That the Portuguese have no right of dominion over the Indians by title of war.

Now that we have disposed of the pretexts just discussed, having plainly shown that (as Victoria\textsuperscript{k} himself declares) the Hispanic peoples did not carry with them to
After ‘agnoscere’ the ms. has an addition in the bottom margin which was later crossed out: ‘sicut inter alia regnum amplissimum Peruanum hoc titulo armis quaesitum est, quod Rex Atabaliba Breviarium Romanum paginis sibi aliquot expositis quasi nullius usus librum proiectisset’. In the margin: ‘v. Joh. Met. Praef. ad Osorium’; a reference to Johannes Metellus in his preface to Osorius, ed. fol. 12 v. The addition was probably written at the same time as the one on p. 12 which was not crossed out; the crossing out on p. 10 probably dates from the preparation for publication.

In the margin of the ms. there is a separate reference to ‘Matt. X. 23’, which was probably written before the references of note c. In Ml it was put at the end of note c. preceded by ‘argum.’; this probably meant that a general argument could (also) be taken from the text of Matthaeus. Hamaker puts the reference (in the form it has in the ms.) before the references of note c; Williams places it between the reference to Thomas and the one to Decretum Grat. Dist. 45, 5.

The conclusion which follows – ‘Quantum-cunque … bonis suis’ – is, apart from the passage in parentheses, literally taken from Victoria, De Indis, pars 1 num. 41 [= pars 2, num. 15], ed. p. 252, not mentioned by Grotius. The references to Thomas, the Decretum Gratiani and Innocentius (see...