

Climate Crisis and Biblical Ecological Readings in Pope Francis's Writings*

JUAN-CARLOS INOSTROZA

Universidad Católica de la Santísima Concepción

jinostro@ucsc.cl

ORCID: 0000-0003-1170-5316

Abstract: The Climate Crisis is not just biological or physical; it also constitutes a value and spiritual crisis. Ecological reading of the Bible is a very recent approach that has entered the exegetical field practically from 2000 onwards. In recent decades, the Catholic Church, especially under the leadership of Pope Francis, is contributing with a proactive and urgent discourse to promote the value of nature and the global ecological commitment. This article analyzes and evaluates the current discourse of the Catholic Church, focusing our assessment especially on the ecological reading of three documents: *Laudato Si'*, *Querida Amazonia* and *Laudate Deum*, which present relevant convergences and divergences with the current trends in ecological hermeneutics. First, we address Francis's ecological reading, articulating two main aspects: the creational and eschatological perspectives concerning the earth and the ecological debate. Finally, we offer some conclusions that invite an evaluative dialogue between Francis's ecological reading and others of similar sensitivity and hermeneutics.

Keywords: bible, ecological reading, ecology, ecotheology, integral ecology, pope Francis.

* This article is part of the Research Project: "Fundamentos bíblicos del magisterio del papa Francisco: hacia una reforma eclesial y sinodal" (2022–24). An International Academic Cooperation Initiative led by the Grupo Humanitas of the Facultad de Teología y Humanidades of Universidad Católica de Oriente (Rionegro, Colombia), in which the author of the present work participates as a co-researcher. This research is also part of the Antonio Moreno Casamitjana UCSC-Research Group.

Introducción

It is a fact that various pontiffs have carried forward the orientations of the Second Vatican Council during the second half of the twentieth century and the beginning of the twenty-first. This issue has had a relevant impact on world's public opinion and the role of the Church in the contemporary world. Pope Francis has not been an exception in this regard. His interventions in the ecological crisis have had particular interest and impact. His encyclical *Laudato Si* (2015) (=LS) has generated relevant forums, publications, and commentaries. The same has not happened with the other two subsequent documents: the Apostolic Exhortation *Querida Amazonia* (Beloved Amazonia) (2020) (=QA), and the Apostolic Exhortation *Laudate Deum* (2023) (=LD). On the other hand, while there have been some rather isolated publications on the use of Sacred Scripture in LS, no study has specifically addressed the so-called ecological reading concerning these three documents of Francis.

In this sense, the question that directs our inquiry is whether it is possible to establish and show certain convergences between Francis's use of Scripture and the so-called ecological reading of the Bible, understood as an approach that has entered the exegetical field relatively recently, practically from 2000 onwards and that, for the same reason, it is not even mentioned in the already well-known document of the Pontifical Biblical Commission, *The Interpretation of the Bible in the Church* (1993). Something that changes with the Post-Synodal Apostolic Exhortation *Verbum Domini* (2010) which already mentions in paragraph 108 the relationship between the Bible and ecology. The working hypothesis is that Francis's ecological reading of the Bible provides the biblical basis for his theological anthropology and that, on the other hand, is convergent in many aspects with the exegetical projects of ecological reading of the Bible that have been going on since 2000.

This paper explores some biblical texts that Francis calls "the great biblical narratives" (Gen 1–3; Rm 8:18–30) and quotes to support the catholic ecological agenda. We aim to demonstrate the principles of his ecological reading of the Bible in the three mentioned pontifical

documents. We argue that Francis' eco-theology is based on biblical anthropology and the theological principles of the Catholic hermeneutic of the Bible. The convergence of Pope Francis with the sensitivity and developments of many of the current trends in the ecological exegesis of the Bible is not a result of an accommodating strategy or anything like that, but the consequence of a well-founded biblical interpretation and a coherent pontifical teaching, particularly that of his more recent predecessors on the Chair of St. Peter.

The importance of a study like this lies in showing that the universal dialogue on the Common Home that Pope Francis intends not only supports an environmental agenda, but also promotes a theological reading of the Bible, which is capable of dialoguing and integrating the most current hermeneutical contributions. All of which orients and encourages everyone to what we could perhaps call a dialogic and missionary reading of the Bible in today's world. This paper follows a documental and exegetical methodology.

1. Pope Francis's biblical ecological reading

What is the ecological reading of the Bible? The ecological reading is a general label for a particular field of biblical studies that focuses on critical questions about the interpretation of creation stories, human particularity and eschatology in the context of the modern ecological crisis. There is not a single label to name this area. Several expressions are used in this regard. Norman Habel was probably the first who introduced the label "Ecological Hermeneutics" (Horrell 2022, 23). However, there were already other nomenclatures in the field of literature and literary studies, such as "Ecocriticism"¹ "Ecological criticism", "Green Readings",

¹ The term *ecocriticism* was coined by William Rueckert in 1978, in his essay *Literature and Ecology: An Experiment in Ecocriticism*. This essay is the second part (pp. 71–86) of the same article composed of two essays and published under the following general title: "Into and Out of the Void: Two Essays", *IowaReview* 9.1 (winter 1978) 62–86. Isolated reprinted in Cheryl Glotfelty and Harold Fromm (eds.), *The Ecocriticism Read-*

“Ecological Readings”. This time I will use the expression that, in my opinion, is the most generic and broad of all: “Ecological Reading”.

How is the ecological reading of the Bible understood? In general terms, we can say that it is a certain type of contextual approach, insofar as the ecological interpretation of a text always depends on the mentality and concerns of its readers. It is an exegesis committed to ethical principles that seeks to implement a transformative praxis of today’s world and implies both a serious and critical reading and an attempt to appropriate the biblical text to one’s own circumstances or context. Ecological reading not only seeks to oppose the anthropocentrism that underlies texts and their interpretation. Nor is it simply an exploration of what a given text may say about creation, nature, or Earth. In this approach, Earth is not a theme for analysis. It is not about ecology and creation or ecology and theology. The ecological reading of the Bible points to a radical shift in our relationship with the earth as a subject in the texts. For this reason, suspicion and recognition of our anthropocentric conditioning are not enough; it also seeks identification with and a recovery of the earth, if its voice and of everything that composes it. It is, therefore, a reading that seeks to achieve an intimate empathy with the earth, reading the texts with the awareness of being terrestrial creatures, solidary members of the earth (Habel and Trudinger 2008).

Pope Francis’s biblical ecological reading must be understood within the framework of the Catholic biblical interpretation. In fact, *LS* §67 insists on appropriate hermeneutics to interpret the Bible.² *LS* denounces there that a wrong hermeneutic has been normally adduced to sustain a tyrannical and distorted anthropocentrism. An appropriate hermeneutics should pay attention to the context of biblical passages. Not only the literary context but also the canonical one. It is noteworthy that *LS* § 99 propose a Christological reading of all reality. Christ as the Logos Who became flesh and dwelt among us, and as the Lord of the

er. Landmarks in Literary Ecology (Athens and London: The University of Georgia Press, 1996), 105–123.

² See *VD* §34: “Only where both methodological levels, the historical-critical and the theological, are respected, can one speak of a theological exegesis, an exegesis worthy of this book”.

entire Creation acts in a hidden way in natural reality. Thus, the Pope postulates not only a Christian reading of the Old Testament, but also, of the whole of created reality. The ecological reading of Francis is shaped by a decisive Christological hermeneutics which frames both his interpretation of natural reality and the sources of Christian revelation. This Christological principle implies also another one: the unity of all Scripture. Francis opens the 8th Chapter of his encyclical *Laudato Si'* (§§ 96–100) with a reference to the entire Old Testament assumed by Jesus. A Christological reading may seem obvious however the truth is that it is only an emerging trend among exegetes (Johnson Leese 2020, 192).

1.1. Creational perspectives in ecological debates

We turn now to Gen 1:28, which has been a central concern in ecological scholarship.

1.1.1. The problem of the concept of “dominion”

White (1967) in his famous paper, and others after him, attributed to the Christian doctrine, specifically to that of *creation* (“*creatio ex nihilo*” and “dominion”) to have ultimately caused the ecological crisis. Today, almost sixty years after White’s article, we have a better perspective to evaluate the factors which conditioned the origin of this crisis and the historical and ideological criteria used by White and other to substantiate such a reproach. Moreover, today we know that what is reproached in the Bible is a modern erroneous reading of the biblical texts, marked by an anthropological conception alien to biblical anthropology.

Pope Francis underlines a *non-dualistic* stance on faith and ecology, the same approach as his predecessors. Francis teaches “we are not God”. Francis confirms the current exegesis and the Church interpretation: the use of “dominion” in Gen 1:28 and its immediate and large context of the priestly writer account does not connote “unbridled exploitation of nature”, here the Hebrew verb *radah* doesn’t imply violence.³ Francis

³ Lohfink, N., *Theology of the Pentateuch: Themes of the Priestly Narrative and Deuteronomy* (Edinburg: T&T Clark, 1994) 8–17, who argues that Jewish-Christian doctrine

asserted that the dualistic reading “is not a correct interpretation of the Bible as understood by the Church” (LS §67). Similarly, Richard Bauckham credits Francis Bacon for creating a vision that interprets dominion as a mandate for the progressive exploitation of the earth’s resources for the improvement of human life (Bauckham 2020).

To confront and correct the “Baconian Interpretation”, a significant number of scholars in ecological exegesis has proposed the non-biblical concept of *Stewardship*, with other terms associated with it, such as “guardianship”, “earthkeeping”, or “responsible care”. This way of understanding the meaning of the texts of the Book of Genesis is also widely and commonly embraced by Catholic exegesis (LS §§116 and 236; International Theological Commission 2004). However, some scholars are critical of such concepts because they consider them too limited and even dominated by the bias of anthropocentrism. Thus, they think that we should go beyond those notions. Their weakness lies in the fact that they do not express clearly the proper and irreducible value of non-human nature, but this fact, in some way, needs us to realize its full potential. The concept of *Stewardship* would at most only soften (Daly-Denton 2020, 141–142) the “Baconian Interpretation” but leave human superiority intact over the rest of creation. To definitively break with this bias, some scholars suggest that we should aim for categories that recognize the genuine otherness of the other creatures. And to achieve that we must return to the traditional trend of focusing on Genesis 1:26–28 in isolation from its context in the rest of Scripture, and discover that the world is theocentric, not anthropocentric, or even biocentric. However, the essential features of *stewardship* concept are found in the expression *Image of God* (Middleton 2022): humans are the *visible representatives of the invisible God*, and function as “vice-regents” or “servant king” with a derived authority. *Image of God* has a double aspect: on the one hand, it indicates the relationship with God, and, on the other, it indicates

of humanity regards human beings very highly, but it would never designate them as absolute rulers of the universe. On the contrary, N. Habel, *The Birth, The Curse and The Greening of Earth. An Ecological Reading of Genesis 1–11* (Sheffield: Phoenix Press, 2011), who sees Gen 1:26–28 and Gen 2:15 as diametrically opposed and the command of dominion in Gen 1:28 as ecologically destructive.

the relationship with the world. The fall did transform those relations into hostility. Thus, the problem seems not to have been related to the *stewardship* concept *per se*, but rather to a “de facto” situation that disrupted it (Liederbach 2022).

1.1.2. The axiological primacy of the human being: “Situated anthropocentrism”

In many ways, Pope Francis confirms the Catholic doctrine on the axiological primacy of human being. First, he rejects the misguided anthropocentrism of the culture of modernity based on the dualistic Baconian-Cartesian interpretation of the Bible. Second, he insists on the Church hermeneutics of the Bible, specifically on Genesis and the role the Scripture gives to mankind respecting all creation. Third, he highlights the intrinsic relationship between human ecology and the care of the Common Home. This axiological primacy of the human being becomes evident in the diachronic reading of the *LS* and *LD*. In *LS*, Pope Francis gave an exclusively negative use to the term anthropocentrism. However, in *LD*, completely dispensing with the negative use of it in *LS*, Francis makes a positive use of the term qualifying it as “situated anthropocentrism”.

In pursuit of greater and better ecological awareness, many have questioned the biblical doctrine about the particularity of the human being amid creation. The focus has primarily fallen on the texts of Gen 1:26–27 (Uribe-Ulloa 2022) and Gen 2:7, which are also mentioned in *LS*§§ 65–67. The axiological primacy of the human being has never meant absolute or tyrannical dominion over creation in Catholic doctrine. This axiological primacy is not anti-ecological. It does not constitute supremacy that separates human being from other created beings. It is not a question of a misunderstood *avertio mundi* or *fuga mundi*. In the Bible, human beings appear perfectly integrated during creation. Therefore, *LD* helps us to understand *LS* better, by introducing the concept of “situated anthropocentrism” (*LD* §67).

“Situated anthropocentrism” recognizes the unique and central value of the human being amid all God’s creatures, against all anthropocentrism of a dualistic nature, it is also affirmed that human life is incomprehensible and unsustainable without other creatures. The allusion to Donna

Jeanne Haraway made in *LD* § 66 already underlined the idea of the interconnectedness of life on the planet. From my viewpoint, this quote from Haraway has a greater symbolism in the ecological dialogue that Francis intends. Haraway is not only a renowned scholar (now emeritus) of prestigious institutions and chairs; she is also a leading figure in women's studies, science, technology and information. She has stood out in the discussion on the Anthropocene and multispecies politics. Haraway's concept: the world is a "zone of contact", allows us to glimpse the opportunity and the need for dialogue, mutual support, communion and commitment. In this way, *LD*'s "situated anthropocentrism" concept is an important complement of "common home" concept of *LS* and, it suggests that they have to be understood within the framework of his broader and own teaching, configured under the theological, as well as pastoral, categories of joy, fraternity/brotherhood, encounter, and mutual care.

Some scholars have worked on the concept of "community" to highlight the condition of interdependence and interrelated of all creatures (Hiebert 2022). I think, there is truth in that. However, an accurate observation of the first account of Genesis allows us to perceive that there is a better concept which it is implicit and involved in it: "family" and "brotherhood". All creation is like a family. "Family" and "brotherhood" are pivotal ideas of Genesis. And if any biblical text is at stake in ecology, that is the book of Genesis.

I suggest that there are at least three elements that shape Gen 1–2 and show all creation as a "family" and "brotherhood". Firstly, the Hebrew term *tol'dôt* (Gen 2:4a). It speaks of the generation (*tol'dôt*) of the heavens and the earth. This term ties Creation to the genealogical web until Abraham. Secondly, the threefold use of the Hebrew verb *bara'* to characterize the human couple (Gen 1:27). And thirdly, the use of "dust" and the names of "Adam" and "Eva". I would dare to suggest a fourth element, the *shabbat* as the feast day; a day when all creation is dedicated to feast and enjoy together. The purpose and goal of all creation are *to do fest (hag)* in honour of Yahweh. Fest (*hag* – *shabbat*) expresses the gratuitousness of all creation, the great gift from God: "And God saw that everything was very good" (Gen 1:31).

On the other hand, it is important to recognize that after the collapse of Wellhausian theory in the 1970s theory regarding the composition of the Pentateuch, the understanding of the origin accounts is quite different. This is not the time to go into all the details (Kratz 2011); however, it is essential to understand that these are not only late accounts from the late fifth or early fourth century BCE., but also that Gen 1:1–2:4a should not be considered as an isolated unit, but as part of a larger story: Gen 1,1 – Ex 39–40. Moreover, the so-called “second creation account” and link to the Yahwist source (Wellhausen – Von Rad), dated around the tenth century BCE (Römer 2006), is today shown to be later than the priestly account of Gen 1:1–2:4a, and of a Deuteronomic nature, since the theme is the earth: received as a gift and lost because of sin.

These changes in the understanding the Pentateuch clarify its composition and the theological anthropology that emerges from it (García López 2011). The account of Gen 1:1–2,4a emphasizes the Sabbath from the beginning; the end (Ex 39–40) of the entire section of the priesthood, after Sinai and the construction of the sanctuary, shows that God created the cosmos and the human being to live in communion with him. Gen 2–3 (Deuteronomic in nature) shows that the first man (like the Israelites after the Exodus) is placed in the right place: the narrative uses the expression *wayyannihehu* (Gen 2:15) which recalls the term *menuhah* used by the Deuteronomist (Dt 12:9; 25:19; 1Re 8,56) to refer to the quiet possession of the land. The condition for remaining in the Garden of Eden (the earth) is obedience to the divine mandate, its disobedience will lead to death (Gen 2:16–17). However, as in the Deuteronomic and Deuteronomist traditions, disobedience ends up being punished not with death but with expulsion from paradise; from Eden (Gen 3:23–24), from land (2 Kings 24–25).

The importance of contextualization for an adequate interpretation of biblical texts, repeatedly collected by Francis in *LS* (§67 for example), is a trend of contemporary exegesis that since the 1980s has been progressively abandoning the atomistic exegesis of isolated texts. In my opinion, the proposal that Pierre Beauchamp (1987) made almost 40 years ago is correct concerning our subject and that, as Félix García López (1989) acknowledges, has not been sufficiently taken up by exegesis.

Beauchamp's proposal illuminates both, the discussion about dominion and the axiological primacy of the human being in creation. According to Beauchamp, Gen 1:29–30 does not only deal with a dietary question of what is permissible to eat, nor does it only have to do with animals (the non-human living creatures), but is particularly relevant to define what it means to be human.

In the larger context of Gen 1–9, Gen 1:29–30 refers to relationships between human and non-human living creatures. Unlike Gen 9:2, Gen 1:29–30 describes a world of harmonious relationships. The vegetarian regime alluded precisely to that. This is important for understanding the verbs *kadash* and *radah* mentioned above, because –as John Rogerson (Rogerson 2010) recognizes– whatever they mean in other contexts, in Genesis 1 they occur in the context of a non-violent world. Any coercive sense that they possess must be understood in a non-violent way. In that sense, the world described by Gen 1 is not the one we experience. In this way, Gen 1 is a prophetic text that presents an ideal that does not exist yet. Gen 1 shows that God created the world differently, not as we live it. When reading Gen 1, taking into account the structure and context of Gen 1–9, we realize that is not a mandate for the human exploitation of the world, but a critique of the actual state of human behaviour.

1.2. Eschatological perspectives in ecological debate

While the biblical accounts of creation constitute one of the most salient and recognized points of discussion, today difficult questions about biblical eschatology related to the ecological crisis and the value of life on the planet are increasingly appearing in this field. Pope Francis touches eschatology, especially in *QA*. This document highlights hope for a transformed and renewed future under the category of “dream”. In addition, it should be noted that Francis repeatedly speaks of transformation in *QA*. The initiating character of Christian eschatology is confirmed by the Pope's quotation of *LS* §235 in *QA* §74, mentioning that the Gospel introduces a seed of definitive transformation. This way of presenting the initiated eschatology is typical of the Catholic teaching and reading of the Bible and converges with other ecological readings.

1.2.1. The voice of Creation

It is very significant that *Laudato Si* opens his biblical allusions by mentioning two key texts that have been much debated in the history of modern ecological discussion: Genesis 1–2 and Romans 8: 18–30. We have already touched on some important aspects of Genesis 1–2. Now let us dwell on the Pauline text of Romans.

In *LS* §2, Francis articulates Catholic hermeneutics clearly with an ecological reading. At first glance it might seem that two biblical passages are quoted in passing as if they were simply a couple of other elements at the service of the exordium of the discourse of the document. However, if we pause for a moment, we can see a series of biblical and theological criteria at work here that are already from the outset and imply the type of reading of the Bible that Francis will apply in the document.

We notice that Francis first quotes the New Testament and then the Old Testament. Although it may seem obvious, he stands before the Bible from Jesus Christ and New Testament revelation. Then we can see that he has chosen to start by quoting a text of St. Paul in Romans that speaks not only about creation, but also about Christian eschatological hope, and then goes on to quote a text from the Book of Genesis (Gen 2:7) that speaks of the origins of creation, particularly of the creation of the human being, of Adam. Francis thus embraces the entire arc of biblical anthropology, looking at it from the perspective of final hope. This comprehensive examination of the entire arc of salvation history relates to one of the tenets of Catholic hermeneutics of the Bible: the principle of the unity of all Scripture. Another aspect that jumps out at the reader who is aware of the encyclical and that does not remain in the mere phenotext of the document, is the connection that Francis makes between the two texts, particularly the Adamic background of the Pauline text, something quite prominent in the current exegesis for the text of Rm 8:18–22 is built on Gen 1–3 (Byrne 2016). Francis indeed interprets the groaning of creation in Rom 8:22 as a lament, which for some scholars might not fit the Pauline sense or background of Gen 3 (Daly-Denton 2020). However, this interpretation is recognized by some scholars in current exegesis. Claus Westermann, for example, states that when Paul speaks here of the

“groaning of creation”, he is referring to the suffering of creation in the present world age (Westermann 1982, 165).

Rom 8: 18–30 is a complex text, dense and loaded with multiple Christological, Old Testament, apocalyptic and eschatological allusions, among others. I do not intend to make an exhaustive exegetical commentary on this passage, but only to address some connotations that are especially relevant to Pope Francis’ ecological reading.

The text highlights the mutual dependence of all living things. It is striking to note the smoothing of the tone or even bias of any anthropocentric or anthropomorphic perspective. The idea of the interdependence between the destiny of human beings and that of the physical creation is underlined more strikingly in verses 22 and 23 (Tofana 2010), particularly in its underlining on the body. This Pauline climatic text of the Romans is so holistic that it is impossible to avoid seeing humanity as one part of creation, a portion of the diverse, visible and invisible creation.

Some scholars have suggested that this Pauline passage of Romans may parallels Gen 3 as intertext. So, the Creation –understood as “all living”– would have its correspondence with the woman –Eve, “the mother of all living” (Gen 3,20). And just like Eve had to assume the consequences of intense pain in labor and bringing forth children, Creation actively participates in the process of bringing forth the children of God, also groaning and in the pains of childbirth. This reading implies not only accepting an active role of the Creation through its entire existence, avoiding seeing it as a passive subject, but also means understanding the Pauline text not as referring only to the historical level, and take “*ta panta*” not as “all events”, but as “all things” (Balabanski 2022).

An ecological reading of this section of Romans must be aware of the powerful trend to anthropomorphize the voices of Creation. And in doing so, falling into the trap of anthropocentric bias. Creation, and thus the Earth, has its voice or voices. We are one among others voices. If we respect the noises of the Earth, they will invite us to recognize its own language: humming, rustling, whirring, and roaring. This non-human language of Creation is also admired by the Psalmists in the Bible; they invite us to attune our ears.

In my opinion, it is pertinent to take up the catechesis of John Paul II on Ps 148, quoted by Francis in *LS* §5. There, the Pope recognized the voice of the psalmist, and he also the voices of the other creatures. He also illustrated these voices with other places in the Bible where biblical authors call on different parts of creation to praise God. It is not simply a poetic act, in which the poet lends his voice or pen to give voice, but of recognizing the voice all creatures have as their own in their enormous diversity (Ravasi 1986, 961–977).

I would like to end these pages by remembering some words of Pope Francis in *QA* which constitute, from my viewpoint, something very close to what Ecocriticism has called “textualization” of the nature. He says poetry helps give voice to the cry of the Amazon region (*QA* §§ 46; 47–57). This “ecotextualization” is in Francis a clear echo of Romans 8, when he looks at and speaks about the Amazon:

If we enter into communion with the forest, our voices will easily blend with its own and become a prayer: “as we rest in the shade of an ancient eucalyptus, our prayer for light joins in the song of the eternal foliage”. This interior conversion will enable us to weep for the Amazon region and join in its cry to the Lord (*QA*§56).

Conclusions

After this brief tour, we can see that our initial hypothesis and the question that has guided our inquiry have reached a reasonable degree of confirmation. We have shown that Pope Francis indeed make an ecological reading of the Bible and converges with the exegetical projects of ecological reading of the Bible that have been going on since 2000.

We have also demonstrated that such an ecological reading of Francis has specific features and anchors its principles in the Catholic interpretation of Sacred Scripture. In this regard, the principles of the unity of all Scripture and the living Tradition of the Church are particularly noteworthy. Our inquiry has also shown that Francis agrees with his predecessor Benedict XVI, who has explicitly stressed the importance of

the Christological criterion. This criterion has only very recently begun to be of interest in some (few) proposals for ecological reading of the Bible, which is why it is surprisingly absent in the vast majority of the ecological hermeneutics of the Bible. It is striking that in the interpretation that is made, for example, of the texts of the Old Testament in the current lines of ecological reading, it does not reflect a Christian reading, but rather an interpretation closed in the pre-Christian strata. I have noted that something has already begun to change hand in hand with patristic studies in the field of ecological exegesis of the Bible.

We have also verified that this ecological reading of the Bible serves as the basis for the theological anthropology that is reflected in the documents studied, framing the understanding of the current ecological crisis within the entire arc of the history of salvation and the proclamation of the Gospel. This pastoral and missionary feature links these documents and their biblical hermeneutics with the broad agenda of the new evangelization initiated at the Second Vatican Council and promoted without interruption by all the pontiffs from Paul VI to Francis.

We can also highlight our observation that in the diachronic reading of the three documents, Pope Francis develops and nuances the reaching of the axiological primacy of the human being in creation. After an almost completely negative use of the concept of anthropocentrism in *LS*, he moves on to a nuanced use of the term in *LD*, introducing the concept of *situated anthropocentrism*. It is here that the critique coming from non-Catholic ecological hermeneutics is most severely unloaded on Francis' proposal.

On the other hand, the ecological reading of biblical texts with eschatological content does not distance us from the current concern for the ecological crisis, but on the contrary promotes a renewed commitment to life on the planet. The biblical ecological reading in the documents studied shows the scriptural basis of an authentic integral ecology.

References

- Balabanski, Vicky. 2022. "Pauline Epistles. Paul's Vision of Cosmic Liberation and Renewal." In *The Bible and Ecology*, edited by Hilary Marlow, Mark Harris, 241–55. Oxford: University Press.
- Bauckham, Richard. 2010. *Bible and Ecology*. London: Darton, Longman and Todd Ltd.
- Bauckham, Richard. 2020. "Being Human in the Community of Creation. A Biblical Perspective." In *Ecotheology. A Christian Conversation*, edited by Kiara A. Jorgenson – Alan G. Padgett, 21–30. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans.
- Beauchamp, Paul. 1987. "Création et foundation de la loi en Gn 1,1–2,4." In *La Création dans l'orient ancien*, edited by Louis Derousseaux, 139–82. Paris: DuCerf.
- Benedict XVI. 2010. *Post-Synodal Apostolic Exhortation Verbum Domini. On The Word of God In The Life and Mission of the Church*. Rome.
- Brown, William Patrick. 1999. *Cosmos and Ethos: The Genesis of Moral Imagination in the Bible*. Grand Rapids MI/Cambridge: Eerdmans.
- Byrne, Brendan, 2016. "A Pauline Complement to Laudato Si'." *Theological Studies* 77: 308–27.
- Daly-Denton, Margaret, 2020. "Laudato Si' and the reinterpretation of Scriptures in light of the ecological crisis." In *Laudato Si' and The Environment. Pope Francis' Green Encyclical*, edited by Robert McKim, 137–51. London and New York: Routledge Taylor & Francis Group.
- García-López, Félix, 1989. "El hombre, imagen de Dios, en el Antiguo Testamento." In *El hombre, imagen de Dios*, edited by Nereo Silanes, 13–30. Salamanca: Secretariado Trinitario.
- García-López, Félix, 2011. "Los fundamentos de la antropología bíblica. Gn 1–3 a la luz de los estudios exegeticos recientes." *Salmanticensis* 58: 191–204.
- Habel, Norman. 2011. *The Birth, The Curse and The Greening of Earth. An Ecological Reading of Genesis 1–11*. Sheffield: Phoenix Press.
- Habel, Norman and Trudinger, Peter, eds., 2008. *Exploring Ecological Hermeneutics*. Atlanta: SBL.
- Hiebert, Theodore, 2022. "Genesis." In *The Bible and Ecology*, edited by Hilary Marlow, Mark Harris, 81–94. Oxford: University Press.
- Horrell, David G. 2022. "Ecological Hermeneutics. Origins, Approaches, and Prospects." In *The Bible and Ecology*, edited by Hilary Marlow, Mark Harris, 19–34. Oxford: University Press.
- International Theological Commission (2004). *Communion and Stewardship: Human Persons Created in the Image of God*. Rome.

- Johnson Leese, John J. 2020. *Christ, Creation and The Cosmic Goal of Redemption. A Study of Pauline Creation Theology as Read by Irenaeus and Applied to Ecotheology*. London: T&T Clark.
- Kratz, Reinhard G. 2011. "The Pentateuch in Current Research: Consensus and Debate". In *The Pentateuch. International Perspectives on Current Research*, edited by Thomas B. Dozeman, Konrad Schmid, and Baruch J. Schwartz, 31–61. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
- Liederbach, Mark D. 2022. "Stewardship A Biblical Concept?" In *The Bible and Ecology*, edited by Hilary Marlow, Mark Harris, 310–23. Oxford: University Press.
- Lohfink, Norbert. 1994. *Theology of the Pentateuch: Themes of the Priestly Narrative and Deuteronomy*. Edinburg: T&T Clark.
- Middleton, J.R. 2022. "The Image of God in Ecological Perspective". In *The Bible and Ecology*, edited by Hilary Marlow, Mark Harris, 284–98. Oxford: University Press.
- Phan, P.C. 1994. "Pope John Paul II and The Ecological Crisis." *Irish Theological Quarterly* 60: 59–69.
- Pontifical Biblical Commission. 1993. *The Interpretation of the Bible in the Church*. Città del Vaticano: Libreria Editrice Vaticana.
- Pope Francis. 2015. *Encyclical Letter Laudato Si' On Care for our Common Home*. Rome.
- Pope Francis. 2020. *Post-Synodal Apostolic Exhortation Querida Amazonia*. Rome.
- Pope Francis. 2023. *Apostolic Exhortation Laudate Deum*. Rome.
- Ravasi, Gianfranco. 1986. *Il Libro dei Salmi. Commento e attualizzazione*, III, Bologna: Dehoniane.
- Rogerson, John. 2010. "The Creation Stories: Their Ecological Potential and Problems." In *Ecological Hermeneutics. Biblical, Historical and Theological Perspectives*, edited by David G. Horrell, Cheryl Hunt, Christopher Southgate, and Francesca Stavrakopoulou, 21–31. London–New York: T&T Clark.
- Römer, Thomas. 2006. "The Elusive Yahwist: A Short History of Research." In *A Farewell To The Yahwist? The Composition of the Pentateuch in Recent European Interpretation*, edited by Thomas B. Dozeman – Konrad Schmid, 9–27. Atlanta: SBL.
- Rueckert, William. 1978. "Into and Out of the Void: Two Essays." *IowaReview* 9.1 (winter): 62–86.
- Tofana, Stelian, 2010. "The Relation between the Destiny of Humankind and that of Creation according to Romans 8:18–23." In *Theologies of Creation in Early Judaism and Ancient Christianity, In Honour of Hans Klein*, edited by Tobías Niklas – Korinna Zamfir, 335–52. Berlin–New York: W. de Gruyter.

- Uribe-Ulloa, Pablo. 2022. *Hagamos al ser humano a nuestra imagen (Gn 1,26). Una síntesis bíblico-teológica de la categoría imagen de Dios en la tradición católica*. Paris: Ediciones del pueblo.
- Westermann, Claus. 1982. *Elements of Old Testament Theology*. Atlanta: John Knox Press.
- White, Lynn. 1967. "The Historical Roots of Our Ecologic Crisis", *Science* 155: 1203–207.