

Giordano Bruno
Teaches Aristotle

Studia Classica et Mediaevalia

Band 12

**hrsg. von
Paolo Fedeli und Hans-Christian Günther**

**Accademia di studi italo-tedeschi, Merano
Akademie deutsch-italienischer Studien, Meran**

Paul Richard Blum

**Giordano Bruno
Teaches Aristotle**

Translated by Peter Hennefeld from the German *Aristoteles bei Giordano Bruno*, *Studien zur philosophischen Rezeption*. München (Fink) 1980 (*Die Geistesgeschichte und ihre Methoden* 9).

This publication was made possible by the Czech Science Foundation, as part of the project GA R 14-37038G “Between Renaissance and Baroque: Philosophy and Knowledge in the Czech Lands within the Wider European Context”, and by the Center for The Humanities at Loyola University Maryland.

Verlag Traugott Bautz

Bibliografische Information Der Deutschen Nationalbibliothek
Die Deutsche Nationalbibliothek verzeichnet diese Publikation in der
Deutschen Nationalbibliografie; detaillierte bibliografische Daten sind
im Internet über <http://dnb.d-nb.de> abrufbar.

Cover: Illustration of the coincidence of the maximum with the minimum, the
straight with the curved line, and the circle with the point. From Giordano Bruno: *De
triplici minimo et mensura*. Frankfurt 1591, chapter 4, p. 10.

Verlag Traugott Bautz GmbH 99734
Nordhausen 2016
ISBN 978-3-95948-124-3

Table of Contents

Preface to the English Edition 7

Foreword to the German Edition 11

Introduction

- a. Topic and task 15
- b. Bruno's teachings on Aristotle 21
- c. Overview of the order of presentation 25
- d. Preliminaries to Bruno's method of reception 26

I. Logic

- 1. Aristotle's Topics 37
- 2. Transcendental Logic 42
- 3. Ars Lulliana and Ars Memoriae 46
- 4. Syllogisms and Categories 52
- 5. Ens Rationis and Ens Reale 60

II. Cosmology

- 6. Location and Space 67
- 7. Abstraction and Extrapolation 78
- 8. Multitude of Worlds 90
- 9. The Infinite 94
- 10. Distinctions of the Infinite 103
- 11. Natural and Relative Location 109
- 12. The Infinite by Division 117
- 13. The Minimum 122
- 14. Time and the Atom of Time 131

III. Principles of Nature

- 15. Teleology and Reason in Nature 144
- 16. The Concept of Nature in Bruno's Philosophy 155
- 17. Matter as Substratum of Forms 159
- 18. The Mode of Being of Matter:
 Substratum, Substance, Subject 166
- 19. The Principles Matter and Form 179
- 20. Matter in the Dialectic Oneness of Being 191
- 21. The Natural Principles
 in the Context of the Method of Reception 199

IV. Unity and Multiplicity

- 22. Unity as Substance 205
- 23. The Unmoved Mover 213
- 24. Physical and Metaphysical Motion 225
- 25. Immanence and Transcendence
 in the Unity of God and Nature 231
- 26. Absolute Immanence 240
- 27. Verification 248
- 28. Thought as Motion 257
- 29. Outcome and Conclusion 266

Abbreviations 275

Bibliography 279

Index of Names 293

Preface to the English Edition

This is a study of a pivotal moment in the history of modern philosophy: Giordano Bruno teaches how to read Aristotle.¹ Bruno's appropriation of Aristotle is a paradigmatic case of philosophy in the making through challenging past philosophy. Bruno was trained in the late scholastic philosophy and theology, as was the rule among the Dominican friars; however, he acquainted himself also with deviant traditions, for instance Platonism and Epicureanism. What is important for our understanding of philosophy in general is this: Bruno deliberately used the philosophers of the past for the sake of developing his very original positions. As will become clear in this study, he was not a historian of philosophy and, yet, he neither claimed to be solving philosophical problems just so; rather, he was aware that every philosophical problem has its history and that without such history the problem would not even exist.² Therefore he attacked Aristotle who was the originator of a clear set of philosophical

¹ Bruno was born in Nola in 1548, entered the order of the Dominicans, but soon after obtaining a doctorate, he started a journey through Europe in search of material and intellectual support. After appearances, among others, in Paris, London, Prague, Wittenberg, and Padua he was arrested and interrogated by the Inquisition in Venice and Rome; in 1600 he was condemned a heretic and burned at the stake in Rome. For details see Blum 2012 (below note 3) and Ingrid D. Rowland, *Giordano Bruno: Philosopher/Heretic*. New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 2008.

² As Eugenio Canone recently put it: If any paradigm is to count at all then "in making the doctrines of the past live": "Giordano Bruno – Portrait of a Philosopher Opposed to the Authority Principle," in Martin McLaughlin et al. (eds), *Authority, Innovation and Early Modern Epistemology: Essays in Honour of Hilary Gatti*. Cambridge / Leeds: Legenda, 2015, pp. 106-117; 110. Cf. Paul Richard Blum, "How to Think with the Head of Another? The Historical Dimension of Philosophical Problems", *Intellectual History Review* 26 (2016), forthcoming.

problems, as discussed in this book. In waging his anti-Aristotelian campaign Bruno proved that many problems of philosophy, most notably the notions of being and cognition, are latent in Aristotle's method and conclusions. One successful way of solving philosophical problems, as shown paradigmatically by Bruno, consists in uncovering them at their origin, reformulating them and drawing new conclusions. In other words: the thorough study of the history of philosophy generates philosophy.

The opportunity to republish one's book after many years in a new translation is humbling. I am grateful to my colleagues who urged me to make my book available to an English reading audience, especially Marco Sgarbi (Venice). Naturally I was tempted to edit and partially rewrite the book, but then I realized that I could not dedicate as much attention and diligence to it as I had when writing it. Hence its coherence and focus could go lost tampering with it. However, updating the book in details would not be necessary because its main message – the paradigm of philosophy in the making – needs no updates.³ Needless to say that

³ As to my own later publications on Bruno I may mention the following: *Giordano Bruno: An Introduction*. Translated by Peter Henneveld. Amsterdam: Rodopi, 2012. *Early Studies of Giordano Bruno* (Series of reprints: Bartholmèss 1846-47; Clemens 1847, Frith 1887; Tocco 1889-1892), 6 vols. with Introductions and Bibliographies, Bristol (Thoemmes Press) 2000. 'Istoriar la figura': Syncretism of Theories as a Model of Philosophy in Frances Yates and Giordano Bruno, in: *American Catholic Philosophical Quarterly* 77 (2003) 189-212. Franz Jacob Clemens e la lettura ultramontanistica di Bruno, in: *Brunus redivivus, Momenti della fortuna di Giordano Bruno nel XIX secolo*, ed. E. Canone, Pisa-Roma 1998, 67-103. Giordano Bruno, Matthias Aquarius und die eklektische Scholastik, in: *Archiv für Geschichte der Philosophie* 72 (1990) 275-300. "Heroic Exercises: Giordano Bruno's *De gli eroici furori* as a Response to Ignatius of Loyola's *Exercitia spiritualia*," in *Brunina & Campanelliana* 18 (2012) 359-373. „Giordano Bruno's Changing of Default Positions," in *Turning Traditions Upside Down: Rethinking Giordano Bruno's Enlightenment*. Edited by Henning Hufnagel and Anne Eusterschulte. Budapest / New York: Central European University Press, 2013, pp. 13-18.

many a study of Bruno – and of Renaissance philosophy in general – has come out since this book appeared in public. However, the main reason why this book merits translation and republishing is the surprising fact that there is little later research on the key topic of this book.⁴ This is one more reason to leave the book basically unaltered. The original bibliography contained only those works that had influenced the book in the process of writing. Therefore, further additions are not needed, while, on the other hand, modern bibliographies are easily accessible.⁵ Bruno's works are cited

⁴ Recently was published Lucia Girelli, *Bruno, Aristotele e la materia* (Bologna: Archetipo Libri, 2013). Our book is not cited there. For further studies related to Bruno and Aristotle see, for instance, the editions: Giordano Bruno, *Acrotismo Cameracense. Le spiegazioni degli articoli di Fisica contro i peripatetici*, ed. Barbara Amato, Pisa-Roma: Serra 2009; *Centoventi articoli sulla natura e sull'universo contro i peripatetici – Centum et viginti articuli de natura et mundo adversus Peripateticos*, ed. Eugenio Canone, Pisa-Roma: Serra 2007. Cf. also Leen Spruit, *Natural Science and Human Knowledge in Giordano Bruno's Comments on Aristotelian Physics*, in *The Dynamics of Aristotelian Natural Philosophy from Antiquity to the Seventeenth Century*, ed. by Cees Leijenhorst et al. Leiden-Boston: Brill 2002, pp. 349-373; Leen Spruit, "Motivi peripatetici nella gnoseologia bruniana dei *Dialoghi italiani*," *Verifiche*, 18 (1989), 4, pp. 367-399; Rita Sturlese, "Averroes quantumque arabo et ignorante di lingua greca: Note sull'averroismo di Giordano Bruno," *Giornale critico della filologia italiana*, 71 (1992), 2, pp. 248-275; Maurizio Cambi, "Bruno commentatore di Aristotele: il 'De progressu et lampade venatoria logicorum,'" in *Autobiografia e filosofia: l'esperienza di Giordano Bruno: atti del Convegno Trento, 18-20 maggio 2000*, ed. Nestore Pirillo (Roma: Edizioni di storia e letteratura, 2003), 287-319; Eugenio Canone, *Il dorso e il grembo dell'eterno. Percorsi della Filosofia di Giordano Bruno*, Pisa-Roma: IEPI 2003, chapters III and IV on Averroes and on Aristotle's *Metaphysics*. Eugenio Canone, Germana Ernst (eds.), *Enciclopedia bruniana e campanelliana*, 2 vols., Pisa-Roma: IEPI 2006-2010.

⁵ The periodical *Bruniana & Campanelliana* publishes new studies and reviews. Additions to the bibliography of Salvestrini are available in Maria Cristina Figorilli and Alain Philippe Segonds, *Per una bibliografia di Giordano Bruno: 1800-1999*, Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 2003; Maria Elena Severini, *Bibliografia*

according to the editions available when the book was written. Several new editions of the collected and of individual works have been published since. For the purpose of this book there seems to be no need to prefer one or other modern text. The originals as quoted here are easily readable online at “La biblioteca ideale di Giordano Bruno”: <http://bibliotecaideale.filosofia.sns.it>.

Re-reading one’s own German and observing the translator struggling with it was an embarrassment at times. My language and style was that of a young man trying to establish himself as a scholar – and a German at that. German prose permits long-winded sentences with complex subordinate clauses, without becoming fuzzy. In the course of translation this virtue turns into a curse. Moreover, German philosophical style allows for subtleties that can be teased out of words with distinct derivatives and nearly synonyms. In interpreting the writings of Bruno – himself a hallmark of linguistic versatility – I did my best to exploit the richness of German philosophical style. It was a pleasure to work with the translator Peter Henneveld who unfailingly detected the linguistic problems, single handedly partitioned impossible sentences, reestablished transitions and coherence, and pointed out ambiguities in the German, finding elegant solutions in English. (It should be noted that all translations from the sources are ours, unless cited otherwise.) If the reader still thinks that this book is not an easy reading, I can only ask for patience and diligence. Philosophy dumbed down dies. The theme of this book is the appropriation of one thinker’s philosophy by another philosopher. That is not easy but it is what philosophers do.

Olomouc/Baltimore, Spring 2016
Paul Richard Blum

di Giordano Bruno: 1951-2000, Roma: Edizioni di storia e letteratura, 2002. I am indebted to Eugenio Canone for bibliographical information.

Foreword to the German Edition

When one presents a study on Giordano Bruno's polemics directed against Aristotle, and furthermore, when one presents such a study as part of a series which is dedicated to methodical problems of intellectual history, then the reader should also be provided with a preliminary note that points out the methodology applied – even at the risk of anticipating some points contained in the introduction. It would be presumptuous if the author interpreted his method as being exemplary; nonetheless it seems to have produced results which point beyond the immediate scope of the study.

As is well known, Bruno's works are inundated with fruits of all kinds of provenance in such a way that almost any one of Bruno's phrases which are of some philosophical pertinence has already been said by some other author. Reading Bruno's works critically therefore runs the risk of reducing Bruno's intellectual work to spheres of influence or of atomizing through in identifying the sources. And it would only be the lesser evil that, in doing so, Bruno's own work would be obscured; even more fatal would be the fact that a methodological legitimization of comparisons between Bruno and the respective influences would be missing completely inasmuch as any kind of comparison requires a secured instrument with respect to content or methodology.

However, as we will see in the introduction below, the author himself – Bruno – offers such an instrument in claiming that any philosophical critique has to present and justify the opponent until the starting points of the critique are disclosed. Consequently, a new approach has to result from the aporetic contradictions of the philosophy that is being revisited. Without addressing the philosophical problem of eclecticism, we are called to relate Bruno's way of thinking to the originals and models used by him. Now the perspective is reversed: We are not interested in

pursuing some particular source; rather, we will focus on Bruno's critical intention. In order to avoid being overwhelmed by an abundance of influences, the reader has every right to select a specific source as a research object according to personal preferences.

The main focus of this study was Aristotle. We intend to demonstrate that Bruno has indeed a very precise knowledge of Aristotle's works, and he quotes them in an equally precise and knowledgeable way. Furthermore, we want to demonstrate that Bruno sees through the philosophical intention of the authority and that he demonstrably and consistently revitalizes it in a fruitful way towards his own philosophical questions. In this way, Bruno's philosophy can be presented as an attempt to overcome Aristotelian aporetic solutions. We anticipate much in saying that Bruno understands the problem of Aristotle's *Metaphysics* as an epistemological problem which he intends to solve by means of abolishing the differentiation between subject and object in the reflection of the understanding intellect. The priority of reflecting subjectivity, however, yet again confirms Bruno's philosophical reception as well as the specific kind of researching the sources as pursued in this study.

The interpretation of how significant Aristotle was for Bruno led to a specific understanding of Bruno's philosophical intention. This may show the potential of looking for other sources used by Bruno which appear in a very peculiar assimilation. For example, his position regarding the Plotinian or Florentine nuances of Neoplatonism, Thomas Aquinas, or the problem of universals might provide further information regarding Bruno's philosophical method.

I am grateful to Prof. Dr. Stephan Otto for his encouragement, guidance, and supervision of this study and for accepting it as part of the series of publications. Prof. Otto is the Director of the "Institut für Geistesgeschichte des Humanismus" (Institute of Intellectual History of Humanism) which provided the

organizational and personal framework which allowed for this study to be written. I am grateful to all the members of the Institute for making this possible.

Munich, October 1978
Paul Richard Blum

Introduction

a. Topic and task

More than two centuries have passed since F. H. Jacobi published his “Excerpts from Jordan Bruno” (1789). Since then, Bruno’s works have been studied, and time and again there have been works that intended to present and acknowledge his philosophy in a general view. Simultaneously, however, there have been special studies regarding the particular and individual aspects,¹ and indeed it is time, as F. Papi suggested,² to drive forward in an intensified manner with such exploratory works in order to aid the understanding of Bruno’s significance in terms of historical philosophy. Both the research of individual works and problems and those studies that investigate Bruno’s sources, indispensable for any author, achieve this goal.³

Accordingly, no further justification is needed for us to investigate Bruno’s relationship with Aristotle: on the one hand, several treatises dealing with this subject have been written by Bruno himself and are known (we will indicate these treatises below); on the other hand, a comprehensive study of this subject is still missing. Apart from scattered remarks in almost all general and detailed presentations (which, understandably, never move beyond the conclusion that there seems to be an interplay between adaptation and simultaneous polemics)⁴ there are only two studies

¹ With special emphasis on F. J. Clemens, *Giordano Bruno und Nicolaus von Cusa*; regarding the history of reception, see also W. Beierwaltes, “Einleitung,” XXXIV-XL.

² Papi, *Antropologia*, p. IX.

³ We will refer to any studies which are connected to our field of study in the respective passages.

⁴ The following examples are one of the earliest and one of the most recent academic studies: Bartholmèss, *Jordano Bruno*, vol. 2, 316: “Nous avons

which have specifically dealt with this problem thus far: a dissertation by Hugo Wernekke, dated 1871, and an essay by John Powell, dated 1935.⁵ The dissertation meets the need for a structured compilation of Bruno's theses regarding his cosmology, influenced by Copernicus, and the comparison with the corresponding theorems of Aristotle. Powell's essay deals with the cosmological topic and is restricted to reflections about the postulate of perfection. Judging on the basis of the research situation, a study of Bruno's reception of Aristotle ought to be legitimate.

It is imperative to elucidate the subject area and method of our study: it does not claim to bring out Bruno's position regarding Aristotelianism in general, but rather regarding to the teachings of Aristotle himself. This reservation against the consideration of the historical development of Aristotelianism is made in the awareness of the fact that it must remain an unattainable goal to bring out *the* Aristotelianism which could be considered valid for Bruno's adoption and criticism. Bruno has access to theorems of Aristotelians of all stages in the history of the reception of Aristotle;⁶ therefore, it is illusory trying to determine globally what he understood by "Aristotelian" or "Peripatetic" unless it is being reconstructed which particular trend is being addressed in the individual case. The consequence is that one follows one particular variant of Aristotelian doctrine in Bruno's work. Bruno himself on

montré bien des fois, que Bruno se présente comme un adversaire d'Aristote; le moment est venu de faire voir qu'il est l'antagoniste des péripatéticiens de son époque, plutôt que d'Aristote même. Bruno s'avoue, dans plus d'un endroit, le disciple du Stagirite." Beierwaltes, "Einleitung," IX: Bruno endorsed the basic Aristotelian forms of thought, without which his innovations would be unimaginable and unintelligible.

⁵ Cf. the bibliography. O. Walzel's study, *Aristotelisches und Plotinisches*, deals with Plotinus' influence on Bruno's poeology.

⁶ Cf. the references throughout Tocco, *Le fonti*. Theoretical statements of Bruno are found in his *De l'infinito*, III, 467, and V, 499-500.

the one hand deals in various treatises with the work and teachings of Aristotle; on the other hand, and especially with regard to Bruno's purposeful mastering of the tradition, there are unambiguous indicators that Bruno knows to differentiate between Aristotelians and Aristotle himself.⁷ Therefore, it is not only rational but appropriate first of all to examine his position regarding Aristotle.⁸ It is a truism that Bruno, for example, intended to use his Paris theses to aim at the Peripatetics of his time⁹ as one can generally suppose that he wrote for a contemporary audience – for our purposes, it is decisive that in order to attain his goal, he did not compose a pamphlet against statements of nameable relevant authors at that time but goes back to the common source and criticizes the physical writings of Aristotle point by point.

This determines the formal method of this study: in all topical areas Bruno's criticism is always to be compared to the sources so as to raise the diverging points from the confrontation of both authors; finally, they are to be interpretatively evaluated. However, here it is necessary to clarify that there are no indicators whatsoever that Bruno read Greek; on the contrary, it can be verified that he always used Medieval Latin translations. The Latin Aristotle/Averroes edition,¹⁰ easily accessible to us in reprint, has proven to be useful and usable because of numerous literal correspondences between the medieval text and Bruno's

⁷ See below, beginning of Chapter II, section 8. – Beierwaltes, "Einleitung," XLIV, note 55: Bruno was aware of the scholastic reception of Aristotle.

⁸ Therefore, the use of "Aristotelian" throughout this study always refers to Aristotle himself.

⁹ Cf. Bartholmèss, as quoted in note 4, as well as below, beginning of section (d) of the Introduction.

¹⁰ *Aristotelis opera cum Averrois commentariis*, Venice 1562 (reprint: Frankfurt 1962). This edition provides a translation in Medieval Latin and one in Humanistic Latin.

quotations.¹¹ This study is not concerned with an interpretation of the genuinely Aristotelian way of thinking; rather, it intends to find out how Bruno received and understood Aristotle, what he adopts and what he criticizes. Therefore we will have no recourse to the editions which are substantial for modern research of Aristotle.¹²

The area of investigation is thus limited regarding the historical difficulty as well as the source material. Nonetheless, the purpose must not be a schematic enumeration of congruencies and divergences of isolated theses of both authors – especially since then immediately the demand of summary completeness would arise, and we do not intend to go there since it is unattainable. Rather, we try to find a method used by Bruno in dealing with his source, and we try to interpret which philosophical intentions manifest themselves in his reception so that the criticism of Aristotle becomes an indicator of his own philosophical achievement. Therefore the investigation needs to detach itself at times from the immediate comparative material in order to determine the systematic role of a theory within Bruno's thought and the impact of reading Aristotle on his way of thinking.

At this point, however, we must ask whether such an element of his theory should not also be determined with regard to the chronological place within Bruno's opus. We might ask whether we have the right to use the interpretation of one treatise in order to assess another treatise without prior categorizing it with regard to a possible development in his way of thinking. There have been several attempts to do such periodization. F. Tocco¹³ for example tried to delimit three phases: a 'Neoplatonic emanation,' a 'Heraclitean monism,' and finally an 'atomism according to

¹¹ See the parallels continually quoted throughout Chapters II and III.

¹² This should not discourage from occasionally consulting more contemporary literature regarding Aristotle in order to solve individual questions and especially for *further* reference to similar or corresponding problems.

¹³ Tocco, *Le opere latine*, 357.

Democritus and Leucippus.’ However, he feels forced to assume that Bruno himself did not have the full awareness of this development since to him these ‘philosophical systems’ did not make a substantial difference¹⁴ – and this means to admit the inappropriateness of this distinction with regard to Bruno’s own agenda and especially the fundamental continuity of his work. G. Gentile also arrives at the paradoxical conclusion that Bruno’s Neoplatonic (1st phase) pantheism (2nd phase) and monadism (3rd phase) are always interconnected and present in all three phases.¹⁵ Bruno refers in his later treatises to the earlier ones as valid discourses;¹⁶ this external argument as well contradicts such a division into periods. Therefore, we are dealing with changing topical focuses; however, they have nothing to do with a

¹⁴ Ibid.: “Ma, si può chiedere, ha il Bruno piena coscienza di queste trasformazioni, e delle profonde differenze che separano gl’indirizzi da lui successivamente abbracciati? Non certo, e la principal ragione è che egli non vede tra i sistemi filosofici quelle divergenze, che storicamente s’hanno da ammettere.”

¹⁵ Gentile, “Le fasi,” 320 and throughout the entire work. Namer, throughout *Il problema*, also voices agreement with regard to the consistency of Bruno’s work.

¹⁶ Bruno quotes from

De umbris idearum (1582) in De magia mathematica (1590), 502; and in De imaginum, signorum et idearum compositione (1591), 94 and more

Cantus circaeus (1582) in De imaginum, signorum et idearum compositione (1591), 193;

De compendiosa architectura (1582) in De progressu et lampade venatoria logicorum (1587), 82; and in De imaginum, signorum et idearum compositione (1591), 115 and more;

Triginta sigillorum explicatio (1583) in Lampas triginta statuarum (1591), 218; De la causa (1584) in Acrotismus (1588), 102; for more citations, see *Ursache*, note 110, 23.

De l’infinito (1584) in De rerum principiis et elementis et causis (1590), 510.

(This is not a complete and comprehensive list; dates according to Singer, *Giordano Bruno*, Appendix I. With regard to the references, see the List of Abbreviations.)

developmental process. Furthermore, his prolific authorship arose between 1582 and 1591, the years from his public appearance in Paris until his incarceration in Venice – an odyssey throughout Europe characterized by changes regarding circumstances and conditions but not by times of foundational refocusing.¹⁷ Therefore, if an interior biography of Bruno is to be drawn up, the decisive changes in orientation and establishing need to be transferred to the thirty-four years of Bruno’s life prior to the first publication; there are only indirect documents which deal with this time span. When A. Corsano retraced the “history of Bruno’s mind,”¹⁸ he actually showed the objective unfolding of interior consequences of Bruno’s basic concern, which has its basis in the early days, as Corsano continually emphasizes. Accordingly, N. Badaloni discussed especially Corsano’s interpretation of Bruno’s development *prior* to his first treatises and concluded that there are no more dramatic breaks in the overall picture of Bruno’s publications.¹⁹ Therefore, as long as there are no more detailed studies and investigations, we can regard Bruno’s work as an integrated whole.

Of course, no one should conclude that we intend to offer a general view of Bruno’s philosophy. Rather, we restrict ourselves to the greatest possible extent to his reception of Aristotle, excluding the interpretation of his position regarding other sources, such as the Aristotelian and Platonic traditions at large. Our conclusions regarding Bruno’s philosophical method, then, claim to be valid only insofar as they are obtained from his own critical

¹⁷ Cf. the biographies: Spampanato, *Vita*; Aquilecchia, *Giordano Bruno*.

¹⁸ Corsano, *Il pensiero*; in particular, pp. 265-275.

¹⁹ Badaloni, *La filosofia*, 3-10 (regarding Corsano); p. 112: “Non ci sono fratture in questo quadro [...]; dopo la rottura del primitivo materialismo, non ci sono drammatici passaggi da una posizione di pensiero ad un’altra [...]” Regarding Badaloni’s own reconstruction of Bruno’s early development, see below (Chapter III, note 141).

position regarding Aristotle. A comparative examination of the results presented here and other elements of his thinking and other receptions remains open.

After these formal preliminary considerations we need to characterize the main treatises in question, outline the structure of this study, and – finally – present an interpretation of Bruno’s own presentation of his method of reception which shall justify our own methodology.

b. Bruno’s teachings on Aristotle

In many of his works, Bruno comments in different ways on the philosophy of Aristotle. In the *Ash Wednesday Supper* and in *De l’infinito* he brings up for discussion theorems on nature, especially cosmology.²⁰ In *De la causa* he treats in a similar way the terms matter and form, potency and act – crucial terms used by Aristotle. In *Acrotism*, he formulates polemic theses against the philosophy of nature and the cosmology as found in *Physics*, as well as *De caelo*; at the same time, he proposes a plain compendium in the *Figuratio physici auditus*. In the same sober style, however this time centered on his own doctrine, he treats the same questions in the third part of his Frankfurt trilogy (*De minimo, De monade, De immenso*).²¹

Furthermore we possess a treatise in which 52 terms are being explained on three levels: first, regarding their meaning, then

²⁰ Regarding the general characteristics of the treatises mentioned here and in the following sections, we would like to refer to the studies done by Felice Tocco (*Le opere latine* and *Le opere inedite*), Augusto Guzzo (*Giordano Bruno*), as well as Virgilio Salvestrini’s bibliography.

²¹ Frankfurt, 1591; the dedicatory letter proves that this treatise is in fact designed and intended as a trilogy (*Opera* I 1, pp. 193-199; here: p. 196); cf. Aquilecchia, *Giordano Bruno*, 82.

as applied to “God or Mind” and “intellect or idea.”²² Bruno’s student Raphael Eglin (also Egli; 1559-1622) published this treatise in 1595 under the title “*Summa terminorum metaphysicorum*”; by this time, Bruno had been a prisoner of the Inquisition for three years.²³ In 1609, a second edition was published, and this edition had been enlarged with the part of the mentioned applications as well as two more indices of terms written by other authors.²⁴ This fact is due to the intention of the editor to provide a useful manual for philosophy students – not a manual of the specific terminology used by Bruno, but rather a manual of Aristotelian philosophical terms.²⁵ For the same reason the editor provided the title of the treatise (*Summa terminorum*),²⁶ which was by no means given by Bruno himself. Rather, Eglin drew his material from a lecture entitled “*Lampas de entis descensu*,” given in Zurich by his teacher, which he had written

²² *Summa terminorum metaphysicorum* (*Opera* I 4), esp. p. 73; the third application with regard to “*amor seu anima mundi*” is mentioned but not preserved. Due to the interpretative importance of the problems of tradition it is necessary to take a closer look at bibliographical issues.

²³ Bruno was arrested on May 23, 1592 (Aquilecchia, *Giordano Bruno*, 85). Regarding Raphael Eglin, cf. Bartholmèss, *Jordano Bruno*, vol. 1, 182, note 1; Spampanato, *Vita*, 449.

²⁴ For a detailed description of both editions, see Salvestrini, *Bibliografia*, nos. 209 and 210. An excerpt from a treatise by Pseudo-Athanasius and a treatise by Rudolph Goclenius were added to the second edition; cf. *Opera* I 4, 127-128.

²⁵ Eglin in *Summa terminorum metaphysicorum*, 5, 11-13: “*hunc libellum, non magnopere a doctrina Peripateticorum abhorrentem, et utilem et gratum fore studiosis omnibus spero.*”

²⁶ The title “*Summa terminorum*” runs throughout the entire 1609 edition. The fact that a former reader wrote an alphabetical topical index on the endpaper of the copy held in the Biblioteca Nazionale in Florence (Fondo Guicciardini 2.4².64) proves that the book was perceived as a philosophical dictionary. A comparison of the listed terms shows that there are almost no overlaps of the three topical indices.