

# Early Church Fathers on creation, death and eschatology

Benno A. Zuiddam

For several early Church Fathers the doctrine of creation was important. This affected not only the way they looked at this world, but also how they saw God, as well as what they expected of him for the future. Chrysostom, Irenaeus and Theophilus of Antioch taught that the beginning and the end of this world belong together. The paradise once lost will be regained. They taught that this present world, including the animal kingdom, is essentially in discontinuity with the original creation. The suffering and death of animals was something that did not belong to God's good original creation. Irenaeus and Theophilus specifically claimed that God's future will include the restoration of the animal kingdom to a state that excludes violent death and suffering.

**D**id animals that have the “breath of life” die in Paradise?<sup>1</sup> Was physical death first introduced into the created world at mankind's fall into sin, or was it there from the beginning of creation, only now also extending to humanity?<sup>2</sup> How good was the original creation really? Was man perhaps mortal from the very start?<sup>3</sup> In circles of academic leadership many theologians have given up on traditional concepts. This article will consider how early Christians saw creation, death, and God's plans for the future of this world.

In a 21<sup>st</sup> century world where the evolutionistic worldview reigns supreme in most systems and public life, it is not surprising that the answers theologians give to these questions are usually shaped by this environment. Many ministers and even more theological professors see physical death in the original creation as a fact of science. Doesn't the fossil record show all those layers of dead animals before man arrives on the scene? Of course animals must have died in Paradise.<sup>4</sup> Death and decay were indispensable parts of the ‘good’ creation, and man was really mortal from the beginning.

This view is based on the premise of a basic continuity between the original creation and the fallen world. The presumption is that the laws of physics (as we know them now) operated and that external influences are excluded (closed universe). The problem with this way of reasoning is that physics is applied to metaphysics. Penetrating into data of the primeval world can hardly be done in a scientific way, and belongs to the realm of suppositions and premises. Science can only speculate about primeval history on the basis of theory. These theories can presume either continuity or discontinuity with the present world; theistic involvement or exclusively material factors. They belong to the realm of metaphysical choices. This is a reality for the religious, agnostics and atheists alike.

## Religion taught discontinuity

For most of its history, humanity has embraced what it experienced as divine revelation on the subject of creation. Perhaps most people on this planet still do, if one dares to ignore Western secular culture, its all-pervasive propaganda and powerful interests. The Bible, as well as myths such as the Greek tradition of Pandora's clay pot, teach that this present world is vastly different from when it first appeared.

This notion is now widely discarded. First the Enlightenment disallowed revelation as a reliable source of knowledge and in science. Then Darwinism claimed that natural selection created this world and that the process included sickness, death and ruthless competition from the start. As a result the prevailing teaching at Western centres of education is that the biblical creation and the fall of man is scientifically wrong or irrelevant, perhaps only helpful in some sociological sense. For all practical purposes it is insisted upon that ours was an imperfect world of death and decay from the beginning.

In light of the cultural and professional pressures that prevail in our society, it is not surprising to note that theologians have adapted their interpretation of Scripture to suit what is generally accepted as the so-called ‘facts of science’. This is not a new development, as this naturalistic worldview started to take over visibly in the 17<sup>th</sup> century—not only in the writings of Spinoza and to a lesser extent Descartes, but also in more popular books. In 1691 the Rev. Balthasar Bekker wrote a book against the existence of demons, spirits and witches.<sup>5</sup> He even doubted the existence of the devil. This book was so popular that quickly thousands of copies were sold, resulting in a stream of pamphlets. Within a few years his book was published in German, French and English respectively. The agnostic position of the 18<sup>th</sup> century philosophers—Immanuel Kant

one of the most influential—further paved the way to a situation where divine revelation was no longer considered a valid source of scientific knowledge. Even if theologians in Protestant countries didn't compromise all the way (like 19<sup>th</sup> century continental liberalism), the new positions were often embraced without realizing the logical fallacies and inconsistencies that resulted at an exegetical and doctrinal level.

### Creation and eschatology

In the study of theology, the fields of creation and eschatology (teachings about the end times, last phase of the world) are closely connected, because the doctrinal concepts involved affect one another. When continental German, French and Dutch universities embraced mythological interpretations of Holy Scripture in the 19<sup>th</sup> century, this came with a changed expectancy for the future. This is particularly evident in professor Scholten from Leiden University and his pupils.<sup>6</sup> There was no longer any hope for the resurrection of the body and life everlasting in that sense. Everything was spiritualized and eternal life was eventually restricted to the human soul. Science had taught theology that miracles don't happen and that dead bodies don't come to life again, so the theories of the theologians changed accordingly. The personal God of Christianity was replaced with the abstract Force of Deism.<sup>7</sup> In the 20<sup>th</sup> and 21<sup>st</sup> centuries, subsequent development saw many theologians, ministers and priests embrace naturalistic worldviews, giving up their belief in a personal God, and a conscious personal future after the death of the body.

Historical evangelicalism withstood this trend originally; preferring traditional views of creation and eschatology. Although in the United States more than 40% of the population has young creationist views on the origins of man,<sup>8</sup> there is hardly any support for creationism among the evangelical academic leadership. Creationism is rarely taught in American colleges and seminaries.<sup>9</sup> Best-selling evangelical authors such as N.T. Wright, Alister McGrath, and Tim Keller are all evolutionists. That, surprisingly, about half of the evangelical pastors still hold creationist views is due to outside factors, and despite their professors. In Europe the situation is worse, also among the general public. A recent survey published in *National Geographic* shows:

“In European countries, including Denmark, Sweden, and France, more than 80 percent of adults surveyed said they accepted the concept of evolution. The proportion of Western European adults who believed the theory ‘absolutely false’ ranged from 7 percent in Great Britain to 15 percent in the Netherlands.”<sup>10</sup>

On the basis of the general situation in colleges and seminaries, and the almost complete lack of creationist

publications by theologians with a university position, it is safe to conclude that nature in the “very good” Genesis creation is now generally redefined by evangelical theologians to include death and decay. In the field of eschatology these ‘neo-evangelical’ scholars tread more carefully. This is understandable since the cross, regeneration, going to heaven, ‘eternity’ and the second-coming are prominent teachings in these circles. Many evangelical denominations and movements had their origins, at least in part, in particular teachings about the end times.

The doctrine of creation was more vulnerable as evangelical circles often contrasted New Testament Christianity with the old dispensation of Moses and the Law. It was much easier in such a context, to let go of Mosaic creation concepts—which never featured prominently from the pulpit anyway—than to contradict widely shared socio-cultural expectations for loved ones and professional associates alike. Also for personal reasons and private hopes, theologians are more inclined to keep the old eschatology, in some form or other. For many this would still include the resurrection of the body, for humans that is. Some Christian evolutionists, fully embrace the old eschatology, seemingly extending Christ's redemptive power to all creation. N.T. Wright, for example, designates Christ's resurrection in a popular publication as “the hope for God's renewal of all things, for his overcoming of corruption, decay, and death, for his filling of the whole cosmos with his love and grace, his power and his glory”.<sup>11</sup> In line with the church's teachings over many centuries, Wright affirms that the liberation of the body of Christ from death and decay foreshadows the liberation of the rest of the old creation.<sup>12</sup>

Wright affirms traditional eschatology in a situation where many theologians have given up on the traditional Catholic doctrines concerning creation and the eventual renewal of this world alike. Still, Wright's affirmation of the traditional Christian eschatology would have gained in persuasion if the basis for this had not been destroyed by the introduction of a new doctrine of creation. The goodness of the old creation is largely spiritualized, while on a material level Darwinism reigns.<sup>13</sup> Instead of Paradise lost, Adam was mortal long before he trespassed; the fall into sin was really about spiritual death: “The result is that death, which was always a part of the natural transience of the good creation, gains a second dimension, which the Bible sometimes calls spiritual death.”<sup>14</sup>

With the old view of a vastly different nature of the original creation largely discarded and redefined, doctrines about the person of Christ and God's character have quietly shifted. Simply put, even those Christians who reinterpret the biblical doctrine of creation along Darwinian lines still want Jesus to be the one who delivers from death and decay. In the meantime they ignore the cosmic implications of this newly embraced supposition, namely: Jesus Christ creating the old

order through billions of years of death, sickness, destruction, by means of devastating viruses, cancer mechanisms and murderous creatures alike. Is this the sort of allegedly unchanging Saviour we look up to for the redemption of creation and the end to all death and decay?

### Mortality of man in church history

Although during the past two millennia theologians have differed on whether mankind was mortal in Paradise or not, that debate was on a completely different level than the present considerations. Augustine (and John Calvin) thought that Adam was mortal in principle, but that this mortality was activated and effectuated by sin. Augustine supposed that Adam would have automatically moved into immortality if he had not sinned:

“Nor was there any reason to fear that if he had happened to live on here longer in his natural body, he would have been oppressed with old age, and have gradually, by increasing age, arrived at death. For if God granted to the clothes and the shoes of the Israelites that ‘they waxed not old’ during so many years, what wonder if for obedience it had been by the power of the same [God] allowed to man, that although he had a natural and mortal body, he should have in it a certain condition, in which he might grow full of years without decrepitude, and, whenever God pleased, pass from mortality to immortality without the medium of death?”<sup>15</sup>

Calvin takes a similar view in his commentary on Genesis (3:9):

“Truly the first man would have passed to a better life, had he remained upright; but there would have been no separation of the soul from the body, no corruption, no kind of destruction, and, in short, no violent change.”

Thomas Aquinas, on the other hand, was of the opinion that Adam and Eve possessed real and inherent immortality from the start, but that God took this away as part of the Curse: “a thing may be incorruptible on the part of its efficient cause; in this sense man was incorruptible and immortal in the state of innocence.”<sup>16</sup> For both schools, however, Adam and Eve would have continued to live forever if they had not sinned. This is completely different from the contemporary views that introduce mortality not as a potential, but as a reality in the pre-Fall situation.

This idea of actual mortality of humans runs contrary to both Augustine and Aquinas. Thomas comes closest as he speculated that matter was subject to decay from the start, but that God had originally exempted mankind from this decay as divine favour.<sup>17</sup>

### Animal death, Aquinas and Basil the Great

Although he doesn’t elaborate on this, Aquinas seems to suppose that animals were mortal from the start, because as part of a scholastic argument about death as punishment for man, he states that animals have mortal souls. Implicitly his argument calls for the conclusion that animal mortality was a part of creation from the beginning.<sup>18</sup>

This idea of animal death before the Fall was not invented by Aquinas. It hardly features in his work and then only implicitly. Still this view has old papers in the history of Christianity. It can be traced to at least the 4<sup>th</sup> century, the writings of the eastern theologian Basil the Great in particular.

Around AD 370, Basil delivered an influential series of homilies on the six days of creation. In these, he presents animal death as part of the original creation:

“So nature, being put in motion by the one command, passes equally through birth and death in a creature, while it keeps up the succession of kinds through resemblance, to the end. Because it is so that a horse succeed to a horse, a lion to a lion, an eagle to an eagle. And while every one of the living beings is preserved by these uninterrupted successions, she directs them to the end of it all.”<sup>19</sup>

For Basil, animals belong to the realm of non-human nature, where death was not only acceptable but viewed as a natural principle. Young-earth creationists today look in a similar way at plant or insect death. Basil just extended this to all of the animal kingdom. More a closet monk than a biological observer, he saw animal life and multiplication as impersonal perpetuation, creatures without relevant capability of sensing pain and loss. Whether they lived or died, they continued to live in the blood of the species. For the Church Father one horse was as good as the next, as long as the idea of horse was perpetuated. His views are based on limited perceptions of biology, rather than flowing from a careful exposition of Scripture. Even in Basil’s time, someone with even a limited exposure to animal life would have been aware that animals are capable of sensing pain and anguish, if not loss, as, for instance, the death rituals of elephants and dolphins suggest.<sup>20</sup>

With the words “the end of it all” Basil refers to the ultimate goal of history, the end of the world as we know it. The “command” he refers to takes creatures through stages of life and death (τὴν ἐν τῇ γενέσει καὶ φθορᾷ κτίσιν). This is a reference to God commanding the earth to bring forth living creatures. Isolated from its textual context this command could have meant God’s curse at the Fall of mankind, in which case animal death could have referred to the post-Fall situation only, but the passage rules this out, as Basil continues:

“The peculiarities of animals are not destroyed

or effaced by any length of time; but forever young their nature follows its course in time, as though it had been just constituted. Let the earth bring forth soul-creatures! [Obedience to] this commandment was continued on earth, and there has not been a pause in its performance to the Creator.”<sup>21</sup>

For Basil, the divine commandment was the initial creation-word in Genesis 1:24, God ordering the earth to bring forth living creatures. Although Basil looks at creation in retrospect, in a post-Fall situation, the textual context of animals as species not being destroyed but staying the same all the time and not being affected by the destruction of individual animals, through endless ‘reincarnations’, makes it clear that Basil believed in what would now be defined as death in the animal world before the Fall. It is just that he had a different concept of death for animals than most people have today. One should be careful not to equate his perceptions with the proponents of animal death in the modern situation, as there is a vast theological difference. Basil the Great basically believed in what is now called “insect death” for all animals, on the basis of what is now recognized as a defective biology.

Basil wrote relatively late, but his views on the subject seem to reflect what was regarded as an acceptable interpretation in the late 4<sup>th</sup> century, otherwise controversies on the subject were likely to have been recorded.

as a firmament of smoke, and the earth shall wax old like a garment, and they that dwell therein shall perish in like manner’ (Isa 51:6). Now you see in what sense the creation is ‘in bondage to vanity’, and how it is to be freed from the ruined state.”<sup>22</sup>

Chrysostom called attention to the cosmic effects of mankind’s rebellion against God.<sup>23</sup> As man was the crown, the steward of this world, everything under him was likewise subjected to God’s curse. For him, this included the universe. In his sermon on Romans 8, the connection of creation and *eschaton* (God’s finalization of history) is also very prominent. Despite the decay that the curse brought, Chrysostom expected that God was going to bring renewal and redeem all of Creation. The Church Father taught “Paradise Lost” as well as a hope for “Paradise Regained”.

### Irenaeus—animal redemption

The earlier the Church Fathers, the more explicit are their teachings about the animal world being affected by the Fall of mankind. Irenaeus of Lyons (c. AD 180; figure 2) did not leave much room for misunderstanding when he wrote on the subject. In direct contact with a generation of believers who had still known the Apostles, he unambiguously teaches that animals were not carnivorous in the original creation. He also brings creation and eschatology together when he writes in his books *Against the Heresies* (*Adversus Haereses*, book 5, chapter 33):<sup>24</sup>

“Predicting these times, Isaiah says: ‘And the wolf shall feed with the lamb, and the leopard shall rest with the kid; the calf, the bull, and the lion shall feed together, and a little boy shall lead them. The ox and the bear shall feed together, and their young shall live together; the lion and the ox shall eat straw. An infant boy shall thrust his hand into the asp’s den and into the nest of young asps, and they shall do no harm nor hurt to anyone upon my holy mountain’ (Isa 11:6–9). Again, recapitulating, he says, ‘Then wolves and lambs shall feed together; the lion like the ox shall eat straw; the serpent shall eat earth as bread; and they shall do no harm or hurt upon my holy mountain, says the Lord’ (Isa 65:25). I am aware that some try to refer these texts metaphorically to savage men who out of various nations and various occupations come to believe, and when they have believed live in harmony with the just. But though this now takes place for men who come from various nations into the one doctrine of the faith, nevertheless it will take place for these animals at the resurrection of the just, as we have said; for God is rich in all things, and when the world is re-established in its primeval state all the animals must obey and be subject to man and return to the first food given by God, as before the disobedience they were subject to

Chrysostom—corrupted creation



Figure 1. John Chrysostom (c. 347–407), Byzantine mosaic.





Figure 2. Irenaeus of Lyons, c.180.

Adam (Gen 1:28–30) and ate the fruit of the earth. This is not the time to show that the lion will eat straw, but this indicates the size and opulence of the fruits. For if an animal like the lion eats straw, what will be the quality of the wheat whose straw is food for lions?<sup>25</sup>

Irenaeus specifically addresses the condition of the animal world before the Fall, and connects this up with the future when God’s promises shall be fulfilled. The animosity between present carnivores and their prey will be something of the past. Even a defenceless little boy will be quite safe in the company of bulls and lions (figure 3). They will even do his bidding.

In both quotations from Isaiah the generic term for straw or grass is introduced as the future food source for ox and lion alike. Even snakes shall cease to be carnivorous. Harm and hurt will no longer be allowed. The textual context indicates that the Church Father does not only apply this to the world of humans, but to the situation of animals as well. Lambs shall be safe from wolves, kids from their natural enemies, while calves will have nothing to fear from lions anymore. The original food of animals was vegetarian,<sup>26</sup> and so it shall be again.

### Literal fulfilment

Although Irenaeus shows himself aware of allegorical interpretations of these passages—and deems these legitimate at a spiritual level in the present—he denies that the metaphorical sense is the ultimate fulfilment of the prophecies concerned. In other words, this is not just a passage about wild pagan people converting and no longer being a threat to Christians (the lambs, kids and calves of God’s kingdom). Yes, it is true that savage men come to faith now (*in quibusdam hominibus, ex variis gentibus in unam sententiam fidei venientibus*), but in the resurrection of the just (*in resurrection justorum*) the text says this will take also place for literal animals (*super iis animalibus*). For Irenaeus, this is ultimately what Isaiah’s prophecy points to.

In *Adversus Haereses* the Church Father teaches that the new heaven and earth of eschatology will be a re-creation of the old. The world will be re-established in its original state (*conditione revocata*) and this will be true of the animals as well. They will revert to their original food, the fruit of the earth (*fructum terrae*), which God gave them at first (*ad primam a Deo datam*). Irenaeus also indicates that the new creation will be at a far higher level than this present world, which is hard to imagine for mere mortals now. Whether the vegetarian food will be literal straw as we know it, is not really relevant for Irenaeus. That these animals will no longer eat each other, but will consume “fruit of the earth” is the main thing for him. “Straw” may have been used in a generic way and the fact that it will be able to feed a lion indicates the enormous capabilities and lavishness generated in this fruit of the earth. If the quality of the vegetarian food for lions (straw, *palea*) will be such as to feed the King of the Animals, what will the food for humans (wheat, *tritium*) be like? He knows he cannot pry—it is like a “mirror dimly”—but he is confident that God’s future is going to be great for humans and animals alike.

### Theophilus—carnivores result of sin

Irenaeus worked in the south of France. Elsewhere in the Roman Empire of the 2<sup>nd</sup> century Christians had similar convictions on the subject of animal death and the restoration of all things in a perfect state. Theophilus, who became bishop of Antioch (Syria) in the eighth year of the reign of Marcus Aurelius, c. AD 168, writes in his essay to Autolytus (*Theophilus ad Autolytus 2.17*):<sup>27</sup>

“And on the sixth day, God having made the quadrupeds, and wild beasts, and the land reptiles, pronounced no blessing upon them, reserving His blessing for man, whom He was about to create on the sixth day. The quadrupeds, too, and wild beasts, were made for a type of some men, who neither know nor worship God, but mind earthly things, and repent not. For those who turn from their iniquities and live righteously, in spirit fly upwards like birds, and mind the things that are above, and are well-pleasing to the

will of God. But those who do not know nor worship God, are like birds which have wings, but cannot fly nor soar to the high things of God. Thus, too, though such persons are called men, yet being pressed down with sins, they mind grovelling and earthly things. And the animals are named wild beasts, from their being hunted, not as if they had been made evil or venomous from the first—for nothing was made evil by God, but all things good, yea, very good,—but the sin in which man was concerned brought evil upon them. For when man transgressed, they also transgressed with him. For as, if the master of the house himself acts rightly, the domestics also of necessity conduct themselves well; but if the master sins, the servants also sin with him; so in like manner it came to pass, that in the case of man’s sin, he being master, all that was subject to him sinned with him. When, therefore, man again shall have made his way back to his natural condition, and no longer does evil, those also shall be restored to their original gentleness.”<sup>28</sup>

For Theophilus, wild beasts (θηρία), derived from “being hunted” (θηρεύεσθαι), were a consequence of mankind’s fall into sin. He takes care to explicitly state that they were not created violent or even venomous (οὐχ ὡς κακὰ ἀρχῆθεν γεγεννημένα ἢ ἰοβόλα). Theophilus specifically uses a Greek word (κακὰ) that often has the meaning of “evil” or “bad.” It was the sin of man that brought this evil on the animal world (ἡ δὲ ἁμαρτία ἡ περὶ τὸν ἄνθρωπον κεκάκωκεν αὐτά), and it was their nature that *was made* evil (κακοποιῶν).

As with Irenaeus and Chrysostom, one finds the expectation with Theophilus that, eventually, in the fullness of time, the evil consequences of the Fall for the animal world will be undone. For him God’s *eschaton* means the final restoration, not only of mankind, but of animals as well.



Figure 3. Painting by William Strutt, *Peace*, on the Isaiah passage.

### In summary—creation and eschaton

Looking back on this journey through the early church, one comes to realize that the doctrine of creation is important. It affects the way we look at this world, but also how we see God and what we expect of him.

For Chrysostom, Irenaeus and Theophilus, the beginning and the end of this world belong together. The paradise once lost will be regained. It is Jesus Παντοκράτωρ (“all powerful”) who will overcome the discontinuity between the original world and the sin-affected present. Their theological claim that this world is essentially in discontinuity with the original creation, is foundational for God’s redemptive actions in the present and for his promises regarding the future of heaven and earth.

In their teachings Jesus is both Alpha and Omega, the Logos Creator and the Logos Redeemer, the same yesterday, today and forever. For the early church it was this consistency of God’s character that gave hope for a better future. God was worshiped as a real redeemer of a real creation, a world presently suffering from pain and hurt, the animal kingdom included.<sup>29</sup> Creation cries out desperately; not for a theoretical entity who redeems in a spiritual and metaphorical sense only, but for actual deliverance from pain and loss. The God of very early Christianity was someone who promised redemption of Paradise lost; for humans, animals and the rest of the created world alike.

The goodness of his original creation inspires trust in God’s character, the absence of harm and hurt in his *eschaton* hope for the future.

### References

1. On the importance of breath of life (*nephesh chayyah*) in defining animals: creation.com/no-death-before-the-fall.
2. Munday, J.C., Creature mortality: from creation or the Fall? *JETS* 35(1), March 1992; www.reasons.org/articles/creature-mortality-from-creation-or-the-fall, accessed 3 October 2013.
3. About death instinctively experienced as an undesirable phenomenon: creation.com/understanding-death.
4. See creation.com/pre-fall-animal-death.
5. Bekker, B., De betoverde wereld &c. Seer geleerd, bondig en krachtig beschreven ten nutte der algemeene christenheyt (“The enchanted world, &c. Very learned, concise and powerfully written for the benefit of Christianity as a whole.”) Gent 1691.
6. Zuiddam, B.A., Reason’s dead end in David Faure: why the Cape’s earliest liberal minister embraced spiritualism, *In die Skriflig/In Luce Verbi* 43(2):271–290, 2009.
7. Lucci, D., Scripture and deism: the biblical criticism of the eighteenth-century British deists; in: *Studies in Early Modern European Culture*, vol. 3, Peter Lang Publishers, Bern, Switzerland, 2008.
8. In the United States of America, about 46% of the population believes in a recent creation of the human race. See 2012 Gallup poll on the origins of human life, www.gallup.com/poll/155003/Hold-Creationist-View-Human-Origins.aspx, accessed 3 October 2013.
9. See Stafford, T., Evangelical Evolutionists Meet in New York, N.T. Wright, Tim Keller, John Ortberg among Biologos conference attendees, *Christianity Today*, 30 March 2012, www.christianitytoday.com/ct/2012/marchweb-only/biologos-new-york.html, accessed 3 October 2013.
10. Owen, J., Evolution Less Accepted in U.S. than Other Western Countries, Study Finds, *National Geographic News*, 10 August 2006, news.nationalgeographic.

- com/news/2006/08/060810-evolution.html, accessed 3 October 2013.
11. Wright, N.T., *Surprised by Hope: Rethinking Heaven, the Resurrection, and the Mission of the Church*, Harper One, San Francisco, CA, p. 269, 2008.
  12. Wright, ref. 11, p. 275.
  13. See also creation.com/animal-suffering-and-western-sensibility.
  14. Wright, ref. 11, p. 95.
  15. Anti-Pelagian Writings 1.3.
  16. *Summa Theologica* 1.97.1. Cf. 1.97.4.
  17. *Summa Theologica* 2.2.164.
  18. The view of animal death as a creation arrangement is also generally followed by modern day old-earth creationists, see: creation.com/the-carnivorous-nature-and-suffering-of-animals.
  19. *Hexaemeron*, Homily 9.2: οὕτως ἡ φύσις τῶν ὄντων ἐνὶ προστάγματι κινήθεισα, τὴν ἐν τῇ γενέσει καὶ φθορᾷ κτίσιν ὁμαλῶς διεξέρχεται, τὰς τῶν γενῶν ἀκολουθίας δι' ὁμοιότητος ἀποσώζουσα, ἕως ἂν πρὸς αὐτὸ καταντήσῃ τὸ τέλος. Ἴππον μὲν γὰρ ἵππου ποιεῖται διάδοχον, καὶ λέοντα λέοντος, καὶ ἀετὸν ἀετοῦ· καὶ ἕκαστον τῶν ζώων ταῖς ἐφεξῆς διαδοχαῖς συντηρούμενον μέχρι τῆς συντελείας τοῦ παντός παραπέμπει.  
English translation from B. Jackson (Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers, Second Series, vol. 8).
  20. For death rituals in the animal kingdom, see e.g. www.bbc.com/future/story/20120919-respect-the-dead, accessed 3 October 2013.
  21. *Hexaemeron*, Homily 9.2: Οὐδείς χρόνος διεφθαρμένα ἢ ἐξίτηλα ποιεῖ τῶν ζώων τὰ ἰδιώματα, ἀλλ' ὡσπερ ἄρτι καθισταμένη ἡ φύσις αἰεὶ νεαρὰ τῷ χρόνῳ συμπαρτρέχει. Ἐξαγαγέτω ἡ γῆ ψυχὴν ζώων. Τοῦτο ἐναπέμεινε τῇ γῆ τὸ πρόσταγμα, καὶ οὐ παύεται ἐξυπηρετουμένη τῷ κτίσαντι.
  22. Schaff, P. (Ed.), Chrysostom, Homily 14 on Romans 8, Saint Chrysostom: Homilies on the Acts of the Apostles and the Epistle to the Romans; in: *Nicene and Post Nicene Fathers Series I*, vol. 11, Eerdmans, Grand Rapids, MI, 1999.
  23. For some of St Paul's perspectives from his Epistle to the Romans, see: creation.com/cosmic-and-universal-death-from-adams-fall-an-exegesis-of-romans-819-23a; and also: creation.com/the-fall-a-cosmic-catastrophe.
  24. *Adversus Haereses* V. 33 (Migne CPG): Haec ergo tempora prophetans isaias ait: <et compascetur upus cum agno, et pardus conquiescet cum haedo, et vitulus, et Taurus, et leo simul pascentur, et puer pusillus decut eos. Et bos, et ursus simul pascentur, et simul infants eorum erunt; et leo, et bos manducabant paleas. Et puer infans in cavernam aspidum, et in cubile filiorum aspidum manum mittet, et non male facient, nec poterunt perdere aliquem in monte sancto meo.> Et iterum recapitulans ait: <Tunc lupi et agni pascentur simul, et leo quasi bos vescetur paleis, serpens autem terram quasi panem; et non nocebunt, neque vexabunt in monte sancto meo, dicit Dominus.> Non ignore autem, quoniam quidem haec in feros (51), et ex diversis gentibus et variis operibus credentes, et cum crediderint consentientes justis, tentent transferre. Sed etsi nunc hoc sit in quibusdam hominibus, ex variis gentibus in unam sententiam fidei venientibus; nihilominus in resurrectione iustorum super iis animalibus (52), quemadmodum dictum est: Dives enim in omnibus Deus. Et oportet conditione revocata, obedire et subjuncta esse omnia animalia homini, et ad primam a Deo datam reverti escam [quemadmodum autem in obedientia subjecta erant Aadae (53)], fructum terrae. Alias autem et non est nunc ostendere leonem paleis vesci. Hoc autem significabat magnitudinem, et pinguedinem fructuum. Si enim leo animal paleis bescitur, quale ipsum triticum erit, cuius palea ad escam congrua erit leonum? Notes, 51: *Feuardent. Et Voss. habent inferos. 52: Super iis animalibus.*
  25. *Irenaeus of Lyons*, Translation by Grant, R.M., Psychology Press, London, p. 179, 1997.
  26. Gen 1:29–30; cf. 9:3.
  27. Θεόφιλος ο Αντιοχεύς, Προς Αυτόλυκον, Βιβλίο 2.17: Ἐκτη δὲ ἡμέρα ὁ θεὸς ποιήσας τὰ τετράποδα καὶ τὰ θηρία καὶ ἐρπετὰ τὰ χερσαῖα τὴν πρὸς αὐτὰ εὐλογίαν παρασιωπᾷ, τῆρὸν τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ τὴν εὐλογίαν, ὃν ἡμελλεν ἐν τῇ ἕκτῃ ἡμέρᾳ ποιεῖν. Ἄμα καὶ εἰς τύπον ἐγένοντο τὰ τε τετράποδα καὶ θηρία ἐνίων ἀνθρώπων τῶν τὸν θεὸν ἀγνοούντων καὶ ἀσεβούντων καὶ <τὰ ἐπιγεια φρονοούντων> καὶ μὴ μετανοούντων. οἱ γὰρ ἐπιστρέφοντες ἀπὸ τῶν ἀνομιῶν καὶ δίκαιως ζῶντες ὡσπερ πετεινὰ ἀνίπτανται τῇ ψυχῇ. <τὰ ἄνω φρονοῦντες> καὶ εὐαρεστούντες τῷ θελήματι τοῦ θεοῦ. οἱ δὲ τὸν θεὸν ἀγνοοῦντες καὶ ἀσεβούντες ὅμοιοι εἰσιν ὄρνέοις τὰ πτερὰ μὲν ἔχουσιν, μὴ δυναμένους δὲ ἀνίπτασθαι καὶ τὰ ἄνω τρέχειν τῆς θεοῦ φύσεως. οὕτως καὶ οἱ τοιοῦτοι ἄνθρωποι μὲν λέγονται, τὰ δὲ χυμαιοφερῆ καὶ <τὰ ἐπιγεια φρονοῦσιν>, καταβαρούμενοι ὑπὸ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν. Θηρία δὲ ὀνόμασται τὰ ζῶα ἀπὸ τοῦ θηρεῦσθαι, οὐχ ὡς κακὰ ἀρχῆθεν γεγενημένα ἢ ἰοβόλα, οὐ γὰρ τι κακὸν ἀρχῆθεν γέγονεν ἀπὸ θεοῦ ἀλλὰ τὰ πάντα καλὰ καὶ <καλὰ λίαν>, ἢ δὲ ἁμαρτία ἢ περὶ τὸν ἄνθρωπον κεκάκωκεν αὐτὰ· τοῦ γὰρ ἀνθρώπου παραβάτος καὶ αὐτὰ συμπαρέβη. ὡσπερ γὰρ δεσπότης οἰκίας ἐὰν αὐτὸς εὖ πράσῃ, ἀναγκαῖος καὶ οἰκέται
  28. Schaff, P. (Ed.), Fathers of the Second Century: Hermas, Tatian, Athenagoras, Theophilus, and Clement of Alexandria, in: *The Ante Nicene Fathers*, vol. 2, Eerdmans, Grand Rapids, MI, 1979.
  29. For animal perceptions of pain and loss, see for instance, video: nationalgeographic.com/video/animals/mammals-animals/elephants/elephant\_african\_mourning/.

**Benno Alexander Zuiddam** D.Th. (Church History) Ph.D. (Greek) studied at four universities in Europe and South Africa. He is research professor (extraordinary associate) with the Faculty of Theology of North West University, Potchefstroom, South Africa. He also serves with Greenwich School of Theology (UK) and the Centre for Patristic Research (Free University Amsterdam/University Tilburg). Prof. Zuiddam has published in a great variety of peer-reviewed journals, including international publications in the fields of Greek and Old Testament Studies. He also authored an in-depth study on the authority of the Scriptures in the early church. His research focuses on divine revelation in early Christian and biblical literature and the Greco-Roman world, but he also takes a professional interest in theological liberalism, particularly in the 19<sup>th</sup> century. His most recent book *Hope and Disillusionment, a basic introduction to the history of the Western church, has been described as an "Alpha course for Church history" (Reformed Daily).*