
A table of contents for *The Churchman* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_churchman_os.php

Cheeseburger in Paradise? New Creation, the Spirit, and Animal Rights

Laura Robinson

This article argues that in light of the harmonious relationships in the original creation and the anticipated new creation, God's Spirit works in us now to renew us in God's image and so enables us to work toward more harmonious relationships with animals now.

The last quarter of the twentieth century saw an explosion of scholarly interest in three theological fields that all apparently converge on the subject of Christianity and animal rights: eco-theology, pneumatology, and eschatology. The goal of this paper is to pull from the gains made in all three fields and use them to address a topic that has long been neglected in western churches—the relationship between humans and animals. Christian theology has historically underperformed concerning the doctrine of animals and human responsibility. Taking its marching orders from Genesis 1:27-28, and defining the 'image of God' as the rational capacity that animals (according to humankind) do not have, all too often theologians take this as biblical evidence that human needs trump needs of animals, that animals lack rights and the capacity to think and feel, and that God made them primarily for our benefit and use. Augustine, for example, wrote that an animal's 'life and death are subject to our use' (*De Civ. Dei* i, 20); Aquinas upheld this when he decided that 'the life of animals…is preserved…for man' (*Summa Theo*. 2. 64). Aside from anecdotes of saints behaving compassionately towards other creatures[1] and hints of ambivalence in major theological works,[2] the majority of Western theology and philosophy has provided little help for modern theologians seeking to develop a doctrine of animals and human responsibility.

In recent years, though, a number of theologians have spoken out to counteract this, particularly following the rise of eco-theology. Andrew Linzey, for example, has written extensively on Christianity and animal rights, and celebrated Christian ethicists have joined the conversation as well. One common tactic these theologians use to promote animal welfare is to use Scripture and theology to emphasise the worth of animals themselves. This is Linzey's primary strategy, who deduces that animals are

[1] For examples, see E.S. Turner, *All Heaven in a Rage* (Fontwell: Centaur, 1992), p. 25; or Rod Preece, *Animals and Nature: Cultural Myths, Cultural Realities* (Vancouver: UBC Press, 1999), p.127.

[2] Rod Preece and David Fraser, 'The Status of Animals in Biblical and Christian Thought: A Study in Colliding Values,' *Society and Animals* 8.2 (2000): pp. 25-258.

intrinsically valuable because God creates and animates them through his immanent Spirit.[3] The earth is the Lord's and everything in it, and because the Lord continues to sustain and protect his creation, humanity ought to value the things that God values and treat his creatures with respect.

This is good, but a high estimation of animal life still does not answer all our questions (or even most of them) concerning our practical duty towards creatures. All this definitively affirms is that Christians must not be indifferent towards animals and their welfare. It does not tell us what we can or cannot do to them. We can believe animals are important

[3] Andrew Linzey, *Christianity and the Rights of Animals* (London: SPCK, 1987), pp. 8–9. A similar approach appears in Daniel L. Migliore, *Faith Seeking Understanding: An Introduction to Christian Theology* (2d ed.; Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 2004), pp. 103–104; Elizabeth A. Johnson, *Women, Earth, and Creator Spirit* (New York: Paulist Press, 1993), p. 20; Steven M. Studebaker, 'The Spirit in Creation: A Unified Theology of Grace and Creation Care,' *Zygon* 43.4 (2008): pp. 943–960. A pneumatological variation of this approach elevates creation's value by emphasising the immanence of the Spirit in the created world and establishing creation (and thereby animals) as the Spirit's manifestation. See Jurgen Moltmann, *God in Creation: A New Theology of Creation and the Spirit of God* (San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1985), pp. 9ff.; Jurgen Moltmann, *The Way of Jesus Christ* (San Francisco: Harper-Collins, 1990), pp. 274–305; Mark I. Wallace in 'The Green Face of God: Recovering the Spirit in an Ecocidal Era,' in *Advents of the Spirit: An Introduction to the Current Study of Pneumatology*, (eds. Bradford E. Hinze and D. Lyle Dabney; *Marquette Studies in Theology 30*; Milwaukee: Marquette University Press, 2001), pp. 444–464; and Mark I. Wallace, *Fragments of the Spirit: Nature, Violence, and the Renewal of Creation* (Harrisburg, PA: Trinity Press, 2002).

I am indebted to Stephen H. Webb, who develops a theology of animal care that centers on the rhetoric of grace, love, and mutual sacrifice that characterises Christian theological language as well as the relational dynamics between humans and pets. This provides an outstanding model of how to conceive of Christian animal care, but again, I want to locate a direct command from God concerning animals in Scripture. Webb identifies compassionate care for individual animals as a trait that mimics God's compassionate care for individual humans. This work is outstanding, and I want to incorporate some of his observations about the necessity and nature of animal care into the framework of human calling and sanctification. See *On God and Dogs: A Christian Theology of Compassion for Animals* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1998).

Another valuable contribution comes from Laura Hobgood-Oster, who identifies the moral imperative to care for animals in the task of hospitality. There is considerable overlap between the duties she identifies as hospitality for animals and the duties I identify as kingship, and her discussion on this subject is creative and thought-provoking. However, I believe we can make a better biblical case for the concept of humans as king rather than the concept of human as host. See *The Friends We Keep: Unleashing Christianity's Compassion for Animals* (Waco, Tex.: Baylor University Press, 2000).

and still kill them if we believe something else is more important.[4] Many hunters find no tension between respecting a creature and eating it, and scientists who justify testing drugs on chimpanzees argue that, even if a chimp's life is valuable, a human patient's life is more valuable still. Nor does Scripture's high view of animals dictate that God has given us a conscience-binding moral law concerning them. Take Linzey's argument, for example: if animals are God's creation, they have intrinsic dignity and we 'have a duty to look after them as God would look after them.'[5] First, the conclusions do not logically follow the premise. Just because God creates something good doesn't mean he expects us to take care of it. Angels care for us, not the other way around. Secondly, what does it mean to 'care for animals as God would care for them'? Such God-mimicry is difficult to enact because there is no one-to-one correspondence between God's ability to look after animals and ours. God works all things towards his ends (Romans 8:28), but he does not look after every individual being in the same way. God has the right as a creator to bless, punish, sustain, or kill his creatures. We did not make animals, so we lack the authority to exercise God's rights over them. Furthermore, God's wisdom enables him to act towards all individuals in a manner that is consistent with his holy character and purposes. We lack this wisdom and should not think that our instincts towards animals are correct. To simply ask, 'What would God do?' every time we encounter a squirrel, snake, or steak could become a license to use creatures for our glory instead of God's. While Linzey intends the high value of animals to inspire Christians to exercise compassionate care of animals, ultimately his model does not sufficiently bind the conscience, and it does not clarify our practical responsibilities to animals.

Since animals' intrinsic value does not lead directly to a requirement to care for them, other writers have sought to ground regard for animal welfare not in the worth of the animal but in God-given responsibilities. This is the so-called 'stewardship' model, which asserts that, because God has given humanity dominion over creation, we are 'morally accountable to (God) for treating creation in a manner that best serves the objectives of

[4] The way around this, of course, is to assert that human life is one of many forms of God-given life that are all of equal value in his sight, and that the killing of animals has been a sin against God in all times and places of human history. See J.R. Hyland, *God's Covenant with Animals: A Biblical Basis for the Humane Treatment of All Creatures* (New York: Lantern Books, 2000). I do not advocate for this view since the special status and worth of humanity is repeatedly stated in Scripture (Genesis 9:6, Psalm 8:5, Matthew 10:31). We cannot call such 'biological egalitarianism' an evangelical view of animal rights, since it seems to ignore the witness of Scripture.

[5] This is essentially the thrust of Linzey's argument in the first chapter of *Animal Gospel* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 2000), pp.1-17.

the kingdom of God.'[6] Notice how ambiguous the language of stewardship can be, though. While stewardship lays a moral imperative to care for creation at the feet of the human species, the emphasis on the 'objectives of the kingdom of God' still does not help us determine what exactly it is that Christians owe to animals. What place do animals have in the kingdom of God? Should image-bearing humans ever prioritise animals over themselves? Apparently not, according to some organisations. The Acton Institute and Cornwall Alliance, for example, 'honor God's emphasis on meeting human needs' by petitioning governments not to intervene in industrial growth[7] and discouraging belief in climate change. If humans owe anything to animals, such a loosely-defined model of stewardship leaves room for the debt to be forgiven as soon as human interests are on the line.

I don't disagree entirely with either of the representative views above. Animal life is precious and humanity has a special responsibility to care for it—but the witness of the Spirit allows us to say much more. As much as I appreciate Linzey's work in this field, what I want to talk about is not caring for animals as God would care for them, but caring for animals as God would have us care for them. The key to a biblically-based mandate to respect animals is the doctrine of the Holy Spirit: God as the Creator and re-creator of earth. In the beginning, the Holy Spirit created and appointed human beings to be priest-kings over creation and to reign with him benevolently over their shared animal subjects. Unfortunately, our sin has ruined our reign over animals—we are sometimes weak and ineffectual leaders, and sometimes domineering and selfish. But the Spirit has not revoked our scepters. Instead the Spirit is at work transforming the world into a new Eden and people into the image of Christ, the new Adam. To show responsible care and respect for animals is an eschatological act that anticipates the day when our sanctification is complete and humanity is made anew into the priest-kings Adam was intended to be. This so-called 'kingship model' of creation care, which views humans as the Spirit-anointed, Spirit-empowered royal priesthood of the animal world, provides us with a framework to accomplish what other models of Christian animal care do not. Kingship lays forth a reliable blueprint to help us construct clear ethical instructions on how to deal with animals, because it looks back to Adam and Eve as embodiments of the paradigmatic human-animal relationship which the Spirit intends to restore. It also establishes compassion for animals as a God-given moral

[6] Definition found in the Acton Institute's *Environmental Stewardship in the Judeo-Christian Tradition: Jewish, Catholic, and Protestant Wisdom on the Environment* (Acton Institute: 2007), p.69.

[7] Found at http://www.cornwallalliance.org/docs/the-cornwall-declaration-on-environmental-stewardship.pdf, accessed 03/04/14.

imperative, because it recognises that responsible rule over animals is a facet of Christlikeness and an aspect of our sanctification.

In the beginning it was not so: what God intended for the human–animal relationship in Eden

I begin in Genesis 1–2 to determine how God intended humanity to function as kings of creation and what his original plan for the God-human-animal relationship looked like. Since the kingship model assumes human dominion over animals, let us first address concerns that human dominion is discriminatory with regard to species (what might be called 'species-ist'). Scripture ascribes incredible dignity to animals and asserts that we have much in common with them. God forms us both 'out of the ground' (Genesis 2:7, 19). He blesses us, instructs us to multiply (1:22, 28), and gives us fruits and vegetables to eat and enjoy (1:29-30). He animates us with his Spirit, the 'breath of life' (2:7; 7:2) and we all depend on him for food and life (Psalm 104:27-29). Animals even find pleasure in God's presence[8] and praise him alongside angels and humans (Psalm 148). Given our common dependence on our Creator, as well as our shared status as recipients of his attentive care, humans have more in common with animals than many acknowledge.

However, Scripture also distinguishes between humans and animals because God made humans to rule. When God creates people in Genesis 1, he declares first how he will make them (in his image and likeness) and, second, why he will make them (to have dominion over other creatures). The dominion God gives humans over animals cannot be understood apart from our designation as bearing the image of God. The image of God was a common Ancient Near Eastern (ANE) term that designated the king as the representative of his city's patron deity. As the god's representative, the king ruled his people by maintaining his relationship with the god, subsequently securing said god's blessings, and preserving justice and order for his subjects.[9] All of humanity bears God's image; therefore, God has established all people as his representative authorities over the animal kingdom.

Furthermore, since the kingship and priesthood were not separated until much later in Israel's history,[10] the kingship of humanity also includes

[8] As indicated by the fact that they mourn when they cannot perceive him, according to Psalm 10:29.

[9] Kenneth A. Mathews, Genesis 1–11:26: *An Exegetical and Theological Exposition of Holy Scripture* (*New American Commentary* 1A; Holman Reference, 1996), p. 169. See also Peter J. Gentry and Stephen J. Wellum, *Kingdom through Covenant: A Biblical-Theological Understanding of the Covenants* (Downers Grove: Crossway, 2012), pp. 19-197.

[10] See, for example, the Melchizedek story (Genesis 14:17-24).

priestly elements. In Genesis 2 God calls Adam and Eve as representatives of humanity to serve as priests in Eden, the first sanctuary. The language of Genesis 2 makes it clear that we are to read Eden as a prototype for the temple[11] and Adam and Eve as prototypes for the priesthood, who worship God through temple service and maintaining the sacred space where he dwells.[12]

If we take humanity to be a race of rulers, and Adam and Eve as Earth's priest-kings, this invites the question as to what sort of rule and ministry God assigned when he imparted these titles upon us. Beginning with the task of kingship, the fact that we bear God's image shows that God intends us to rule as his representatives. The 'image of God' in the ANE referred not only to kings but also to idols through which the work of the deity represented by the idol was done on earth.[13] God's images reign as his agents on earth, and our reign should resemble his own. God's reign over his people is not oppressive. In the Psalms, God as King listens to the distraught cries of his subjects (Psalm 5:2) and saves them from oppressors (Psalm 44:4-7). Furthermore, though Jesus is the rightful king of Israel, he endures abuse for the sake of his people only a week after his triumphal entry (Matthew 27:31-46). If our God is the king who cares for his subjects and engages in radical acts of self-sacrifice on their behalf, a human seeking to reign in his likeness will likewise show regard for the needs of our subjects and make sacrifices for their well-being when necessary.

That said, let us now turn to the oft-abused commands God gives to humans when he inaugurates their reign. The instruction to subdue the earth and have dominion over animals is not a license to act as despots. Read through the lens of *chaoskampf*,[14] humanity's responsibility to

[11] Based on both the similar appearance of the garden and the temple, as well as its similar function (that is, both are places where God is uniquely present, humanity goes to serve and worship him, and where humanity and God enjoy each other's presence). For a discussion of the ways in which Edenic imagery is evocative of the temple and vice-versa, see G.K. Beale, *The Temple and the Church's Mission: a Biblical Theology of the Dwelling Place of God* (Downers Grove: IVP, 2004), pp. 66–80. For a discussion of the similar functions of Eden and the temple see T. Desmond Alexander, *From Eden to the New Jerusalem: An Introduction to Biblical Theology* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Kregel, 2008), p25.

[12] The language used to describe their responsibilities—to 'work' (עָבַד) and 'keep' (שָׁמַר) the garden (Genesis 2:15)—is evocative of Levitical temple service. See Beale, *Temple*, pp. 6-69.

[13] John H. Walton, *Ancient Near Eastern Thought and the Old Testament: Introducing the Conceptual World of the Hebrew Bible* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Baker Academic, 2006), p.130.

[14] *Chaoskampf* is the 'common depiction of creation as a battle between the creator god and the powers of chaos, usually represented by primeval waters and the monsters that rise from them.' Robin Routledge, *Old Testament Theology:*

subdue the earth is no more oppressive than the act by which God created life in the first place. When God subdues the world, he subdues the forces that inhibit flourishing and creates space for order, beauty, and diversity. Such subduing is beneficial for animals. Where would elephants and cheetahs live if God had not subdued the ocean to keep it away from land? When humans subdue in the likeness of God's subduing, we should expect to find more order, beauty, and life—not less. A retaining wall along a riverbed to protect the bank from erosion, a vaccine preventing disease, or trees planted to preserve topsoil—in other words, any human invention that inhibits decay and preserves order—are all examples of godly subduing. An oil spill or burning coal mine is not. Secondly, the command to רָדָה ('tread down') animals is stock royal vocabulary.[15] It affirms humanity's status as kings and charges them to lead animals as subjects. It is not a command to crush them.

The question of how human priesthood relates to animals is a bit more complicated. In the ANE, the priest's responsibility included protecting the temple's purity and performing rituals that met the deity's needs.[16] We have indications that Adam and Eve were to keep uncleanliness out of the temple,[17] but beyond that, other rituals that normally defined ANE temple service seem out of place. ANE priests performed temple rituals in order to provide the deity with adequate privacy, keep him or her fed, and make

---

A Thematic Approach (Downers Grove: IVP Academic, 2009), pp. 127–128; and John. H. Walton, 'Creation in Genesis 1:1–2:3 and the Ancient Near East: Order out of Disorder after Chaoskampf,' *Calvin Theological Journal* 43.1 (2008): pp. 48–63. According to ANE cosmogony, in order to create a functional and productive world God first had to conquer the opposing forces of chaos and formlessness so that life and order might flourish—forces often embodied in 'chaos monsters' like the Leviathan and Rahab.

[15] This is a term that is easy to misconstrue since רָדָה literally refers to 'treading down' or 'trampling.' However, it would be incorrect to read this term as therefore implying merciless exercise of power or oppression. First, this unusual term is derived from court language of other ANE empires; it denotes ordinary, legitimate rule and affirms Adam and Eve's status as divinely installed authorities over creation. See Claus Westermann, *Genesis 1-11: a commentary* (London: SPCK, 1984), pp. 158–159. Secondly, when רָדָה is used in the Old Testament, it requires a prepositional phrase (בְּפָרֶךְ –'with severity') to refer to tyranny. Without this prepositional phrase, רָדָה as 'to rule' is either morally neutral or positive. This is confirmed in Psalm 8 when humanity's rule over animals is described with the more common (and also more obviously positive) term מָשַׁל.

[16] Walton, *Ancient Near Eastern Thought*, p.130.

[17] First, because God gives them the command to שָׁמַר 'to keep or guard' the garden in 2:15; second, because the serpent's presence in the garden indicates that contamination is a very real possibility, and third, because when Adam and Eve become contaminants themselves, the cherub has to שָׁמַר the garden from them. See Beale, *Temple*, pp. 6-71.

propitiation when the deity was offended.[18] None of these tasks belong in Eden. God does not seek privacy—when he finds himself alone he goes out looking for his people (Genesis 3:9). He feeds his own priests instead of the other way around (2:9, 16), and Adam and Eve, because they do not sin, do not require propitiation.

Since standard priestly functions don't fit the way God was worshiped in Eden, we need to take a broader view of 'priestly activity' to understand the couple's service. One answer is that everything Adam and Eve did to cultivate the garden was 'priestly service' since it was part of maintaining sacred space.[19] The paradigmatic act of worship—the first sacred assignment God gave to an individual—was maintaining the beauty of the natural world. Creation care is divine household management. For Adam and Eve, creation care was not something done for the sake of humanity or Eden itself. Caring for the earth was service rendered to God, done on behalf of his home.

This is the 'upward' act of priestly mediation—service rendered to God. But as mediators between God and the nation, the Levitical priests also would have rendered 'downward' services geared toward the people. One would expect the prototypical priests to do something similar. As facilitators of the relationship between God and the nation, the priests relayed God's blessings back to the people. They taught and preserved Torah, blessed the nation, and maintained the space where God settled among them, mediating God's gifts beyond the priesthood to the entire nation. Adam and Eve are not mediating God's presence to any people. Both of them are on equal priestly footing[20] and don't need mediators themselves, and there aren't other people who require mediation in Eden.[21] However, the only time we get a specific account of a priest at work in Eden, he is clearly depicted as mediating the blessings of God—not to people, but to animals. When God creates[22] in Genesis 1, he creates by bestowing order, differentiation, and purpose over the created world. The consummate act of creation is assigning names to his handiworks, signifying that he has assigned them a function in his thriving, orderly

[18] Walton, *Ancient Near Eastern Thought*, pp. 130-131.

[19] Beale, *Temple*, p.68.

[20] Similarity of function and rank is implied by the title עֵזֶר כְּנֶגְדּוֹ that God gives to Eve in Genesis 2:18. Eve is literally a 'helper like opposite him,' indicating that Eve and Adam have similar authority and responsibility. See Westermann, *Genesis*, p. 227 and John L. Harris, 'An Exposition of Genesis 2:4-11:32,' *Southwestern Journal of Theology* 44.1 (2001): pp. 3-41.

[21] None of them show up when Adam goes looking for a partner among the creatures, at any rate (2:20).

[22] For a discussion of the Hebrew word 'to create,' see Walton, *Ancient Near Eastern Thought*, pp.181–184 and John H. Walton, *The Lost World of Genesis One: Ancient Cosmology and the Origins Debate* (Downers Grove: IVP Academic, 2009), pp. 3-45.

cosmos.[23] Adam as namer of the animals functions as God's representative in a priestly and kingly role. Naming animals is an act of authority as well as an act of mediation. Adam, standing in as co-creator alongside God, mediates the gift of order to animals by establishing their place in the garden. As the custodian of Eden's harmony and order, Adam acts as a priest on behalf of the animals by sharing God's blessings with them. He maintains the space where all creatures dwell with God, gives them places and functions in the thriving and orderly cosmos, and imitates the kingship of God by ruling justly over creation.

It is worth noting that, during the brief sinless part of humanity's reign, Adam and Eve's rule over animals never required them to kill one. They didn't eat meat (1:29), didn't wear leather (2:25), didn't defend themselves from pests or predators,[24] and didn't perform sacrifices. Order between God, humans, and animals occurs in Eden without any party submitting to harm or exploitation from another. When God created humanity in his image he granted kingship to all people, and the priesthood of Adam and Eve gave humanity the responsibility of mediating God's blessings to the created world.

Fall and restoration: the Spirit and the return of Adam, Eve, and Eden

The above portrait of Eden is, I think, an accurate look at what humanity was created to be. In the beginning, man and woman reigned with God over the animal kingdom for the benefit of their creaturely subjects. Only after sin entered the garden did the human-animal relationship became antagonistic. Though no animal was ever harmed in Eden, God and humans start killing creatures immediately after the Fall. Adam and Eve were told to cover their nakedness with the skin of their own suffering subjects (Genesis 3:21), Abel begins the sacrificial system (4:4), animals die in the flood for the sins of their rulers (7:21), and, finally, God acknowledges the growing division between humans and animals and allows humans to eat them (9:2).

The slow encroachment of sin upon the world destroyed the relationship between humans and animals, but the prophets who anticipated God removing the sins of the world also anticipated an eschatological reconciliation between humans and animals. Isaiah conceives of this newfound harmony as the work of the Spirit-bearing

[23] For the significance of naming in the ANE, see Walton, *Ancient Near Eastern Thought*, pp. 188-190.

[24] Death and difficulty in agriculture are not real threats to Adam and Eve until the curse (3:17–19), and animals are still constrained to a vegetarian diet until after the Flood (1:30). We can presume that Adam and Eve are not dealing with locust swarms or hungry lions during their period of service in Eden.

Messiah (Isaiah 11:2-9). When the Messiah becomes ruler and judge of the earth, he will erase predator-prey distinctions and animals will once again live peacefully alongside their human protectors.[25] The New Jerusalem is the new home of the Tree of Life, from which people can eat for healing and nourishment just as Adam and Eve once did (Revelation 22:1-5).

Our relationship with animals and our benevolent kingship over them was lost at Eden when Adam and Eve sinned. What has happened since is that we have failed to rule in a way that befits our status as image-bearers of our God. We have not lost the image of God—we still bear his token of kingship—but we do not reflect his likeness in the way that we were intended to. Furthermore, just as Adam and Eve lost their priestly status when they were thrown out of Eden, we have all failed to mediate blessings to animals in the way that God blesses us. The work of the Holy Spirit, then, is to restore Eden and remake our marred image back into a perfect likeness of God. In New Testament terminology, the Spirit remakes us into the likeness of Christ, the New Adam, the priest-king of creation. By the Spirit we are transformed into what we were intended to be—holy, just, and gentle vice-regents with God over creation, who guide the world as God guides us and bless our subjects with our righteous, priestly rule.

The capacity to rule in God's likeness has always been a gift of the Spirit. In Eden, the Spirit of God animated Adam for governance through the 'breath of life.'[26] In an environment without sin, the sustaining life of God was enough to empower Adam to reign properly from the temple. The paradigmatic couple were the first anointed priest-kings of the world, and the model to which we are being restored. Proper governance is a sign of the Spirit's presence even after the Fall. Later in Israel's history God's Spirit falls upon prophets, judges, priests, and kings to enable them to enact God's will through their jurisdiction on earth. God's Spirit empowers Joseph to use his understanding to save two nations from famine (Genesis 41:38). He (the Spirit) enables the elders to issue wise decrees over Israel in the wilderness (Numbers 11:16) and strengthens Joshua to take the Promised Land (Numbers 27:18). He raises up judges

[25] See also Isaiah 65:21–25. Isaiah's picture of the Eschaton, described in both of these 'peaceable kingdom' sequences, is of a return to Eden's conditions, where humans enjoy meaningful work alongside animals on God's 'holy mountain.'

[26] In Ezekiel 37:9–10, 14 and Job 27:3–4, the 'breath of life,' 'breath of God,' and 'spirit of God' are all treated as interchangeable ideas. God forms Adam and animates him with his own spirit, in the way that he animates all life with his sustaining presence. See G. K. Beale, *A New Testament Biblical Theology: The Unfolding of the Old Testament in the New* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2011), p. 563; George T. Montague, 'The Fire in the Word: The Holy Spirit in Scripture,' in *Advents of the Spirit: An Introduction to the Current Study of Pneumatology*, pp. 36–37; Christopher J.H. Wright, *Knowing the Holy Spirit through the Old Testament* (Downers Grove: IVP Academic, 2006), pp. 2-29.

to fight off Israel's oppressors (Judges 3:10; 6:34, 11:29; 14:6), and he anoints the kings to transform them into rulers whom God approves (1 Samuel 10:6, 10; 16:13). To receive the Spirit as a leader is to receive the wisdom, discernment, and power that is necessary to act as an agent of God's activity on earth. If we as Christians understand ourselves to be bearers of the Holy Spirit—the 'Spirit of wisdom and revelation' (Ephesians 1:17) who 'strengthens with power' (3:16), we likewise ought to expect that as the Spirit works in our lives we would also become wise and godly kings.

The Spirit also enables creativity and the ability for human beings to create beauty, design, and order (Exodus 31:3, 31), much like the creativity Adam would have needed to maintain the beauty of the garden. The anointing Spirit of God is not a Spirit who inspires passivity, or induces human beings simply to retreat from the animal world and allow nature to take its course. Rather, the Spirit of God moves people to engage with the world and forge symbiotic relationships with the animal kingdom. Human creativity enables us to find ways to carry out tasks as diverse as moving stranded multi-ton whales off a beach and training dogs to sniff out cancer.[27] We as a species have shown incredible aptitude in finding ways to serve animals and enabling animals to serve alongside us. Since we were made to reign over animals and live among them, we should expect that the Spirit has made us to develop these relationships with animals and is delighted when they flourish.

Above all, though, the work of the Spirit is to make us Christlike—New-Adam-like. By 'New Adam' I mean that Christ has become the new paradigm of humanity in whose footsteps we are to tread—one who is holy and set apart for God's purposes, and is perfectly obedient to the Father by the power of the Spirit. This idea appears in Philippians 2, in which Paul presents Christ as an example to the congregation because he was 'obedient to the point of death, even death on a cross' (2:8), something that was not true of Adam. Although Adam was not intended to be like God in knowing good and evil (though he was absolutely intended to be like God in having dominion!), Adam broke from his God-given calling, and all of creation suffered as a result. Jesus was aware of the purpose for which he was sent. He fulfilled and obeyed it, and now stands as the supreme example of Spirit-empowered human life.

To follow the example of Christ is to acknowledge the place that the Creator Spirit has given us and to uphold the responsibilities that come with it, even when it is painful and difficult. This is not easily done. In fact, we can do this only by the power of the Holy Spirit, who knows that we are to be holy and strives to make it so. According to Scripture,

[27] See Dina Zaphiris, 'Can Dogs Smell Cancer?' Online: http://www.dogsdetectcancer.org/dogs-detect-cancer-blog/can-dogs-smell-cancer, accessed 03/04/2014.

to be holy is to be 'set apart,' reserved for God's use and possession and commissioned to carry out God's own purposes.[28] In this respect Adam was indeed meant to be holy. God took him alone of all the creatures on earth, and placed him in Eden for divine service. Israel's holiness, or lack thereof, was also defined in terms of their distinctness as a nation and their obedience to God's purposes. They alone of all the people were designated as God's 'treasured possession' (Deuteronomy 7:6) and intended to be a 'light to the nations... so that all the world might be saved' (Isaiah 49:6; cf. Exodus 19:6). To be holy is also to be like God. Israel's standard of holiness was their God's own character—'be holy as I am holy' (Leviticus 11:44–45; 19:2; 20:7). The same is true for Christians today, who are sanctified by the Holy Spirit to take on the likeness of Christ (Ephesians 4:24; Colossians 3:10).[29] Truly holy people are marked by the fact that they have been called out for a special task, act in obedience to carry it out, and take on God's own character as their own.

As the Holy Spirit sanctifies us, then, we should expect to see ourselves manifest these traits of holiness in our own lives as well. We are unique among the species in that we have been called into service as priest-kings over the earth, so as we surrender more and more of ourselves to the Holy Spirit, our desire and ability to exercise this authority ought to grow as well. We mediate the blessings of God to animals as well as to other people, and seek to make God's presence known and manifest on the earth. As we grow in Christlikeness, our self-centred, sinful old nature will continue to deteriorate and we will find ourselves motivated more by love than by self-love. We will become, in other words, kings and queens in the image of God, ruling after the pattern of the one who gave us our kingship.

The Holy Spirit gives us the authorisation, wisdom, power, and holiness to rule over creation in the way that Adam was intended to. People who fail to rule righteously violate the will of God, deviate from Christ's example, and resist the work of the Spirit in their lives. If righteous reign over animals is required of a holy people in this age, and will be ubiquitous in the age to come, this requires practical reflection to decide how the Spirit intends us live out our kingship in the present.

Putting human kingship into practice

I would not go so far as to say that killing, buying, and eating animals are sins. Jesus fished and ate with his disciples, shared a Passover meal with them, and was still a sinless sacrifice. Nevertheless, we should take our

[28] See Sinclair B. Ferguson, *The Holy Spirit (Contours of Christian Theology;* Downers Grove: IVP Academic, 1996), p.140.

[29] See Ferguson, *The Holy Spirit*, pp. 141-142.

calling as Christians seriously and ask how we should relate to animals in a way that anticipates the Eschaton. In *The Ethics of Hope*, Moltmann calls the spirit 'the beginning of Christ's parousia... (and) the pledge and guarantee of glory.'[30] As people who have received the Spirit's pledge of eschatological hope, we live in anticipation of God's perfect reign and reclaim the creation mandate that God gave to Adam.

It is beyond the scope of this paper to apply this to every aspect of the human-animal relationship, and thereby determine comprehensively what we may do to animals and what we may not. However, I want to close with a few practical conclusions to show how I anticipate this kingship ethic working in real life, and to call upon my readers prayerfully to consider the concept of the creation mandate and to evaluate their own relationship with animals.

1. If the redeemed world involves no hostility between humans and animals, is anthropocentric, profit-oriented subjugation of animals a step in the opposite direction? In industrial egg farms, male chicks are immediately culled and either shredded (alive) in macerators or sucked through pipes onto electrified kill plates. Female chicks have their beaks seared off with hot razors and spend their lives in battery cages, which provide each bird with roughly eight by ten inches of floor space.[31] Pig gestation crates are only slightly larger than a pig's body, which means that throughout a breeding pig's life it can neither turn nor lie down.[32] These practices might be good for producing large amounts of cheap meat, but are they good governance of our animal subjects? If Christians are to take up the banner of reconciliation between humans and animals, how can we patronise a system that profits from such cruelty?

2. Humans are to have dominion over the animal world. That said, in this 'time between the times' we carry out our reign in a fallen system and may need to employ scientists and naturalists to intervene wisely in the animal world and promote its flourishing. Not everything in the animal kingdom is currently in top working order. In The United States, for example, poor stewardship in the past has destroyed much of the bobcat, cougar, and wolf population, so that white-tailed deer no longer have natural predators. For this reason, the Department of Natural Resources (DNR) allows controlled hunts to prevent deer overpopulation. While selective culling of certain species apparently did not occur in Eden, it often needs to happen now. Responsible stewardship might therefore require us to make difficult decisions in order to maintain balance in the environment.

3. How different humans will manifest Spirit-empowered kingship until the Eschaton will vary widely between cultures. In the west, we

[30] Jurgen Moltmann, *Ethics of Hope* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2012), pp. 3-38.
[31] http://www.farmsanctuary.org/learn/factory-farming/chickens, accessed 03/04/2014
[32] http://www.farmsanctuary.org/learn/factory-farming/pigs-used-for-pork, accessed 03/04/2014.

can invest their considerable economic resources in protein received either ethically from animals (such as free-range eggs and dairy) or from legumes or meat substitutes (tofu, seitan, quinoa, etc). In regions where protein is scarce, though, simply eliminating animal products from one's diet may wreak havoc on human health. In communities where chickens and goats are the only reliable sources of protein, western vegetarian Christians must not pass judgment on communities that rely on animal death to survive. Stewardship in these regions, in a fallen age of scarcity and starvation, would most likely consist of attentive, humane care of one's animals, not prioritising the life of one's chickens over the health of one's children.

Human beings carry the image of God, which makes them the rulers of the created world. Sin may have made our reign tyrannical and inept, but our rulership, whether we like it or not, is still in effect. There is no opting out from our lordship over animals. We see this every time we drive over a possum, train a dog, or wipe a bug off our windscreen. We are the only species that has successfully mechanised and industrialised the lives of other creatures—in the USA alone, one million broiler chickens are killed every hour on industrial poultry farms.[33] This is what our reign is like now, but in the beginning it was not so. The Creator Spirit has created a being with incredible power to rule the earth. However, the Creator has also not left us without the wisdom and strength to exercise our power well. The eschatological future of humanity and animals will bring about a reconciliation between us and our subjects, and the Spirit is already working to make this happen. In the meantime, we must surrender ourselves to the Spirit's power in our lives, and allow him to remake us in the image of Christ, and restore us to our rightful role as responsible stewards of God's creation.

LAURA ROBINSON has an MA in Biblical Exegesis and is pursuing an MA in Systematic Theology at Wheaton College.

[33] 'Humane Society of the United States Report: The Welfare of Animals in the Meat, Egg, and Dairy Industries' Online: http://www.humanesociety.org/assets/pdfs/farm/welfare_overview.pdf, accessed 03/04/2014.