THE ROAD TOWARDS AN ECOLOGICAL BIBLICAL AND THEOLOGICAL HERMENEUTICS

Ernst Conradie
Department of Religion and Theology
University of the Western Cape

Abstract

This article builds on a review essay on the Earth Bible project (Scriptura 85, 125-133). It defends the creative role, indeed the necessity and inevitability of doctrine in biblical exegesis. It argues that the Earth Bible project assumes its own set of doctrinal presuppositions, that this forms the very core of its critical and creative impulse and that such presuppositions should be recognised and subjected to further critical reflection. This can provide a meeting place where mutually critical collaboration between biblical hermeneutics and constructive theology can become possible.

Key words: Earth Bible Project, Ecology, Theological hermeneutics

Introduction

In a recent review article on the Earth Bible project (*Scriptura* 85, 125-133), I described the ecological biblical hermeneutics employed by the Earth Bible project, with specific reference to the six ecojustice principles formulated by the Earth Bible team. I also offered a constructive proposal on how the notion of an ecological Biblical hermeneutics may be developed somewhat further. The gist of this proposal was to extend such an ecological hermeneutics beyond its ideology-critical function in order to develop a hermeneutical theory that would touch on all aspects of the interpretation process. These would include factors influencing interpretation from a) the world 'behind' the text, b) the text itself, c) the world 'in front of' the text, d) the contemporary context, e) the rhetorical context within which interpretation takes place, f) the so-called world 'below' the text (ideological distortions) and g) the act of contemporary appropriation.

I then offered an overview of contributions which have been made from the point of view of an ecological hermeneutics on each of these aspects. This was illustrated by the history of interpretation of the famous, crucial and controversial text in Genesis 1:27-28. My argument was that an ecological hermeneutics may develop a comprehensive hermeneutical theory if the work which has been done on these aspects of the interpretative process can be integrated with or at least related to one another.

In this contribution I will focus on the last of the above mentioned seven aspects, namely the contemporary act of appropriating the meaning of biblical texts. My argument is that attention to this aspect may provide a clue for such a task of integration toward a more comprehensive ecological hermeneutics. More specifically, I will argue that the role of 'doctrinal keys' should be noted in this regard.

The role of Doctrinal Keys in the Appropriation of Biblical Texts

How does interpretation actually take place? How do we manage to relate the message of the Bible to and appropriate it within a particular contemporary context? There is a long tradition of philosophical and theological reflection on this topic.

David Tracy has suggested that this is *de facto* possible through the power of what he calls an analogical imagination.[1] Interpretation can only take place when some analogies, that is, similarities-amidst-differences, are identified, in the case of theological interpretation between the Biblical texts, the Christian tradition and a contemporary context. Tracy (with Paul Ricoeur) refers to the classic axiom of Aristotle in this regard: "To spot the similar in the dissimilar is the mark of poetic genius."[2] The ability to identify these similarities, and to express them in an accessible form (image), is based on the power of the imagination.[3]

The identification of such similarities does not take place in a coincidental way. Such similarities are discovered through long-standing theological traditions that have formulated and developed the necessary conceptual tools to facilitate this process. I propose that certain *heuristic* or *doctrinal keys* play an important role in this regard.

Heuristic keys are typically based on the dominant beliefs, doctrines, values, customs, theological trajectories,[4] and habits of (ecclesial or academic) interpretative communities. They are not directly derived from either the Biblical texts or the contemporary world but are precisely the product of previous attempts to construct a relationship between text, tradition and context. Since such heuristic keys usually coincide with some of the dominant theological motifs within a particular context, it may be helpful to specify such heuristic keys as doctrinal keys.

Doctrinal keys are comprehensive theological constructs which may be used to establish a relationship between the Biblical texts and a contemporary context. They play a crucial role in the identification of similarities (amidst differences) between the Biblical text and a contemporary context. They have a double function in this regard. They provide a key to unlock the meaning of *both* the contemporary context *and* the Biblical texts and simultaneously enable the interpreter to establish a *link* between text and contemporary context. Doctrinal keys are not only employed to *find* similarities but to *construct* similarities, to *make* things similar (idem-facere),[5] to enforce such similarity, if necessary through the use and defence of power structures and with reference to various authorities. The scope of such interpretative keys is often quite comprehensive: They purport to provide a clue to the core meaning of the contemporary context *as a whole* and the Biblical text *as a whole*. They therefore also offer a uni*fy*ing vision, that is, a construction of unity (unum-facere).[6]

The dangers of simplification, a far-reaching harmonising of differences and a legitimising of domination and power structures in an analysis of both the Bible and the contemporary context, should be quite apparent. However, this may be inescapable since any act of

---

[1]   See Tracy 1981.

[2]   Tracy 1981:410.

[3]   For an in-depth analysis of the notion of an 'analogical imagination', emphasising the identification *and* imaginative expression of analogies, see Conradie 1992b.

[4]   On the notion of trajectories, see the various contributions by Klaus Nürnberger (1992, 1993, 1997, 2002).

[5]   According to Ricoeur (1978:148), the creation of metaphorical meaning does not only involve the identification of existing similarities. It also involves an association of semantic fields that have hitherto been considered as quite different from one another. It is thus necessary to *make* these semantic fields similar: But we miss entirely its semantic role if we interpret it in terms of the old association by resemblance... The assimilation consists precisely in *making* similar, that is, semantically proximate, the terms that the metaphorical utterance brings together.

[6]   See Eaton (2000:71) who recognises the need for such a unifying (ecological) vision despite the obvious dangers of homogeneity, imperialism and oppressive structures. My argument here is that such a unifying process is probably unavoidable, albeit that the unity that is constructed in this way may well be oppressive and less 'successful', that is, less unitary, reconciliatory or cohesive than the concept seems to indicate. See also the discussion below.

interpretation requires the identification of some form of *similarity*-in-difference. It may be necessary and entirely appropriate to unmask and avoid one set of doctrinal keys, but it will be naïve not to recognise the way in which such doctrinal keys are often replaced by others. This implies the need to construct other, less totalitarian and authoritarian doctrinal keys – perhaps keys derived from liberation theology, feminist theology or ecotheology, although the lasting appeal of some earlier theological constructs should not be underestimated. It also implies the need for interpreters to accept responsibility for their own constructions *and* (almost inevitably) their own distortions of meaning.[7]

Such interpretative keys are usually derived from the dominant beliefs or an interpretative community. The following well-known examples of such comprehensive doctrinal keys, based on core Christian beliefs in particular traditions, may be mentioned: The victory over the powers of death (Eastern orthodox), justification by faith alone (Lutheran), the kingdom (reign) of God (Calvin), sin-grace (Augustine), nature-grace (Thomas), the imitation of Christ (Thomas a' Kempis), the notion of a new covenant, Christian love and charity, the incarnation, the cross-resurrection dialectic, the ongoing work of the Spirit, the gifts of the Spirit (the charismatic movement), the duty of Christians as 'prophets, kings and priests', liberation from oppression, ecological wholeness, mission and witness, hope, etc. In each case, a particular doctrinal key not only provides an explanation of the historical meaning of the Biblical texts; it also provides the parameters for contemporary Christian living in the continued presence of God.

The doctrinal key of 'liberation' may serve as an example here. The confession that 'God is a Liberator' is used in liberation theology as a doctrinal key to link Biblical texts (stories on how God liberated people in the past) with particular contexts of oppression today. In this sense a new theology would indeed lead to a new form of hermeneutics because of the introduction of a different doctrinal key.

Such a doctrinal key thus provides a strategy to establish a link between text and context. When such a doctrinal key is used persistently and pervasively within long-standing theological trajectories, a plurality of connotations are likely to be associated to – in the abovementioned example – the notion of 'liberation.' This would call for a systematic clarification of this particular doctrinal key and its relationship with other core Christian symbols.[8] Inevitably, it becomes the contribution of (systematic) theology to provide such a clarification and perhaps also an imaginative reconstruction of the content of such doctrinal keys.

One implication of this analysis is that it is simply not possible to 'jump' from the Biblical text to a specific problem in the contemporary context without the use of such doctrinal keys. The appropriation of the meaning of biblical texts is filtered through a complex set of 'vectors' constituting the 'world' of the interpreting subject or community.[9] Such vectors (of varying strengths and centrality) include cosmologies, religious beliefs, values, life-stories, obligations, habits, rituals, institutional affiliations, social relationships, and a wide range of experiences. The influence of these vectors on the appropriation of biblical

---

[7]   See Eaton (2000:61) on the need for the reader to accept responsibility for the production of meaning.

[8]   The dominant doctrinal keys of an interpretative community may sometimes remain hidden, unarticulated, taken for granted. Any attempt to define these may even be regarded as sacrilegious since the meaning should be 'obvious' to everyone. To mention one example: I have argued elsewhere (Conradie 1992a) that there is a tendency in Gerald West's work, *Biblical hermeneutics of liberation* (1991), to ontologise and absolutise the notion of 'liberation'. It thus becomes self-explanatory, all-inclusive, and mystified. See also Nürnberger's (2002:47-51) sharp criticisms of such uses of the category of liberation.

[9]   See Conradie (2001) for a more detailed description in this regard.

studies is studied in theological sub-disciplines such as church history, systematic theology, Christian ethics, and practical theology.

While Biblical scholars – quite rightly – have been dismayed by the way the Bible has been used and abused in Systematic Theology (by reading support for various doctrines into Biblical texts), there has been an unhelpful tendency among some Biblical scholars to pretend that faith convictions (and Christian doctrines reflecting on such convictions) do not play an inevitable, necessary and crucial role in interpreting and appropriating Biblical texts.[10] While some interpreters may prefer to avoid or even to resist traditional doctrinal distinctions at all costs, newly constructed doctrines tend to surface through the persistent use of heuristic keys.[11] This analysis therefore confirms the pervasive, if often highly ambiguous influence of Christian doctrine and values in the process of Biblical interpretation.

Three further comments on the role of doctrinal keys are important here:

a) The identification of the role of these doctrinal keys may clarify the often rather diffuse use of the word 'hermeneutics'. Various contemporary theological movements have their own hermeneutics because of the dominant doctrinal key (e.g. 'the oppression of women', 'liberation for the poor and oppressed', 'the struggle of the black working class' or the 'need to re-appropriate traditional African customs') employed in a particular movement.

b) These examples make it clear that doctrinal keys have both a constructive and an ideology-critical function. They enable interpreters to identify and construct the meaning of the text (and the context), but they also provide a tool to evaluate the available evidence and to unmask (in terms of that particular perspective) any distortions in the process of interpretation (in the production of texts, in the texts themselves, in the history of interpretation of the text and in the contemporary context).

c) The choice of doctrinal keys will necessarily (almost by definition) lead to a distortion of both text and context. Such distortions may well be ideological in the pejorative sense of the word. A hermeneutics of suspicion towards the use of heuristic keys is therefore of the utmost importance. However, this is hampered by the pervasiveness of heuristic keys because they also influence the selection of ideology-critical tools. Heuristic keys prescribe to their users what they should be suspicious about.

Doctrinal Keys and an Ecological Hermeneutics

In the context of ecological theology, the controversial term 'stewardship' illustrates the use of such doctrinal keys with reference to Genesis 1:27-28. The word stewardship does not appear in the text itself. Nevertheless, it has become a very common key to interpret the meaning of the Hebrew words *kabash* ('subdue') and *radah* ('have dominion'). In his influential study, *The steward, a Biblical symbol come of age,*[12] Douglas John Hall develops a theology of stewardship that suggests that we human beings are responsible for the whole earth, that we are together responsible for the whole earth, that this responsibility includes the non-human as well as the human world, that this responsibility must seek to express itself in just and merciful political forms and that this responsibility must be exercised in the light not only of the immediate situation but of the near and distant future as well. It is

---

[10]   Despite such a denial, Biblical scholars themselves often employ theological categories that they find more to their liking. One example of this is West's consistent use of the soteriological category of 'liberation' in the 'liberation hermeneutics' that he promotes (see West 1991).

[11]   The replacement of former doctrines by new heuristic keys based on the doctrines of emerging theological traditions, is again well illustrated by West's (1991) use of the notion of 'liberation'.

[12]   Hall 1990.

clear that 'stewardship' functions here as a heuristic key to relate biblical texts with ecological responsibility within the contemporary context. One may be able to identify a number of other heuristic keys that have emerged in debates on ecotheology over the last two or three decades. Concepts such as the 'integrity of creation' or the 'whole household of God' play a similar role by providing a root metaphor which enables interpreters to relate the biblical roots of Christianity, together with their subsequent traditions of interpretation, with contemporary challenges which Christians may seek to address.[13]

Many criticisms have been raised against such a notion of stewardship, for example that it is too hierarchical, too managerial, too androcentric, aimed at those in positions of power, not visionary enough and that it portrays God as either a patriarch or an absentee Landlord. Such criticisms suggest that all doctrinal keys have to be subjected to a hermeneutics of suspicion.[14] In his essay on Genesis 1:26-28, Habel adamantly concludes that the claim that the mandate in this passage has been misunderstood and that it can best be interpreted in terms of a benign stewardship model is untenable.[15] By contrast, the fifth principle of the Earth Bible project proposes a sense of *mutual* custodianship, albeit that some of the criticisms raised against stewardship may apply to the notion of custodianship too.

What has to be noted here is that the six ecojustice principles as identified by the Earth Bible team have the same heuristic function as the category of stewardship. This assessment calls for some clarification.

The ecological hermeneutics developed within the context of the Earth Bible project may be described as being predominantly a hermeneutics of suspicion and retrieval. The best analogue for the Earth Bible project's hermeneutics is feminist hermeneutics[16] (e.g. the work of Elizabeth Schüssler-Fiorenza). Many feminist biblical scholars have reached the conclusion that the Bible is not a neutral book with regard to the oppression of women. The Bible consists of a corpus of books written predominantly by men, reflecting a male-chauvinist perspective and serving primarily male interests. Thus the Bible can be used as a weapon *against* women's struggle for liberation. In the words of Schüssler-Fiorenza: "The source of our power is also the source of our oppression."[17] This calls for a two-pronged hermeneutics, including both a hermeneutics of suspicion and of reconstruction. The hermeneutics of suspicion requires an ideology-critical analysis of androcentric distortions at work in the production and interpretation of biblical texts. This is supplemented with reconstructive work in which the stories of the victims of patriarchy and misogyny are excavated and where more inclusive traditions in the production and interpretation of these texts are retrieved.

In a similar way, the Earth Bible project articulates the suspicion that the production and the appropriation of biblical texts have been distorted as a result of an anthropocentric bias that marginalises and suppresses other creatures and the voice of the Earth itself. With Schüssler-Fiorenza such a hermeneutics may wish to place a warning label on all biblical texts: "Caution! Could be dangerous to your health and survival."[18] Its suspicion is that "biblical texts, written by humans to meet human circumstances, will reflect human inter-

---

[13] In this vein, it is interesting to note that the contribution on ecological hermeneutics by Van den Brom (1998) focuses on the heuristic function of the notions of the 'integrity of creation' (in its relationship with justice and peace), stewardship, servanthood and 'reverence for life.'

[14] See Conradie (2000, 2005) for a more detailed critical discussion of the notion of stewardship.

[15] Habel (ed.) 2000:31, Habel 2000b:34-48, Habel & Balabanski (eds.) 2002:10.

[16] See the helpful essay by Eaton (2000, also 1996) on the connections between feminist perspectives on biblical hermeneutics and an ecojustice hermeneutics.

[17] Schüssler-Fiorenza 1986:35.

[18] As quoted in Habel 2000a:33.

ests at the expense of the non-human Earth community."[19] It suspects that biblical texts are likely to be anthropocentric, as well as patriarchal or androcentric because most writers and interpreters of the Bible in past periods were males socialised within the dominant patriarchal traditions.[20] It acknowledges that we as members of the human community have all too often exploited, oppressed and endangered the existence of other members of the Earth community. It therefore seeks to ascertain whether Earth and Earth community are silenced or liberated in the production, transmission and interpretation of particular Biblical texts.

The approach followed in the Earth Bible project is therefore to ask whether there is a concern for Earth community in the text or whether Earth is being treated unjustly in the text. It also offers an incipient 'hermeneutic of retrieval' by seeking to discern and retrieve alternative traditions about Earth or the Earth community that have been unnoticed, suppressed or hidden and that may help the earth community to flourish again.[21] It facilitates a retrieval of alternative traditions that hear the voice of the earth and that value the earth as more than a human instrument. In this way it wishes to allow the often marginalised voices of Earth to be heard again. A theology based on such alternative traditions has to help us to live as part of the earth community on the planet's terms and not on our own.[22]

The Earth Bible project thus explores the Biblical texts from the perspective of Earth. In order to clarify this perspective, the Earth Bible team identified the following six guiding ecojustice principles for Biblical interpretation:[23]

1) *The principle of intrinsic worth*: The universe, Earth and all its components have intrinsic worth / value;

2) *The principle of interconnectedness*: Earth is a community of interconnected living things that are mutually dependent on each other for life and survival;

3) *The principle of voice*: Earth is a subject capable of raising its voice in celebration and against injustice;

4) *The principle of purpose*: The universe, Earth and all its components, are part of a dynamic cosmic design within which each piece has a place in the overall goal of that design.

5) *The principle of mutual custodianship*: Earth is a balanced and diverse domain where responsible custodians can function as partners, rather than rulers, to sustain a balanced and diverse Earth community.

6) *The principle of resistance*: Earth and its components not only suffer from injustices at the hands of humans, but actively resist them in the struggle for justice.

Together, these six ecojustice principles provide a creative and constructive new doctrinal key which can help us to read the Biblical texts in a new way and to appropriate it within a context of the devastation of whole ecosystems (especially through deforestation), a heavily polluted environment, gross economic disparities and injustices and rising concerns over the impact of a hotter, drier, more dangerous climate. It should also be noted how a normative priority is attributed to the set of ecojustice principles in this way. They are employed to judge both the validity of the text and contemporary culture.[24]

---

[19]   Habel & Balabanski (eds.) 2002:1.

[20]   See Habel 2004:6.

[21]   Habel & Balabanski (eds.) 2002:1.

[22]   See Habel 2000a:35.

[23]   See Habel (ed.) 2000:42-53 and Eaton (2000) for a detailed discussion of these principles.

[24]   Eaton (2000:63) correctly notes that this priority of the principles over the texts is entirely appropriate; the emancipatory interests of women have priority over both misogynist texts and power structures.

One could even argue that these six ecojustice principles provide nothing less than a 'small dogmatics.' The first two principles on the intrinsic worth (instead of the utilitarian value) of all matter[25] and on interconnectedness form an incipient doctrine of creation.[26] The emphasis on the earth community and a kinship between all creatures could also be read as a revised and more inclusive ecclesiology.[27] The third principle on voice (a vital aspect of human personhood) could be read as an anthropology where the voices of humans are situated amongst (and therefore not necessarily privileged[28]) the varied modes of self-expression or silent communication of others in the earth community and beyond (as epitomised by Psalm 19[29]). The fourth principle on design, purpose and an orientation towards an implicit goal is an (immanent) eschatology in the making.[30] The fifth principle on mutual custodianship and partnership challenges earlier anthropologies based on dominion and stewardship and constructs a doctrine of providence and an ecological ethics on a recognition of the ways in which Earth has sustained humanity and all life on Earth.[31] The sixth principle on resistance acknowledges the impact of evil and injustices, suggests the focus of an alternative doctrine of sin accordingly,[32] and locates the sources of redemption from such injustices in the ability of Earth and its components to offer resistance. As Habel notes, ecosystems are not necessarily fragile, but have a limited yet "remarkable capacity to survive, to regenerate and adapt to changing physical circumstances in spite of human exploitation and short-sighted greed."[33]

The vision articulated in these six ecojustice principles is bold, audacious, uncompromising and attractive in many respects. There are a number of striking features of this 'small dogmatics.' Firstly there is no reference to 'creation' or creatures, precisely in order to avoid any reference to or assumption of a Creator. This is indeed a radically this-worldly

---

[25] See the discussion by Habel & Balabanski (2002:8-10) on the distinction between intrinsic worth, utilitarian value and the notion of 'added value.'

[26] Habel (1998) himself develops this principle into a theologia crucis where the hidden presence of the Creator can be discerned in, with and under all created realities.

[27] See Habel (ed.) 2000:44-46.

[28] See Habel (ed.) 2000: 46-48. The privileging of some voices above others calls for the supplementary principle on ecojustice – precisely because of the conflicting agendas amongst those humans who wish to function as the mediating voice of the 'voiceless' Earth in human decision making processes. See Eaton 2000:67.

[29] See Habel 2004:12.

[30] See Habel (ed.) 2000:48-50, Habel & Balabanski (eds.) 2002:5-6. The principle of purpose is described in terms of material processes as an inherent tendency of matter towards life and of life towards increasing diversity, complexity and symbiosis.

[31] See Habel (ed.) 2000:50-51. The formulation by Habel and Balanski (2002:10) is illuminating in this regard: "There is a tendency to discern God as the sustainer of life without also recognizing Earth as the immediate agent of sustenance, support and creative energy." Mutual custodianship implies that Earth is a life partner to be understood, respected and appreciated.

[32] See Habel's (1998:119) ecological reformulation of the doctrine of sin as the distortion of the human ability to see God's glory in creation. His formulation is eloquent: 'To violate the earth, therefore, is to tear God's masks, to scar God's physical face, to desecrate God's earthly dwelling. The material medium through which God may be revealed to the eyes of faith has been corrupted, blurred and distorted. The capacity, therefore, for humans to discern God in creation is reduced. It is hard to see God's glory in the sunset when smog fills the air; it is difficult to stand in awe of the rainforests when they are slashed and burned. Sin has blinded us to the beauty of God's masks.' Elsewhere in the same article Habel (1998:121-122) describes sin as the disintegration of the bonds that hold all participants in the earth community together. This calls for ecological doctrine of redemption as a reconciliation of all things (*ta panta*) through solidarity in suffering on the basis of the cross of Jesus Christ.

[33] Habel (ed.) 2000:53. Habel (1998:121) formulates this principle from a theologia crucis perspective in the following way: "Justice for the earth requires that we recognize the presence of God in Christ suffering with and within creation and join the Christ of the cross as suffering partners in the struggle of the earth to resist those forces that violate the integrity of earth by following the way of the cross."

'theology' (if it could be called that) with no reference to divine presence (immanence) in the world, not to mention a recognition of the possibility of transcendence. As may be expected, any categories reminiscent of the particularity of Christianity (expect the focus on the Bible itself) are avoided in order to allow for a more universal (?) appeal of such an ecological hermeneutics, especially in a secular context and in conversation with other faith traditions.[34] On this basis there can be no suggestion of references to God the Father (or Mother), Jesus Christ or the Holy Spirit, not to mention theological constructs such as trinity, incarnation, cross, resurrection justification, sanctification, ecclesiology, sacraments, or eternal life.[35] The contrast between the 'small dogmatics' of the Earth Bible team and the Nicene Creed could scarcely be starker.

I have no intention of testing the orthodoxy of the Earth Bible's 'small dogmatics' or to supplement the six principles with doctrinal allusions or to legitimate its principles by planting a cross on its fertile soil or to baptise them in the name of the Father, Son and Spirit. That would not only be cheap, but would also be a form of colonisation and conquest and would not recognise the resistance against doctrinal interference in biblical exegesis. At the same time, the emergence of such a 'small dogmatics' raises my curiosity precisely because it illustrates the inescapability of such heuristic keys very well. It also invites further critical reflection.[36] Clearly the six ecojustice principles cannot be regarded as sacrosanct or in a Platonic way as eternally abiding *principia*. If Biblical scholars feel the need to construct their own 'dogmatics' because the doctrinal keys provided by constructive theologies are no longer plausible, this calls urgently for cooperative efforts and interdisciplinary work.

Conclusion

What on earth, then, could an ecological biblical hermeneutics be? I have suggested that the contributions that have been made thus far can indeed offer a comprehensive hermeneutical theory if such contributions can be integrated with one another. The clue to this task of integration is to recognise the role played by heuristic keys in biblical interpretation. The Earth Bible project's description of a set of six ecojustice principles offers an innovative and resolute articulation of such a heuristic key. Its strength is its critique of the anthropocentrism underlying the production and reception of biblical texts. Such a critique of anthropocentrism remains insufficient for an ecological hermeneutics though. A hermeneutics of suspicion does not only have to account for the emergence of anthropocentrism, but also for the more overt problem of domination in the name of the differences of gender, race, class and species. As I have argued elsewhere, this would require nothing less than an ecological reformulation of the doctrine of sin.[37] Moreover, a hermeneutics of suspicion may have to be supplemented with a more constructive hermeneutics, perhaps a hermeneutics of trust. Here it may be necessary to draw on the full range of constructive contributions which have emerged in ecotheology in recent decades. As I have argued elsewhere, one of the crucial tasks which have to be addressed in this regard is a reintegration of the themes of creation, sin, redemption and eschatological consummation.[38]

---

[34]   See Habel (ed.) 2000:38, Habel 2004:8 where this motivation is explicitly mentioned.

[35]   The article by Habel (1998) illustrates how such ecojustice principles can be developed from the perspective of a theology of the cross.

[36]   See Habel (2004:8) on this invitation and the critical reflection on the six ecojustice principles offered by Eaton (2000).

[37]   See chapter 4 of my forthcoming work on an ecological Christian anthropology (Conradie 2005).

[38]   See Conradie 2004a:24-25.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Barth, K 1960. *Church Dogmatics III/2.* Edinburgh: T & T Clark.

Brueggemann, W 1993. Trajectories in Old Testament literature and the sociology of ancient Israel. In: Gottwald, NK & Horsley, RA 1993. *The Bible and liberation. Political and social hermeneutics.* Maryknoll: Orbis Books.

Conradie, EM & Jonker, LC 2001. *Angling for interpretation. A guide to understand the Bible better.* Study Guides in Religion and Theology 4. Bellville: University of the Western Cape.

Conradie, EM 1992a. Review Article: *Biblical hermeneutics of liberation. Modes of reading the Bible in the South African context of liberation* by Gerald O West (Pietermaritzburg: Cluster Publications). *Journal of Theology for Southern Africa* 85, 61-65.

Conradie, EM 1992b. What is an analogical imagination? *The South African Journal of Philosophy* 11:4, 103-112.

Conradie, EM 2000. Stewards or sojourners in the household of God? *Scriptura* 73, 153-174.

Conradie, EM 2001. What are interpretative strategies? *Scriptura* 78, 429-441.

Conradie, EM 2004a. An agenda for ecological theology: Some reformed perspectives from the South African context. In: Edwards, D & Worthing, WM (eds.): *Biodiversity & Ecology: An interdisciplinary challenge. Interface: A Forum of Theology in the World* 7:1, 14-29.

Conradie, EM 2004b. Towards an ecological biblical hermeneutics: A review essay on the Earth Bible project. *Scriptura* 85, 123-135.

Conradie, EM 2005. *An ecological Christian anthropology: At home on earth?* Aldershot: Ashgate.

Eaton, H 1996. Ecological-feminist theology. In: Hessel, DT (ed.) 1996. *Theology for earth community: A field guide,* 77-92. Maryknoll: Orbis Books.

Eaton, H 2000. Ecofeminist contributions to an ecojustice hermeneutics. In: Habel, NC (ed.) 2000. *Readings from the perspective of Earth.* Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press.

Habel, NC & Balabanski, V (eds.) 2002. *The Earth story in the New Testament.* London: Sheffield Academic Press / Cleveland: Pilgrim Press.

Habel, NC & Wurst, S (eds.) 2000. *The earth story in Genesis.* Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press.

Habel, NC (ed.) 2000. *Readings from the perspective of Earth.* Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press.

Habel, NC 1996. The crucified land: Towards our reconciliation with the earth. *Colloquium* 28, 3-18.

Habel, NC 1998. Key ecojustice principles: A theologia crucis perspective. *Ecotheology* 5-6, 114-125.

Habel, NC 2000. Geophany: The Earth story in Genesis 1. In: Habel, NC & Wurst, S (eds.) 2000. *The Earth story in Genesis.* Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press.

Habel, NC 2004. The origins and challenges of an ecojustice hermeneutics. In: *Relating to the text. Festshcrift for Martin Buss.* New York: Continuum.

Hall, DJ 1990. *The steward: A Biblical model come of age.* Grand Rapids: WB Eerdmans.

Nürnberger, K 1992. The royal-imperial paradigm in the Bible and the modern demand for democracy. *Journal of Theology for Southern Africa* 81, 16-34.

Nürnberger, K 1993. The God of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob: The trajectory of a soteriological paradigm in Biblical times. *Scriptura* 46, 1-23.

Nürnberger, K 1997. The conquest of chaos: The Biblical paradigm of creation and its contemporary relevance. *Journal of Theology for Southern Africa* 98, 45-63.

Nürnberger, K 2002. *Theology of biblical witness. An evolutionary approach*. Hamburg: LIT Verlag.

Ricoeur, P 1978. *The rule of metaphor*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Schüssler-Fiorenza, E 1986. *In memory of her*. New York: Crossroad.

Tracy, DW & Grant, RM 1984. *A short history of the interpretation of the Bible*.[2] Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 151-187.

Tracy, DW 1981. *The analogical imagination: Christian theology and the culture of pluralism*. London: SCM Press.

Van den Brom, LJ 1998. Ecological hermeneutics. In: König, A & Maimela, S (eds.) 1998. *Initiation into theology: The rich variety of theology and hermeneutics*. Pretoria: Van Schaik.

West, GO 1991. *Biblical hermeneutics of liberation. Modes of reading the Bible in the South African context*. Pietermaritzburg: Cluster Publications.