

Johannes Amos Comenius [Leszno] to Samuel Hartlib [London]
[between November 1638 and the beginning of January 1639]

Comenius decided to send some news even if unpleasant rather than send nothing at all. He read the news from Hartlib lately about Jungius who has decided to publish nothing more during his lifetime because of the misunderstanding his works evoked. Comenius has been surprised by the human folly and envy that does not favour any advance in sciences and had not realized that the same danger threatens him. A Polish noble (Hieronymus Broniewski) accused Comenius of heresy while sending his notes to his Praeludia conatum pansophicorum to the Elders of the Church. There has been a session about this matter and Comenius defended himself. He even asked (in vain) to be discharged from school as the noble accused him of being a bad influence on youth.

Jesus!

637(r)

Scripsi 15. Julii (Gregoriani scilicet calendarii, quomodo velim intelligas semper temporis assignationem; eo enim utimur hic calendario) atque per Dantiscum misi, uti ex adjacente copiâ intelliges. (Nunc per Lipsiam: paucis quidem propter turbatum
5 mentis statum et alia impedimenta, quia tamen frequentiores promisi, malo etiam pauca et ingrata quam nihil.)

Cum nuper in submissis à Te legerem Dominum Jungium pulchris inventis suis logicis tam exiguam iniisse gratiam Rostochii et Hamburgi, ut potius crabronum instar non philosophi solum, sed et theologi involent in bonum virum (unde fit, ut ille animi fractus
10 vix quidquam suorum publicari velit se vivo), mirari coepi stultitiam humanam sibi et seculo profectus qualescunque invidentem; sed et invidiae ac τῆς διαβολῆς vim optimos etiam conatus retundere valentem. Id autem cogitans nesciebam ejusdem bestiae mihi quoque jamjam imminere dentes. Intra enim paucos dies haec, quae referam, accidere. Nobilis quidam Polonus, non postremè literatus, confessionis nostrae, datis ad ecclesiae
15 seniores literis queri coepit, foveri et ad munia publica promoveri homines suspectos, obtestans per omnia sacra, ut periculis maturè obviam eatur. Misitque annotationes suas in Praeludia conatum pansophicorum, quibus evincere laborat, sub methodi concinnitate teterrimum nescio quod errorum chaos mundo propinari, nominatim
20 Divinam sapientiam humanae, coelum terrae permiscendi. Ridere primum libuit vanitatem hominis, tanto conatu tantas nugae agentis; sed cum viderem gloriae Dei zelum (637v) praetendi et in suspicionum partes alios atque alios trahi, non potui non animadvertere serium adversandi Satanae pio proposito conatum. Accedit, quod adjungere se actoris partibus velle videntur, qui non debent, stimulante (ut interpretantur qui melius,
25 quid morbi sit invidia, intelligunt) livore.

Consessus jam ea de re habitus, heri; examinataeque illae Aristarchi mei Animadversiones quinquaginta, ad quas ego sic respondi, ut nullitas earum liquidò apparet

1 Jesus! in BODL ad dextram marg. N.º 5. positum – 2 scilicet scripsi] scil: BODL; scil. Kvač – 2 quomodo BODL] quo modo Kvač – 6 nihil.) scripsi] nihil. BODL; Kvač (qui utrobique alterum uncinulum mox ante, scilicet post impedimenta posuit) – 7 Cum nuper sine intervallo BODL, Kvač – 9 animi BODL (forsan recte, v. commentarium)] animo Kvač – 14 postremè BODL, KvačKorr II] postremo KvačRef – 20 permiscendi BODL] promiscentem Kvač – 26 Consessus jam intervallum Kvač inseruit; sine quo BODL – 26 illae BODL] illius Kvač – 27 earum BODL] eorum Kvač

omnibus. Et quia ille inter alia protestatur periculo, si juventutis scholaeque regimen nobis committi, petii dimissionem, sed non impetravi. Hoc autem decretum est, ut quamprimum revocentur praecipui ecclesiae et ministrorum patroni (ille inprimis, qui hanc nobis intentat litem) denuoque et seriò recognoscantur omnia.

Ita vides, quo me praecipitaris immaturâ illâ Praeludiorum editione; ego autem me ipsum praefestinâ communicatione. Praestitisset haec tacitè agi, donec essent peracta. Confidamus tamen futurum, ut haec in eventum spe nostrâ meliorem disponat Sapientia Dei nostri. Et quidni hac fiducia utamur? Non nostrum utique negotium est, Dei gloria agitur: quam ille non deseret, sive per nos promotam velit, sive per alios. Mihi vel id solatio erit (si non dabitur prodire ultra), consevisse animorum agros seminio quodam novo, quâquâ tandem in herbam, florem, fructum erupturo. Id enim unde sperem, non deest jam.

(638r) Verum de hoc negotio et aliis pluribus proximè; exspecto enim in horas reditum Dantisco consulis nostri, | amici mei, et cum illo forsân Tuorum aliquid. Nunc nihil nisi in sinum Tuum effundere volui hunc meum dolorem: si tamen dolor dicenda est exasperata et magis etiam contra nitens bonae causae fiducia. Non enim usque adeò puer fui, heri, jam et nudius tertius, qui nescirem magna negotia sine magnis difficultatibus et impedimentis, sed et periculis tractari vix posse. Josuam sacerdotem describit nobis Zacharias stantem coram angelo Domini: sed mox ad latus ejus Satanam, qui adversaretur ei, atque si aliud non potest, commacularet et sordidaret vestes sacerdotis. Sed solatio est Jehovam increpare posse Satanam et reddere servis suis munditiem etc.

Interim Tu mecum Deum orabis, ut non deserat causam suam. D(ominum) Pöhmerum adhuc prospectamus indies. Ego mihi domum jam emi (ducentis et decem aureis nummis), quam immigrabo his diebus; utinam mecum lumen vultûs Dei nostri. Tu inque: Amen.

Atque jam vale. Te quoque Deus sospitet.

Amen. Amen. |

I periculo, si (periculo si BODL)] periculose Kvač - 2 dimissionem Kvač] dimissionem BODL - 3 quamprimum BODL] quam primum Kvač - 3 inprimis BODL] inprimis Kvač - 5 Ita vides sine intervallo BODL: Kvač signum praecisionis anteposuit - 5 praecipitaris in BODL corr. ex ? - 5s. me ipsum BODL] meipsum Kvač - 13 Verum de hoc negotio sine intervallo BODL, Kvač - 13 exspecto sec. Kvač] Exspecto BODL - 15 si tamen BODL (ubi si ad codicis tergum occultum)] tamen Kvač - 16 contra nitens BODL] contranitens Kvač - 19 Satanam scripsi] Sathanam BODL, Kvač - 21 Satanam et reddere sec. BODL (ubi Sathanam)] Sathanam qui adversaretur ei et reddere Kvač - 22 Interim Tu mecum sine intervallo BODL, Kvač - 23 indies BODL] in dies Kvač - 24 quam Kvač] quas scilicet supposito aedes pro domo ? BODL - 24 lumen BODL] tamen Kvač - 24s. nostri. Tu inque BODL] nostri Tuique Kvač - 26 Atque jam vale sine intervallo BODL, Kvač

SIGLA

| | |
|--------------------|---|
| <i>BODL</i> | Bodleian Library, Oxford, MS Rawl. C 911, ff. 637(r)–(638v) |
| <i>KvačKorr II</i> | Kvačala, Korrespondence II, 25 |
| <i>KvačRef</i> | Kvačala, Reform 101 |
| <i>Kvač</i> | consensus <i>KvačKorr II</i> et <i>KvačRef</i> |

This letter is one of seventy extant letters from Comenius to Samuel Hartlib. Their correspondence, however, must have been much larger. The edition is based on a scribal copy without a date, signature or address which is housed in the Bodleian Library, Oxford (MS Rawl. C 911, ff. 637(r)–(638v)). It is difficult to determine the exact date of this letter. Kvačala supposed it was written in September 1639 (Kvačala, Korrespondence II, 25) or in August 1639 (Kvačala, Reform 101). Reber (VSJAK I, 392) gave the same datation as Kvačala. Both datations of the letter are impossible since the second edition of *Conatuum Comenianorum praeludia* already appeared in September 1639 under the authorised title *Prodromus pansophiae* together with the *Dilucidatio* reacting to Broniewski's objections. Stanislav Souček criticised both datations and suggested that the letter was written in early January 1639 or the end of 1638 (Souček, Archiv, 464ff). A meeting with the elders, which Comenius mentions in his letter as having taken place the day before, discussed Broniewski's objections for the first time, allowed Comenius to answer them, and decided to convene another meeting of the nobles. According to Souček this meeting of the nobles and protectors of the Brethren took place at the end of January 1639 and two months afterwards the convocation of 20–21 March 1639 followed where Comenius defended himself publicly. Comenius himself gives this sequence without concrete dates in *Continuatio*, 49. Souček later changed his mind (Souček, Ke Komenského) and argued that the letter must have been written even earlier, probably in November 1638. He based this conjecture on two facts. The Brethren synod of 15–21 October 1638 did not discuss Broniewski's objections, therefore it seems that he sent them later. At the same time, Hartlib's introduction to the second edition of *Prodromus* which was dated 11 January 1639 (1 January according to the Julian calendar) proves that he already had Comenius's *Dilucidatio* written as reaction to Broniewski's accusations. Therefore, concludes Souček, the letter in question must have been written considerably earlier, before Comenius wrote *Dilucidatio* and sent it to Hartlib. This conclusion, however, remains questionable. Hartlib might have written his introduction later and added an earlier date to it. Hübner's letter to Comenius of 14/24 December 1638 does not mention *Dilucidatio* or the affair with Broniewski. The meeting which had taken place the day before Comenius wrote his letter and which he mentioned as "consensus" might have happened at the beginning of January. On the other hand, Broniewski wrote to Marcin Orminius on 5 January 1639 alluding to some paragraphs from *Dilucidatio*. This was most probably its first printed version published in Leszno in 1638 (if the year is correct) but Broniewski also could have had some manuscript material (cf. Hendrich, Comeniana, 4–8; Čapková – Pavlíková, Nález). It seems that Hübner received this printed version (or a manuscript draft) in early January too (most probably via Hartlib) since he mentioned it in his letter to Comenius of 18/28 January 1639 (see below, pp. 28, 32b). This would mean that the meeting ("consensus") which had taken place the day before Comenius wrote his letter happened earlier, perhaps already in November 1638, as suggested by Souček (Souček, Ke Komenského). For comments on the datation see also recently Kłosová, O Předešle pansofie. The manuscript of the letter was compared with two modern editions.

Editions: Kvačala, Korrespondence II, 25; Kvačala, Reform 101.

- 17 2 *Scripti 15. Julii* This letter which follows the one of 1 July 1638 (DJAK 26/I, 212–214) is not extant.
- 4 *copiā* This copy of a letter of 15 July is not extant.
- 7 *in submissis à Te* Probably a copy of a letter from Hartlib which is not extant.
- 7 *Jungium* Joachim Jungius (1585–1657), see DJAK 26/I, 83b. Because of the mentioning of philosophers, it seems that Comenius refers here to the controversy between Johannes Scharff and Jungius. See Elsner – Rothkegel, Der Briefwechsel, 19–20. Cf. Hartlib to Tassius, 10 August 1638, Staats- u. Universitätsbibliothek Hamburg, Sup. Ep. 100, 60B. Hartlib thanked Tassius for Jungius's *Logica* and expressed his regrets that Jungius should have struggled against misinterpretations.
- 9 *animi fractus* An unusual phrase, but cf. similar phrases *animi incertus* (*dubius, anxius*) which appear in Terentius, Sallustius, Vergilius and Livius, v. TLL s. v. *animus* (col. 100). (M. Steiner)
- 14 *Nobilis quidam Polonus* Hieronymus Broniewski, a Polish noble, member of the Polish branch of the Unity of Brethren. He participated in the colloquium charitativum in Toruń in 1645.
- 16s. *annotationes suas* Broniewski sent his fifty critical objections under the title *Annotatiuncula quaedam in praeludia Comeniana ad Portam Sapientiae* to the Brethren elders. The scribal copy preserved in HP 7/62/1A–4B. He also criticised pansophia in his letter to Marcin Orminius, 5 January 1639 (HP 7/62/4B–6A).
- 17 *Praeludia conatuum pansophicorum* Hartlib printed this work without Comenius's agreement

under the title *Conatum Comenianorum praeludia* in Oxford in 1637. See DJAK 15/II, 402–406 and most recently Klosová, O Předehře pansofie. See also Comenius to Hartlib, 26 January 1638, DJAK 26/I, 190–196.

- 17 26 *Consensus* The exact date of this meeting is uncertain. It might have happened most probably between mid-November 1638 and the beginning of January 1639.
- 26 *Aristarchi mei* Aristarchus of Samothrace (c. 220–c. 143 BC), a Greek grammarian and librarian. Here the name is used for a critic of Comenius, Broniewski.
- 18 1s. *periculo, si ... committi* The sentence is unusual from the syntactic point of view. To combine a conditional sentence with an infinitive form is acceptable in the colloquial style only with reservations. In addition, Comenius admitted

that he was writing the letter in anger. It is possible that the author finished this sentence inconsistently with its beginning and forgot to correct its first part or that a scribe made a mistake in transcription. (M. Steiner)

- 3s. *quamprimum revocentur praecipui ecclesiae et ministrorum patroni ... et recognoscantur omnia* It is unclear when this meeting of secular patrons of the Unity of Brethren took place, perhaps at the end of January 1639. It seems that the issue was discussed again during the synod on 5–9 September 1639.
- 5 *Praeludiorum editione* See above.
- 14 *consulis nostri* It is unclear who this friend of Comenius was.
- 19 *Zacharias* See Zech. 3:1.
- 22s. *Pöhmerum* Johann Abraham Poemer (1604–1687), see DJAK 26/I, 207b.

Edited by Martin Steiner, annotated by Vladimír Urbánek.

Joachim Hübner (London) to Johannes Amos Comenius [Leszno]
28 January 1639

Hübner has received Comenius's letter in which he invited Hübner to collaborate with him on pansophic work and asked him to express his opinion on some discrepancies between their original proposals. Hübner is happy to take part in this work and explains and corrects his opinion in the following matters: a) On the matter (materia) of knowledge. Hübner wanted to add another source to the three sources of Comenius (God is recognized in the inaccessible light, creatures in their sedes, i.e. habitat, Man in himself). Now he considers his idea wrong, his fourth source of knowledge (water) is only to be subordinated to the first three. The mistake resulted from his confused understanding of the Scripture, where the metaphor of water is frequent. b) On the means of knowledge. He respects the triad: individual study, experience of others (both oral and written description) and God's revelation. c) On the way of gaining knowledge through these means; the three means must be combined. d) On the division of pansophia. In spite of Comenius's triad: Pansophia, Historia, Pandogmatia, Hübner wishes Pansophia to be followed by Historia and Philologia. Comenius is considering only the most needed parts; Hübner, however, would like to encompass all knowledge but in fundamentals only. Hübner will not respond to Comenius's Dilucidatio for now, as long as the treatise has not been finished. He further encourages Comenius to work on his studies in physics and metaphysics. Hübner also repeats his opinion that a great number of collaborators are needed for the pansophic work. However, they might be able to compose Prodigium, a short version of Pansophia, which could serve as an introduction. Hübner has already discussed this with Hartlib and would like to know Comenius's opinion on the matter. Hübner has been recently writing a paper in which he explains how to promote Pansophia and what its likely expenses are. It could help Hartlib to find sponsors.

Christus Sapientia nostra!

Reverende vir, amice plurimum observande,

(6v)

quo nihil exoptatius hoc praesertim ineuntis anni exordio contingere mihi potuit,
advenere octo abhinc diebus literae Tuae, totae cum summi amoris, tum interioris
5 sapientiae odore fragrant, hoc uno tantum graves, quod in meas laudes effusae reciproc
ciprocae humanitatis debito rigidè nimis mihi interdiciunt et ad ipsamet statim rerum
capita responsurum vocant. Nimirum collaboratorem me Tibi, non collaudatorem vis
et ideò me laudas, ut quid agendum sit, tantò compendiosius et velut aliud agendo mihi
injungas. Utcunque durum sit silere, cum tanta de me ad me loquaris, cum interioris
10 juxta amicitiae et laborum pansophicorum conscientiam et societatem ultrò cooptes,
nam vel arrogans videar, nisi removeam ad me non spectantia, vel ingratus, si non
agnoscam à Te adeò amanter mihi oblata; Tuis tamen mandatis, quam meae voluntati
et recepto mori morem geri aequius est, hac ex silentio commoditate, quò incom-
parabiles dotes Tuae sic meâ non deterentur infantiâ majorque et illibatio erit apud
15 tacentem Tui observantia et veneratio. Id tantùm profiteri hîc semel licebit, quando

1 Christus in *BL*₁ in marg. sinistro alia recentiore manu adscriptum; No. 2] in *BL*₂ in marg. dextro alia recentiore manu adscriptum No. 3 – 5 laudes effusae *BL*₁, *KvačKorr I*] laudes adeò effus(...) *BL*₂, ubi litterae ad marginem illegibiles – 7 responsurum *BL*₁, *BL*₂] responsum *KvačKorr I*

συνέργου honore me dignatus es, annexurum me omnibus viribus, ut si minus ingenio et eruditione, docilitate tamen et laboris promptitudine et constantiâ expectationi Tuae satisfaciam, in caeteris submisso veneratus Deum, coelestem nostrum Patrem, ut rata facere dignetur preces et vota Tua, quae sub initium et finem svavissimae epistolae Tuae effudisti longè calidissima. Illo coeptis nostris annuente et suam exerente 5 omnipotentiam in imbecillitate nostrâ irritus non erit labor noster et omnis in ipsum, gloriae omnis fontem, exindè redibit gloria.

7(r) Felices nos, si fideles reperiamur operarii in vineâ Domini! Et, spero, reperiemur, quia fidelis est, qui nos vocavit et tam mira hactenus suae in utrumque nostrum benignitatis indicia prodidit. Hoc non hujus tantum, sed complurium posthac Deo volente 10 epistolarum mearum prooemium erit, etiam cum non erit. | Ne illis, de quibus minimè dubitas, charta occupata illa excludat, quae scire ex me maximè cuperes. Ingeniosas blanditias aulae sibi habeant, nostra non verbis, sed factis constabit amicitia. Pergratum fecisti ea ex meis responsioni Tuae excerpando, in quibus à me seorsim sentis. Plus me Tibi sic obligasti, quam si simpliciter omnia approbasses, quanto veritatis et scientiae 15 incrementa ex hoc rationum placido collisu egregiè subnascentia quemvis cordatum magis, quàm laudes propriae delectant. Quis timeat errare, quando sic alteri sui uberius instruendi occasionem subministrat? Tale beneficium mei à Te errores reportarunt, et ne offensam suspiceris aut mantellum, à me quoque in apricum producendi et meis ipsius telis configendi sunt. Non probas igitur, quòd in constituendis omniscientiae 20 nostrae fontibus quaternionem ternario Tuo praetulerim. Quo plenius et distinctius patefiat, quid in illo priorum literarum mearum capite probem, quid improbem, patiaris, quaeso, summam Tibi dictorum, aut potius dicendorum paucis hic repeti. Concipiendae ibi quàm perfectissimae futurorum operum ideae rationem tradere animus fuit; eam verò, antequam per partes enucleatius deducerem (quod aliae occupationes tum 25 non permiserunt), sequentia paulò diligentius disquirenda fuerunt. 1. Quenam justa scientiae nostrae esset materia, seu quid ab homine sciri posset? 2. Quibus mediis sciri posset? 3. Quomodo per haec media sciri posset, deberet? 4. Quomodo ita cognita quàm perfectissimè disponi. Ipsa enim tradendi ratio, quae praeter ordinis concinnitatem alia plura sibi vindicat, ad alterum propositae consultationis caput rectius pertinuit. 30

De primo igitur si quis, quanam plena scientiae nostrae materia seu objectum sit, quaerat, brevissima responsio erit esse id *totum hoc Universum*, in quo nihil praeter Creatorem et creaturas. Quas docendi gratiâ Illi benedicto in secula jungi, non magis 35 ad ignominiam ejus tendere mihi videtur, quàm illud apo|stolorum: visum est Spiritui S(ancto) et nobis etc.; quo plura de his ignoraverimus, eò longius ab illâ, quam commendamus et urgemus, omniscientiâ abfuerimus. Hoc volui fontibus illis, quos primaevos seu genuinos appellavi, propterea quòd res ita, uti in se sunt, exhiberent: Deum in luce illâ inaccessibili, creaturarum quamlibet in sede seu elemento suo, hominem in se ipso perfectissimè cognosci. Nec refert, quod nos in hac mortalitate Deum in inaccessibili luce cognoscere nequeamus. Verissimum enim nihilominus manet in illa tantum plenissimè 40 cognosci. Fons quoque αὐτογενωσίας nostrae à fonte reliquarum creaturarum, quae extra nos, distinctae trichotomiae ergò retineri potuit, cum contemplandi semet ac nova

2 expectationi *scripsi*] expectationi *BL*₁, *BL*₂, *KvačKorr I* – 4s. finem svavissimae epistolae *BL*₁, *KvačKorr I*] finem epistolae *BL*₂ – 5 exerente *scripsi*] exerente *BL*₁, *BL*₂; exerente *KvačKorr I* – 10 indicia *BL*₂] iudicia *BL*₁, *KvačKorr I* – 11 prooemium *BL*₂, ubi *corr. ex praemium*] proëmium *BL*₁, *KvačKorr I* – 15 quanto *BL*₁, *BL*₂] quando *KvačKorr I* – 30 vindicat *BL*₁, *BL*₂] vindicat *KvačKorr I*

opera producendi potestate facile ab animatorum et inanimatorum grege secernatur. Alioqui ut pars Universi praestantissima creaturae vocabulo unâ absorbeatur.

Nihil itaque alienum à verò dixissem, si hîc substitissem. Ulterius progressus jure è calamo Tuo obelos elicui. Nam non tantum tribus illis genuinis fontibus quartum
 5 adjunxi, qui tamen aquarum ex prioribus manantium receptaculum potius quoddam, quàm fons quidam peculiaris est, adeoque inter instrumenta potius scientiae nostrae, quàm materiam referendus, sed etiam de quatuor horum fontium perpetuâ unione rectaque subordinatione multis egi, cum silentio doctrinam de mediis omniscientiae nostrae prorsus praeterivissem, sine quâ tamen rectus horum fontium usus plenè non
 10 explicatur. Fateor παρόρραμα hoc grande fuit, sed ita mero saepè in meridie caecutimus. Sanè cum ista scriberem, mihi ipsi non satisfaciebam, quominus tamen errorem deprehenderem, nihil aequè video obstitisse, quàm illam fontium metaphoram, quae nescio qua Venere prae aliis mihi sese tum commendabat, nec alio nomine à me recipiebatur, quàm ut nudam scientiae materiam designaret, quippe cum | et à Servatore nostro Spiritui S(ancto) fluviorum aquae viventis nomen attributum et à Petro mundum ex aquis
 15 extitisse disertè affirmatum meminissem. Verùm intentiori in hanc imaginem animo eadem nec libris, quippe ex quibus pleraque hodiè erudito peteretur, disconvenire visa est, qui dum plures, quàm opus erat, constituere laborat, cogitationum suarum fluxus extra ripas ire non animadvertit. Magnâ imposterum cautione, ne translatis vocabulis
 20 utar, quando propria suppetunt, in explicandis praesertim rebus siccis illis et abstractis, ubi vel levissimus inter principia admissus error omnem postmodum accuratae deductionis seriem turbat. Nunc opera dabitur, ut alveo suo redditus orationis cursus paucis exponat media et modum sciendi, quae secundo et tertio loco considerata dixi, sed in priori epistolâ partim omisi, partim confusè nec satis dilucidè proposui. Complectar
 25 verò sententiam meam paucis aliquot aphorismis.

I. Quicquid scimus, vel propriâ observatione et experienciâ, vel recipienda alterius traditione didicimus. Observationi nostrae praeter instinctum naturalem sensus interni et externi subserviunt et hisce subnixa ratio. Caeterum qui impertire nobis ignotorum cognitionem queat, aut ejusdem nobis, aut praestantioris naturae esse oportet, adeoque
 30 vel homines, vel angelos, vel ipsummet omnium conditorem Deum, qui omnes vel vivâ voce, vel scriptis adversum nos utuntur. Quibus nonnunquam tacitam et supernaturalem inspirationem et revelationem Supremus Deus (in cujus solius ea potestate est, nam de angelorum hoc in genere viribus nondum satis liquet) superaddit. Creata inferioris naturae propriè loquendo nos non docent, sed velut idonea cognitionis objecta sese
 35 nobis sistunt, nihil nisi scrutantibus et rimantibus nobis de sui naturâ communicatura. Porrò traditiones horum, quos diximus, quatenus de rebus sunt nos aut res caducas | spectantibus, iisdem animae nostrae facultatibus recipiuntur, quibus res incognitas
 40 scrutamur; coelestia et supernaturalia solus recipit spiritus noster, cui ut ait Paulus, testimonium dat Spiritus Dei nos esse filios Dei.

5 receptaculum *BL₂*, *KvačKorr I*] receptandum *BL₁* – 16 disertè *BL₁*, *KvačKorr I*] disertim *BL₂* – 19 imposterum *BL₁*, *KvačKorr I*] in posterum *BL₂* – 27 sensus *sec. BL₂* et *f. 9v*, ubi per instinctum naturalem, sensus et rationem legitur, temptavit Steiner] casus *BL₁*; seaus (*incertum*) *BL₂*, *KvačKorr I* – 29 queat *BL₁*, *KvačKorr I*] queant(...) *BL₂*, ubi litterae illegibiles – 32 inspirationem *BL₁*, *KvačKorr I*] inspira(...) *BL₂*, ubi pars chartae ad marginem deest – 32 cujus *BL₁*, *KvačKorr I*] quibus *BL₂* (*incertum*) – 33 hoc in genere *BL₁*, *KvačKorr I*] hoc (...) genere *BL₂*, ubi pars chartae ad marginem deest – 36 diximus *BL₁*, *KvačKorr I*] dix(...) *BL₂*, ubi pars chartae ad marginem deest – 37 facultatibus *BL₁*, *KvačKorr I*] [(...)tibus *BL₂*, ubi pars chartae ad marginem deest – 38 solus recipit spiritus *BL₁*, *KvačKorr I*] solu(...) spiritus *BL₂*, ubi pars chartae ad marginem deest