

Old Testament approaches to creation care: Creation, Covenant and the Prophetic Imagination.

Rev. Dr. Dave Bookless
London School of Theology Summer Conference, 2021

The twin creation accounts of Genesis 1:1–2:4 and Genesis 2:5–25 inevitably form the basis for most Christian theologies of creation due both to their canonical placement and their historical influence upon the Western theological tradition. Yet, these are texts with significant exegetical difficulties which have been interpreted through numerous philosophical and cultural lenses. The Genesis creation accounts have generated a massive theological literature from patristic to modern times.

Firstly, whilst the theological significance of their location at the start of the biblical canon is indisputable, it is noteworthy how little they are referred to elsewhere in the Hebrew Scriptures. In particular, the phrase "image of God" (*imago Dei*) occurs only within the narratives of Genesis 1–11 (1:26–27, 5:1, 9:6). Given the rich theological significance of the term, does this suggest that this part of Genesis, in its final form, had a late, possibly exilic, authorship? Richard Middleton argues, "On the face of it, it seems unlikely that so fecund a notion as the *imago Dei*, if it were early, would receive no intrascriptural commentary whatsoever, given the general proclivity of the biblical writers to engage in such commentary".¹

Despite its canonical scarcity, *Imago Dei* has engendered a bewildering variety of interpretations throughout Christian history, including being en-souled (Ambrose), rationality (Athanasius), intellect and will (Augustine), moral righteousness (the Reformers) and physically upright form (von Rad). It is not surprising that Karl Barth, in stated: "For it is obvious that authors merely found the concept in the text and then proceeded to pure invention in accordance with the requirements of contemporary anthropology".² Thus, in order to articulate a truly biblical anthropology and adequately understand our place in relation to fellow creatures and wild nature, it is vital not only to explore the Genesis creation narratives but also to examine humanity's place in creation elsewhere in the Hebrew Scriptures.

A second issue concerns perceived tensions between Genesis 1:1–2:4 and Genesis 2:5–25. The first creation account is highly structured, symbolic and densely poetic in style, with parallelism between the first three days of separation and the second three days of filling. From patristic to modern times, most commentators have assumed a hierarchical progression through six 'days' of creation culminating in the creation of humanity. The second passage, in apparent contrast, begins with the first man's creation from dust and the search for intimacy, initially with other animals and finally with the creation of woman. Some have seen humanity's creation from physical matter, calling to tend the earth (2:15) and close connection with animal-kind as giving a radically different emphasis to the apparent hierarchy of Genesis 1:1–2:4.

J. Baird Callicott argues that there are two basic interpretative choices regarding Genesis: "One could either adopt the mastery interpretation or the stewardship interpretation".³ He himself favours the latter.⁴ However, there are also strong critics of the term 'stewardship' in describing humanity's place in nature. Whilst 'stewardship' may imply a more nurturing relationship than 'dominion' or 'mastery', Clare Palmer claims it is nevertheless an anthropocentric, managerial concept with damaging ecological consequences. She objects to stewardship theologically, claiming, "God is understood to be an absentee landlord, who has put humanity in charge of his possessions"⁵. David Horrell also notes that stewardship "does not appear as such in Genesis 1, nor indeed is it a major biblical theme, certainly not in relation to humanity's responsibility for

creation"⁶. According to Horrell, stewardship is a category we hermeneutically impose upon scripture rather than one that emerges from it. However, in the light of Christ's stewardship parables perhaps we can say that stewardship is never explicit as a biblical metaphor for humanity's role vis-à-vis the rest of creation. If we use 'stewardship' we need to define and qualify it carefully, and use additional more relational terms such as guardianship, companionship and service.

A third barrier to interpreting Genesis is the assumptions that commentators impose upon the text. Many commentators seek to support pre-existing ideas rather than allowing the text to challenge them. Thus, Norman Habel as part of his *Earth Bible* project reads the Genesis texts from the perspective of Earth (*erets*)⁷. Consequently, he rejects any hierarchies in favour of readings that "emphasizes the intrinsic value of Earth as the centre of the cosmos and the source of life"⁸. He simply rejects Genesis 1:26–30 as an alien interpolation into the original earth-centric account. Habel sees the *imago Dei* as hierarchically elevating humanity over against other creatures and Earth itself, creating a radical separation between humans and nature⁹.

Habel's interpretation projects a post-modern earth-centric environmental sensibility onto the ancient Genesis texts. Reading the Hebrew Bible "from the perspective of Earth" is as equally flawed as reading it as if it is only about humanity. These are fundamentally theocentric texts, wherein the whole of creation find its origin and purpose in relation to God. To impose an alien hermeneutical matrix upon them as a means of evaluating their ecological worth, whether from an ecocentric or anthropocentric perspective, is to do violence to the texts.

Habel's reading of Genesis reacts against the twentieth-century critical consensus which saw the Pentateuch exclusively through the lens of God's saving acts in human history (*Heilgeschichte*). Gerhard von Rad, certainly in his earlier writings, saw creation as simply a theatrical backdrop for salvation, arguing creation "is but a magnificent foil for the message of salvation."^{10,a} This deeply anthropocentric Enlightenment worldview placed rational humanity at the centre of the universe and of God's purposes, with fateful consequences in science and technology, as well as theology. Despite being much critiqued by contemporary Old Testament scholars such as Walter Brueggemann, the perception that nonhuman creation is of marginal importance continues to be highly influential in seminaries and pulpits.

One significant contemporary example is Stephen M. Vantassel, whose *Dominion over Wildlife? An Environmental Theology of Human-Wildlife Relations*¹¹ resolutely defends a 'dominionist' understanding of Genesis 1 and 2. Vantassel unapologetically dedicates his book to fur-trappers for their "vital role in the responsible management of our natural resources"¹². His is an extreme form of the 'mastery' understanding of Genesis: "humans were divinely placed in a position superior to animals in power and/or ontology and bestowed the privilege to utilize animals to fulfil human needs and desires"¹³. This is not only anthropocentric but anthropomomist, seeing human interests as the only ones that matter. It is both hierarchical and utilitarian, seeing animals solely as a means of meeting "human needs and desires". To Vantassel, the natural order implies that "humanity has a superior status in creation, and that this status provides a moral basis for humans to wield power over nature, and to compel it to serve human needs and interests"¹⁴. Vantassel's personal obsession with trapping wildlife, his vilification of all who discern creaturely commonality between humans and other animals within Genesis,^b and his selective use of

^a von Rad's later writings qualified this judgment but it remained highly influential.

^b Vantassel describes all his critics, including theologians such as Brueggemann, as C.A.R. (Christian Animal Rights) activists.

both scripture and critical scholarship, mean it is difficult to take his case seriously.

All these commentators impose a pre-existing worldview upon the Genesis text. Whilst all interpretations are inevitably influenced by context¹⁵, the overwhelming anthropocentrism of Western cultures through the influences of Hellenistic philosophy, Renaissance humanism, Enlightenment rationalism and human mastery over nature through science and industry have greatly coloured interpretations of Genesis 1–2.

Lynn White's thesis

It is undoubtedly due to this anthropocentric dominionist tradition that Lynn White's famous thesis, *The Historical Roots of our Ecologic Crisis*¹⁶, has been so enormously influential. White's thesis and the massive debate ensuing from it, accusing Genesis 1:26–28 of providing ideological foundations for environmental destruction, provides another major difficulty in approaching the Genesis texts. His original article in *Science* was republished numerous times¹⁷, and his thesis has been taught uncritically in universities around the world. According to Lodge and Hamlin, "White's thesis was simple and pithy. In many quarters it became gospel"¹⁸.

There has been an enormous literature critiquing White¹⁹. Many have noted that his proposed solution was not rejection but reinterpretation of Judaeo-Christian attitudes to nature in the light of the non-anthropocentric tradition of St Francis of Assisi²⁰. This, however, has done little to dent the popular perception that White's thesis proved a causal link between the Bible and ecological destruction. In Hiebert's words, it "has become a largely unquestioned truism in environmental circles"²¹.

White's thesis was seriously flawed on a number of accounts. His theological exegesis was sketchy and misleading, and he over-emphasised the impact of theology on societal norms. It is not only Christianity but any worldview which is anthropocentric and places humanity above nature, whether Islam, communism or humanistic capitalism, that leads to the unsustainable exploitation of nature. Richard Bauckham convincingly traces ideas on the aggressive domination of nature in western Europe to Renaissance humanism rather than biblical theology, reaching its apex with the Christian humanist Francis Bacon²².

To Bacon, nature existed solely for human benefit and it was "a prime human duty to exploit it for human benefit as far as possible"²³. Bacon believed science and technology's role was to restore humanity's lost dominion over creation. This novel Baconian dualism between faith and science, combined with an increasingly mechanistic understanding of nature's workings (seen in Descartes' belief that animals were insensible automata), and a utilitarian attitude to the exploitation of animals and other natural 'resources', fit far better with the historical facts than White's Genesis-based hypothesis. As Bauckham states in relation to Bacon and his contemporaries, "Despite the continued references to God the Creator, this is the point at which western attitudes to nature become exclusively anthropocentric rather than theocentric"²⁴.

Creation theology beyond Genesis

Taken together, the lack of reference to Genesis 1–2 in the Hebrew scriptures, the perceived tensions between the two Genesis accounts, the anthropocentric interpretative history, and the issues surrounding Lynn White's critique and its reception, all create significant barriers to clear hermeneutical

understanding of the Genesis creation accounts in relation to ecological anthropology.

David Kelsey argues that, in Genesis 1–2, “The narrative logic of stories of God creating is bent under the pressure of the narrative logic of God relating to reconcile”²⁵. His critique is less of the text than of the layers of interpretative varnish that have to be scraped away to understand it in context. Kelsey suggests reading Genesis 1–2 in the light of Job 10, providing “separate voices in the chorus of canonical Holy Scripture”²⁶. In Job 10, humans are described variously as moulded from clay, curdled like cheese, clothed in flesh and knitted together, illustrating both creaturely ordinariness and divine attention to detail. Kelsey’s conclusion is that whilst humanity in Genesis 1 may indeed be uniquely privileged, yet, in the light of Job, humanity is nevertheless “only the first among equals” and, taken together, Genesis and Job “stress the inherent relationality of human creatureliness”²⁷.

In a similar vein, Richard Bauckham, addressing centuries of anthropocentric interpretation of Genesis, states: “To counter such hubris and excess, strong medicine is needed ... We need to rediscover those biblical accounts of the human place in creation that are completely unconcerned with dominion and that do not set humans above other creatures”²⁸. He argues that, whilst the Genesis accounts are basically theocentric, there is a tendency to read them anthropocentrically, overlooking the commonality between humans and other creatures: “The human rule over other creatures will be tyrannous unless it is placed in context of our more fundamental community with other creatures”²⁹.

Biblical wisdom and creation

Thus, in order to give perspective to the Genesis creation accounts, we will now turn to biblical wisdom literature and allow other Old Testament voices to be held in dialogue with Genesis. James Crenshaw helpfully emphasises the key characteristics of wisdom, “in terms of relationships with things, people and the Creator”³⁰. Relationships with creation, humanity and God are three keys to understanding wisdom. Biblical wisdom is, consequently, perspectively anthropocentric insofar as it shapes its worldview around human flourishing, yet it is also ecocentric in recognising reality as an indivisible whole which needs to be meditated upon to discover wisdom. Most fundamentally, biblical wisdom is theocentric, rooted in an understanding that “the fear of the Lord is the beginning of wisdom” (Proverbs 9:10). As Katharine Dell puts it, “It is a rich and multifaceted term covering both the human quest for wisdom and the divine origin of wisdom”³¹.

Biblical wisdom contains rich resources for creation theology. Leo Perdue writes, “One of the cardinal features of wisdom thought is creation”³². Katharine Dell helpfully distinguishes between core “wisdom literature”, comprising the Proverbs, Job and Ecclesiastes (Qoheleth), and “wisdom influence” which includes some Psalms and the Song of Songs³³. Both share a perception that God’s wisdom is to be discerned by close attentiveness to the rhythms and creatures of the natural world. It is significant that the eponymous wisdom of Solomon, encompassed “plant life, from the cedar of Lebanon to the hyssop that grows out of walls. He also taught about animals and birds, reptiles and fish” (1 Kings 4:33).

Biblical wisdom challenges contemporary perceptions of the wisdom of this world. It is not chiefly found in the introspection of a philosopher’s cave nor the rarefied atmosphere of academia, but in everyday encounter with the lived realities of material creation. Ellen Davis, in commenting on the injunction to “consider the ways” of the ant in order to be wise (Proverbs 6:6–11) notes that: “This is a kind of ‘nature wisdom’, acquired through close observation of the non-human world” and continues, “It is regrettable that the church has in the

last three centuries largely lost sight of the fact that 'nature wisdom' is indispensable to an accurate estimation of the proper human role in God's creation. Perhaps the time has at last come for the revival of this branch of theology"³⁴.

Biblical wisdom is complex and varied. However, as will be argued, taking wisdom as a starting place allows a shift of hermeneutical perspective shedding fresh light on Genesis and the whole Bible. Here, I will briefly examine nature-wisdom as paradigmatic in Proverbs, before an examination of Job, followed by insights from specific wisdom-influenced Psalms.

Proverbial nature wisdom

When the book of Proverbs informs the reader that wisdom is not a product of human intelligence alone but begins with the "fear of the Lord" (Proverbs 9:10) it is asserting two core Hebraic theological concepts. Firstly, Proverbs encourages an orientation that is theocentric rather than anthropocentric. Knowledge of God, rather than self-knowledge, is the key to wisdom. Ellen Davis puts it thus: "The sages strike directly at the root of the problem: 'Do not be wise in your own eyes' (Proverbs 3:7). If we would know the world without doing damage to it and ourselves, then we must raise our sights about our own cleverness and fix them on God, the creator of earth and heaven (vv.19–20)"³⁵. Secondly, wisdom is found in lived relationship both with other people and the natural world of land and creatures. The book of Proverbs is full of detailed observation of the natural world, including ants, eagles, snakes, ants, badgers, locusts, lizards, lions, roosters and goats (6:6–11; 30:18–19, 24–31). There is a tacit assumption within Proverbs and throughout biblical wisdom literature that observing wild nature in detail brings a deeper awareness of self, of others, of ethical reality and of God. In other words, nature-study is a key to God's wisdom.

Two of the most remarkable passages in Proverbs are 3:13–35 and 8:22–31 which offer a prolonged meditation on personified Wisdom. Given ancient Israel's strict monotheism, Lady Wisdom must be a literary trope, rather than a goddess as in other ancient near eastern creation accounts. She is pictured gambolling playfully alongside the Creator in the joyful dance of creation (8:30–31). Kelsey suggests that, "Woman Wisdom stands in for creation, and God's relation to her is paradigmatic of the way God actively relates to creation as its creator"³⁶. In echoes of Genesis 1:31's "very good", the keynote in Proverbs is God's enjoyment of the whole creation including Wisdom, and creation / Wisdom's reciprocal delight in God. Davis states, "The picture of Wisdom playing, even giddily, before God must be allowed to stand as the important theological statement it is. This scene both complements and amplifies the picture of creation in Genesis 1"³⁷. As Hugo Rahner argues, to God creation is not necessary but is an outflow of playful, generous love³⁸.

The clear implication of Proverbs is that if God is so caught up in love and delight at the mystery and wonder of creation, then so also should wise people be. Although biblical wisdom literature does not explicitly articulate a doctrine of humanity as *imago Dei*, it envisages a world that functions well when humans are wisely attentive to, delight in, and show appropriate nurturing care to the world that God has made and the creatures that inhabit it. Proverbs informs us:

"The righteous care for the needs of their animals,
but the kindest acts of the wicked are cruel." (Proverbs 12:10)

Proverbs also describes an interdependent world where human and animal welfare are interlinked, and humans lay aside their habitual hubris in favour of wise learning from God and from creation:

"Be sure you know the condition of your flocks,
give careful attention to your herds;
for riches do not endure for ever,
and a crown is not secure for all generations.
When the hay is removed and new growth appears
and the grass from the hills is gathered in,
the lambs will provide you with clothing,
and the goats with the price of a field.
You will have plenty of goats' milk to feed your family
and to nourish your female servants." (Proverbs 27:23–27)

Job: God's wisdom and wild nature

The book of Job is different in style and content from most of the Old Testament, even from other wisdom literature. It contains a multiplicity of literary genres including prose, poetry, drama, myth, judicial debate, dialogue, reflection, and theophany. Some commentators have regarded it as a muddle of conflicting literary sources ruined by redactive interference and an inappropriate happy ending³⁹, whilst others have seen an Almighty bully intimidating Job and cruelly forcing him into submission⁴⁰.

However, an evangelical canonical approach means dealing with the text as received, and recent commentators have found theological significance precisely in the variety of genres within Job. Carol Newsom portrays Job as "polyphonic text", seeing the different genres as complementary modes of perception on a reality which cannot be contained within a single literary genre⁴¹.

Job is unique within the biblical corpus in several regards. It contains the most profound biblical engagement with issues of suffering, evil and theodicy. It subverts and reinvents biblical wisdom, standing in tension with the confident assurances of Proverbs that the righteous will flourish, and pointing to a deeper wrestling rather than settled answers. Job is also important for theological anthropology. The questions that Job provokes, particularly in the divine speeches (Job 38–41), are as much about 'Who do you think you are?' as 'Why do the innocent suffer?'

In applying Job to today's environmental context, we should not expect all-encompassing definitive answers but rather a complex web of contextual wisdom. Recent developments in conservation biology are analogous, recognising the importance of enlisting "traditional ecological knowledge" (TEK) which may originate in 'unscientific' worldviews, yet incorporates local knowledge and wisdom that is scientifically invaluable⁴².

The text of Job includes numerous references to the natural world, from the cosmological and meteorological to the agricultural and seasonal. References to nature are included in the majority of speeches by Job and his accusers, building to a crescendo in Job's case against God (notably Job 28) and in the divine speeches.^c Here, we will focus particularly on the place of animals in the divine speeches, but within the wider context of Job's engagement with nature.

In Job, nature becomes the contested space within which the competing ethical worldviews of Job and his comforters battle for supremacy, before the divine speeches overturn all their words with a comprehensive natural tour-de-force. Job is put on trial by his erstwhile friends but turns the tables by making a legal case against God. Wild animals and nature's processes are repeatedly placed in the witness box by both sides. Thus, within Job's opening speech, the day and night of his birth are personified before being cursed with

^c This author counted 298 verses with direct reference to the natural world in the book of Job.

death (3:3), darkness (3:4–6), and barrenness (3:7). Day and night are divinely instituted in creation (Genesis 1:3–5, 14–19) and Job is verbalising an “un-creation account”⁴³, demanding that the heavenly bodies including morning stars and sunlight (3:9) cease their natural roles.

Job also refers to Leviathan, the legendary sea monster (3:8) who reappears in 41:1–34. This is one of several occasions where the speeches radically reinterpret earlier natural imagery. In Job 3, Leviathan symbolises the fearsome chaos of the oceans. Yet, when Leviathan is re-introduced, not only is Job (symbolic of all humanity) teased for his inability to control it (41:1–9), but alongside its terrifying, fire-breathing, armour-plated, crocodilian strength (41:13–32) there is a new note. This monster may be fearsome but is God's creature (41: 11). It is placed within God's mysterious ecology rather than belonging beyond the borders of understanding. Moreover, it is spoken of with affection and respect:

“I will not keep silence concerning its limbs,
or its mighty strength, or its splendid frame.” (41:12)

“On earth it has no equal, a creature without fear.
It surveys everything that is lofty; it is king over all that are proud.” (41:33–34)

Whereas Job sees Leviathan as representing the overturning of universal moral order, the divine speeches place it firmly within the moral circle. Mysterious and terrifying creatures are included within the orbit of a much larger moral universe which Job never fully comprehends, yet over which God has oversight.

Leviathan's repositioning is ecologically significant in challenging our tendency to value only those parts of nature which are of apparent benefit to humanity. Much conservation work focuses on flagship species: “popular, charismatic species that serve as symbols and rallying points to stimulate conservation awareness and action”⁴⁴, such as Polar Bear, Tiger or Rhino. Whilst there are advantages in using such species symbolically to protect whole ecosystems, the danger is that conservation priorities become skewed at the expense of less attractive but more vulnerable species, or of habitats that do not contain such flagship species⁴⁵. The conservation movement is aware of these dangers and there is much debate about single-species conservation^d versus landscape-scale or ecosystem conservation.

Aldo Leopold eloquently described the dangers of valuing only part of nature's diversity: “The last word in ignorance is the man who says of an animal or plant: ‘What good is it?’ If the land mechanism as a whole is good, then every part is good, whether we understand it or not. If the biota, in the course of aeons, has built something we like but do not understand, then who but a fool would discard seemingly useless parts? To keep every cog and wheel is the first precaution of intelligent tinkering”⁴⁶. Leopold's view is in accordance with the divine speeches. The book of Job asserts that even the Leviathan, the dangerous and ugly side of wild nature, has a place within God's ecology and is worthy of respect and preservation. This challenges reductionist and anthropocentric approaches to nature, valuing only those aspects of wild nature which appear beneficial or beautiful to humanity.

In the Divine speeches of Job 38:39–39:30, God describes a list of creatures, namely lion and raven (38:39–41), mountain goat and deer (39: 1–4), wild ass (onager; 39:5–8), wild ox (auroch; 39:9–12), ostrich (39:13–18), warhorse (39:19–25), hawk (39:26) and eagle or vulture (39:27–30). Of these, lions are

^d Keystone species, often predators, are those which have a disproportionately greater impact on their environment than their abundance would initially suggest.

referred to by Eliphaz (4:10–11) and Job himself (10:16 and 28:8), onager by Job (6:5, 24:5–8, 30:6–7) and Zophar (11:12), auroch by Job (6:5 although this may refer to domesticated cattle), ostrich by Job (30:29), eagle by Job (9:26) and birds of prey (potentially including both hawk, and eagle or vulture) in 28:7.

Taking these creatures collectively, there are significant parallels and tensions between how they are portrayed in the divine speeches, and earlier by Job and his accusers. God describes each in attentive and affectionate detail; all are unique, valued, and moral subjects rather than objects onto which human feelings are projected. To Job and his colleagues, however, wild animals characterise a moral world revolving around human interests. Thus, Eliphaz uses lions to describe God's punishment of the wicked, describing with relish how lion cubs starve when God withholds food (4:7–11). Job sees himself as a lion hunted by a vexatious God (10:16–17), and favourably compares the human ability to mine deep below the earth's surface with the inability of lions and other wild animals to do so (28:1–8). Lions, to Eliphaz are feared but detested, whilst to Job they symbolise both strength and contingency. As objectified symbols of nature's alien power and threat, they relate to humanity only in their vulnerability to a capricious Deity.

In contrast, the divine speeches invite Job to provide for the lion and to understand its behaviour (38:39–40). Refuting Eliphaz, God is the lion's protector and provider, not its persecutor. Moreover, whilst independent of human control, lions are absolutely dependent upon a God who knows their habits and their habitat. William Brown accurately summarises the contrast: "For Job and his friends, the lion is worthy of only fear and contempt ... In the divine economy, however ... God has transformed an object of fear and disdain to one of compassion"⁴⁷. There is a significant parallel between Job 38:39–40's appreciation of lions and Psalm 104:20–23 where lions and humans are fellow-citizens in a theocentric creation, equally dependent for their sustenance on God's provision and the earth's resources.

As the list continues, divine delight in the diversity and detail of creation becomes even more evident. God is a gentle midwife to mountain goat and deer, whereas Job is of no relevance to their gestation and birth (39:1–4). The onager, or wild ass, which Zophar makes fun of (11:12) and Job sees as a hapless illustration of his own troubles (6:5) and those of the poor and marginalised (24:5–8; 30:1–9) is, to God, wild and free beyond the restrictions of human society (39:5–8). What is more, the onager is given grassland steppes as its home, ascribing it a value totally independent of humanity. Similarly, Job (and with him all humanity) is mocked for being unable to harness the wild auroch (39:9–12). Here is a creature, not in competition for resources, but whose existence and importance matter to God and for whom human beings are marginal.

The description of the ostrich, which Job regards as a despised outcast associated with jackals (30:29), is equally remarkable. Acknowledging the oddity and apparent stupidity of this flightless bird (39:13–16), God nevertheless celebrates its bravery and superior speed. The ostrich is no miserable fool but a joyful, wing-flapping, elegant long-distance runner. The abiding impression, once again, is of a creature that humans fail to understand but that matters deeply to God.

The warhorse initially appears a surprising inclusion, in that it alone is used by human beings, but again the emphasis is on its proud independence (39:19–25). Its strength and bravery mean that humans depend on it rather than vice versa. Moreover, it is celebrated as God's creature, leaping, snorting, pawing, and laughing in its own right. It is a subject of moral importance under the Creator's design and care, rather than an objectified weapon of war.

Finally, the hawk and eagle are described soaring above and beyond humanity's earthbound restrictions (39:26–30). Human wisdom and knowledge are left behind by these creatures which remain under God's command. Like all the species in the divine speeches, each has their own *raison d'être* and each is answerable to God alone. As Gordis points out, "They possess a beauty which human beings can enjoy, but basically they were not created to serve man, but to fulfil God's purpose"⁴⁸.

The depiction of wildlife in Job 38–39 serves to reorientate Job's worldview profoundly. No longer can he see animals simply as objects for work, food, or poetic illustration, and no longer can he see privileged humans as the sole locus of God's purposeful interest. Karen Pidcock–Lester puts it vividly: "It is as though God is saying, 'Who do you think you are, Job? You are not the center of the universe.' God is. And what's more, the God who is at the center is not cold or distant, not deaf or even silent. The God who is at the center of the universe is in love with the world. Every bit of it"⁴⁹.

In Job 38:25–27 God rhetorically and explicitly dethrones the illusion that the earth was made exclusively for humanity's use:

"Who has cut a channel for the torrents of rain,
and a way for the thunderbolt,
to bring rain on a land where no one lives,
on the desert, which is empty of human life,
to satisfy the waste and desolate land,
and to make the ground put forth grass?"

God's question mocks hubristic anthropocentrism. As John Muir famously observed, the idea that the world revolves around humanity "is a presumption not supported by all the facts"⁵⁰. Whereas in chapters 1–37, "humanity is considered by all participants in the dialogue to be the chief object of God's attention and most important of God's creatures"⁵¹, in contrast the divine speeches proclaim that places and creatures beyond the circumference of human interest matter greatly to God.

The implications of the divine speeches for wildlife conservation are significant. The book of Job suggests a view of wild nature which challenges the presuppositions of today's globalised world. It suggests a revolution of the imagination which lifts humanity beyond its inherent anthropocentrism into a larger moral universe wherein animals and humans belong together in God's world.

The Psalms, wisdom and creation

The Psalms also see creation as evidence of God's wisdom (104:24, 135:5), and therefore a source of doxological inspiration, drawing humanity towards worship and, importantly, affirming that nonhuman creatures praise God independently, according to their kind. More than 40 of the 150 canonical Psalms explicitly express nonhuman creation's worship of its Creator.^e In addition, the Psalms affirm God's care and provision for all creatures. Psalm 145:9 states "The Lord is good to all; he has compassion on all he has made." The term *racham*, denoting God's compassion towards all creatures, is consistently used in the Hebrew Scriptures both of God's characteristic nature

^e Psalm 18:7–15, 19:1–6, 24:1, 29:3–11, 33:5–11; 36:5–9; 42:6–9; 46:4–10; 47:7; 50:1–4, 12; 57:5–11; 65:5–13; 68:7–10; 69:34; 71:19; 72:1–19; 74:12–17; 77:16–19; 78; 80:8–13; 83:13–15; 84:3–6; 89:9–13; 93:1–4; 96:11–13; 97:1–6; 98:7–9; 100:1–3; 104:1–35; 105:16, 28, 41; 107:25–38; 108:4–5; 113:4–6; 114:1–8; 119:64, 90; 135:6–7; 139:7–10; 144:5–15; 145:13–21; 146:6; 147:4, 8–9, 15–18; 148:1–13

and of human behaviour in response. The Hebrew root relates to the word for 'womb', suggesting a deep protective and nurturing instinct. God's compassion is a major theological theme in the Psalms⁵², so it is unsurprising that Psalm 145 is central to Jewish worship, uniquely repeated three times daily⁵³. This note of God's compassion towards all creatures is important in discerning the manner in which humanity, as the *imago Dei*, is to reflect God's character towards nonhuman creatures. If God has constant maternal compassion towards all living creatures, the implication is that such an attitude should also characterise human–animal relations.

Psalm 104 is worthy of particular consideration. It stands alongside Genesis 1–2 and the Job Divine speeches as a third great creation narrative, more extensive and detailed than Genesis. In it, a variety of creatures, mainly wild animals living independently of humanity, join in praising their Creator. It is bracketed by exclamations of God's greatness and power, and the focus is resolutely theocentric. Unlike Genesis, Psalm 104 cannot be construed as describing an anthropocentric world. Humanity is but one of God's works, neither created last nor given authority over other creatures. Across 35 verses, references to humanity are few, and significant both in what they say and what they omit. In vs. 14–15 God allows people to cultivate plants, producing wine, oil and bread, yet God's provision also extends to running water for donkeys, trees for nesting birds, rain for the soil, grass for cattle, and mountains for goats and hyrax. In vs. 19–23 the rhythms of night and day, dark and light are described, and the psalmist uses three stanzas (vs. 20–22) to describe creatures that live and eat by night and only one stanza (vs.23) to humans who work by daylight, almost deliberately challenging our habitual anthropocentrism.

The final reference to humanity in v.35 contains the psalmist's wish that God would remove sinners from the earth. The contemporary conviction that humans are the 'virus species',^f without which an otherwise good creation would thrive, would be alien to the Psalmist who carefully includes humanity amongst God's creatures. Yet, the world of Psalm 104 is neither teleologically nor functionally anthropocentric. The earth belongs not to humanity but firstly to God and secondarily to all the creatures that God sustains and cares for, with humans simply as one amongst the many. The only reference to any species having ownership over any part of creation is in v.18 where high mountains 'belong to' the wild goats. According to Psalm 104, the natural world provides for all species and its riches are to be shared, not accumulated or squandered by one species at the expense of others.

Not all the Psalms, however, appear to affirm such a nurturing relationship between humanity and creation. Psalm 8, in particular, parallels Genesis 1 in apparently placing humans in a position of supremacy:

^f eg. Agent Smith in the film *The Matrix* (1989): "Every mammal on this planet instinctively develops a natural equilibrium with the surrounding environment but you humans do not. You move to an area and you multiply and multiply until every natural resource is consumed and the only way you can survive is to spread to another area. There is another organism on this planet that follows the same pattern. Do you know what it is? A virus. Human beings are a disease, a cancer of this planet. You're a plague and we are the cure."
<http://www.imdb.com/title/tt0133093/quotes>

"You have made them a little lower than the angels
and crowned them with glory and honour.
You made them rulers over the works of your hands;
you put everything under their feet." (Psalm 8:5-6)

Seen through the lens of Greek Philosophy and its 'Great Chain of Being'⁵⁴, this locates humans hierarchically above nonhuman creatures. Habel alleges, "Earth is depicted as a slave prostrate at the feet of human royals"⁵⁵. Psalm 8 has, understandably, often been used to bolster a dominionist interpretation of Genesis⁵⁶.

Yet, whilst Psalm 8 undeniably portrays humanity as central to God's purposes and in a position of regal power over creation, what is remarkable is the accompanying emphasis on humanity's cosmic insignificance and utter dependence:

"When I consider your heavens, the work of your fingers,
the moon and the stars, which you have set in place,
What is mankind that you are mindful of them,
human beings that you care for them?" (Psalm 8:3-4)

Taken as a whole, Psalm 8 provides a sophisticated meditation on the ambiguity of human nature: a tiny creature in a massive universe, yet entrusted with extraordinary responsibility, and capacity for good or evil. Its anthropocentrism is carefully framed within God's character and purpose for the whole created order. The primary focus of Psalm 8 as a whole is theocentric. Crucially, its descriptions of humanity's exalted place are bracketed by identical opening and closing stanzas extolling the supreme majesty of God's name throughout the created order: "Lord, our Lord, how majestic is your name in all the earth!" (Psalm 8:1, 9).

Thus, notions of hierarchy within God's creation are given perspective by the subjection of all God's creatures, human and nonhuman, before the Divine majesty. If this all-powerful God, before whose creation of stars and planets human beings are infinitesimally small, can voluntarily share power and responsibility with the human creature, what model of leadership, what nature of kingship, does that imply? Humanity's privilege, with echoes of Genesis 1, is to rule over "all flocks and herds, and the animals of the wild, the birds in the sky, and the fish in the sea, all that swim the paths of the seas" (Psalm 8:7-8) but, as in Genesis, this rule is to reflect the character and beneficent rule of the God who has chosen humanity for this task.

Read within this theocentric framing, and in the light of all we have observed from Job and Psalm 104 (as well as in anticipation of New Testament concepts of kenotic service), Psalm 8 implies that humanity's leadership within nature should follow the divine model of self-giving love and compassion in relation to other creatures. Whilst Psalm 8 is clearly anthropocentric in a functional sense, it is thus by no means clear that it is teleologically anthropocentric. God's glory in Psalm 8 is expressed most fully when all creation thrives and is released to worship, and as humanity expresses God's character towards nonhuman creation.

Wisdom and Genesis in dialogue

Biblical wisdom literature, particularly in Job, provides an invaluable lens through which to re-examine the relationship between humanity and 'wild nature', shifting the focus away from the anthropocentric narratives of western culture to the complex witness of the biblical texts. Based on the material examined here, it is now important to turn back to Genesis 1–2. Biblical wisdom literature becomes a lens through which fresh light may be shone on passages obscured by centuries of contested debate.

Is wild nature worthy of protection because of what it does for us, or for its own sake? The Genesis creation accounts have generally been used to support anthropocentric motivations for valuing nature. Of the two major streams of interpretation, the 'dominionist' or 'mastery' stream sees nature as subject to human interests, whereas the milder 'stewardship' tradition is characterised by a less utilitarian yet nevertheless functionally anthropocentric orientation, placing humanity in the position of benevolent autocrats. From the time of the Church Fathers, and heavily influenced by Greek philosophy, an overwhelming anthropocentrism has been apparent, albeit often cloaked in a theocentric cape: the world is fundamentally God's, but God chooses to privilege humanity and place us at the centre of creation. Origen believed animals' only value related to their usefulness in resourcing, assisting or entertaining humanity: "The Creator, then, has made everything to serve the rational being and his natural intelligence. And for some purposes we need dogs, for example for guarding flocks ... or as house-dogs; for others we use beasts to carry burdens or baggage. Similarly, the species of lions and bears ... have been given to us in order to exercise the seeds of courage in us"⁵⁷. Whilst the Reformers generally rejected the Hellenistic 'Great Chain of Being', its influence lingered. Calvin's commentary on Genesis 1 states that the creation of animals and plants was simply so that "none of the conveniences and necessities of life might be wanting" to human beings⁵⁸.

However, when the Genesis accounts are read in the light of Hebrew wisdom literature, it is clear that such utilitarian teleological anthropocentrism is a distortion of the texts. Throughout the Hebrew Scriptures, the whole created world, human and non-human, belongs in its totality to God. Animals and humans alike are created and contingent beings. The book of Job follows biblical convention in proclaiming God's continuing ownership of the earth and all it contains (Psalm 24:1–2; Leviticus 25:23; Exodus 19:5). In these texts, as elsewhere in the Old Testament, Yahweh grants use of land and, within constraints, of creatures to humanity, but always retains ownership and oversight. As Sylvia Huberman Scholnick has observed, "Creation poetry makes clear that the Lord has never transferred title to any part of the universe he formed"⁵⁹.

The consequence of God's creation and ownership of all things is that the source of all 'value' in creation is ultimately neither utilitarian nor intrinsic, but primarily contingent upon God's valuation. All of the Hebrew Bible's creation texts are resolutely theocentric including both those which delight in nonhuman creatures and those which appear to privilege humanity. Psalm 8 and Genesis 2 both make it clear that human beings, apart from God, are, respectively, cosmically insignificant (Psalm 8:3–4) and lifeless clay (Genesis 2:7a).

Insisting that all value is contingent upon God provides a crucial alternative to the dualistic options of anthropocentrism and ecocentrism. It establishes that nature is not to be worshipped, as it is not itself divine, but that it must be treated with wonder and respect as God's creation and possession. Yet, in discussion with those of more secular worldviews, it is also possible to speak in a secondary sense of anthropocentric or ecocentric valuations of creation. This

is because the Bible's theocentrism can potentially be expressed in anthropocentric or ecocentric outcomes. To clarify, whilst the world and its creatures may in absolute terms derive their value contingently from God, God may choose in a secondary sense to attribute greater or lesser value to particular aspects of creation. Thus, theologians such as Origen and Calvin would have claimed that it was God who ordained humanity as Lord of creation, and that God had created other creatures for human use.

When we pose this possibility of theo-anthropo-centrism to passages such as Psalm 104 and the divine speeches in Job, as well as Proverbs' portrayal of God's delight in creation, we find it holds little weight. For instance, whilst Job and his companions habitually treat animals as satellites orbiting an anthropocentric world, yet to God, in chapters 38–41 they are moral subjects, each uniquely fitted to its ecological niche, some threatening human interests, and others so independent that humanity's existence is irrelevant to them. Similarly, Psalm 104 portrays humanity as simply one amongst the many of God's creatures and, like Job 38–41, repeatedly describes creatures that are of no use to humanity and yet which matter profoundly to God.

Thus, in biblical Wisdom literature, animals and indeed the whole of wild nature are inherently valuable in the sense of being valued by God regardless of their significance for humanity. This attitude might be called 'theo-eco-centrism' in that what God values most is not the thriving of one species, but the thriving of the whole of creation together within a theocentric universe.

We then turn anew to Genesis 1 and 2 to search for clues for this theo-eco-centrism in these long-debated passages. Firstly, within the ordering of creation in Genesis 1:1–2:4, the imposition of a hierarchical 'Great Chain of Being' onto the Genesis text is mistaken. Humans are created on Day Six alongside all other land animals, emphasising their creaturely commonality. The true crown of creation is the Sabbath, rather than humanity (Genesis 2:2–3⁶⁰). Significantly, when God declares the whole creation *very good*, it is not because humans have been created, but rather an affirmation of the completion or fullness of "all that he had made" (1:31), including the rich biodiversity on earth. Furthermore, the poetic structure of Genesis 1:1–2:4 is not six progressively hierarchical days but rather three days of separation paralleled by three days of filling⁶¹. Overall, what we have is a strictly theocentric account of all creation, within which God celebrates the goodness of all creatures and shares creation's bounty with them. It is, in this sense, a truly theo-eco-centric account.

Secondly, both humans and other creatures alike have the 'breath of life' from God. The same Hebrew phrase, *nishmat chayyim* is used in Genesis 2:7 of Adam, and in 2:19 for the animals and birds which Adam names.

Thirdly, any interpretation of *imago Dei* stemming directly from the context of Genesis 1:26–28 must embrace humanity's relationship with other creatures: "the fish in the sea and the birds in the sky and ... every living creature that moves on the ground" (Genesis 1:30). Richard Middleton's *The Liberating Image* has made a detailed study of the context of the phrase, demonstrating overwhelming evidence of a background in ancient near-east royal ideology⁶². What is distinctive about ancient Israel's account is that it is "intentionally subversive literature"⁶³, democratising Kingship to include the whole of humanity within God's temple-creation, and altering the nature of Kingship from self-aggrandisement into "generous, loving power ... used to nurture, enhance, and empower others, non-coercively, for their benefit"⁶⁴. Thus, humanity's role as *imago Dei* is not a licence to dominate and exploit but a responsibility towards nonhuman creatures, "actively mediating divine blessing to the nonhuman world"⁶⁵.

Further clarity regarding humanity's nature is found in Genesis 2:7 which characterises the first human, Adam, as made from *adamah* or soil⁶⁶. To convey the Hebrew, Alter translates 2:7 as 'human' made from 'humus'⁶⁷. Humans are creatures made both from 'the dust of the earth' and 'in the image of God'. We are carbon-based life-forms, like all other living creatures in our contingency and physicality, and yet uniquely called apart within the diversity of creatures, with a divine calling to reflect God's image in self-giving leadership within the community of creation.

In summary, when re-examined in the light of other biblical wisdom, Genesis 1 and 2 are finely-balanced narratives emphasising humanity's commonality with other creatures and also drawing out the unique privileges and responsibilities incumbent on being human. Genesis 1-2, when read in the light of wisdom literature, do not portray a dominionist theo-anthropo-centric world, where other creatures exist simply to serve human wants and needs. As Attfield summarises it, "The despotic attitude is a possible interpretation of the Old Testament only by means of selective quotation and disregard for Hebrew thought"⁶⁸. Rather, Genesis, along with the rest of the Hebrew Bible, demonstrates a theo-eco-centric ethic wherein God delights in creating and providing for all creatures, and humanity's vocation is to reflect God's character in assisting in the flourishing of the whole good creation.

Thus, Hebrew creation theology's answer to the question, "why do we value wild nature?" is firstly, because God creates, sustains and values it, secondly because it therefore has value independently of its usefulness or beauty to humanity and thirdly, because it is what we were made for. Human beings are created with responsibility towards nonhuman creation, making biodiversity conservation a missional task and a key means of reflecting God's image towards the whole created order.

Likewise, the meaning of *imago Dei* in Genesis 1:26-28, when re-examined in the light of biblical wisdom, relates primarily to humanity's role amongst its fellow creatures. We are created in God's image in order to shepherd and guide (1:28), to serve and preserve (2:15) our fellow creatures. Thus, biblical anthropology is fundamentally ecological anthropology. Our guiding purpose as a species is to be found in how we reflect God's character in relating to what David Kelsey calls our "proximate contexts"⁶⁹, our human and nonhuman neighbours and the ecosystems that support them and us.

To interpret the relationship between humans and fellow creatures in any manner that instrumentalises or objectifies creatures which share the divine gift of the breath of life, is not only to misread the text but to do violence to the divine word that proclaims all that has been made 'very good'. Thus, theologies of mastery and dominionism do not stand up to the witness of biblical creation texts as a whole. Rather, it is clear that *Adam* is created from *adamah* (Genesis 2:7), human from humus, and that alongside the *imago Dei*, humanity requires the humility to see itself essentially as part of the community of creation.

The steward motif has been both suggested and critiqued as an alternative to 'mastery', in exploring ecological anthropology. The radical message of Job implicitly qualifies and limits both 'dominion' and 'stewardship'. Job questions the ability of humans to exert dominion over the most wild and mysterious animals, or to express stewardship of the whole of nature. Both individual animals and the whole creation, Job reminds us, belong to God alone and there can be no biblical expression of dominion or stewardship that fails to acknowledge God's power and primacy.

This is not to deny that human work in caring for creation is important. Rather, our starting place and the values we bring to that work are re-imagined. Stewardship should commence with humility, in contrast to our habitual hubris.

Job's reaction to the insights into creation that he is given, is to repent of questioning God (Job 42:1–6). Knowing our place is to know how small we are, how incomplete our knowledge, and how wild and weird our fellow creatures are. It is theologically significant that all the species described by God in Job 38–39 are beyond human control. Job points to our need for a radical shift in our theological orientation, and a calling to be creaturely before attempting to become good stewards of the earth and its creatures.

Along with humility, human involvement with nature requires the virtues of fellow-feeling and respect. In Job 38–41, animals live independently of humans, with a direct relationship to the God who sustains them. Humanity is thus cut down to size, without being belittled. Rather, as Job accompanies God on his extraordinary wildlife tour, all life, including Job's, is seen as marvellous and mysterious. It is significant that senior voices within the secular conservation movement appreciate the importance of such fellow-feeling. Richard Mabey has said "Perhaps it behoves us ... to see ourselves not so much as managers or even stewards of the natural world, but as fellow-creatures"⁷⁰. A creaturely ethic is badly needed in a world dominated by the over-confidence and anthropocentrism of technology and economics.

Our human role, in the light of Job, is not to give up but to re-engage. Genesis is not to be abandoned but reinterpreted. Schifferdecker argues that humanity should see its role, "not as one of dominion or control, but as one of participation and appreciation ... Adam is given responsibility to 'serve' and to 'keep' the garden (Gen. 2:15). Job is taught humility in relationship to the natural world. In our current environmental crisis, both biblical voices should be heeded"⁷¹. Gerald Janzen similarly integrates the Joban and Genesis themes: "If human lordship over the animal realm is part of the realization of the divine image, then the portrayal here of God's divine rule of the animals offers Job an opportunity to re-conceive himself in that image ... enticing Job into a transformed understanding of his vocation as lord of the animal kingdom"⁷².

The connotations of superiority that have characterised centuries of dominion and stewardship theology need to be challenged by a different set of ecological virtues. Delight, wonder, humility, fellow-feeling and respect are needed if humanity is to re-imagine its role sufficiently to address the scale of today's ecological crises. Kathleen O'Connor captures this spirit in writing that the divine speeches "invite endless, joyous labor for justice for the earth and for all its wondrous, wild and creative creatures"⁷³.

Human involvement with wild nature must engage both imagination and emotions. In the divine speeches, God's enjoyment of the beauty, mystery and diversity of wild creatures contrasts with Job and his companions. If the book of Job is largely dark and despondent, the divine speeches stand out as playful, joyful and hopeful. God's self-evident delight in the strange creatures he introduces to Job calls forth a similar response from human beings. O'Connor writes, "God challenges Job to recognise his participation in the beauty and wild freedom of creation and its Creator"⁷⁴. Similarly, Schifferdecker: "The divine speeches articulate God's delight and pride in a world full of wild and beautiful things, and they call human beings to take such delight in the world, too"⁷⁵.

Bill McKibben, who comments on Job as an environmentalist, writes, "Not only are all these things mighty and inexplicable and painful, but they are unbearably beautiful to God. They are right. They should brew in us a fierce and intoxicating joy"⁷⁶. The implication is that, whether as pastors or scientists, we should not be afraid of evoking subjective pleasure in nature. Richard Bauckham states, "People feel that it is simply good that such creatures exist, even if they never encounter them themselves. People have a gut sense of what a loss it would be to the creation if such magnificent creatures went extinct"⁷⁷. We need

rigorous science, but we equally need to engage the affective and imaginative dimensions.

Biblical wisdom reminds the reader that context is fundamental to conclusions. Both theology and science are predicated on centuries of anthropocentric assumptions, leading to an inevitable danger of repeating past mistakes. Job challenges us to realise that theology and science need not only the academy but also the vastness, variety and mystery of nature. They need wonder, the arts, and imaginative engagement if they are to be attentive to the needs of a complex biodiverse planet. The divine speeches in Job are the longest passage about non-human creation in the Bible, and they should be read meditatively and imaginatively. Perhaps Job is best read in the context of personal experience of the existential otherness of wild nature.

Job provides a vital antidote to either creation theologies or secular views of nature which excuse unbridled human exploitation of the natural world and abuse of fellow creatures. Gordis accurately sums up the implications of Job: "Though the poet did not intend to present a religio-ethical basis for ecology, he has in effect done so. Man takes his place among the other living creatures, all of whom are the handiwork of God and have an equal right to live on His earth"⁷⁸. Bauckham adds, "for addicts of domination and excess the book of Job offers a healing and transforming vision of both the Creator and his creation"⁷⁹. The call to be radically non-anthropocentric is far more than a theological nicety. It is a vital necessity that human beings learn to find their place once again alongside the wild beasts.

Conclusion

The book of Job is generally acknowledged to have arisen at a time of crisis, quite probably in reaction to the trauma of exile⁸⁰. Today humanity, along with earth's other inhabitants, faces multiple ecological crises which threaten to overwhelm it. David Ford argues that the essence of Job is of theology in the light of "a tear in a tradition"⁸¹, a psycho-social trauma so profound it calls all previous theological approaches into question. Ford develops this in theological reflection on the Holocaust (*Shoah*), but it may equally be appropriated in terms of current environmental crises. This chapter's analysis of Genesis in the light of Wisdom literature has begun the process of a fundamental reworking of human approaches to wild nature. Christian thinking needs to move from the anthropocentric to a form of theo-eco-centrism, wherein humanity plays its particular part in work and worship alongside other creatures which have independent significance to God. The ruptures between science and theology need to be overcome if wisdom for a sustainable world is to be acquired.

We inhabit a world where greater scientific understanding has delivered many benefits in terms of health, wealth and convenience, but has often failed to engender greater happiness for humanity or greater flourishing for fellow creatures. The book of Job calls for a fundamental ethical reorientation in attitudes to other creatures, and consequently in how humanity uses science, technology, and economics. Job questions human endeavour that is overconfident and hubristic. As Bauckham states, "We need the humility to recognise the unforeseeable risks of technology before we ruin the world in pursuit of technological fixes to all our problems. We need the humility to know ourselves as creatures within creation, not gods over creation, the humility of knowing that only God is God"⁸².

¹ Middleton 2005, p.144

² Barth 1958, p.193

³ Callicott 1999, p.188

⁴ *ibid*, pp.191-192

⁵ Palmer 2006, p.68

-
- ⁶ Horrell, 2010, p.6
⁷ Habel 2000
⁸ *ibid*, p.45
⁹ *ibid*, pp.45–46
¹⁰ von Rad 1966, pp.138–139
¹¹ Vantassel, 2009
¹² *ibid*, p.v
¹³ *ibid*, p.xii
¹⁴ *ibid*, p.2
¹⁵ Middleton 2005, pp.33–37
¹⁶ White, 1967
¹⁷ Lodge and Hamlin 2006, pp.31ff
¹⁸ *ibid*, p.3
¹⁹ Pepper 1984, pp.44–46
²⁰ White 1967, pp.1206–1207
²¹ Hiebert, 1996, pp.14–15
²² Bauckham, 2011, p.19
²³ *ibid*, p.50
²⁴ *ibid*, p.52
²⁵ Kelsey 2009, p.162
²⁶ *ibid*, p.305
²⁷ *ibid*, pp.305–306
²⁸ Bauckham, 2010, p.37
²⁹ Bauckham 2011, p.5
³⁰ Crenshaw 1969, p.132
³¹ Dell 2000, pp.1–2
³² Perdue, 1986, p.295
³³ Dell, 2000, p.3
³⁴ Davis, E. 2000, p.56
³⁵ *ibid*, p.44
³⁶ Kelsey, 2009, p.163
³⁷ Davis, 2000, p.68
³⁸ Rahner, 1972, p.11
³⁹ listed in Rendtorff 1986
⁴⁰ notably Jung 1984
⁴¹ Newsom, 2009, pp.11ff
⁴² Gosler et al. 2013
⁴³ Schifferdecker 2008, p.28
⁴⁴ Heywood, 1995, p.491
⁴⁵ Simberloff 1998
⁴⁶ Leopold, 1993, p.146
⁴⁷ Brown, 1999, p.361
⁴⁸ Gordis 1985, p.196
⁴⁹ Pidcock–Lester 2000, pp.128–129
⁵⁰ Muir 1988, p.4
⁵¹ Schifferdecker 2008, p.61
⁵² Bell 2018, pp.97–104
⁵³ Apple 2016
⁵⁴ Glacken 1967, pp.198–199; Santmire 1985, p.50, *passim*
⁵⁵ Habel 2009, p.67
⁵⁶ Vantassel 2009, pp.36, 39, 163
⁵⁷ Quoted in Glacken 1967, p.186
⁵⁸ Calvin 1965, p.96, quoted in Clough 2012, p.14
⁵⁹ Scholnick 1987, p.191
⁶⁰ Moltmann 1973, p.276
⁶¹ Roehrs 1965, p.320
⁶² Middleton 2005, pp.59–60
⁶³ *ibid*, p.186
⁶⁴ *ibid*, p.295
⁶⁵ *ibid*, p.90
⁶⁶ Gregersen 2015, p.229
⁶⁷ Alter 1996, p.8
⁶⁸ Attfield 1983, pp.26–27
⁶⁹ Kelsey 2009, p.893
⁷⁰ Mabey 1993, p.ix
⁷¹ Schifferdecker 2008, pp.131–132
⁷² Janzen 1985, p.241
⁷³ O'Connor 2003, p.179
⁷⁴ *ibid*, p.177
⁷⁵ Schifferdecker 2008, p.128
⁷⁶ McKibben 1994, p.43

⁷⁷ Bauckham 2011, p.221

⁷⁸ Gordis 1985, p.199

⁷⁹ Bauckham 2010, p.38

⁸⁰ Terrien 1990, p.240

⁸¹ Ford 2007, p.152

⁸² Bauckham 2010, p.46

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Apple, R. (2016). "Addenda to Psalm 145." *Jewish Bible Quarterly*

Alter, R. (1996). *Genesis: Translation and Commentary*. New York, W. W. Norton & Co.

Attfield, R. (1983). "Christian Attitudes to Nature." *Journal of the History of Ideas* 44(3): 369–386.

Barth, K. (1958). *Church Dogmatics vol. 3: The Doctrine of Creation, part 1: The work of Creation*. Edinburgh, T. & T. Clark.

Bauckham, R. (2010) *Bible and Ecology: Recovering the Community of Creation*. London, DLT.

Bauckham, R. (2011). *Living with Other Creatures: Green Exegesis and Theology*. Waco, TX, Baylor University Press.

Bell, R. D. (2018). *Theological Themes of Psalms: The theology of the book of Psalms*. Eugene, OR, Wipf & Stock.

Brown, W. P. (1999) *The Ethos of the Cosmos: The Genesis of Moral Imagination in the Bible*. Grand Rapids, MI, W B Eerdmans.

Callicott, J. B. (1989) *In Defense of the Land Ethic: Essays in Environmental Philosophy*. Albany, NY, New York State University Press.

Clough, D. L. (2012). *On Animals: Systematic Theology: 1*. London, Bloomsbury T. & T. Clark.

Crenshaw, J. L. (1969). "Method in Determining Wisdom Influence upon Historical Literature." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 88(2): 129–142.

Davis, E. F. (2000). *Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, and the Song of Songs*. Louisville, KY, Westminster John Knox.

Dell, K. (2000) *'Get Wisdom, Get Insight': An Introduction to Israel's Wisdom Literature*. London, DLT.

Ford, D. (2007). *Christian Wisdom: Desiring God and Learning in Love*. Cambridge, CUP.

Glacken, C. J. (1967) *Traces on the Rhodian Shore: Nature and Culture in Western Thought from Ancient Times to the End of the Eighteenth Century*. Berkeley, CA, University of California Press

Gordis, R. (1985) "Job and Ecology (And the Significance of Job 40:15)." In *Biblical and Other Studies in Memory of S. D. Goitein*, edited by Ahroni, R. HAR. Columbus, OH, Ohio University Press, 189–202.

Gosler, A., et al. (2013). "Leadership and Listening: Inspiration for Conservation Mission and Advocacy." *Key Topics in Conservation Biology 2*. D. W. Macdonald and K. J. Willis. Hoboken, NJ / Oxford, Wiley–Blackwell: 92–109.

Gregersen, N. H., ed. (2015). *Incarnation: on the scope and depth of Christology*. Minneapolis, MN, Fortress, 229

Habel, N. C. and S. Wurst (2000). *The Earth Story in Genesis*. Sheffield, Sheffield Academic Press.

Habel, N. C. (2009) *An Inconvenient Text: Is a Green Reading of the Bible Possible?* Adelaide, ATF Press.

Heywood, V.H., ed. (1995) *Global Biodiversity Assessment*. Cambridge: UNEP / CUP.

Hiebert, T. (1996). *The Yahwist's Landscape: Nature and Religion in Early Israel*. Oxford, OUP.

-
- Horrell, D. G., et al., (eds.) (2010). *Ecological Hermeneutics: Biblical, Historical and Theological Perspectives*. London, T. & T. Clark.
- Janzen, J. (1985) *Job*. Atlanta, GA, John Knox Press.
- Jung, C. G. (1984) *Answer to Job: Researches into the Relation Between Psychology and Religion*. London, Routledge.
- Kelsey, D. H. (2009) *Eccentric Existence: A Theological Anthropology*. 2 vols Louisville, KY, Westminster John Knox Press
- Leopold, A. (1993) *Round River* New York, OUP.
- Lodge, D M, and C. Hamlin, eds. (2006) *Religion and the New Ecology: Environmental Responsibility in a World in Flux*. Notre Dame, IN, University of Notre Dame Press.
- Mabey, R. (1993, 2nd ed.). *The Common Ground: A Place for Nature in Britain's Future*. London, J. M. Dent.
- McKibben, W. (1994) *The Comforting Whirlwind: God, Job and the scale of Creation*. Grand Rapids, MI, Eerdmans.
- Middleton, R. J. (2005). *The Liberating Image: The Imago Dei in Genesis 1*. Ada, MI, Brazos Press.
- Moltmann, J. (1973). *The Crucified God: The Cross of Christ as the Foundation and Criticism of Christian Theology*. London, SCM.
- Muir, J. (1988) *John Muir in His Own Words: A Book of Quotations*. Lafayette, CA, Great West Books.
- Newsom, C. A. (2009) *The Book of Job: A Contest of Moral Imaginations*. New York, OUP.
- O'Connor, K. M. (2003). "Wild, Raging Creativity: The Scene in the Whirlwind (Job 38–41)." *A God So Near: Essays on Old Testament Theology in Honor of Patrick D. Miller*. B. A. Strawn and N. R. Bowen. Winona Lake, IN, Eisenbrauns: 171–179.
- Palmer, C. (2006). "Stewardship: A Case Study in Environmental Ethics". *Environmental Stewardship*. R. J. Berry. London, T. & T. Clark: 63–75.
- Pepper, D. (1984) *The Roots of Modern Environmentalism*. London, Croom Helm.
- Perdue, L. G. (1986) "Job's Assault on Creation." In *Biblical and Other Studies: Tenth Anniversary Volume*, edited by Ahroni, R. HAR. Columbus, OH: Ohio State University, 1986
- Pidcock–Lester, K. (2000) "'Earth Has no Sorrow that Earth Cannot Heal': Job 38–41." In *God Who Creates*, edited by Brown, W. P. et al. Grand Rapids, MI, Eerdmans, 125–32.
- Rahner, H. (1972). *Man at Play: or did you ever practice Eutrapelia?* New York, Herder & Herder.
- Rendtorff, R. (1986) *The Old Testament: An Introduction*. Minneapolis, MN, Fortress Press.
- Roehrs, W. R. (1965). "The Creation Account of Genesis: Guidelines for an Interpretation." *Concordia Theological Monthly* 36: 301–321.
- Santmire, H. P. (1985) *The Travail of Nature: The Ambiguous Ecological Promise of Christian Theology*. Minneapolis, MN, Fortress Press.
- Schifferdecker, K. (2008) *Out of the Whirlwind: Creation Theology in the Book of Job*. Cambridge, MA: HUP.
- Scholnick, S. H. (1987) "Poetry in the Courtroom: Job 38–41." In *Directions in Biblical Hebrew Poetry*, edited by Follis, E. R. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 185–204.
- Simberloff, D. (1998). "Flagships, Umbrellas, and Keystones: Is Single-Species Management Pass in the Landscape Era?" *Biological Conservation* 83: 247–257.
- Terrien, S. (1990) "Job as a Sage." In *The Sage in Israel and the Ancient Near East*, edited by Gammie, J. G. and L. G. Perdue. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1990, 231–42.
- Vantassel, S. M. (2009). *Dominion over Wildlife? An Environmental Theology of Human–Wildlife Relations*. Oregon, Resource Publications.

von Rad, G. (1966). *The Problem of the Hextateuch and Other Essays*. London, SCM.

White Jr., L. (1967) "The Historical Roots of Our Ecologic Crisis." *Science* 155, no. 3767: 1203–1207.