) Austin, Texas: Sweet Publishing Company, 1974), p. 142; and G.R. Beasley Murry, The Book of Revelation, New Century Bible Commentary (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Wm. B. Eerdmans, Pub. Co., 1974), p. 258.

<sup>38</sup>McGuiggan, Revelation, pp. 181-82; and Ken Butterworth and John Shaver, "The Beast of Revelation in the Light of Prophecy, Fulfillment and History," (Unpublished Tract, Jasper, Alabama: The Bible Speaks, n.d.)

<sup>39</sup>The exact nature of apocalyptic literature lies at the center of this discussion. In other apocalyptic literature the various details of animal imagery often represent specific things in history. This is especially true, for example, in the "Dream Visions" section of the book of Enoch.

## Conclusion

In this paper I have tried to demonstrate the close relationship between the fourth beast in Daniel 7 and the beast in the book of Revelation. There are four positions that I have put forward herein that I believe need to be given further consideration by Biblical commentators: 1). The fourth beast in Daniel 7 is the Roman empire, not the Grecian empire; 2) There are other antecedents to the beast concept in Jewish literature, but these are not fundamentally related to the beast in Revelation in the same way as is the fourth beast in Daniel; 3) The beast in the book of Revelation is the Roman empire; and 4), both beasts (Daniel and Revelation) point to the Roman empire and in junction with this; both describe a number of other significant details that can be correlated to each other.

Because most critical scholars who comment on Revelation believe that the fourth beast of Daniel is Greece and not Rome, they under value the impact that the fourth beast has on the discussion of the beast in Revelation. In doing this they may also be neglecting an important link to an understanding of the relationship between God's people and the Roman empire both in scripture and in history.