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Introduction

1. The Manuscript

The text that is printed here for the first time is part of one of the Grotian manuscripts in the Amsterdam University Library, where they are on loan from the Remonstrant Church. The manuscript has the shelf-mark III C 5. As is clear from a handwritten note on the endpaper, Adriaen van Cattenburgh, the eighteenth-century biographer of Grotius and professor at the Remonstrant Seminary, deposited the manuscript at the library of the Remonstrant Community of Amsterdam on October 14, 1737 at the request of Pieter Cornets de Groot van Kraaijenburg (1684–1747), bailiff of the Marquisate of Bergen op Zoom and great-grandson of Hugo Grotius.\footnote{Therefore, this manuscript was not part of the famous collection of Grotiana that was put up for auction at Martinus Nijhoff’s in The Hague in 1864.}

The manuscript has 421 folios, not quite impeccably numbered by Grotius himself. Our tract is on folios 87–119 and is also separately paginated 1–68, presumably also by Grotius himself. Pages 53 and 54 are missing, although there is no gap in the foliation. It seems logical to infer from this that Grotius himself cut out the leaf, possibly to make use of it for another purpose. Since the volume contains several documents dating from the 1620s,\footnote{We have found no documents dated later than 1629.} we assume that Grotius arranged it and had it bound some time after 1630, when he felt the need to sort out his papers and bring together related documents in separate volumes.\footnote{Similar volumes in the same collection are MSS III C 2, III C 3, III C 4 and III C 6.} Self-made indexes, as can also be found in this volume, had to guarantee easy consultation.

The manuscript contains documents (and also some printed pamphlets) related to the conflict between Remonstrants and Counter-Remonstrants and is sys-
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tematically arranged. There is no general title; however, there are five sections, each beginning with a subtitle. Our tract is part of a section that starts on fo. 72 and is entitled 'Gebesoigneerde van H. de Groot tot de Accommodatie' (‘Grotius’ attempts to come to an accommodation’).

2. Authorship

The manuscript is anonymous and written by an unknown scribe. No explicit mention of it is found in Grotius’ correspondence. Nor is it referred to in his published works. In our view, however, there is sufficient reason to ascribe the tract to Grotius. Our arguments are the following:

- Immediately after his trial in 1619, when held in detention at Loevestein, Grotius wrote a ‘Memorandum of my intentions and noteworthy vicissitudes’, in which he mentions some unpublished works, which he describes as follows: ‘eenige ongedruckte geschriften, waerin ick vergadert hebbe de passagien van Remonstrantsgesinden ende anderen, dye malcander naest quamen op hoop van accommodatie’ (‘some unprinted writings, in which I have collected the passages of the Remonstrant-minded and others that came closest to one another, hoping to accommodate them’). One of these writings is, as it seems, Grotius’ Conciliatio dissidentium de re praedestinataria et gratia opinionum, written before April 1613 but only posthumously published in 1652; it seems not unwarranted to assume that our tract is another one.

- The manuscript has been corrected by Grotius himself, who has also added some passages in the text and some marginal references.

4 Cf. the description of the manuscript in M.B. Mendes da Costa – J. Berg, Bibliotheek der Universiteit van Amsterdam, Catalogus der handschriften VII, De handschriften, krachtens bruikleencontract in de Universiteitsbibliotheek berustende, Amsterdam 1923, pp. 41-42. See also A. Eyffinger, De handschriftelijke nalatenschap van Hugo de Groot, inventaris van de papieren in Nederlandse openbare collecties, Den Haag 1985 (unpublished typoscript); here, however, the first subtitle has erroneously been interpreted as the title of the whole; the further subtitles have not been identified as such.
