



Animal flourishing
Annotated Bibliography

These sources, which include some discussion of animal flourishing, are in alphabetical order in each section. Where appropriate, quotations or other notes are included to indicate the tone of the interpretation. Many are available through the links to the Common Awards Hub books, via EBSCO or JSTOR on the Hub, or elsewhere online. (Exceptions are highlighted in yellow but may be available through a local University library) **For Hub sources you will need to log into your Moodle and then go to the Hub before using the link.**

Flourishing Of Creatures As A Theological Concept	2
Creatures Praising God Through Being What They Are.....	5
Other Related Topics	10
Flourishing In Non-Theological Writings.....	11

Flourishing of creatures as a theological concept

David Clough's work

Clough, David L. *On animals. Volume 1 (systematic theology)* (London: Bloomsbury, 2011)

HUB:

https://hub.commonawards.org/blocks/configurable_reports/viewreport.php?id=40&filter_var=9780567171214 *This does not include much directly on flourishing; there is no actual definition of flourishing, nor a direct link to any Hebrew or Greek terms that translate directly as flourishing. Here is a discussion of infanticide among chimpanzees.*

p.83 'While non-human infanticide is not prohibited in the Genesis 9 covenant, we could extend the metaphor of covenant to propose that infanticide as practised by Passion and her family is outside the boundaries of creaturely flourishing envisaged in the commands to be fruitful and multiply (Gen. 1.22, 8.17). The characterization of sin as forgetting God's ways in Psalm 78 is applicable in a similar way: for non-human animals to depart from the mode of flourishing God intended for them could be described as their forgetting God's ways. Similarly, the portrayal of humans living under the power of sin in the New Testament seems readily relevant to the situation of non-human animals: all creatures suffer from the violence that fills the earth in Genesis 6 (v. 11) and Romans 8 pictures the liberation of all creation (v. 21).'

+++

On animals. Volume 2 (theological ethics) (London: Bloomsbury, 2018)

HUB:

https://hub.commonawards.org/blocks/configurable_reports/viewreport.php?id=40&filter_var=9780567660886 *This has very many more instances of the use of the term 'flourish/flourishing' and it is unpacked more clearly.*

p.1 'Part I argued that creation is best understood as God's gracious bestowal of being on all creatures, both for their own sake and so that they may glorify God in their participation in the triune life of God. All creatures are declared good by their creator in their own right; all creatures exist in utter dependence on God and mutual dependence on one another; no creature can be comprehended merely as the means to the flourishing of another. God's animal creatures have particular attributes in common: they are fleshy creatures with the breath of life, especially dependent on other organisms for their survival, often the common subjects of God's blessing and judgement, capable of response to God in a distinctive mode. Differences between animal creatures need to be understood in the context of this commonality.'

p.8 animals glorify God in their flourishing

Ch1 deals with what it means for animals to flourish

p.20 'Utilitarianism shares this concern with Christianity, but fails to recognize that our duties towards other animals – and humans – are not exhausted in our responsibility to act benevolently towards them. Non-human animals can be wronged in ways that are not possible to recognize in a utilitarian framework. One example of this is the killing of an animal that falls short of Peter Singer's criterion of sentience. If it is the case that a young chicken does not possess a sense of itself as a being with a future, then on a utilitarian analysis no wrong is done in killing her and replacing her with another being equally capable of preference satisfaction. In a theological perspective, however, a grave harm has been done to *that chicken*.' (emphasis original)

pp.26-7 address flourishing in detail:

'The roots of the concept of flourishing are in Aristotelian thought that we should understand the good of each creature in relation to its particular capacities.⁶² Alasdair MacIntyre summarizes the import of this as 'What a plant or an animal needs is what it needs to flourish qua member of its particular species. And what it needs to flourish is to develop the distinctive powers that it possesses qua member of that species'.⁶³ MacIntyre argues that the concept of flourishing is univocal, rather than analogical across human and non-human species, and relates to the fundamental concept of good: to flourish is to enjoy a good life. As noted earlier in this chapter, Martha Nussbaum also draws on this Aristotelian tradition in order to develop a concept of flourishing relevant to non-human animals, emphasizing that there are a wide range of needs for flourishing among different animals, and therefore that a respect for particular animals means attending to their particular needs so that each can flourish in their own particular mode of life.⁶⁴

The key commonality between the Aristotelian accounts of MacIntyre and Nussbaum and the theological framework for ethics I am proposing is a shared teleological view of animal creatures

combined with a commitment to attend to the particularity of what constitutes the good for each creature. This combination of teleology and particularity means engaging ethically with the question of what a creature is for and the particular pattern of life in which that creature will flourish. This is a requirement derived from recognition of the ‘thisness’ or haecceity of every creature discussed in Chapter 3 of Volume I and referenced earlier in this chapter: we need to be sufficiently attentive to each creature to understand what it means for the creature to cry ‘What I do is me: for that I came’.⁶⁵ This is closely related to the affirmation in the Psalms that every creature praises and glorifies God through its particular mode of existence, as noted in Chapter 2 of Volume I. On this basis, if we encounter a newly hatched chick, we will not understand what it means to treat the chick ethically merely by assessing its current capacities. Instead, we need to know what a chicken is for, the kind of life a chicken is meant to have, what it means for a chicken to flourish as a chicken, which means we need to discover what a good life means for chickens. The ethical evaluation of the practice of killing newly hatched chicks – as is the routine practice for the male chicks of breeds of laying hens in all commercial egg production, as discussed in Chapter 2 – cannot be decided merely on the basis of whether they experience pain in the process, or whether they understand themselves to be subjects of their own lives. A teleological perspective recognizes this killing as problematic because this destruction of life is the most blatant possible blocking of the flourishing of these chicks, preventing them from enjoying the good life which would begin by growth to maturity.’

62 Aristotle, *The Nichomachean Ethics*, Oxford World’s Classics, ed. L. Brown, trans. D. Ross (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009), bk. I.

63 A. MacIntyre, *Dependent Rational Animals: Why Human Beings Need the Virtues* (Chicago: Open Court, 1999), 64.

64 Nussbaum, *Frontiers of Justice*, 327, 349.

65 ‘As kingfishers catch fire, dragonflies draw flame’, lines 7–8, from Hopkins, *Poems of Gerard Manley Hopkins*, 90, quoted in Vol. I, 60.

+++

Clough, David L. (2017) ‘Consuming Animal Creatures: The Christian Ethics of Eating Animals’ *Studies in Christian Ethics* 30 (1) 30-44.

<https://chesterrep.openrepository.com/bitstream/handle/10034/620200/Consuming+animal+creatures+-+SCE+2016+-+corrected.pdf?sequence=1> also itemised as Hub Plus resource

Abstract: This article argues that Christians have strong faith-based reasons to avoid consuming animal products derived from animals that have not been allowed to flourish as fellow creatures of God, and that Christians should avoid participating in systems that disallow such flourishing. It considers and refutes objections to addressing this as an issue of Christian ethics, before drawing on a developed theological understanding of animal life in order to argue that the flourishing of fellow animal creatures is of ethical concern for Christians. Since the vast majority of animal products currently available for purchase are derived from farmed animals reared in modern intensive modes that fail to allow for their flourishing, and this practice is harmful for humans and the environment as well as farmed animals, the article argues that Christians should avoid consuming these products.

+++

Margaret B. Adam, David L. Clough and David Grumett (2019) 'A Christian Case for Farmed Animal Welfare' *Animals* (9) 1116

p.2 'flourishing, a Christian account of the best life possible for animals.'

p.5 *account of biblical passages indicating concern for animal welfare (donkey loads, mother/infant passages etc):* '(Exodus 20:8–11, 23:12; Deuteronomy 5:14) and even affirm the importance of providing for wild animals (Leviticus 25:6–7). First-born male livestock must remain with their mothers for seven days before being sacrificed (Exod 22:30), and mothers and cows or ewes should not be slaughtered with their young on the same day (Lev. 22:28). Donkeys must be released from being trapped under their burdens (Exod 23:4–5; Deut 22: 1–4), kids may not be boiled in their mothers' milk (Exod 23:19; Deut 14:21), a mother bird should not be taken with her fledglings or eggs (Deut 22:6–7), and oxen should not be muzzled when treading the grain (Deut 25:4). These texts have been interpreted by Jews and Christians as requiring concern for animal welfare.'

Further down page 5: 'These are but a few of the ways Christians understand scripture in terms of animal welfare.'

p.8 introduces flourishing: 'The starting point for the Christian ethics of farmed animal welfare we propose picks up strands from the tradition noted in the previous section to affirm that, for Christians, the lives of all creatures have value because they are created by God as ends in themselves and to glorify God in their flourishing. ... The theological basis for this understanding of animals is developed in Clough' [Vol 1 above].

Also: [Adam, Margaret 'Flourishing Dominion? Human and Animal Creatures in Relationship'](#) 200-221 in *Made in the Image of God: Essays on Religious Anthropology* Michael Fuller & David Jasper (eds) (Durham: Sacristy, 2021)

Also pp 15-16 in same book [Nicholas Taylor](#) 'In the image of God: Being human in the biblical tradition' 5-30

+++++

Creatures praising God through being what they are

Links are sometimes made between an animal fulfilling its natural functions/flourishing and its giving of praise to God in and through that process.

Bauckham Richard 'Joining Creation's Praise of God.' *Ecotheology* 7 (2002): 45-59.

p.47 'The passages about creation's praise are, of course, metaphorical: they attribute to non-human creatures the human practice of praising God in human language. But the reality to which they point is that all creatures bring glory to God simply by being themselves and fulfilling their God-given roles in God's creation. A lily does not need to do anything specific in order to praise God; still less need it be conscious of anything. Simply by being and growing it praises God'

A copy of this may be requested from the author:

https://www.researchgate.net/publication/276914762_Joining_Creation%27s_Praise_of_God

+++

Bauckham Richard *Living with other creatures: green exegesis and theology* (Waco, TX: Baylor, 2011), p.22.

To summarize, when we read Genesis 1:26–8 in its biblical context, we see that the dominion, the God-given authority of humans within creation is:

- a. An authority to be exercised by caring responsibility, not domination;
- b. An authority to be exercised within a theocentric creation, not an anthropocentric one;
- c. An authority to be exercised by humans as one creature among others;
- d. A right to use other creatures for human life and flourishing, but only while respecting the order of creation and the right of other living beings also to life and flourishing;
- e. An authority to be exercised in letting wild nature be as well in intervening in it, an authority to be exercised as much in restraint as in intervention.

Not on the web.

+++

Bible and Ecology: Rediscovering the Community of Creation (London: Darton, Longman and Todd, 2010)

Whole volume may be available at <https://library.oapen.org/> using search facility.

‘It is therefore significant and intelligible that the image of God is connected not with the subduing of the Earth but with the dominion over other living creatures. When humans obey the command to be fruitful and to multiply, to fill the Earth and to subdue it, they are not imitating God in a unique way but behaving like other species. All species use their environment and, though agriculture is unique to humans, it can be seen as a peculiarly human extension of the right of all animals to use their environment in order to live and to flourish. If the human dominion over other creatures were merely a matter of power, it too would be only the superlative version of what other creatures have. What links it to the image of God is that it is a delegated participation in God’s caring rule over his creatures.’ p.19

To flourish is not simply to live: ‘All living creatures need to make use of other creatures, animate or inanimate, in order to live and to flourish.’ p.28

Flourishing is something shared with other members of Earth’s community: ‘What we have in common with the lilies of the field is not just that we are creatures of God, but that we are fellow-members of the community of God’s creation, sharing the same Earth, affected by the processes of the Earth, affecting the processes that affect each other, with common interests at least in life and

flourishing, with the common end of glorifying the Creator and interdependent in the ways we do exactly that.' p.88

With reference to Isa 32: 'Verses 16–17 indicate not only that the flourishing of the natural world of soil, plants and trees will be accompanied by justice and well-being (shalom) in human society, but also that right relationships will unite human society and the natural world in perfect harmony. In other words, the created order will be respected. Animals, however, are not mentioned until verse 20, which means that people will be able to let their domestic animals roam freely because they will no longer be in danger from dangerous predators. Wild animals will no longer be a threat, but we are not told here what has happened to them!' p.116

Pp 132-140 deal with domestic animals and animal welfare.

+++++

Fretheim, Terence E. "Nature's Praise of God in the Psalms." *Ex Auditu* 3 (1987): 16-30.

p22: he suggests that, if God is a rock or an eagle, then rocks/eagles have similarities to/there are continuities between them and God. 'if rock and eagle and other natural metaphors for God are in some ways descriptive of God, then they reflect in their very existence, in **their being what they are**, the reality which is God. It is in view of this that nature's praise of God is to be understood and explicated.' (emphasis mine)

p.23 wrt Ps 148, what is the reason for praise?

'In this interaction with God the creatures become more of what they are or have the potential of becoming. Without the call to praise some possibilities for praise might not be realized. ... In vv. 5b-6 the reason given is the fact of creation by God and being given a particular place within the created order for all time. It is thus praise for being what they are. ... Praise occur when the creature fulfils the task for which it was created.'

+++++

Marlow, Hilary, and Mark Harris, eds. *The Oxford Handbook of the Bible and Ecology*. Oxford: OUP, 2022

https://hub.commonawards.org/blocks/configurable_reports/viewreport.php?id=40&filter_var=9780190606749

See within this volume for the following chapters:

Theodore Hiebert 'Genesis' (81-94)

p85: 'If God brings a flourishing world into being, it is the human's primary work to ensure that the world continues to flourish as God created it and wishes it to flourish. That is the logic of human rule in Priestly perspective (Brown 199, 35-58; 2010, 34-66).'

p87 flourishing guaranteed by God central concern in biblical theology -seen as 'God's intention for the earth and all of its life'

+++

Deborah Rooke 'Leviticus' (95-110)

p95 Lev shows concern to regulate relationship between humans and the rest of the natural world.

p107 Gleaning rules (Lev 19) would allow other animals and plants to flourish and promote biodiversity

+++

William P. Brown 'Deep Calls to Deep: The Ecology of Praise in the Psalms' (166-183)

p180 on Ps 148 'For any creature to give full praise to God, it must be fully flourishing. ... For creation to give praise to God, ecological health is a necessity.'

+++

Ellen Bernstein 'The Ecotheology of the Song of Songs' (197-210)

p198 among principles to interpret Song ecologically: 'Flourishing is the ability of a species or ecosystem to sustain itself over time; it is a sign of ecological exuberance.'

pp205-206 expand on the principle of flourishing: sustainability can be taken to be equal to maintenance of the status quo. 'while flourishing implies growth and prosperity (in a biological sense)—the ability of an ecosystem to thrive over time.'

p206 she speaks of flourishing through seeds, in other words reproduction.

+++

Susan Miller 'John's Gospel' (228-240)

p236 Jesus here 'concerned with "the life of the world" (6:51)' 'This phrase emphasizes the interconnected nature of human life and the earth. Jesus is concerned with the flourishing of the whole of creation and the formation of a stable environment in which human beings and the earth may be fruitful.'

+++++

McFarland, Ian A. *From Nothing : A Theology of Creation* (Louisville, KY : Westminster John Knox, 2014)

pp.73-4 'The doctrine of creation counsels that the world be seen in just such terms: as a coherent whole, ordered by God for the benefit of creatures (Isa. 45:18). From this perspective the diversity of creation is properly interpreted as an integrated unity, in which the flourishing of the many different

kinds of creatures is both desired by God and achieved through relationships of mutual interdependence.'

p. 74 'talk about the wholeness of creation must affirm the integrity of every creature in God's sight, such that (1) no creature exists merely for the sake of some other one (as though its value were reducible to another's flourishing), since (2) each has its own inherent value before God as something meant to flourish in its own right, though (3) each is so constituted that it cannot flourish in isolation from other creatures. In line with this principle, Augustine insisted that it is only in taking stock of the diversity of creatures in their interrelatedness that creation's goodness is fully manifest:' [Goes on to cite Augustine]

p.107 'At the same time, it is part of Christian belief that redemption and glorification, while not entailed by creation, in their own distinct ways bring creation to perfection in ways consistent with the movement intrinsic to creaturely existence. God intends creatures to flourish, but even within the context of creation alone, this flourishing is not instantaneous. For nonangelic beings at least, the goodness of created life includes growth in time—from acorn to oak tree, spore to mushroom, infant to adult—quite apart from the hope of eschatological summation. This latter hope reflects the further belief that a movement of grace supervenes upon the movement of nature in order to effect a return to God, in which creatures' existence is not only continually sustained by God objectively but also continually experienced subjectively as communion with God. While the story of this return takes us beyond the doctrine of creation, it is rooted there, since it is the same world created in the beginning that is to be glorified in the end. The task of part 2 of this book is to explore the context within which creation, having arisen from the love of God, is drawn to perfection in that love by showing how the ways in which creatures both flourish and fail to flourish in the present shape Christian hope for the fulfillment of created life in glory.'

p.133 in context of discussion of evil: 'part of creatures' inherent goodness, and what it means for them to flourish, is to undergo the kinds of changes associated (in the case of living beings) with growth and maturation.'

p.141 'Questions do arise, however, in the face of the fact that the vast majority of terrestrial organisms do not live to adulthood, and still fewer die "old and full of days." And the difficulties become only more pronounced in light of the disparities in the quality of preservation from individual to individual, such that some have an abundance of resources available to enhance their existence, while others' days are marked by pain and want. There are no easy answers to these questions. It is possible to redescribe the facts in a way that highlights divine generosity rather than creaturely transience. For example, arguing that it is part of the peculiar goodness of the dandelion that it should put forth hundreds of seeds, or of the octopus that it produces tens of thousands of eggs, places the focus on God's provision for the species rather than for the individual.¹¹ But there are limits to this strategy, since the flourishing of the population is no remedy for the death of the individual. Interpreting conservation as God's continued production of every creature therefore does not explain how any particular creature's failure to flourish is consistent with God's will for the flourishing of all. The evident vulnerability of all creatures to destruction does, however, bring into relief their common and absolute dependence on God in order to exist. In this way, the doctrine of creation from nothing serves as a reminder that it is not "natural" (in the sense of being automatic or inevitable) that creatures, once made, should continue in being. That they do so is the result of

God's will that they should flourish, of which their continued existence is a necessary condition. Creatures' preservation, no less than their creation, is thus a matter of grace.'

Not on web

+++++

Other related topics

King, Sarah Withrow (2016) *Animals are not ours (no really they are not): An Evangelical Animal Liberation Theology* Cambridge: Lutterworth.

Description from publisher: Why should Christians care about animals? Is there a biblical basis for abstaining from eating animals? Is avoiding companies that use (and misuse) animals a viable way for Christians to better live out the message of God? In this book, Sarah Withrow King makes the argument that care for all of creation is no 'far-fetched' idea that only radical people would consider, but rather a faithful witness of the peaceful kingdom God desires and Jesus modelled. King uses her decade-plus experience as a vegan, her seminary education, her evangelical Christian faith, and her years working with PETA to call Christians to examine how we treat and view the nonhuman animals with whom we share a finite planet.

LINK FROM WITHIN HUB:

https://hub.commonawards.org/blocks/configurable_reports/viewreport.php?id=40&filter_var=9780718844813

+++++

McDonald, Suzanne (2020) 'Waiting with Eager Longing: The Inseparability of Human Flourishing from the Flourishing of All' in G. Forster & A. R. Cross (eds) *Human Flourishing: Economic Wisdom for a Fruitful Christian Vision of the Good Life* Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock, pp. 45-57.

Ch. 4 at https://books.google.co.uk/books?hl=en&lr=&id=-jYEEAAAQBAJ&oi=fnd&pg=PA45&dq=bible+animal+flourishing&ots=LBl_Q9H4nG&sig=s9_23cWId4A_kCCSn6TxIIEJ52Y#v=onepage&q=bible%20animal%20flourishing&f=false

+++++

Olyan, Saul (2019) 'Are there Legal Texts in the Hebrew Bible that Evince a Concern for Animal Rights?' *Biblical Interpretation* 27, 321-339.

<https://www.academia.edu/download/64352919/OLYAN-Animal%20Rights-BibInt27.pdf>

Abstract

Much has been written about animal rights in the four decades since the appearance of Peter Singer’s classic monograph *Animal Liberation* (1975) and not a few studies consider – often in passing – what biblical texts have to contribute to debates about animal rights. These studies are, however, almost exclusively the work of non-specialists. I begin to address this dearth of professional scholarship on this topic by exploring what four biblical laws – Exod. 23:10-11, 12; Lev. 25:2-7 and Deut. 5:12-15 – might suggest about the legal standing of animals. As legal scholar Gary L. Francione states, “[W]e normally use [the term “rights”] to describe a type of protection that does not evaporate in the face of consequential considerations.” In this article, I consider whether the four biblical laws in question meet this standard.

+++++

Sherman, Phillip (2020) ‘The Hebrew Bible and the “Animal Turn”’ *Currents in Biblical Research*, 19(1) 36–63.

<https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/pdf/10.1177/1476993X20923271>

Abstract

Animal Studies refers to a set of questions which take seriously the reality of animal lives, past and present, and the ways in which human societies have conceived of those lives, related to them, and utilized them in the production of human cultures. Scholars of the Hebrew Bible are increasingly engaging animals in their interpretive work. Such engagement is often implicit or partial, but increasingly drawing directly on the more critical aspects of Animal Studies. This article proceeds as a tour through the menagerie of the biblical canon by exploring key texts in order to describe and analyze what Animal Studies has brought to the field of Biblical Studies. Biblical texts are grouped into the following categories: animals in the narrative accounts of the Torah, legal and ritual texts concerning animals, animal metaphors in the prophets, and wisdom literature and animal life. The emergence and application of zooarchaeological research and a number of studies focusing on specific animal species will be discussed. Sustained attention will be given to two recent works which have brought Animal Studies into the fractured fold of biblical scholarship more directly. Finally, I will suggest some future directions for the study of the Hebrew Bible in light of Animal Studies.

+++++

Flourishing in non-theological writings

Three papers in special section of *Environmental Humanities* (2014) 4 (1)

<https://read.dukeupress.edu/environmental-humanities/article/4/1/113/26162>

Franklin Ginn; Uli Beisel; Maan Barua ‘Flourishing with Awkward Creatures: Togetherness, Vulnerability, Killing’ *Environmental Humanities* (2014) 4 (1) 113–123.

‘Flourishing can be described as an ethic which enshrines life's emergence and the prospects or conditions for life's emergence as the good to be upheld or nurtured. Environmental and feminist philosopher Chris Cuomo uses flourishing “both to avoid the impression that there is just one possible set of criteria (the good life), and because I believe flourishing more fluently captures the valuable unfolding of nonhuman life.” Haraway, meanwhile, has argued for an ethic of multispecies co-flourishing in which the outcomes are never certain, ethical judgments stick close to the action of worlding rather than abstract principles, and in which emotion and reason both play their parts. We also know, from the thorough working of biopolitics in recent years, that life and death are not polar opposites, but forces that circulate through the same spaces and bodies. Flourishing is not some ‘soft’ alternative to biopolitics. **Flourishing always involves a constitutive violence; flourishing does not imply an ‘anything goes’ free-for-all, but requires that some collectives prosper at the expense of others.** This perspective requires us to see nonhumans not always as victims, nor humans (or more accurately geographically and historically specific groups of humans) as perpetrators. Rather, **flourishing involves many species knotted together, often imbricated in human landscapes or economy, working with and against other multispecies assemblies.** This makes some assemblies ‘the enemy’ and some not. Thus flourishing **makes no claims to innocence or universality, asking instead who lives well and who dies well under current arrangements, and how they might be better arranged.** Vague and unsatisfying ethical precepts, perhaps. But this special issue seeks to test this ethic of flourishing through three grounded studies, seeking to get us a few steps further towards doing life on earth a bit differently.’ (emphasis mine)

+++++

Low, Nicholas & Gleeson, Brendan *Justice, Society and Nature: An Exploration of Political Ecology* (London & New York: Taylor & Francis, 1998)

‘The first principle of ecological justice is that every entity is entitled to enjoy the fullness of its own form of life. Non-human nature is entitled to moral consideration.’ (p.156, emphasis original)

https://www.google.co.uk/books/edition/Justice_Society_and_Nature/qE4qBgAAQBAJ?hl=en&gbpv=1&dq=Justice,+Society+and+Nature:+An+Exploration+of+Political+Ecology+fullness&pg=PA156&printsec=frontcover

+++++

Nussbaum, Martha C.
Frontiers of Justice: Disability, Nationality, Species Membership (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2006).

See Chpt. 6 ‘Beyond “Compassion and Humanity”’: Justice for Non-Human Animals’

+++++

Schlosberg, David *Defining Environmental Justice: Theories, Movements, and Nature* (Oxford: OUP, 2007)

Chapter 6.6 'Justice to Nature 2' (pp.129-62) discusses applying the concept of flourishing to non-humans and engages with Nussbaum, among others.

'As discussed in Chapter 2, the capabilities approach, developed both individually and collaboratively by Amartya Sen and Martha Nussbaum, focuses on the variety of activities that humans need in order to fully flourish—from political freedoms to health care to social affiliation. Importantly, capabilities theory moves beyond a sole focus on a utilitarian or goods focus—justice is about more than GDP, for example—and into how individuals translate the goods they have into functioning lives. In addition, the capabilities approach incorporates distributional concerns along with recognition and political inclusion for a fairly comprehensive vision of justice. It is a lack of flourishing that is indicative of injustice, and the absence of specific capabilities that produce flourishing that is to be remedied.

The broad argument here is that this language of capabilities and functioning can also be applied to the natural world in a theory of ecological justice. The capabilities approach is important for ecological justice because flourishing is not an element that relates only to humanity, nor is it an element based in human life that we simply apply to nature along the lines of similarity. Capabilities include what is necessary for functioning and flourishing of human and nonhuman alike; it is an integral aspect of the living process. In this section, I want to discuss how the theory could be applied to nature.' (around 142-3 but pages unclear on e-copy)

+++++