

GIORDANO BRUNO IN THE CONTEXT OF THE “CRITICAL THEORY OF PATRIARCHY”

Written by Mathias Behmann

Contents and Methods

The project consists of three tightly interconnected parts, which I plan to work through in chronological order. Each individual part can be tackled only under the condition, that work on the previous one has been concluded. The overall task is to unearth the basic assumptions about a philosophy of nature that underpin matriarchal myths, and to translate them into the terminology of occidental metaphysics, in order to render possible the comparison with the major metaphysical models of the occident that will become necessary later on for the purposes of the development of a “Patriarchy-Critical Philosophy of History”. The goal is to first of all develop, and give a more detailed explanation of, the basic building blocks of such a “Matriarchal Philosophy of Nature” through an engagement with matriarchal myths, and in the context of a systematic comparison with Giordano Bruno’s philosophy of nature. Giordano Bruno was chosen for this purpose because of my initial hypothesis that Bruno’s philosophy of nature may show a number of agreements with the fundamental assumptions of the “Matriarchal Philosophy of Nature” that will be elaborated from the matriarchal myth. This hypothesis is to be verified/falsified in the context of a comparison. The individual steps will be the following:

1. Review of the extant literature regarding the matriarchal myth. Systematic development of the structural commonalities of the different mythological narratives. My basic hypothesis is that the ontological substratum of matriarchal myths will be characterised by a number of central structural elements: the assumption of a cyclicity of natural/cosmic processes, which are interpreted as processes of transformation of the female body; the assumption of a worldly reality that is structured not by opposites but by polarities; as well as the assumption of a divinity of the female, in particular in its form as nature-in-general, as a result of its generative potential as “*arché*” (hence: matriarchy as *mater arché*). Finally, I assume that the order of the matriarchal myth might be characterised by an essential “interconnectedness of all beings”, which would have to be ontologically specified in point 2.
2. Transcription of this “essence” of the matriarchal myth into the terms of occidental metaphysics in order to create the possibility of comparing the former to the metaphysical models generated over the course of the history of European philosophy, for the purposes of the development of a “Patriarchy-Critical Philosophy of History” that is understood as the history of the increasing distance to the matriarchal understanding of nature as it is expressed in the matriarchal myth. The point of the present project is to achieve comparability with Giordano Bruno’s philosophy of nature, to prepare for the more detailed – comparative – exposition of the “Matriarchal Philosophy of Nature” that emerges from this transcription, i.e. of the matriarchal myth in the language of occidental metaphysics. Its ultimate goal is the ontologically precise determination of the “interconnectedness of all beings” that matriarchal myths – seen as experiences – express in mythological imagery, and which is postulated as the “essence” of the former, by drawing on the central metaphysical concepts of the occidental philosophical tradition.
3. A comparison of the “Matriarchal Philosophy of Nature” thus generated with Giordano Bruno’s philosophy of nature, with the goal of answering the question to what extent the latter displays some “matriarchal traits”.

Verification or falsification of the hypothesis according to which there exist significant areas of overlap between the “Matriarchal Philosophy of Nature” distilled from the matriarchal myth and Giordano Bruno’s philosophy of nature. To this end I will engage in a precise analysis of the structural analogies with respect to the respective ontological presuppositions of the various philosophies of nature. The ultimate goal is finding an answer to the research question of whether Giordano Bruno can in this sense, that is, against the background of structural analogies with regard to basic metaphysical assumptions, at least partially be seen as standing in a “matriarchal tradition”.

Below, I will develop in more detail the substance as well as the methodological feasibility of the three aspects of the research project sketched above. I will also introduce the relevant literature, compare my thesis with those who worked on Bruno already and ask why the question underlying this proposal has not been asked before.

PART 1 – Review, exposition and analysis of the matriarchal myths

In this first part, I will review all existing literature on matriarchal mythology (cf. below). I will then systematically develop the basic structure common to the different myths, with a particular focus on uniting the essential characteristics of all myths into an “essence” of the matriarchal myth. In other words, I will try to distil something like the ontological substratum of *the* matriarchal myth from the various individual myths. In this, I will proceed from the assumption that this “essence” will be characterised by several structural elements. The most important will be: the cyclical order of micro- and macrocosmic processes that appear and are understood as processes of transformation of the female body; the related conception of a reality that is not structured into opposites, but into polarities that refer to each other (night-day, cold-warm, light-dark), and the linked idea of the divinity of the female as well as of nature in general, which in turn is represented as female (pan- and panentheism), in opposition to patriarchal-monotheist conceptions of god and the world. In order to show the breadth and diversity of pre-patriarchal myths, I will include myths from India, Western Europe, Mesopotamia, Palestine, Anatolia, Iran, Crete and Greece, which will not only be presented in a descriptive manner, but also systematically analysed and evaluated in light of the criteria relevant for the present research project. This will then lay the basis for the transcription in part 2 into the terms of occidental metaphysics, which will in turn serve the purpose of the subsequent verification/falsification of the fundamental hypothesis of the “Patriarchy-Critical Philosophy of History” (at a later stage).

Literature to be reviewed (in alphabetical order):

Bachofen, Johann Jakob: *Das Mutterrecht. Eine Untersuchung über die Gynaiokratie der alten Welt nach ihrer religiösen und rechtlichen Natur*, Suhrkamp, Frankfurt am Main 1975

Bornemann, Ernest: *Das Patriarchat. Ursprung und Zukunft unseres Gesellschaftssystems*, Fischer, Frankfurt am Main 1975

Campbell, Joseph: *Die Masken Gottes. Band 1: Die Mythologie der Urvölker*, Dtv, München 1996

Chattopadhyaya, Debiprasad: *Lokayāta. A Study in ancient Indian Materialism*, Peoples Publishing House, New Delhi 1972

Cotterell, Arthur: *Die Enzyklopädie der Mythologie. Klassisch, keltisch, nordisch*. Edition XXL, Reichelsheim 2004

Derungs, Kurt: *Die Natur der Göttin*, in: Edwin O. James: *Der Kult der Grossen Göttin*, Amalia, Bern 2003

- Daly, Mary: *Gyn/Ökologie*, Frauenoffensive, München 1991
- Gimbutas, Marija: *Die Zivilisation der Göttin. Die Welt des Alten Europa*, Zweitausendeins, Frankfurt 1996
- Gimbutas, Marija: *Die Sprache der Göttin. Das verschüttete Symbolsystem der westlichen Zivilisation*, Zweitausendeins, Frankfurt 1989
- Göttner-Abendroth, Heide: *Das Matriarchat I. Geschichte seiner Erforschung*, Kohlhammer, Stuttgart 1988
- Göttner-Abendroth, Heide: *Die Göttin und ihr Heros. Die matriarchalen Religionen in Mythos, Märchen und Dichtung*, Frauenoffensive, München 1986
- James, Edwin O.: *Der Kult der Grossen Göttin*, Amalia, Bern 2003
- Meier-Seethaler, Carola: *Von der göttlichen Löwin zum Wahrzeichen männlicher Macht*, Kreuz, Zürich 1992
- Meier-Seethaler, Carola: *Das Gute und das Böse. Mythologische Hintergründe des Fundamentalismus in Ost und West*, Kreuz, Stuttgart 2004
- Merchant, Carolyn: *The Death of Nature*, Harper & Row, New York 1980
- Nettling, Astrid: *Sinn für Übergänge. Zur Parergonalität des Weiblichen in der Philosophie*, Passagen, Wien 1992
- Ranke-Graves, Robert: *Die Weiße Göttin. Sprache des Mythos*, Rowohlt, Reinbek 1992
- Pechriggl, Alice: *Chiasmen. Antike Philosophie von Platon zu Sappho – von Sappho zu uns*, transcript, Bielefeld 2006
- Straube, Ingrid: *Die Quellen der Philosophie sind weiblich. Vom Einfluss weiser Frauen auf die Anfänge der Philosophie*, ein-Fach, Aachen 2001
- Stopczyk, Annegret: *Nein danke, ich denke selber. Philosophieren aus weiblicher Sicht*. Aufbau, Berlin 2003
- Weiler, Gerda: *Der enteignete Mythos. Eine feministische Revision der Archetypenlehre C. G. Jungs und Erich Neumanns*, Campus, Frankfurt a. M./New York 1991
- Weiler, Gerda: *Ich brauche die Göttin. Zur Kulturgeschichte eines Symbols*, Helmer, Königstein i. Ts. 1997
- Wolf, Doris: *Was war vor den Pharaonen? Die Entdeckung der Urmütter Ägyptens*, Kreuz, Zürich 1994
- Zimmer, Heinrich: *Indische Mythen und Symbole. Schlüssel zur Formenwelt des Göttlichen*. Diederichs, München 2000

PART 2 – Transcription of the ontological substratum of the matriarchal myth into the terms of occidental metaphysics, construction of a “Matriarchal Philosophy of Nature”

The second step is to transcribe the “essence” of the matriarchal myth, which was developed and distilled from the matriarchal myths in part 1, into the terms of occidental metaphysics in the context of an implicit and partly explicit engagement with the central figures and concepts of the latter, in order to establish the comparability of the matriarchal and the patriarchal philosophy of nature. My goal is the construction of a “Matriarchal Philosophy of Nature”, the substance of which is identical with the fundamental assumptions of the matriarchal myth, as an “occidental correlate to the matriarchal myth”. For this to occur it would be necessary to first, by way of the creation – possible *qua* abstraction – of basic terms that are equally suitable for the description of both the matriarchal as well as the patriarchal philosophy of nature (as well as mythology) – such as “matter”, “spirit”, “substance”, “soul”, “god”, etc. – develop the basic conditions for such a connection in the form of the conceptual possibility of commensurability. Subsequently, it will be necessary to transfer into the realm of “matriarchy” those key terms that are already defined within and through patriarchy by way of a fundamental redefinition drawing on matriarchal ideas

(for this, I will draw on the results of the investigation in part 1). Only thus will it be possible, my hypothesis goes, to reformulate the fundamental substance of matriarchal myths by drawing on the occidental nomenclature of a philosophy of nature, and thus represent the philosophical history of the occident as the history of the increasing distance, in parallel to the social, economic and technical development of patriarchy, to a matriarchal understanding of, and relationship to, nature. The primary task of the “Matriarchal Philosophy of Nature” in this would be to re-trace the natural process that leads from the “absolute” to the individual, generated “particular” as an entirely matriarchal process (*mater arché* = in the beginning was the mother), that is, as an event that can be comprehended as a permanent cycle of birth and rebirth of different instances of the “maternal”. In the context of this goal, to give a matriarchal structure of meaning to the order of things, the task would be to construct a decidedly matriarchal system of terms that – thus the hypothesis – would enable us to give new answers to the fundamental questions to be asked of a philosophy of nature, in other words, to subject them to a patriarchy-critical process of clarification. Crucial amongst these ontologically fundamental questions:

- the question about the essence (*Was-Sein*) of nature with respect to its *quantity* (this would imply a need to define the relationship between “unity” and “multiplicity”, or, respectively, between “identity” and “difference” within nature);
- the question about the essence (*Was-Sein*) of nature with respect to its *quality* (this would imply a need to define the relationship between “matter” and “spirit”/“soul” and lead to the question of how the relationship between human and nature can be thought);
- the question about the mode of being (*Wie-Sein*) of nature with respect to the phenomenon of time (this would require a clarification of the cyclical order of processes of becoming and decay within nature).

Thus a philosophy of nature will emerge that, analogous to the matriarchal myth, and operating at a critical distance to the majority of occidental metaphysical models, which are seen as patriarchal, will help to overcome the logic of separation that dominates the latter, especially the separation of “human” and “world”, or “subject” and “object” (“matter” and “spirit”), respectively. The hypothetical basis of the argument is the assumption of a matriarchal or matrilineal metaphysical genealogy of “primordial mother” (*Ur-Mutter*), “mother”, and “child”, which thus postulates the “mother-child-connection”, so central in matriarchal societies, as the ontological founding principle of the order of reality (the need for such a matriarchal terminology, at the centre of which stands the mother as generative being, arises from the substance of the matriarchal myths). Referring exclusively to the research results obtained from part 1 (matriarchal myths), engaging with the central figures of the history of occidental metaphysics, and with the aid of central metaphysical concepts, it is my contention that these foundational matriarchal terms can be defined as follows:

- a) The “primordial mother” could be a unitary substance (in the sense of a Spinozist monism of substance, which perceives spirit and matter as “attributes” of a single substance) in the mode of absolute non-differentiation. Especially by engaging with the concepts developed by Nikolaus von Kues (especially his concepts of god: “*non aliud*”, “*possest*” and “*coincidentia oppositorum*”, the paired concepts “*complicatio-explicatio*” as well as the negative theology of the *Docta ignorantia*), which Bruno refers to and develops primarily in his *De la causa*, I plan to define the “primordial mother” as that principle of unity that is prior to all else, that becomes world only in and through its self-explication (Kues) and that, because of its mode of being of absolute non-differentiation, is absolutely transcendent from an epistemological point of view, as a result of which it can

only be named in the context of negative statements. In part 3 I will then need to answer the question as to whether, and to what extent, we can identify similarities between this matriarchal-philosophical concept of the “primordial mother” and the concept of “one” as it is developed in Giordano Bruno’s *De la causa*, and whether we can thus assume an at least partial analogy between Bruno’s and a matriarchal philosophy of nature. (It is important to point out that thinkers such as Spinoza, von Kues or Bruno should not be placed in a matriarchal context, i.e. seen as articulating a call for a matriarchal societal order. Rather, we are only looking for structural analogies between their thought and the postulated foundational assumptions of matriarchal myths.)

- b) The term “mother” refers to the intermediary units that are located between the “primordial mother” as epistemologically absolutely transcendent *natura naturans* and the sensually perceptible things of concrete natural reality (*natura naturata*), and which, unlike the “primordial mother”/the “one”, are subject to our propositionally structured comprehension and thus speakable. This type of distinguishable substance as primary *natura naturata*, which in turn functions as the *natura naturans* of the concretely perceptible things, primarily contains the substantial attributes “matter” and “spirit”/“soul”, which are to be determined in their respective specificity and mutual relationship in quantity and quality. This analysis will be grounded in the distinction between two different concepts of substance, that enable a clear distinction between, on the one hand, the processual character of nature (*how* is nature?), and, on the other, its qualitative and quantitative constitution (*what* is nature?). Following the classical definition of *natura naturans* (Spinoza), concept no. 1 would refer to that which exists by virtue of itself (the *Aus-sich-selbst-Seiende*), and would serve, applied to the terms “primordial mother” and “mother”, to explain the cosmic process of the emergence of the world. Concept no. 2, however, would refer to the substantive qualities of the respective units and explain what they are made of. The point here would be to arrive at a definition of the relationship of the substantial attributes “matter” and “form” (“spirit”/“soul”) both with regard to the instances of *natura naturans*, and to the *natura naturata* in the sense of concrete natural realities. This substance, postulated as the unitary substance of “matter” and “spirit” in the sense of concept no. 2, will be referred to as “mater” in the context of a “Matriarchal Philosophy of Nature”. In part 3 I will analyse whether, and if so, how, there exist structural analogies between the concepts of substance developed here, and the distinction between “cause” and “principle” that Giordano Bruno develops in *De le causa*. My hypothesis is this: that with respect to this distinction there might exist, alongside some differences, significant areas of overlap between Giordano Bruno’s philosophy of nature and the “Matriarchal Philosophy of Nature” proposed as an “occidental correlate to the matriarchal myth”.
- c) Within the cosmic “mother-child-connection”, both the universe as concrete explication of the “primordial-motherly” unity (“child”), and the concrete multiplicity of those things that are individuated (“children”) can be referred to as “child”/“children”. Based on the immediate process of emergence – which can be conceived of as birth – of these *natura-naturata*-instances from the prior *natura-naturans*-unities “mother” and “primordial mother”, which are all conceived of as “mater” in the sense of a unitary substance of “matter” and “spirit”/“soul” in their respectively different modes of being (absolute non-differentiation, abstract differentiation/polarity, concrete differentiation/polarity), I will, against the fundamentally materialist attitude of the scientific tradition, attempt to prove the thesis according to which the universe has to be understood not as a fixed, in-*animate* (i.e. soulless) mechanism, but as a universally *animated* organism. The reasons for engaging with Giordano Bruno are thus clear. Today, his thought could promote an exodus from the cold, mechanistic modes

of thought and practice. In part 3, I will have to analyse whether, and to what extent, we can identify structural analogies between the matriarchal-genealogical metaphysics/cosmology and the Brunian concept according to which the concrete unity of the universe, drawing on cusanic terminology, develops as the dynamic explication of the particular unity of the “one”, which as “cause” (cf. concept no. 1) generates concrete natural reality, but as “principle” (cf. concept no. 2) simultaneously remains present within it.

The construction of this matriarchal-philosophical conceptual framework, which draws on the ontological substratum of matriarchal myths developed in part 1, occurs in the context of a largely implicit engagement with the history of the occidental tradition of metaphysics, which in turn rests on an informed understanding of the central philosophical conceptions from antiquity through to contemporary thought. In particular, the inquiry will make explicit reference to the concepts of Baruch de Spinoza and Nikolaus von Kues (given that Baruch de Spinoza devised a mechanistic and strictly deterministic system, I will draw only on his concept of a monistic substance – which was directed against Cartesian dualism – without accepting its mechanistic aspects). Since, however, the point of this inquiry is rather an implicit engagement with the occidental metaphysical tradition in the context of a translation of the foundational ontological assumptions of matriarchal myths into the terms of the former, the bibliography below can only be a narrow selection, whilst none of these classical works are themselves the subject of a detailed analysis. It is only Giordano Bruno’s metaphysical magnum opus, *De la causa, principio et uno* (cf. part 3), that is the subject of a detailed analysis.

Relevant literature (selection, in alphabetical order):

- Aquin, Thomas von: *Über Seiendes und Wesenheit*, Meiner, Hamburg 1988
- Aristoteles: *Metaphysik*, Berlin, Akad.-Verl. 2003
- Aristoteles: *Kategorien*, Meiner, Hamburg 1995
- Augustinus: *De civitate dei*, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, Göttingen 2007
- Bacon, Francis: *Novum Organum*, in: *The Works of Francis Bacon I*, Friedrich Frommann Verlag, Stuttgart-Bad Cannstatt 1963
- Beierwaltes, Werner: *Denken des Einen. Studien zur neuplatonischen Philosophie und ihrer Wirkungsgeschichte*, Klostermann, Frankfurt am Main 1985
- Bruno, Giordano: *Von der Ursache, dem Prinzip und dem Einen*, Meiner, Hamburg 1993
- Bruno, Giordano: *Über das Unendliche, das Universum und die Welten*, Reclam, Stuttgart 1994
- Capelle, Wilhelm: *Die Vorsokratiker. Die Fragmente und Quellenberichte*, Kröner, Stuttgart 1963
- Descartes, René: *Meditationen über die Erste Philosophie*, Meiner, Hamburg 2009
- Descartes, René: *Bericht über die Methode*, Reclam, Stuttgart 2001
- Fichte, Johann Gottlieb: *Grundlage der gesamten Wissenschaftslehre*, Meiner, Hamburg 1997
- Hegel, Georg Wilhelm Friedrich: *Phänomenologie des Geistes*, Meiner, Hamburg 2006
- Heidegger, Martin: *Sein und Zeit*, Niemeyer, Tübingen 2006
- Kant, Immanuel: *Kritik der reinen Vernunft*, Fourier, Wiesbaden 2003
- Kues, Nikolaus von: *Dreiergespräch über das Können-Ist*, Meiner, Hamburg 1991
- Kues, Nikolaus von: *Vom Nichtanderen*, Meiner, Hamburg 1987
- Leibniz, Wilhelm G.: *Monadologie*, Königshausen & Neumann, Würzburg 1997

Platon: *Der Staat*, Artemis & Winkler, Düsseldorf/Zürich 2003

Platon: *Phaidon*, Meiner, Hamburg 2007

Plotin: *Enneaden*, Diederichs, Leipzig/Jena o.J.

Schelling, Friedrich Wilhelm Joseph von: *System des transzendentalen Idealismus*, Meiner, Hamburg 2000

Spinoza: *Ethik*, Wiss. Buchgesellschaft, Darmstadt 1978

Whitehead, Alfred North: *Prozess und Realität. Entwurf einer Kosmologie*, Suhrkamp, Frankfurt am Main 1995

PART 3 – Systematic comparison of the “Matriarchal Philosophy of Nature” with Giordano Bruno’s philosophy of nature in *De la causa, principio et uno*

The subject of part 3 will be a systematic comparison of the “Matriarchal Philosophy of Nature”, that is, the ontological substratum of the matriarchal myth, which was distilled from the matriarchal myth and transcribed into the terminology of occidental metaphysics, with Giordano Bruno’s philosophy of nature, as developed in his main work *De la causa, principio et uno*. This will take the form of a comparison between the different foundational metaphysical terms from *De la causa*, especially the terms “the one” or “god”, “cause” (“first cause”, “next cause”), “principle” (“first principle”, “next principle”), “matter”, “form”, “universe” and “world soul” or “universal intellect”, in chronological order of the respective dialogues in *De la causa*, with the matriarchal terminological system developed in part 2. At the heart of this section lies an attempt to unearth structural analogies and to show what they consist of. The main focus will be on the dialogues 2, 3, 4 and 5 of *De la causa*.

Dialogue 2 is mainly about developing a fundamental distinction between the central concepts of “cause” and “principle”, with respect to, first, god and, second, the things of nature. It also deals with “universal reason” as the innermost capability of the “world-soul” and its effectivity as “inner artist” (*artefice interno*). In the context of the treatment of the “principles”, the focus is first on “form”, that is, on the question of the extent to which this is identical to the “world-soul”. This form is then, in critical distance to the Aristotelian conception of substance, defined as the *substantial* spiritual substance that is prior to all concretely individual entities (= substance in the Aristotelian sense), and through which all things are *animated*. At the end of the 2nd dialogue we already find, in the context of a treatment of the immanence of form to matter, a reference to the close link between the principles of “form” and “matter”, the explanation of which is the subject of the 3rd dialogue. This dialogue, then, first refers to the equal importance of the two “principles”, as they cannot be comprehended outside of their mutual relationship and dependence upon each other. This is followed by a treatment of the “principle of matter” in its different modes of being (non-differentiation in the “one”, differentiability as substantial substance in the concrete, concretisation as individual entity), where Bruno stresses its intelligible, non-perceptible character as primary and secondary *natura naturans* (once again through a critical dialogue especially with Aristotle). The “world-soul” as substantial “principle of form” is then deployed as the polar opposite of the substantial “principle of matter”, in order to then, by way of a recourse to cusanic terminology, deal with its non-differentiability in the absolute (“unity of capability and reality”, “coincidentia oppositorum”, “complicatio-explicatio”, the inability to express the absolute except through negation in the sense of the *Docta ignorantia*). At the end of the 3rd dialogue, “capability” is linked to “form” in the context of a distinction of “matter” as consisting of “capability” and “substratum”, suggesting that “capability” is in fact the effective aspect of matter itself, that it is, in fact, identical with the latter. The question of “matter” as “substratum” is referred to the 4th dialogue. There, “matter” is analysed in its various modes of being – on the one hand

as non-corporeal *natura-naturans*-matter, on the other as corporeal *natura naturata* – while it is stressed, against the Aristotelian tradition, that it never disappears, but that it is one and the same matter that is subject to cosmic processes of change and transformation. As such, it contains within itself all the expansions (forms) that, by virtue of its “passive capability”, and guided by its “active capability”, it can achieve itself, meaning that it is not identical with the Aristotelian tradition’s “prope nihil”. In the 5th dialogue, this unity of “matter” and “form” is once more treated and emphasised as the “one”.

Hypothetically, I am assuming the existence of significant congruences between the metaphysics Giordano Bruno develops in *De la causa*, and the “Matriarchal Philosophy of Nature” established in part 2 by way of a recourse to the matriarchal myths, in particular with regard to the following concepts:

- a) The Brunian concept of the “one”, understood as absolute non-differentiation in the sense of the cusanic principle of “coincidentia oppositorum”, might correspond to the matriarchal concept of the “primordial mother”. Both refer to the ontologically relative but epistemologically absolutely transcendent dimension of *natura naturans* in the mode of being of absolute non-differentiation (complicatio). This thesis will be analysed and verified/falsified by way of a systematic comparison primarily with regard to dialogues 3, 4 and 5 in *De la causa*.
- b) Bruno’s distinction between “cause” and “principle” might correspond to the matriarchal distinction between, on the one hand, the substance-as-effect (cf. concept no. 1), and, on the other, its substantive aspect as being (cf. concept no. 2), in other words, with the terms “primordial mother”/“mother” and “mater”. The “primordial mother” might correspond to Bruno’s concept of the “first cause”, and “mother” to what he calls “next cause”. What Bruno refers to as “principle” might correspond to the matriarchal concept “mater” in the sense of that unitary substance that is composed of “matter” and “form”. Both the absolute unities “primordial mother” and “mother”, and the concrete unities “child”/“children” would thus be “mater” according to their substantive quality, that is, in “principle”: as “mother”, “mater” in the mode of abstract explication (what Bruno calls “next principle”), as “child”/“children”, “mater” in the mode of concretisation (concrete explication). This thesis is to be verified/falsified in the context of a systematic comparison with regard especially to dialogues 2, 3 and 4.
- c) The Brunian “principle”, which is composed of the “principle of form” and the “principle of matter”, might correspond to the matriarchal unitary substance “mater” as inseparable unity of matter and spirit (in the sense of a Spinozist monism of substance).

Alongside the possible analogies with regard to the basic ontological structure of the “Matriarchal Philosophy of Nature” on the one hand, and Giordano Bruno’s philosophy of nature on the other, I will also draw on the following primary and secondary texts in order to elaborate other commonalities and differences that might manifest themselves over the course of the research, in order to gain as exact as possible a perspective on the question at the core of this funding application: whether, and if so, to what extent Giordano Bruno’s philosophy of nature can be understood as standing in a “matriarchal tradition”.

Literature:

Primary texts:

Bruno, Giordano: *Von der Ursache, dem Prinzip und dem Einen*, Meiner, Hamburg 1993

Bruno, Giordano: *Über das Unendliche, das Universum und die Welten*, Reclam, Stuttgart 1994

Secondary texts (in alphabetical order):

- Benzin, Nicolas: *Giordano Bruno und die okkulte Philosophie der Renaissance*, Ancient Mail Verlag, Groß-Gerau 2005
- Blum, Paul Richard: *Giordano Bruno*, Beck, München 1999
- Bönker-Vallon, Angelika: *Metaphysik und Mathematik bei Giordano Bruno*, Akad.-Verl., Berlin 1995
- Bönker-Vallon, Angelika: *Einleitung* in: *Giordano Bruno Werke Band 4: Über das Unendliche, das Universum und die Welten*, Meiner, Hamburg 2007
- Brockmeier, Jens: *Die Naturtheorie Giordano Brunos. Erkenntnistheoretische und naturphilosophische Voraussetzungen des frühbürgerlichen Materialismus*, Campus-Verlag, Frankfurt am Main u. a. 1980
- Dischner, Gisela: *Giordano Bruno. Denker – Dichter – Magier*, Francke, Tübingen u.a. 2004
- Eusterschulte, Anne: *Giordano Bruno – Eine Einführung*, Panorama-Verlag, Wiesbaden 2005
- Hentschel, Beate: *Die Philosophie Giordano Brunos – Chaos oder Kosmos? Eine Untersuchung zur strukturalen Logizität und Systematizität des nolansichen Werkes*, Lang, Frankfurt am Main u. a. 1988
- Kirchhoff, Jochen: *Giordano Bruno*, Rowohlt, Hamburg 1980
- Kirchhoff, Jochen: *Räume, Dimensionen, Weltmodelle. Impulse für eine andere Naturwissenschaft*, Drachen Verlag, Klein Jasedow 2008
- König, Andrea: *Giordano Bruno – An der Schwelle der Moderne*, Tectum, Marburg 2003
- König, Andrea: „*Academico di nulla Academia – detto il Fastidito*“ – ein Naturphilosoph im protestantischen Deutschland, in: Rothgangl, Martin/Schwarz, Hans (Hg.): *Glaube und Denken*, Jahrbuch der Karl-Heim-Gesellschaft, Band 20, Lang, Frankfurt am Main 2007
- Leinkauf, Thomas: *Einleitung* in: *Giordano Bruno Werke Band 3: Über die Ursache, das Prinzip und das Eine*, Meiner, Hamburg 2007
- Mueller, Volker/Steuerwald, Helmut: *Giordano Bruno. Ein Leben für die Geistesfreiheit*, Lenz, Neustadt am Rübenberge 2000
- Samsonow, Elisabeth von (Hg.): *Giordano Bruno, ausgewählt und vorgestellt*, München 1995
- Thiel, Manfred: *Giordano Bruno – Der Philosoph in Flammen. Eine analytische Darstellung*, Elpis-Verlag, Heidelberg 2002
- Ulbrich, Hans/Wolfram, Micheal: *Giordano Bruno – Dominikaner, Ketzer, Gelehrter*, Königshausen u. Neumann, Würzburg 1994
- Verrechhia, Anacleto: *Giordano Bruno*, Böhlau, Wien 2002
- Wehr, Gerhard: *Giordano Bruno*, Dtv, München 1999
- Wildgen, Wolfgang: *Das kosmische Gedächtnis – Kosmologie, Semiotik und Gedächtnistheorie im Werke Giordano Brunos (1548 -1600)*, Lang, Frankfurt am Main u. a. 1998
- Winter, Jochen: *Giordano Bruno – Eine Einführung*, Parerga, Düsseldorf 1999
- Winterfeld, Uta von: *Naturpatriarchen. Geburt und Dilemma der Naturbeherrschung bei geistigen Vätern der Neuzeit*, Oekom, München 2006
- Yates, Frances A.: *Giordano Bruno and the Hermetic Tradition*, London/New York 1964

Project Goals / Research Questions

In summary, this project is to answer mainly the following questions:

- What are the substantial-structural similarities between the various matriarchal myths, and how are the latter brought to common ground?
- If brought to common ground, which structural elements are characteristic of this common „ontological substrate” of matriarchal myths?
- What are the differences between the basic ontological assumptions of matriarchal myths and those of the occident’s classic Christian-Greek tradition of philosophy?
- Is it possible to transcribe, for comparative ends, the “interconnectedness of all beings” inherent in the matriarchal myth into the terminology of occidental metaphysics? If so, what are the possible ways to elaborate a conceptual commensurability of patriarchal occidental metaphysics and matriarchal mythology?
- What would a „Matriarchal Philosophy of Nature” based on the matriarchal myths look like, and how would it have to be ontologically determined?
- Are there any thinkers and currents within patriarchally defined occidental philosophy that one could build upon in this research project?
- How apt is Bruno’s philosophy of nature in terms of the closer definition of the basic ontological structure of „Matriarchal Philosophy of Nature“, and are there any cross-cutting features between the matriarchal and Brunian philosophies of nature?
- If so, what are the analogies, and how can one highlight the latter in an ontologically precise fashion?
- Does Giordano Bruno explicitly or implicitly follow a “matriarchal tradition”?
- What is the purpose of following Giordano Bruno’s ideas in light of the current crisis of civilization that is based on an incorrect understanding of the concept of and relation to nature?