

R E I N V E N T I N G

Eden

The Fate of Nature In Western Culture

C A R O L Y N M E R C H A N T

ROUTLEDGE NEW YORK & LONDON

rions and to W. W. Norton for allowing me to include materials from the essay throughout the book.

I received additional support for developing my ideas as a 1995 John Simon Guggenheim Fellow, which allowed me to spend the 1996 year writing the book, and in 2001 as a John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Fellow in the Ecological Humanities at the National Humanities Center in North Carolina, which allowed me to continue my research and writing. The fellows and staff at the Center were most helpful in contributing ideas and challenging my thinking in an extraordinarily congenial setting. In 2002, a fellowship from the Center for Theology and the Natural Sciences at the Graduate Theological Union in Berkeley allowed me to finalize the manuscript.

My colleagues and graduate students at the University of California-Berkeley have over the years helped me to fine-tune parts of my argument and challenged me to probe more deeply into particular ideas. Grants from the Committee on Research at the University of California-Berkeley have contributed to my research, acquisition of illustration permissions, and the preparation of the index. I am indebted to Mary Graham for editing the manuscript and contributing her keen insights to its argument and prose. My students Shana Cohen, Earth Trattner, and Ken Worthy read portions of the manuscript, encouraged my thinking, and helped me refine my ideas. Over the years students in my graduate courses have helped me to think through my arguments. I am especially grateful to Victor Rotenberg, Dean Bavington, Ron Feldman, Tim Hessel-Robinson, Carol Manahan, Ray Maria McNamara, Sarah Trainor, and Greg Zuschlag.

My editor at Routledge, Ilene Kalish, encouraged me to make my own perspective more visible throughout and to clarify the implications of my ideas. I am grateful to Celeste Newbrough, who prepared the index for this as well as several previous books and who has been an important inspiration in my thinking about women and nature. My son David Ilitis has afforded me the pleasure of including his poem, "The Lesson," in the chapter on "Partnership." My partner and husband Charles Sellers has been my intellectual inspiration and rock of support through this process and to him I give my deepest thanks. This book is for him.

Berkeley, California
June 2002

ONE

A Garden Planet

LIFE

LIKE A SPIDER

SPINS ITS WEB

IN CYCLICAL MELODIES

TELLING ENIGMATIC, SACRED TALES

TO DEAF, DUMB, BLIND ME.

—Carolyn Merchant, 1998

A lush garden. Pathways wander invitingly among rolling lawns and fragrant flowers. Lilies, roses, and herbs send forth a sweet ambrosia. The air smells continuously fresh. Peacocks strut among the trees in the near distance and doves make their distinctive three-note coo. A cottontail, appearing unconcerned, nibbles at grass nearby, while lambs suckle at their mother's teat. Nearly hidden among the taller and more distant cedars, a doe and fawn munch at the undergrowth. A small grove of fig trees can be glimpsed down a side path. A couple strolls arm in arm toward a fig grove near the middle of the garden, where a waterfall gushes over rocks fed by a clear bubbling stream. At the garden's very center are two trees known simply as the tree of life and the tree of the knowledge of good and evil.

Where is this Eden? It is not in the Mesopotamian lands of the pre-Christian era. It is the new downtown square on the promenade in

Anytown, California. The square is replete with fountains, grassy knolls, meandering streams, and benches for passersby. Along each side of the river flowing through the square are the shops of the revived cityscape. Gracefully arched bridges connect the two sides of the street, and the shops face the greenbelt along the river. The stores are those found in hundreds of towns across the nation: Borders Books, Starbucks Coffee, Cost Plus World Market, Noah's Bagels, Banana Republic, The Gap, Crate and Barrel, and Jamba Juice. This is the new American Eden.¹

The Garden of Eden story has shaped Western culture since earliest times and the American world since the 1600s. We have tried to reclaim the lost Eden by reinventing the entire earth as a garden. The shopping mall, the "new main street," the gated community, and the Internet are the latest visions of a reinvented Eden. From Christopher Columbus's voyages, to the search for the fountain of youth, to John Steinbeck's *East of Eden*, visions of finding a lost paradise have motivated global exploration, settlement, and hope for a better life.

The Recovery of Eden story is the mainstream narrative of Western culture. It is perhaps the most important mythology humans have developed to make sense of their relationship to the earth. Internalized by Europeans and Americans alike since the seventeenth century, this story has propelled countless efforts by humans to recover Eden by turning wilderness into garden, "female" nature into civilized society, and indigenous folkways into modern culture. Science, technology, and capitalism have provided the tools, male agency the power and impetus. Today's incarnations of Eden are the suburb, the mall, the clone, and the World Wide Web.

As with any mainstream story, however, a counternarrative challenges the plot. Recent postmodern and postcolonial stories reject the Enlightenment accounts of progress. Many environmentalists see the loss of wilderness as a decline from a pristine earth to a paved, scorched, endangered world. Many feminists see a nature once revered as mother now scarred, desecrated, and abused, and women as the victims of patriarchal culture. Similarly, many African Americans and Native Americans see their history as one of colonization by Europeans who "explored," "discovered," and took over their lands and viewed their bodies as animal-like and close to nature. But even as they call for new pathways to a just society, these counterstories of a slide downward (or declension) from Eden buy into the overarching, metanarrative of recovery. Both storylines,

whether upward or downward, compel us to find a new story for the twenty-first century.

Narratives form our reality. We become their vessels. Stories find, capture, and hold us. Our lives are shaped by the stories we hear as children; some fade as we grow older, others are reinforced by our families, churches, and schools. From stories we absorb our goals in life, our morals, and our patterns of behavior. For many Americans, humanity's loss of the perfect Garden of Eden is among the most powerful of all stories. Consciously at times, unconsciously at others, we search for ways to reclaim our loss. We become actors in a storyline that has compelled allegiance for millennia.

But "mastering" nature to reclaim Eden has nearly destroyed the very nature people have tried to reclaim. The destruction of nature in America became clearly apparent in the late nineteenth century. The railroad, the steam engine, the factory, and the mine began to demolish forests, blemish landscapes, and muddy the air and water. Romantics reacted sharply. They began to tell a new story of what went wrong—a story of decline from pristine nature. Explorers, writers, poets, and painters proclaimed their love for untouched wilderness. The early conservation movement attempted to redeem both nature and humanity by saving places of pristine beauty.

Yet the new parks, the modern suburbs, and the garden cities reclaimed nature at a cost. These Edenic spaces ostracized those "others" of different classes and colors who did not fit into the story. The green veneer became a cover for the actual corruption of the earth and neglect of its poor; that green false consciousness threatened the hoped-for redemption of all people. The middle class appropriated wild nature at the expense of native peoples by carving national parks out of their homelands. The new suburbs existed at the cost of poor minorities who lived with polluted wells, blackened slums, and toxic dumps. Today, many people of color look back to an apparent Edenic past before slavery and colonization changed their lives forever.

The narrative of reinventing Eden, told by progressives as well as environmentalists, raises fundamental questions about the viability of the Recovery Narrative itself. Do not the earth and its people need a new story? What would a green justice for the earth and humanity really look like? Why do people tell stories, and whose ends do they serve? Both the modern progressive and declensionist stories, however compelling, are flawed.

They are products of the linear approach of modern scientific thinking and also reflect the oppositional polarities of *self* and *other*. New kinds of stories, new ways of thinking, and new ethics are required for the twenty-first century.

A narrative approach raises the question of the fit between stories and reality. There is a reality to the progressive story. Great strides have been made in many people's struggle for survival and ease of life. There is also a reality to the Decline from Eden narrative. The environmental crisis and its connections to overdevelopment, population, consumption, pollution, and scarcity are critical issues confronting all of humanity. Through these contrasting stories, we can see both progress and decline in different places at different times. Progressives want to continue the upward climb to recover the Garden of Eden by reinventing Eden on Earth, while environmentalists want to recover the original garden by restoring nature and creating sustainability.

The two stories seem locked in conflict. Played out to its logical conclusion, each narrative negates human life: the mainstream story leads to a totally artificial earth; the environmental story leads to a depopulated earth. Pushed to one extreme, the recovered Eden would be a completely reinvented, totally managed, artificially constructed planet in which shopping on the web would replace shopping at the mall, the gated community the urban jungle, and greenhouse farms the vicissitudes of nature's droughts and storms. Pushed to the opposite extreme, the recovery of wilderness implies a humanly depauperate earth. The tensions between the two plots create the need for a new story that entails a sustainable partnership with nature.

We interpret our hopes and fears through such powerful cultural stories. We act out our roles in the stories into which we were born. The American dream holds out a promise, dangling its rewards for those who work hard and are lucky enough to find its treasures. For those who fail, dire consequences may result. These larger stories propel those who act within them to reinvent the planet as a new world garden. Rich and poor alike buy into the mainstream recovery story and act it out over their lifetimes.

The environmental crisis of the 1960s showed that all was not well on the "garden planet." Rachel Carson's *Silent Spring* alerted the nation to the disruptive effects of pesticides on the food chain,² while the testing of nuclear weapons raised the specter of the widespread effects of radiation

on biotic, especially human, life. In 1967, historian Lynn White Jr.'s classic article "The Historical Roots of our Ecologic Crisis" laid the blame for environmental disruption on an idea: Christian arrogance toward nature. "God . . . created Adam and, as an afterthought, Eve to keep man from being lonely," White wrote, "Man named all the animals, thus establishing his dominance over them. . . . Especially in its Western form, Christianity is the most anthropocentric religion the world has seen." White's assessment was, "We shall continue to have a worsening ecologic crisis until we reject the Christian axiom that nature has no reason for existence save to serve man," and the article brought forth cries of criticism over its assignment of the ecological crisis to a single cause. Critics such as Lewis Mumford responded that a more complex scenario was needed that included capitalism, industrialization, the American frontier, manifest destiny, urbanization, population growth, and property ownership. Others argued that the rise of science and technology contributed to the ability of humanity to dominate nature and to the idea that mechanistic science promoted the separation of humans from nature.³

The complexity of causes leading to environmental degradation as well as efforts to conserve nature and its resources helped to spawn the field of environmental history. In the 1970s and 1980s, an array of books documented the loss of wilderness, the erosion of soils, increased urban pollution, and the decline of biotic diversity. The early successes of environmental history helped to create an overarching narrative of environmental decline as one of the dominant themes in the field. By the mid-1980s, Donald Worster, William Cronon, and others identified the plots of many environmental histories as "declensionist." Cronon compared two different narratives by two different authors about the 1930s Dust Bowl of the Great Plains, both with virtually the same title (*The Dust Bowl* and *Dust Bowl*), and both published in the same year (1979)—one a story of progress, the other a story of decline. Cronon wrote, "Although both narrate the same broad series of events with an essentially similar cast of characters, they tell two entirely different stories. In both texts, the story is inextricably bound to its conclusion, and the historical analysis derives much of its force from the upward or downward sweep of the plot." The question raised was one of the fit between stories and reality. How accurately did these or any histories fit the events in question? Who were the characters in the stories? Who was omitted? Was all environmental history declensionist history? And even if that were the case, did this insight

in any way undercut the value of environmental history's insights into historical change?"

By the 1990s, chaos and complexity theory further challenged ecology and environmental history. The new approaches disrupted the idea of a balance of nature that humans could destroy but also restore. Humanity was not the only major disturber of an evolved prehuman ecosystem. Natural disturbances, such as tornadoes, hurricanes, fires, and earthquakes could in an instant wipe out an old-growth forest, demolish a meadow, or redirect the meander of a river. Humanity was less culprit and more victim; nature more violent and less passive. Environmental history moved away from assigning all destructive change to humans and toward chance and contingency in nature.³

My own view is that both progressive and declensionist stories reflect real world history, but from different perspectives. Both open windows onto the past, but they are only partial windows depending on the characters included and omitted. The linearity of the upward and downward plots also masks contingencies, meanderings, crises, and punctuations. Including nature and its climatic and biotic manifestations, however, adds complexity and contingencies to the unidirectional plots of progress and decline. Droughts, freezes, "little ice ages," domesticated animals and plants, invasive nonnative species, bacteria, viruses, and humans are all actors who are often unpredictable and unmanageable. They inject uncertainties into the trajectories of progress and decline. As environmental historian Theodore Steinberg argues, "it is quite simply wrong to view the natural world as an unchanging backdrop to the past. Nature can upset even the best-laid, most thoroughly orchestrated plans. . . . We must acknowledge the unpredictability involved in incorporating nature into human designs and, in so doing, bring natural forces to the fore of the historical process."⁴

My view is that the new sciences of chaos and complexity not only reinforce the role of natural forces in environmental history, they also challenge humanity to rethink its ethical relationship to nature. The new sciences suggest that we should consider ourselves as partners with the nonhuman world. We should think of ourselves not as dominant over nature (controlling and managing a passive, external nature) or of nature as dominant over us (casting humans as victims of an unpredictable, violent nature) but rather in dynamic relationship to nature as its partner. In the following pages I present a new perspective on the history of humanity's relationship to nature. I draw on the framework of progressive and

declensionist plots, on the roles of men and women in transforming and appreciating the environment, on ideas of contingency and complexity in history, of nature as an actor, and of humanity as capable of achieving a new ethic of partnership with the nonhuman world.

In *Reinventing Eden*, I begin by naming the powerful, overarching story of modern history as a Recovery Narrative. I show how the new millennium presents a major turning point for both the progressive Enlightenment stories and the counternarratives told by women, minorities, and nature itself. I look at the origins of the Recovery Narrative as it arose through biblical, ancient, and medieval history and then set out its political and environmental codification during the Scientific Revolution and European Enlightenment. I focus on the role of Christianity in the formation of the Recovery Narrative and do not attempt to include the influence of Judaism or the Hebrew interpretation of the Genesis stories. Although I am aware that a very large and important literature on biblical interpretation exists, my goal is not to reinterpret biblical scholarship, to write a history of religion, or to examine the development of religious movements, denominations, and sects; nor do I attempt to review or assess the vast literature on Eden in Western culture or Edenic ideas in other cultures and throughout the world.⁵

I then examine the impact of the mainstream Recovery Narrative as it comprises European culture's development and transformation of the New World. American stories—from John Winthrop's Puritan garden to Thomas Hart Benton's manifest destiny—follow and re-create the progressive Recovery storyline. This powerful story of reclaiming and redeeming a fallen earth by human labor becomes the major justification for the westward movement and the effort to remake indigenous Americans in the image of European culture. Eastern wilderness and western deserts are turned into gardens for American settlers.

Throughout the ensuing chapters, I also examine the second story, or what went wrong—the story of Earth in decline. From Plato to Henry David Thoreau, writers have noted the destruction of nature and the problems of vanishing forests and fouled waters. I set out the nineteenth century origins of the romantic counternarrative, the conservation movement, and the late-twentieth-century narratives of environmental crisis. The effects of development on nature, women, and minorities are part of a larger counterstory of the loss of an evolved, earthly abundance and

human equality. Despite nuances, hopeful advances, and upward trends, these counternarratives of decline and loss relate the all-too-real experiences of large numbers of people. The continued downward spiral leads to an impoverished earth where diversity is decreasing and environmental health is declining. This also is a story in which we live. It too affects our lives. Over time the Recovery Narrative with its two storylines—one of progress, the other of decline—has shaped the earth's landscape as well as human hopes, desires, and lives.

Within the broad arc of the Recovery Narrative, nature itself has played a major role in affecting outcomes. Despite the efforts of humans to control the natural world, contingencies and crises have occurred. Lurches, advances, and dips disrupt the apparent linearity of the narrative. Natural disturbances inject unpredictability and question the foundations of the narrative within the trajectory of modernity itself. From Noah's flood in Genesis 7 to the volcanic destruction of Pompeii during the Roman Empire (c.e. 79), to the Lisbon earthquake of 1755 and Hurricane Gilbert in 1988, nature has shaped human actions and limited possibilities. Nature's actions along with new sciences that incorporate contingencies and complexities into their very assumptions suggest new ways for humanity to relate to the material world.³

Since the 1960s, I have witnessed enormous contention within the trajectories of progress and decline. Developers and wilderness advocates are in continual conflict. One group presses for ever greater profits at the earth's expense; the other struggles to save what remains of wilderness on the planet. In the final chapters of the book, I explore possibilities for new narratives about nature. I examine new ways of thinking about the human-nature relationship suggested by postmodern and postcolonial thinking, as well as the implications of recent theories of chaos and complexity. I offer some new ways to think about a multiplicity of stories and introduce ideas about nonlinear plots.

Throughout the book, I suggest possibilities for alternatives to domination based on a partnership between humanity and nature. Finally, I propose an environmental ethic based on a partnership between humans and the nonhuman world: rather than being either dominators or victims, people would cooperate with nature and each other in healthier, more just, and more environmentally sustainable ways. I show how complex interconnections can weave us into cyclical melodies and envelop us within new enigmatic, sacred tales.

PART I

Genesis of the Recovery Narrative

T W O

The Fall from Eden

SHE HAS TAKEN UP WITH A SNAKE NOW. THE OTHER ANIMALS ARE GLAD, FOR SHE WAS ALWAYS EXPERIMENTING WITH THEM AND BOTHERING THEM; AND I AM GLAD, BECAUSE THE SNAKE TALKS, AND THIS ENABLES ME TO GET A REST. SHE SAYS THE SNAKE ADVISES HER TO TRY THE FRUIT OF THAT TREE, AND SAYS THE RESULT WILL BE A GREAT AND FINE AND NOBLE EDUCATION. . . . I ADVISED HER TO KEEP AWAY FROM THE TREE. SHE SAID SHE WOULDN'T. I FORSEE TROUBLE. WILL EMIGRATE.

—Mark Twain, *Extracts from Adam's Diary*

Two grand historical narratives explain how the human species arrived at the present moment in history. Both are Recovery Narratives, but the two stories have different plots, one upward, the other downward. The first story is the traditional biblical narrative of the fall from the Garden of Eden from which humanity can be redeemed through Christianity. But the garden itself can also be recovered. By the time of the Scientific Revolution of the seventeenth century, the Christian narrative had merged with advances in science, technology, and capitalism to form the mainstream Recovery Narrative. The story begins with the precipitous fall from Eden followed by a long, slow, upward attempt to recreate the Garden of Eden on earth. The outcome is a better world for all people. This first

story—the mainstream Recovery Narrative—is a story of upward progress in which humanity gains the power to manage and control the earth.

The second story, also a Recovery Narrative, instead depicts a long, slow decline from a prehistoric past in which the world was ecologically more pristine and society was more equitable for all people and for both genders. The decline continues to the present, but the possibility and, indeed, the absolute necessity of a precipitous, rapid Recovery exists today and could be achieved through a sustainable ecology and an equitable society. This second story is one told by many environmentalists and feminists.

Both stories are enormously compelling, and both reflect the beliefs and hopes of many people for achieving a better world. They differ fundamentally, however, on who and what wins out. In the mainstream story, humanity regains its life of ease at the expense of the earth; in the environmental story, the earth is both the victim of exploitation and the beneficiary of restoration. Women play pivotal roles in the two stories, as cause and/or victims of decline and, along with men, as restorers of a reclaimed planet. But, I argue that a third story, one of a partnership between humanity and the earth and between women and men, that draws on many of the positive aspects of the two stories is also emerging. In this chapter I develop, compare, and critically assess the roots and broad outlines of these stories.

THE CHRISTIAN NARRATIVE

The Christian story of Fall and Recovery begins with the Garden of Eden as told in the Bible. The Christian story is marked by a precipitous fall from a pristine past. The initial lapsarian moment, or loss of innocence, is the decline from garden to desert as the first couple is cast from the light of an ordered paradise into a dark, disorderly wasteland to labor in the earth. Instead of giving fruit readily, the earth now extracts human labor. The blame for the Fall is placed on woman.

The biblical Garden of Eden story has three central chapters: Creation, temptation, and expulsion (later referred to as the Fall). A woman, Eve, is the central actress, and the story's plot is declensionist (a decline from Eden) and tragic. The end result is a poorer state of both nature and human nature. The valence of woman is bad; the end valence of nature is bad. Men become the agents of transformation. After the Fall, men must labor in the earth, to produce food. They become the earthly

saviors who strive, through their own agricultural labor, to re-create the lost garden on earth, thereby turning the tragedy of the Fall into the comedy of Recovery. The New Testament adds the Resurrection—the time when the earth and all its creatures, especially humans, are reunited with God to recreate the original oneness in a heavenly paradise. The biblical Fall and Recovery story has become the mainstream narrative shaping and legitimating the course of Western culture.

The Bible offers two versions of the Christian origin story that preceded the Fall. In the Genesis 1 version, God created the land, sea, grass, herbs, and fruit; the stars, sun, and moon; and the birds, whales, cattle, and beasts, after which he made “man in his own image . . . male and female created he them.” The couple was instructed “to be fruitful and multiply, replenish the earth, and subdue it,” and was given “dominion over the fish of the sea, the fowl of the air, and over every living thing that moveth on the face of the earth.” This version of creation is thought to have been contributed by the Priestly school of Hebrew scholars in the fifth century B.C.E. These scholars edited and codified earlier material into the first five books (or Pentateuch) of the Old Testament, adding the first chapter of Genesis.¹

The alternative Garden of Eden story of creation, temptation, and expulsion (Genesis 2 and 3) derives from an earlier school. Writers in Judah in the ninth century B.C.E. produced a version of the Pentateuch known as the J source, *The Book of J*, or the Yahwist version (since Yahweh is the Hebrew deity). These writers recorded the oral traditions embodied in songs and folk stories handed down through previous centuries. In addition to the Garden of Eden story, these records include the heroic narratives of Abraham, Jacob, Joseph, and Moses; the escape from Egypt; and the settlement in the promised land of Canaan.²

In the Genesis 2 story, God first created “man” from the dust. The name Adam derives from the Hebrew word *adama*, meaning earth or arable land. *Adama* is a feminine noun, meaning an earth that gives birth to plants. God then created the Garden of Eden, the four rivers that flowed from it, and the trees for food (including the tree of life and the tree of the knowledge of good and evil in the center). He put “the man” in the garden “to dress and keep it,” formed the birds and beasts from dust, and brought them to Adam to name. Only then did he create “the woman” from Adam’s rib: “And Adam said, This is now bone of my bones, and flesh of my flesh: she shall be called Woman, because she was taken out of man.”³

Biblical scholar Theodore Hiebert argues that the Yahwist's Eden narrative is told from the perspective of an audience outside the garden familiar with the post-Edenic landscape. The use of the word *before* in the phrases that described God making "every plant of the field before it was in the earth," and "every herb of the field before it grew" signify the pasturage and field crops of the post-Edenic cultivated land in which the listener is situated. Similarly, the phrases that note that "God had not caused it to rain upon the earth" and that "a mist from the earth" came that "watered the whole face of the ground" indicate a post-Edenic rain-based agriculture centered on cultivation of the *adama*, or arable land.¹

The Garden of Eden described in Genesis 2, however, is a different landscape from that of the post-Edenic *adama*; it is filled with spring-fed water out of which the four rivers flow. It contains the "beasts of the field," "fowls of the air," cattle, snakes, and fruit trees, including the fig, as well as humans "to dress and keep it." The image of the garden in which animals, plants, man, and woman live together in peaceful abundance in a well-watered garden is a powerful image; it provides the starting and ending points for both plots of the overarching Recovery Narrative.

Hiebert compares the garden to a desert oasis irrigated by springs. "The term 'garden' (*gan*)," he notes, "is itself the common designation in biblical Hebrew for irrigation-supported agriculture." Irrigation agriculture was typified by the river valley civilizations of Mesopotamia and Egypt, in which rivers overflowed onto the land and water was channeled into ditches running to fields. Of the four rivers mentioned in Genesis 2, two are the Tigris (Hiddekel) and Euphrates of Mesopotamia, while the Pison and Gihon "are placed by the Yahwist south of Israel in the area of Arabia and Ethiopia (2:11-13), and have been identified by some as the headwaters of the Nile," notes Hiebert. The Edenic landscape is thus spring-fed, river-based, and irrigated, whereas the post-Edenic landscape initiated by the temptation is rain-based. Irrigation itself later becomes a technology of humanity's hoped-for return to the garden.²

Genesis 3 begins with "the woman's" temptation by the serpent and the consumption of the fruit from the tree of the knowledge of good and evil. (In the Renaissance this fruit became an apple, owing to a play on the Latin word *bad*, or *malum*, which also means apple). The story details the loss of innocence through the couple's discovery of nakedness followed by God's expulsion from the garden of Adam and his "wife," whom he now calls Eve, because she is to become "the mother of all the living." Adam is



Fig. 2.1. Adam and Eve enter the enclosed, circular Garden of Eden in lockstep. The Tree of Life and the Tree of the Knowledge of Good and Evil are at the center of the Garden, watered by a fountain, while the four rivers flow from the Garden. Ludolphus de Saxonia. *Vita Christi* (Antwerp, Gerard Leou. 1487). Courtesy of the Huntington Library, San Marino, California

condemned to eat bread "in the sweat of thy face," and is "sent forth from the garden of Eden, to till the ground (the *adama* or arable land) from whence he was taken," the same *adama* to which he will return after death. But because Adam has listened to his wife, the *adama* was cursed. Thorns and thistles would henceforth grow in the ground where the "herb of the field" (field crops) must be grown for bread. After the couple's expulsion, God places "at the east of the garden of Eden" the cherubim and flaming sword to guard the tree of life.⁶

The landscape into which Adam and Eve are expelled is described by Evan Eisenberg in *The Ecology of Eden*. By 1100 B.C.E. the Israelites were farming the hills of Judea and Samaria in Canaan with ox-drawn scratch plows and planting wheat, barley, and legumes such as peas and lentils. They pastured sheep, goats, and cattle, and grew grapes in vineyards, olives on hillside groves, and figs, apricots, almonds, and pomegranates in orchards. "Where least disturbed," Eisenberg notes, "the landscape was [a] sort of open Mediterranean woodland . . . with evergreen oak, Aleppo pine, and pistachio. . . . Elsewhere this would dwindle to . . . a mix of shrubs and herbs such as rosemary, sage, summer savory, rock rose, and thorny burnet. The settlers cleared a good deal of this forest for pasture and cropland." They captured water in cisterns and terraced the land to retain the rich, but shallow red soil for planting, using the drier areas for pasturage. The arid hill country in which arable and pasturage lands was mingled was therefore the landscape that would be inhabited by the descendants of Adam and Eve.⁷

Genesis 4 recounts the fate of Adam and Eve's sons, Abel ("keeper of sheep"—a pastoralist) and Cain ("tiller of the ground"—a farmer). God accepts Abel's lamb as a first fruit, but rejects Cain's offering of the "fruit of the ground," grown on the *adama*. Although the seminomadic pastoralists and farmers of the Near East often existed in mutual support, they also engaged in conflict. Cain's killing of Abel may represent both that conflict and the historical ascendancy of settled farmers over nomadic pastoralists. A second explanation stems from the fact that Israelite farms in the hill country incorporated both farming and pastoralism into a subsistence way of life. According to Hiebert, the elder son was responsible for the tilling of the land, whereas the younger son was the keeper of the sheep. Hiebert argues that God's banishment of Cain after the killing of Abel represents a prohibition against settling disputes through the killing of kin.⁸



Fig. 2.2. In the background Eve, tempted by the serpent, holds the apple from the Tree of the Knowledge of Good and Evil as Adam looks on. In the foreground Adam and Eve, having tasted the fruit, are expelled from the Garden, no longer in lockstep, leaving the angel with the flaming sword to guard the Tree of Life. *Adam and Eve with a Serpent* from *Heures à l'usage de Rome*, 1488 by J. J. de Pré. Reproduced in *The Garden of Eden* by John M. Prest, 1982 and originally from *Medieval Gardens* by Sir Frank Consp, 1924. Reference (shelfmark) 19183 d.26.

When human beings fell into a more labor-intensive way of life, their view of nature reflected this decline. Nature acting through God meted out floods, droughts, plagues, and disasters in response to humanity's sins or bountiful harvests in response to obedience. J. L. Russell notes that the Christian interpreter Paul "regarded the whole of nature as being in some way involved in the fall and redemption of man. He spoke of nature as "groaning and travailing" (Romans 8.22)—striving blindly towards the same goal of union with Christ to which the Church is tending, until

finally it is re-established in that harmony with man and God which was disrupted by the Fall." While the term *fall* to characterize the expulsion or going forth from Eden is absent from the Bible, it becomes commonplace in the ensuing Christian tradition. Beginning with St. Augustine, the story is interpreted as a Fall that can be undone by a savior.⁹

Before the Fall, nature was an entirely positive presence. The garden, which is the beginning and end of the Recovery Narrative, is an idealized landscape. The beasts and herbs of Genesis 1 are described as "very good," as are the cattle, fowl, beasts, and trees in the Genesis 2 Garden of Eden. The dust of Genesis 2, from which "man" was formed and which was watered by "a mist from the earth," is positive in valence. The ground, from which the other creatures are made is positive as well. But after the couple disobeys God, the ground is cursed. Adam eats of it in sorrow, and it brings forth thorns and thistles. The serpent changes from being "more subtle" than the other beasts to being "cursed above all cattle and above every beast of the field." In the Christian tradition, the thorns, thistles, and serpent symbolize barren desert and infertile ground, a negative nature from which humanity must recover to regain the garden.¹⁰

With the Fall from Eden, humanity abandons an original, "untouched" nature and enters into history. Nature is now a fallen world and humans fallen beings. But this Fall through the lapsarian moment sets up the opposite—or Recovery—moment. The effort to recover Eden henceforth encompasses all of human history. Reattaining the lost garden, its life of ease from labor, and its innocent happiness (and, I would add, the potential for human partnership with the earth) become the primary human endeavor. The Eden narrative is, according to Henry Goldschmidt, "a story of originary presence which is subsequently usurped by difference; and then of a final presence, reinstated, sweeping away the unfortunate misadventure."¹¹

The Recovery story begins with the Fall from the garden into the desert (and the loss of an original partnership with the land), moves upward to the re-creation of Eden on earth (the earthly paradise), and culminates with the vision of attainment of a heavenly paradise, a recovered garden. Paradise is defined as heaven, a state of bliss, an enclosed garden or park—an Eden. Derived from a Sumerian word, *paradise* was once the name of a fertile place that had become dry and barren; the Persian word for park, or enclosure, evolves through Greek and Latin to take on the meaning of garden, so that by the medieval period Eden is depicted as an



Fig. 2.3. After the expulsion from Eden, Adam is forced to till the barren ground with plow and oxen. G. B. Andreini, "Adamo," *L'Adamo, Sacra Representazione* (Milan, 1617), p. 110. Courtesy of the Huntington Library, San Marino, California



Fig. 2.4. After the Fall, nature becomes a disorderly wilderness in which animals, who once lived in harmony, devour each other, while Adam and Eve are forced to live in caves and clothe themselves in skins. G. B. Andreini, "Eua, Adamo," *L'Adamo, Sacra Representazione* (Milan, 1617), p. 115. Courtesy of the Huntington Library, San Marino, California

enclosed garden. The religious path to a heavenly paradise, practiced throughout the early Christian and medieval periods, incorporated the promise of salvation to atone for the original sin of tasting the forbidden fruit. In the Christian story, time has two poles—beginning and end, creation and salvation.¹²

The resurrection or end drama, heralded in the New Testament, envisions an earth reunited with God when the redeemed earthly garden merges into a higher heavenly paradise. The second coming of Christ was to occur either at the outset of the thousand-year period of his reign of peace on earth, as foretold in Revelation 20 (the millennium), or at the last judgment, when the faithful were reunited with God at the resurrection. Since medieval times, millenarian sects have awaited the advent of Christ on earth.¹³

The Parousia is the idea of the end of the world, expressed as the hope set forth in the New Testament that "he shall come again to judge both the quick and the dead." It depicts a redeemed earth and redeemed humans. "The scene of the future consummation is a radically transformed earth," writes A. L. Moore. *Parousia* derives from the Latin *parere*, meaning to produce or bring forth. Hope for Parousia was a motivating force behind the Church's missionary work, both in its early development and in the New World; Christians prepared for this expected age of glory when God would enter history. Moore notes, "The coming of this Kingdom was conceptualized as a sudden catastrophic moment, or as preceded by the Messianic kingdom, during which it was anticipated that progressive work would take place."¹⁴

THE MODERN NARRATIVE

A secular version of the Recovery story became paramount during the Scientific Revolution of the seventeenth century, one in which the earth itself became a new Eden. This is the mainstream narrative of modern Western culture, one that continues to this day—it is *our* story, one so compelling we cannot escape its grasp. In the 1600s, Europeans and New World colonists began a massive effort to reinvent the whole earth in the image of the Garden of Eden. Aided by the Christian doctrine of redemption and the inventions of science, technology, and capitalism, the long-term goal of the Recovery project has been to turn the entire earth into a vast cultivated garden. The seventeenth-century concept of Recovery

TABLE 2.1.
REINVENTING EDEN:
NARRATIVES OF WESTERN CULTURE

Christian	Modern	Environmentalist	Feminist
Eden	Golden Age	Pristine Wilderness	Matriarchy or Equality
Fall	Dark Ages	Ecological Crisis	Patriarchy
Birth of Christ	Renaissance	Environmental Movement	Feminist Movement
Heaven	Enlightenment, Capitalism	Restored Earth	Emancipation, Equality

came to mean more than Recovery from the Fall. It also entailed restoration of health, reclamation of land, and recovery of property. The strong interventionist version in Genesis 1 validates Recovery through domination, while the softer Genesis 2 version advocates dressing and keeping the garden through human management (stewardship). Human labor would redeem the souls of men and women, while the earthly wilderness would be redeemed through cultivation and domestication.⁵

The Garden of Eden origin story depicts a comic or happy state of human existence, while the Fall exemplifies a tragic state. Stories and descriptions about nature and human nature told by explorers, colonists, settlers, and developers present images of and movement between comic (positive) or tragic (negative) states. Northrop Frye describes the elements of these two states. In comic stories, he notes, the human world is a community and the animal world comprises domesticated flocks and birds of peace. The vegetable world is a garden or park with trees, while the mineral world is a city or temple with precious stones and starlit domes. And the unformed world is depicted as a river. In tragic stories, the human world is an anarchy of individuals and the animal world is filled with birds and beasts of prey (such as wolves, vultures, and serpents). The vegetable world is a wilderness, desert, or sinister forest, the mineral world is filled with rocks and ruins, and the unformed world is a sea or flood. All of these elements are present in the two versions of the Recovery Narrative.¹⁶

The plot of the tragedy moves from a better or comic state to a worse or tragic state (from the Garden of Eden to a desert wilderness). The comedy, on the other hand, moves from an initial tragic state to a comic outcome (from a desert to a recovered garden). Thus, the primary narrative of Western culture has been a precipitous, tragic Fall from the Garden of Eden, followed by a long, slow, upward Recovery to convert the fallen world of deserts and wilderness into a new earthly Eden. Tragedy is turned into comedy through human labor in the earth and the Christian faith in redemption. During the Scientific Revolution, the Christian and modern stories merged to become the mainstream Recovery Narrative of Western culture (see table 2.1).

THE ROLE OF GENDER

The way in which gender is encoded into the mainstream Recovery Narrative is crucial to the structure of the story. In the Christian tradition, God—the original oneness—is male, while in the garden the woman (Eve) is subordinate to the man (Adam). The fall from the garden is caused by the woman, Eve; Adam is the innocent bystander, forced to pay the consequences as his sons, Abel and Cain, are constrained to develop pastoralism and farming. While fallen Adam becomes the inventor of the tools and technologies that will restore the garden, fallen Eve becomes the nature that must be tamed into submission. In much of the imagery of Western culture, Eve is inherently connected to and associated symbolically with nature and the garden. In the European and American traditions, male science and technology mitigate the effects of fallen nature. The good state that keeps unruly nature in check is invented, engineered, and operated by men, and the good economy that organizes the labor needed to restore the garden historically has been male directed.

In Western culture, nature as Eve appears in three forms. As original Eve, nature is virgin, pure, and light—land that is pristine or barren but has the potential for development. As fallen Eve, nature is disorderly and chaotic; a wilderness, wasteland, or desert requiring improvement; dark and witchlike, the victim and mouthpiece of Satan as serpent. As mother Eve, nature is an improved garden; a nurturing earth bearing fruit; a ripened ovary; maturity. Original Adam is the image of God as creator, initial agent, activity. Fallen Adam appears as the agent of earthly transformation, the hero who redeems the fallen land. Father Adam is the image of God as patriarch, law, and rule, the model for kingdom and state.

These denotations of nature as female and agency as male are encoded as symbols and myths into land that has the potential for development but needs the male hero—Adam. But such symbols are not “essences” because they do not represent characteristics necessary or essential to being female or male. They are historically constructed meanings derived from the origin stories of European settlers and the cultural and economic practices they transported to and developed in the New World. These gender symbols are not immutable; they can be changed by exposing their presence and rethinking history.

The male/female hierarchy encoded into the Genesis texts both consciously and implicitly socializes the young into behavioral patterns. Eve, after ingesting the fruit, is told she will be ruled by her husband, and the conflation of animals with women as helpmates is also explicit. In all versions of the story, Eve became Adam's “wife” after the two became one flesh, and she is to be “ruled over” or “dominated” by her husband after she disobeys God.¹⁷

But there is another way to read the gendered message. In the feminist reading, Genesis 1's simultaneous creation of men and women indicates their potential equality (“male and female created He them”). Recovery, therefore, is an effort to reclaim an original gender equality or partnership. Genesis 2, on the other hand, depicts the creation sequentially, first, of a real, material male body from dust and, second, woman from the body of the male. Hence Eve is second in the order of creation, implying the subjection of woman to man.¹⁸ But some feminists argue that Eve is not derivative of Adam; he was not awake at her creation, nor was he even consulted in advance. “Like man, woman owes her life solely to God,” states Phyllis Trible, “to claim that the rib means inferiority or subordination is to assign the man qualities over the woman which are not in the narrative itself.” Eve's role in initiating the Fall can also be debated. Was she the weaker, more vulnerable sex and hence susceptible to the serpent's temptation? Or, was she actually the First Scientist—the more independent and curious of the two—as in the Mark Twain epigraph above. In this reading, Eve was the one who questioned the established order of things and initiated change. As original biologist, Eve talks to the snake and nature rather than to God as does Adam. As prototypic scientist, Eve could hold the key to recovering Eden through a new science.¹⁹

While the Bible does not employ the term *partner* for the male-female relationship, today some people are rethinking the Genesis pas-

sages in terms of partnership. Theologian Ray Maria McNamara interprets the creation story in Genesis 1 in terms of a partnership between God and the earth. She notes that although God said "Let the earth bring forth grass and herb" it was actually the earth as an active partner that "brought forth grass and herb . . . and the tree yielding fruit." Another contribution to a partnership interpretation is made by the Reverend William M. Boyce Jr., who offers a free translation of several of the Genesis verses. He portrays Adam and Eve as helpers, partners, and colleagues to one another and a God who views the whole of creation as very, very good.²¹

STEWARDSHIP VERSUS DOMINION

While the role of gender is central to the story, equally critical is the question of human dominion versus stewardship of nature. If Genesis 1 is accepted as the ethical model, as it is in mainstream Western culture, then the domination of nature could be interpreted as the ideal pathway to Recovery. But if Genesis 2 represents the ethical ideal (humans as stewards over the animals), then Recovery could mean that humans are the caretakers and stewards of nature. The Bible and the Torah, in Christian and Judaic traditions, provide interesting variations on the language of the two creation stories leading to dominance or stewardship.

The terms *dominion*, *mastery*, *subduing*, *conquering*, and *ruling* predominate in different translations of the Genesis 1 story. In order to have dominion, men and women must "be fruitful," "be fertile," "become many," "increase," "multiply," "grow in number," "have many children," and then "replenish," "fill," "fill up," and "people" the "earth" or the "land."²² If the fall from Eden entails the loss of immortality bestowed by the tree of life, humans can henceforth attain immortality only through sexual procreation. Thus, in the mainstream story of Western culture, to recover the Garden of Eden means that people must not only convert the earthly wilderness into a garden, but must also replenish the earth by expanding the human population over space and time. The Genesis 1 ethic, claims Lynn White Jr. argued in 1967, it is "God's will that man exploit nature for his proter ends."²³

Genesis 2 presents stewardship as an ethical alternative to the domination of nature. God puts "man" into the Garden of Eden and instructs him "to dress it and to keep it." The Genesis 2:15 ethic is often interpreted

as the stewardship of nature, as opposed to the Genesis 1:28 ethic of dominion or mastery. In Genesis 2, the earth is a garden—a local plot of land rather than a vast area for spatial conquest—and the man is commanded to "dress," "keep," "tend," "guard," and "watch over" it. According to ecologist René Dubos, God "placed man in the Garden of Eden not as a master but rather in a spirit of stewardship." For many religious sects wishing to embrace an ecological ethic, stewardship is the most persuasive ethic that is also consistent with biblical traditions. Stewardship is a caretaker ethic, but it is still anthropocentric inasmuch as nature is created for human use.²⁴ Moreover, Nature is not an actor, but is rendered docile.

Throughout most of Western history, the biblical mandates of stewardship and dominion have sometimes been explicitly separated and at other times implicitly merged. For example, medieval enclosed gardens were often protected, carefully stewarded spaces, while eighteenth-century garden estates were vast displays of dominion and power. Early American farms ranged from small patches in the forest tended mainly for family provisions to large plantations and capitalist ranches that dominated the landscape. While the former exemplify potential partnerships between humanity and the land, the latter represent the potential for human mastery over the earth. Colonists, planters, and westward pioneers often explicitly cited the Genesis 1:28 mandate in order to justify expansion. In Western culture, the Genesis 1 and 2 accounts have usually been conflated. In the mainstream Recovery project, humanity has turned the entire earth into a vast garden by mastering nature. The Genesis 1:28 ethic of dominion has provided the rationale for the Recovery of the garden lost in Genesis 2 and 3, submerging the stewardship ethic of Genesis 2:15.

When Adam and Eve tasted the fruit of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, humans acquired their potential omniscience of nature. Wanting to become more like God, humanity has craved knowledge of everything. Since the seventeenth century, mainstream Western culture has pursued the pathway to Eden's Recovery by using Christianity, science, technology, and capitalism in concert. That human dominion over nature, however, has costs in terms of the depletion of the planet's resources.²⁵

The Genesis stories provide two ethical alternatives, dominion and stewardship—both of which are anthropocentric. They do not explicitly acknowledge nonanthropocentric ethics, such as ecocentrism in which humanity is only one of a number of equal parts—an ecocentric ethic; nor

is biocentrism a possibility, in which value is grounded in life itself, rather than being centered on humanity. But another form of ethics is the partnership ethic I propose that posits nature and humanity as equal, interacting, mutually responsive partners (see chapter 11). This ethic combines human actions and nature's actions in a dynamic relationship with each other. Here nature is not created specifically for human use, nor are women and animals seen as helpmates for "man." Rather, human life and biotic life exist in mutual support, reciprocity, and partnership with each other. Gardens could exemplify places in which the practice of gardening is a caretaking of the soil and the life it generates.²³

ENVIRONMENTALIST AND FEMINIST NARRATIVES

An alternative to the mainstream story of Fall and Recovery is told by many environmentalists and feminists. This second narrative begins in a Stone-Age Garden of Eden and depicts a gradual, rather than precipitous, loss of a pristine condition. It uses archeological, anthropological, and ecological data, along with myth and art, to re-create a story of decline. Both environmental and feminist accounts idealize an Edenic prehistory in which both sexes lived in harmony with each other and nature, but they are nevertheless compelling in their critique of environmental disruption and the subjugation of both women and nature. When viewed critically, both can contribute to a new narrative of sustainable partnership between humanity and nature.

One version of the environmental narrative is exemplified by the work of philosopher Max Oelschlaeger. Paleolithic people, he notes, did not distinguish between nature and culture, but saw themselves "as one with plants and animals, rivers and forests, as part of a larger, encompassing whole. . . ." In that deep past, people in gathering/hunting bands lived sustainably and "comfortably in the wilderness," albeit within cycles of want and plenty. Contained within the sacred oneness of the *Magna Mater* (the Great Mother), hunters followed rituals that respected animals and obeyed rules for preparing food and disposing of remains. Cave paintings, for example, reveal human-animal hybrids that suggest identity with the *Magna Mater*, while the cave itself is her womb. Although myth rather than science explained life, Stone-Age peoples, argues Oelschlaeger, were just as intelligent as their "modern" counterparts.²⁴

Oelschlaeger sees humankind's emergence from the original oneness with the *Magna Mater* as the beginning of a wrenching division, just as birth is a traumatic separation from the human mother. He writes, "No

one knows for certain how long prehistoric people existed in an Edenlike condition of hunting-gathering, but 200,000 years or more is not an unreasonable estimate for the hegemony of the Great Hunt. Even while humankind lived the archaic life, clinging conceptually to the bosom of the *Magna Mater*, the course of cultural events contained the seeds of an agricultural revolution, since prehistoric peoples were practicing rudimentary farming and animal husbandry."²⁵

Oelschlaeger's narrative is one of gradual decline from the Paleolithic era rather than a precipitous fall as depicted in the Genesis 3 story. Near the end of the last ice age, around 10,000 b.c.e., changes in climate disrupted Paleolithic ecological relations. Animals and grains were gradually domesticated for herding and cultivation, heralding a change to pastoral and horticultural ways of life, particularly in the Near East. Once humans became agriculturists, Oelschlaeger observes, "the almost paradisiacal character of prehistory was irretrievably lost." Differences between humans and animals, male and female, people and nature became more distinct.²⁶ Humanity lost the intimacy it once had with the *Magna Mater*: "Western culture was now alienated from the Great Mother of the Paleolithic Mind."²⁷

The first environmental problems stemming from large-scale agriculture occurred in Mesopotamia. Canals stretched from the Tigris to the Euphrates, bringing fertility to thousands of square miles of cropland; but as these irrigation waters evaporated, salts accumulated in the soils and reduced productivity. Oelschlaeger suggests that agriculture marks a decline from an Edenic past: "If the thesis that agriculture underlies humankind's turn upon the environment, even if out of climatological exigency, is cogent, then the ancient Mediterranean theater is where the 'fall from Paradise' was staged. . . ."²⁸

In the Near East, the great town-based cultures emerged around 4000 b.c.e. By about 1000 b.c.e., the ancient tribes of Yahweh had become a single kingdom, ruled by David, that practiced rain-based agriculture. The God Yahweh above the earth represents a rupture with the *Magna Mater* of the Paleolithic era and a legitimization of the settled agriculture and pastoralism of the Neolithic era. The Hebrews rebelled against sacred animals as idols and placed Yahweh as the one god above and outside of nature. Time was no longer viewed as a cyclical return, but as a linear history with singular determinative events. As the "chosen people," Hebrew agriculturists and pastoralists became part of a broad-based transition from gathering/hunting to farming/herding.²⁹

Ecologically, the fall from Eden, told in Genesis 2, may reflect the differences between gathering/hunting and farming/herding initiated thousands of years earlier. In the Garden of Eden's age of gathering, Adam and Eve pick the fruits of the trees without having to labor in the earth. The transition from foraging and hunting to settled agriculture took place some 9,000 to 10,000 years ago (7000–8000 B.C.E.) with the domestication of wheat and barley in the oak forests and steppes of the Near East. Around 5,000 years ago (3200–3100 B.C.E.), fruits such as the olive, grape, date, pomegranate, and fig were domesticated. By 600 B.C.E., when the biblical stories were codified, fruit trees were cultivated throughout the Near East. The Genesis 2 story may reflect the state of farming at the time and the labor required for tilling fields as opposed to tending and harvesting fruit trees.⁵⁷

The tilling, planting, harvesting, and storing of wheat and barley represents a form of settled agriculture in which the earth was managed for grain production. "By the time the Genesis stories were composed," writes John Passmore, "man had already embarked on the task of transforming nature. In the Genesis stories [he] justifies his actions."⁵⁸ In Genesis 1, the anthropocentric God of the Hebrews commands that the earth be subdued. This represents a rupture with the nature gods of the past that occurred during the transition from polytheism to monotheism and was codified during the years of Israelite exile in Babylon between 587 and 538 B.C.E.

During the Iron Age (1200–1000 B.C.E.), the cultures of Israel and Canaan had overlapped. Canaanite mythology included a pantheon of deities: the patriarch El; his consort and mother-goddess, Asherah; the storm-god Baal, and his sister/consort Anat. Although the worship of Yahweh predominated, Israelites also worshipped El, Baal, and Asherah. During the period of the monarchy (ca. 1000–587 B.C.E.), the figure of Yahweh assimilated characteristics of the other deities, and Israel then rejected Baal and Asherah as part of its religion. "By the end of the monarchy," states Mark S. Smith, "much of the spectrum of religious practice had largely disappeared; monolatrous Yahwism was the norm in Israel, setting the stage for the emergence of Israelite monotheism."⁵⁹

Monotheism represented an irrevocable break with the natural world. Henri and H. A. Frankfort note that the emergence of monotheism represents the highest level of abstraction and constitutes the "emancipation of thought from myth." They write, "The dominant tenet of Hebrew thought is the absolute transcendence of God. Yahweh is not in nature. . . . The God of the Hebrews is pure being, unqualified,

ineffable. . . . Hence all concrete phenomena are devaluated." Although God had human characteristics, he was not human; although God had characteristics assimilated from other deities, he was the One God, not one among many gods.⁶⁰

From an ecological perspective, the separation of God from nature constitutes a rupture with nature. God is not nature or of nature. God is unchanging, nature is changing and inconstant. The human relationship to nature was not one of *I to thou*, not one of subject to subject, nor of a human being to a nature alive with gods and spirits. The intellectual construction of a transcendent God is yet another point in a narrative of decline. The separation of God from nature legitimates humanity's separation from nature and sets up the possibility of human domination and control over nature. In the agricultural communities of the Old Testament, humanity is the link between the soil and God. Humans are of the soil, but separate from and above the soil: they till the land with plows and reap the harvest with scythes; they clear the forests and pollute the rivers; their goats and sheep devour the hillsides and erode the soil. Over time, the natural landscape is irrevocably transformed. At the same time, however, nature is an unpredictable actor in the story. Noah's flood, plagues of locusts, earthquakes, droughts, and devastating diseases inject uncertainties into the outcome. Efforts to control nature come up against chaotic events that upset the linearity of the storyline and create temporary or permanent setbacks.⁶¹

The environmentalist narrative of decline initiated by the transition to agriculture continues to the present. Tools and technologies allow people to spread over the entire globe and to subdue the earth. The colonizers denude the earth for ores and build cities and highways across the land. Despite this destruction, however, environmentalists hope for a Recovery that reverses the decline by means of planetary restoration. The environmental Recovery begins with the conservation and preservation movements of the nineteenth century and continues with the environmental movement of the late twentieth century.

FEMINIST NARRATIVES

Many feminists likewise see history as a downward spiral from a utopian past in which women were held in equal or even higher esteem than men. This storyline was developed in the nineteenth century by Marxist

philosopher Friedrich Engels, who saw the "worldwide defeat of the female sex" at the dawn of written history, and by anthropologists such as Johann Bachofen, August Bebel, and Robert Briffault. It was elaborated in a series of compelling studies by twentieth-century feminists such as Jane Harrison, Helen Diner, Esther Harding, Elizabeth Gould Davis, Merlin Stone, Adrienne Rich, Françoise d'Eaubonne, Marija Gimbutas, Pamela Berger, Gerda Lerner, Monica Sjöö, Barbara Mor, Riane Eisler, Elinor Gadon, Rosemary Radford Ruether, and a host of other feminists and ecofeminists. Like the environmental story, the feminist story captures the imagination by its symbolic force and its dramatic loss of female power. But like the environmental narrative, it must be critically evaluated for its overly utopian past from which women "fell" and its polarization of the sexes into positive female valences and negative male valences.²⁹

In broad outlines the story of the decline of women, goddesses, and female symbolism woven by feminist writers is as follows. Elizabeth Gould Davis in *The First Sex*, sets out the storyline:

When recorded history begins we behold the finale of the long pageant of pre-history. . . . On the stage, firmly entrenched on her ancient throne, appears woman, the heroine of the play. About her, her industrious subjects perform their age-old roles. Peace, Justice, Progress, Equality play their parts with a practiced perfection. . . . Off in the wings, however, we hear a faint rumbling—the . . . jealous complaints of the new men who are no longer satisfied with their secondary role in society. . . . [T]he rebellious males burst onstage, overturn the queen's throne, and take her captive. . . . The queen's subjects—Democracy, Peace, Justice, and the rest—flee the scene in disarray. And man, for the first time in history, stands triumphant, dominating the stage as the curtain falls.³⁰

This story of decline from a past dominated by female cultural symbols and powerful female deities into one of female subordination is presented by many feminist writers. The plot is a downward trajectory throughout prehistory and written history in which female power is lost or obscured. Recovery, however, can occur with emancipation, social and economic equality, and the return of powerful cultural icons that validate women's power and promise. Merlin Stone conveys the argument when she writes that in the Neolithic era (ca. 7000 B.C.E.) people worshipped a female creator, a great goddess who was overthrown with the advent of newer religions. The loss of paradise, she holds, is the loss of a female

deity. The beginnings of this narrative occur in the ancient Near East with the overthrow of goddess worshipping horticulturalists by warriors on horseback.³¹

Horticulturalists who lived during the period from 7000 to 3500 B.C.E. in Old Europe—the area of present-day Greece and the former Yugoslavia—were, according to archeologist Marija Gimbutas, apparently peaceful groups who did not develop destructive weapons. Men and women were buried side by side, indicating equal status. Their lives revolved around fertility rituals based on the female principle. Birth, death, and regeneration were reflected in statues of female deities with large buttocks, pregnant bellies, and cylindrical necks. The concepts of male and female, animal and human, were fused. Nature was venerated. Artifacts show large eggs with snakes wound around them that symbolized the cosmos, while fish, water birds, butterflies, and bees captured the vibrancy of the natural world. Gimbutas's interpretation of grave sites as representing equality and her conjectures about the symbolic meanings of markers on vases and statues have been questioned, but her work is nonetheless compelling in part because the storyline she imposes on the past is one of great power especially for women.

Between 4400 and 2800 B.C.E., Gimbutas argues, the apparent oneness with nature and equality between genders was ruptured. She identifies three major waves of horse-mounted Kurgan invaders that conquered Old Europe and introduced hierarchical social relations and sun-god worship. Excavated graves from this period reveal male chiefs. They were buried with servants at their feet, and their graves contained weapons of human destruction and material possessions to indicate their high status. Sky gods rather than earth deities appear on pottery, suggesting a new worship of the heavens above rather than animate spirits within nature. This interpretation has likewise undergone scrutiny because it attributes all disruption to external forces and seems to give far less credence to internal social changes and adaptations to external events.³²

The feminist narrative continues with the overthrow of goddesses in ancient Mesopotamia and Egypt and their replacement by male principles. Throughout the Mediterranean world, as a more settled way of life began, shifting settlements became towns, and civilizations with recorded histories arose. These cultures were rooted in the cyclical return of rains. Sumeria (Mesopotamia) blossomed in the fertile crescent between the Tigris and Euphrates Rivers. Sumerian gods were identified with nature:



Fig. 2.5. Stone-age female figure with large buttocks and breasts, interpreted by some archaeologists and feminists as representing the fertility of the earth and women. Neolithic Figure, Tel Chagar Bazar, Mesopotamia. Copyright the British Museum, London.

sky (An), earth (Ki), air (Enlil), and water (Enki). Domesticated animals, such as the bull and cow, symbolized fertility.⁴²

An array of powerful female deities existed who were overthrown and replaced by male deities. In Mesopotamia, the Sumerian goddess Ishtar (Inanna) was portrayed with her much smaller son-lover, Tammuz. She renewed life each spring when she descended to the underworld to bring

Tammuz back from the dead. Over time, however, Ishtar faded in importance to Tammuz. Another female deity was the life-giving Tiamat, who symbolized the earth. She was slain by her great great grandson, Marduk, who went on to create the heavens and the earth, heralding the rise of patriarchal society. Similarly, the male hero Gilgamesh (second millennium B.C.E.), who slew the forest god Humbaba, symbolized agriculture's encroachment on the ancient forests.⁴³

In Egypt, Isis represented the maternal principle. She produced vegetation when impregnated by Osiris, her brother-husband. Every spring her tears overflowed to flood the Nile, which made the soil fertile. In one hand she carried a sistrum, or rattle, to awaken the powers of nature. In the other she held a bucket of Nile water, and her gown was decorated with stars and flowers to symbolize nature.⁴⁴ Osiris was the god of the people and bestowed gifts on humankind. He was killed by his brother Seth and restored to life by Isis, his sister-wife. Osiris, however, was a deity who descended from Atum-Re, the Sun God, and was associated with the Egyptian Sun Kings, or pharaohs, who embodied male power and virility.⁴⁵

Feminists argue that a similar transition in the worship of goddesses to that of gods and a decline in the relative importance of female to male principles also occurred in ancient Greece. The Mycenaeans, who worshipped the goddess on the island of Crete at the Palace of Knossos about 1400 B.C.E., founded cities on mainland Greece, bringing with them worship of the mother goddess, which thrived from 1450 to 1100 B.C.E. Artemis, goddess of the hunt, was worshipped, as were the fertility goddesses Demeter and Persephone. The Achaeans' invasions of the thirteenth century B.C.E. began to weaken matrilineal traditions and by the close of the second millennium B.C.E., with the advent of the Dorians, patrilineal succession became established. The goddess Athene was reconfigured as a motherless female, free of maternal desire and labor pains, springing from the head of the male god Zeus. Here the male gives birth to the female, reversing the natural birth process. While the common people continued to worship Artemis, Demeter and Persephone, the ruling elite set up Olympian Gods, such as Zeus and Apollo as a patriarchal, rational idealized pantheon.⁴⁶

The feminist narrative also reverses the biblical story. It begins with powerful female creative principles. It was the goddess Anat (Eve), mother of all the living, who created Yahweh. And, following the tradition in which

ISIS

Magnæ Deorum Matris

APVLEIANA DESCRIPTIO.

Nomina varia
Isidis.

Isis
Minerva
Venus
Iuno
Proserpina
Ceres
Diana
Rhea seu
Tellus
Pellunucia
Rhamnusia
Bellona
Hecate
Luna
Polymor-
plus dz-
mon.

*Explicaciones sym-
bolorum Isidis.*

A Divisionem, munda-
dam, orbem celestem
BB Iter Luna flexuo-
sum, & rim flexuo-
sissimam notat.
CC Turbulas, vim Lu-
nae in herbas, &
plantas.
D Cereis symbolum,
Isis enim spicas in-
venit.
E Vestis vestis mul-
ticolor, multiformem
Luna faciem.
F Innocentia frumenti.
G Dominium in omnia
vegetabilia.
H Radios lunares
I Genius Nili malo-
rum succurrans.
K Si crementis & de-
crementis Luna.
L Humectat, vis Luna.
M Luna vis ridentis, &
vis ditiandi.
N Dominium in hu-
more & mare.
O Terra symboli, &
Medicinae inuentrix.
P Fertilitas, quae se-
quitur terram irriga-
tam.
Q Alteorum Domina.
R Omnia nutrix.
S Terra marisque
M Domina.

A. Neg. Grav. Magnæ matris Isis. p. 1212.

Fig. 2.6. The Egyptian female deity, Isis, symbolized the fertility of nature as the Nile annually overflowed to produce crops. She rattles her sistrum to awaken the powers of nature and with her pail pours water onto the land. Isis, in Athanasius Kircher, *Oedipus Aegypticus* (1652). Courtesy of the Bancroft Library, University of California, Berkeley

goddesses gave birth to sons who then became their spouses, Eve created Adam, who then became her consort. Moreover, in the feminist story, Adam was born of Eve's rib, not vice versa. The very idea that Adam should give birth to Eve (as Zeus similarly gave birth to Athena) reverses the biological process in which women give birth to men. Notes Elizabeth Gould Davis, "[T]he whole intention of the distortion manifested in the Hebrew tale of Adam and Eve is twofold: first, to deny the tradition of a female creator; and second, to deny the original supremacy of the female sex."⁶⁶

The feminist narrative likewise reveals important relationships between Eve and nature. Eve's mythological connections to the mother goddesses Tiamat, Inanna, Ishtar, Isis, and Demeter are reinforced by her associations with the garden, the serpent, and the tree, all of which were both nature and *of* nature. First, the Garden of Eden itself is nature. It was originally created by the mother goddess, and its loss represents the loss of intimacy between woman and nature. Second, the serpent, associated as divine counsel with the mother goddesses and female deities of Mesopotamia (Tiamat, Ishtar); Egypt (Hathor, Maat); Crete (the priestesses of Knossos); and Greece (Athena, Hera, Gaia) was the intimate link between Eve and a nature with which she communicated through speech. Third, the tree symbolized the fertility of nature and Eve's initial ingestion of its fruit initiated sexual consciousness. In the biblical expulsion story, Eve, the serpent, nature, and the body are all relegated, after the Fall, to the lowest levels of being. Merlin Stone sums up the consequences of these ancient associations between Eve and Nature: "[A] woman, listening to the advice of the serpent, eating the forbidden fruit, suggesting that men try it too and join her in sexual consciousness . . . caused the downfall and misery of all humankind."⁶⁷

While many feminists have found evidence for a transition from matriarchy to patriarchy, other writers such as Riane Eisler see humanity as taking a five-thousand-year detour from a partnership society in pre-history to a dominator society that has existed throughout most of recorded history. She argues that today we have the possibility of reestablishing a partnership society in which men and women are linked as equals rather than ranked as dominant and submissive. Although feminist theologian Rosemary Radford Ruether does not employ the term *partnership*, in *Gaia and God* she calls for a healing process that will reconfigure the positive features of Western culture and Christianity. She advocates a reordering of social relations that will promote justice in relationships

between women and men and among races, classes, and nations. And in "Gender and the Problem of Prehistory," Ruether suggests that "the only way we can, as human, integrate ourselves into a life-sustaining relationship to nature, is for both of us, males as much as females, to see ourselves as equally rooted in the cycles of life and death, and equally responsible for creating ways of living sustainably together in that relationship."⁶

COMPARING THE NARRATIVES

The mainstream, environmentalist, and feminist Recovery Narratives all have strengths and weaknesses. The mainstream story of the Recovery of Eden through modern science, technology, and capitalism is perhaps the most powerful narrative in Western culture. It has been absorbed consciously and unconsciously by millions of people over several centuries. This story writ large is one in which people participate as actors and which they incorporate into their daily lives. As a narrative it is both inspiring and realizable, providing a positive earthly goal and a promise of ultimate salvation. A vast treasury of first-rate scholarship exists on the origins and transmission of the Christian and modern stories and their impacts and implications for history and society.

Yet however comprehensive and positive as a narrative, the mainstream Recovery story is also an ideology of domination over nature and other people. In the following chapters, I will argue that, among other things, this narrative provides a justification for the takeover of New World lands and peoples and the management and transformation of forests, fields, and deserts. The Christian narrative is based on the belief and assumption that a monotheistic deity exists who has ordained a mode of behavior for humanity and designated roles for men and women. Such beliefs are based on acts of faith rather than credible evidence. Whatever positive ethics of care and stewardship arise from such beliefs, there exists an equal catalogue of war and violence against humanity and atrocities against the earth in the name of that deity. The deity can take on any attributes any group wishes to assign to it, and becomes a rationale for any actions a particular group wishes to take. As such, God (however defined and by whatever religion or sect) can be seen as a social construct that becomes a justification and an ideology for human behavior. The sacred texts that reveal such a deity can be viewed as humanly constructed stories arising out of specific social, historical, and environmental circumstances.

The environmentalist and feminist narratives likewise have strengths and weaknesses. They use climatological, archeological, anthropological, historical, and mythological evidence to support the storylines. The stories can be criticized, revised, or rejected on the basis of how they use, accept, and organize their evidence. To the extent that they deal with prehistory, their validity depends on how they interpret archeological, anthropological, and mythological evidence and the generalizability of that evidence.

Deciding how an early society behaved toward nature from surviving, nondecomposable artifacts is enormously difficult. Whether a *Magna Mater* or a variety of nature spirits or goddesses existed in prehistory is built on conjecture and extrapolation from later historical documents and anthropological observations. Whether mythologies recorded later in time actually reflect social realities or influence human behavior is problematic. Moreover, of the many statues and images that have survived, some are female, others are male, and still others are male/female or simply anthropomorphic. Some female images are buxom or pregnant with broad buttocks oriented toward the earth, while others are slender with outstretched arms reaching toward the sky, casting doubt on the universality of female fertility symbols. Other problems arise from the causes of transformation from a presumed egalitarian or matriarchal to a patriarchal society. External migrations such as warriors on horseback who infused sky gods into earth-centered egalitarian cultures or invasions of dominant outsiders places too much weight on external as opposed to internal processes, adaptations, and mutual influences. Such critiques undercut the power of the overarching storyline of the environmental and feminist narratives.

Additional problems exist with respect to the very concept of narrative itself. A narrative, whether Christian, environmentalist, or feminist, is an ideal form into which particular bits of content are poured. The form is the organizing principle; the content is the matter. Like Plato's pure forms that explain the changing world of appearances, a narrative is a variant of idealism. What is real is the idea itself. In this sense, a Recovery Narrative is an idealist philosophy. To the extent to which people believe in or absorb the story, it organizes their behavior and hence their perception of the material world. The narrative thus entails an ethic and the ethic gives permission to act in a particular way toward nature and other people.

Narratives however are not deterministic. Their plots and ethical implications can be embraced or challenged. Naming the narrative gives people the power to change it, to move outside it, and to reconstruct it.

People as material actors living in a real world can organize that world and their behaviors to bring about change and to break out of the confines a particular storyline.

CONCLUSION

My own view is that out of the global ecological crisis a new story or set of stories will emerge, but the new stories will arise out of new forms of production and reproduction as sustainable partnerships with nature are tested and become viable. Revisions of older spiritual traditions may help to create a new story, but spirituality alone cannot bring about a transformation. Nevertheless, probing the meanings of narrative, gender, and ethics embedded in the Bible and other historical narratives is critical for the planet's future. In chapter 11, I propose a partnership ethic that may help to guide decision making and the construction of sustainable livelihoods in the twenty-first century.

T H R E E

Recovering the Garden

COLUMBUS,
ADMIRAL OF THE OCEAN SEA,
CATALOGING, CONTROLLING, LEADING ME
OUT OF THE SHADOW OF THAT NETHERWORLD,
WHERE ALL LIES SILENT AND UNHEARD.

—Carolyn Merchant, 1998

The dreams of the Greeks, Romans, and early Christians were motivated by their longing for a better world beyond the shadows of their everyday lives. In between Old World biblical accounts of a lost Eden and Christopher Columbus's voyages to find Eden in the New World, Western history is filled with Greek and Roman images of a golden age and Christian visions of salvation. By 1300, Dante Alighieri's *Divine Comedy* had deftly entwined these two narratives. In this classic allegory, Virgil guides Dante out of a forested wilderness, through the Fall into the Inferno, and then upward to the earthly Eden of purgatory whence he enters the heavenly Eden of salvation.

In this chapter, I argue that these ancient and medieval narratives are integral steps toward the mainstream Recovery Narrative of reinventing the entire earth as Eden. By the seventeenth century, the medieval escape from Earth to a heavenly Eden would become the secular creation of an