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The doctrine of ‘reason of state’ rose to prominence during the late sixteenth century in the aftermath of the publication of Machiavelli’s *Il Principe* (1532). Machiavelli often appeared as the personification of deceit and cunning. However his perception of the state was useful, and therefore appealing, to many early modern authors. Many attempted to reclaim the concept of ‘reason of state’ for the Christian prince. Machiavelli was thus dressed in priestly vestments and the way in which the state’s ethical responsibility was viewed was forever altered.\(^1\) Machiavelli’s first tailor, however, remains relatively unexplored: the Jesuit-trained Italian, Giovanni Botero.\(^2\)

Botero’s books remained extremely popular in Europe following the first publication of his *Della ragion di stato* in 1589.\(^3\) A plethora of Italian, Spanish, Latin and French editions were published in the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries.\(^\) However despite the book’s popularity, demonstrated by the striking number of editions published in continental Europe, the *Della ragion di stato* remained absent from the English printing press.\(^4\)

---


Yet England was arguably accustomed, and not always averse, to the doctrine of reason of state. Religious writers in England had already begun to tackle this seemingly new and pervasive set of abstract political principles. By 1621 we find members of the House of Commons itself incorporating the concept into their own speeches. The Della ragion di stato’s lack of English publication is, therefore, perhaps somewhat surprising, despite the fact Botero was Jesuit-trained. However, a little-explored English manuscript translation does exist in the Sloane collection of the British Library: Sloane MS. 1065. This translation – or rather an ‘Abstract’ of a translation – accompanied by an adjoining ‘Adjunct’, was written by one Richard Etherington in the second decade of the seventeenth century.

The manuscript is entitled ‘An Abstract of Boterus Della Ragione Di Stato With an Adjunct of Conservation of The State’. It is dedicated to ‘Sir Henry Hobart kn: and Baronet, Cheife Justice of his Mat:ies Courte of Common Pleas’. Though the manuscript has been cited in the secondary literature, most notably in Rabb’s history of Machiavelli’s reception and Mosse’s discussion of reason of state and religion, very little has been said about its composition and importance. The fortunes of the Della ragion di stato in England must surely begin with a discussion of the manuscript’s composition and content. This can then be used to indicate the reception of its author, Giovanni Botero, in England.

One must note that the British Library also holds a recently catalogued 1659 translation of the Della ragion di stato by William Lawrence: an until now unknown translation. Unlike Etherington’s version, this translation is not an ‘Abstract’. However it does not include an ‘Adjunct’ or a response from Lawrence himself. Thus Etherington’s translation remains the only known direct English response to the Della ragion di stato. Similarly it remains the only known early English translation of the Della ragion di stato. We might also note that Lawrence’s manuscript is not as complex as Etherington’s version. Though Lawrence’s manuscript might indeed be the presentation copy more thought seems to have been put into Etherington’s manuscript. The purpose of this article is, therefore, a material and textual analysis of the only known contemporary translation of Botero’s Della ragion di stato.

---


7 As will be shown in Part I. BL, Sloane MS. 1065: Richard Etherington, ‘An Abstract of Boterus Della Ragione di Stato with an Adjunct of Conservation of The State’. The first pages of the ‘Abstract’ and the ‘Adjunct’ can be seen in figures 1 and 2.

8 BL, Sloane MS. 1065, ff. 1r and 2r respectively. Note that all folio numbers referred to in these footnotes use the final numbering system indicated in figure 3.

9 The manuscript is briefly identified, without any exposition, in Mosse, The Holy Pretence, p. 35. Similarly the manuscript appears with little explanation in a footnote in Felix Raab, The English Face of Machiavelli: A Changing Interpretation 1500–1700 (Oxford, 1964), pp. 95–6. Etherington’s name is given at BL, Sloane MS. 1065, f. 3r. The manuscript is also used in Joanne Paul, ‘Counsel and Command in Anglophone Political Thought, 1485-1651’ (Unpublished Ph. D. thesis, Queen Mary, University of London, 2013). Paul uses Etherington to supplement her reading of Botero’s Della ragion di stato and in an appendix gives a partial transcription of the manuscript at pp. 336–61.

10 BL, Add. MS. 88928: William Lawrence, ‘Ragione di Stato Or Reason of State’.

11 Comparisons will be made with Lawrence’s translation throughout, as it manifests some important similarities.
Fig. 1. First page of Etherington’s ‘Abstract’ translation (BL, Sloane MS. 1065, f. 4r).
Fig. 2. First page of Etherington’s ‘Adjunct’ (BL, Sloane MS. 1065, f. 49r).
I. An Analysis of the Manuscript

The Author

One cannot currently be certain who Richard Etherington was but it appears that he was a lawyer.12 This is Mosse’s only inquiry regarding the manuscript. He briefly states that its author could be Sir Richard Etherington, a protestant lawyer from Eberston, North Yorkshire. If he was this Etherington then he was also a good friend of the Puritan Lady Hoby and received her and her husband at his house on 4 January 1599.13 It was in 1603 that this Richard Etherington was knighted.14 Mosse tells us that Etherington held all the major offices in Pickering, Yorkshire, from 1606 to 1612 before becoming a master in Chancery.15 He was outlawed for debt in 1621 when his manor was seized by the Crown.16 The supposition here is that he completed the manuscript in order to win back favour at court.17 However we might expect him to sign his name ‘Sir Richard Etherington’. Perhaps even more so given the effort, expense and dedication of the manuscript – as we shall see. If it was not this man it could in turn be his son, also named Richard Etherington, who became a member of Gray’s Inn on 10 August 1616.18 Equally it may also be another Richard Etherington, the son of George Etherington, who was admitted to Gray’s Inn on 3 June 1614. If we turn to the *Alumni Cantabrigienses* we actually find these two Richards listed under the same entry with the supposition that Richard Etherington of Eberston and George Etherington were brothers.19 Of course it may be another, unknown, Richard Etherington but, as we shall see, the manuscript was produced at some expense and dedicated to a high-ranking member of King James’s government: Sir Henry Hobart. Thus it seems likely

---

12 William Lawrence was also a lawyer. Indeed Lawrence’s letter of dedication is even signed ‘Middle Temple 1659’.
16 Mosse, *The Holy Pretence*, p. 35. Also see: ‘Parishes: Ebberston’, in *A History of the County of York North Riding*: vol. ii. Note that Mosse cites *The Publications of the Harleian Society: Yorkshire Pedigrees A-F* (London, 1942), pp. 176–7. Though a ‘Sir Richard Etherington’ appears in the ‘Etherington, of Driffield’ family tree, one should note that this family tree is misleading. The Sir Richard Etherington listed in this genealogy has a will dated 1675 and proved in 1676 which would surely be too late for him to be the Etherington knighted in 1603. Equally this Sir Richard Etherington does not have a son called Richard – the son who appears in the Admission Register to Gray’s Inn: Joseph Foster (ed.), *The Register of Admissions to Gray’s Inn, 1521–1889* (London, 1889), p. 144. It would seem that this genealogy is lacking some members of the family – i.e. another Richard Etherington.
17 ‘Parishes: Ebberston’, in *A History of the County of York North Riding*: vol. ii. Also cited in Paul, *Counsel*, p. 336. The conclusion that the Richard Etherington of Sloane MS. 1065 is this ‘Sir Richard Etherington’ is also the conclusion Paul reaches. Paul takes it for granted that Sir Richard Etherington is the Richard Etherington of Lincoln’s Inn and that he is also the ‘Ric: Etherington’ of BL, Sloane MS. 1065: Paul, *Counsel*, p. 336. Mosse merely suggests this conclusion is the correct one. *The Records of the Honorable Society of Lincoln’s Inn*, vol. i: *Admissions from A.D. 1420 to A.D. 1799* (Lincoln’s Inn, 1896), p. 97. It is interesting to note here that William Lawrence would have been around 46 when he completed his own translation.
18 Foster (ed.), *Register*, p. 134.
19 Foster (ed.), *Register*, p. 134; John Venn and J. A. Venn (ed.), *Alumni Cantabrigienses: Part 1, From the Earliest Times to 1751*, vol. ii, *Dabbs – Juxton* (Cambridge, 1922), p. 107. Indeed, in the genealogy cited by Mosse we find that the Sir Richard Etherington listed has a brother called George – however, once again this seems to be the wrong part of the family tree to work from given that this George was married in 1662 and has no children listed. Once again, this genealogy is insufficient to work from: *Yorkshire Pedigrees A-F*, pp. 176–7.
that the Etherington who produced the manuscript would be one of those mentioned. Indeed, 
far from being the work of a once great lawyer fallen from grace, the manuscript could be an 
attempt by a young lawyer aspiring for favour at court.

One must also note that a letter from Sir Richard Etherington appears in a collection put 
together by Sir Julius Caesar. The letter, regarding the forest of Pickering, is signed with a 
somewhat similar, simple, signature as concludes the dedicatory letter in the Botero manuscript.\(^{20}\) However, one cannot draw firm conclusions from this letter. The hands used in the letter and 
Sloane MS. 1065 are different. Similarly, though the signatures might hold certain similarities, 
they are too different to definitively prove they are the same. However, whoever Richard 
Etherington of Sloane 1065 was, we can note that he was likely from a protestant background 
and that he was trained as a lawyer.\(^{21}\) This is interesting given that the work is a translation of, 
and commentary on, a Jesuit-educated author’s treatise on reason of state.

**Binding**

The manuscript is now bound in a post-Sloane binding. The Sloane catalogue states that the 
Etherington manuscript was bound with two others in the Sloane collection and it was likely 
the British Museum that separated the three. Under the entry for Sloane MS. 1065 the catalogue 
states: ‘Paper, in folio, ff.77, XVII. Cent. Neatly written; bound with numbers 1432 and 
3610’.\(^{22}\) Indeed all three are now bound in the exact same style of binding and carry a common 
numbering system. The first manuscript said to be bound with Etherington’s is Sloane MS. 1432 
a translation by Henry Howard of Emperor Charles V’s ‘Last Instruction’ to his son Phillip II. 
The second is a collection of papers relating to the rule of Phillip III of Spain mainly in Spanish. 
Though the three pieces are somewhat related, in as much as they are discussions regarding the 
state and have connections to Spain, it is likely that Sloane had the three bound together because 
of their comparable sizes, something which was not uncommon.\(^{23}\)

In the top right corner of Etherington’s folios we find a numbering system written in red ink, 
perhaps Sloane’s, running from 1 to 77 and this carries on in Sloane MS. 1432 and then Sloane 
MS. 3610. This numbering system is crossed out in Sloane manuscripts 1432 and 3610 and 
each is given its own numeric identifier in pencil.

Etherington’s manuscript stands out among the three as being an expensively produced 
product. It is in a folio format, and the fact that it has been neatly ruled in red ink as the author 
proceeded, as opposed to having the folios pre-ruled, highlights the effort and probable expense 
that went into its production. The fact that the manuscript appears to have had gold edging 
allows us to further emphasize the importance that Etherington placed on the work.\(^{24}\) This was 
clearly something that Etherington valued highly.

The binding also allows us to establish how the folio pages have been gathered. At various 
points through the manuscript, we find the string visible in the middle of gatherings.\(^{25}\) This 
leads to the conclusion that starting from folio 1 the folios are collected in gatherings of three 
up until folio 61. From here folios 61–68 and 69–76 are grouped in gatherings of four. Folio 
77 then appears to be either a single sheet or conjugate with the page before the title page. 
The manuscript’s construction becomes potentially more confusing, however, when we turn to 
examine its numbering systems.


\(^{21}\) Given that the work is a presentation manuscript to Sir Henry Hobart and seems to be a gesture to win favour, it is more likely that Richard Etherington would be a protestant as opposed to a recusant.

\(^{22}\) *Catalogue of Sloane MSS. 1-1091*, vol. i, p. 215.

\(^{23}\) Etherington’s manuscript is slightly smaller than the other two manuscripts with which it was previously bound.

\(^{24}\) Since the manuscript has been trimmed the gold edging is now only visible from folios 45–58.

\(^{25}\) Even if this string is from the more modern binding one would imagine that the holes left by the original binding would have been used.
## Folio Numbers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Manuscript Wrapper</th>
<th>Abstract (not titled as such at f. 4r)</th>
<th>Abstract (not titled as such at f. 4r)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Manuscript Wrapper</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title page</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>f. 1r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letter of Dedication</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>ff. 2r – 3r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abstract (not titled as such at f. 4r)</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>ff. 1r – 41r</td>
<td>ff. 4r – 44r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- The First Booke of State, The causes of Ruyne and Conservation thereof</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- The Second Booke, Of The Adjunct’s of Reputation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- The Third Booke, Of the manner how to enterteine the people with content</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- T’he Fourth Booke Of the manner to meet with rumours &amp; commotions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- The Fift Booke How Conquered Subiects should be entreated</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ff. 22r – 26r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- The Sixt Booke. Of Security from forraigne enimye</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ff. 26r – 28r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- The Seaventh Booke Of enlargement of the state</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ff. 28r – 31v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- The Eight Booke Of means how to increase people and forces</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ff. 31v – 35v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- The Ninth Booke Of the manner how to multiply th’ exterior increased forces inwardly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ff. 35r – 40v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- The Tenth Booke Of the Capteine, the kindes of forces, and how against whom to vse them</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ff. 40v – 44r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melliflvi Operis Medvllæ. Index</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>ff. 43r – 46v</td>
<td>ff. 45r – 48v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An Advnct to the former Treatise. Of Conservation of the State</td>
<td>ff. 1 – [27v]</td>
<td>ff. 47r – 73v</td>
<td>ff. 49r – 75v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>א</td>
<td></td>
<td>ff. 49r – 51v</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>י</td>
<td></td>
<td>ff. 51r – 56v</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>יא</td>
<td></td>
<td>ff. 56r – 66v</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>יב</td>
<td></td>
<td>ff. 67r – 74r</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>יג</td>
<td></td>
<td>ff. 74v – 75v</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Svmmarie of Th’Advnct Of Conservation of the State</td>
<td>ff. 32r – 33v</td>
<td>ff. 74r – 75v</td>
<td>ff. 76r – 77v</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Fig. 3. The contents of the manuscript indicating the three numbering systems used.*
Numbering Systems

The manuscript falls into three distinct parts, or five, if one includes the brief summaries acting as a type of index at the end of both sections. The first is a dedicatory letter (ff. 2r–3r) which leads into the ‘Abstract’ translation of Botero (ff. 4r–48v) and is then followed by an index (ff. 49r–77v). An ‘Adjunct’ by Etherington himself then follows (ff. 49r–77v) which also has its own index (ff. 76r–77v).

The way in which these sections are foliated would suggest that they were at one point separate. We find that the manuscript uses three numbering systems. One numbering system which runs throughout the work (the final numbering system), one which begins in the ‘Abstract’ (the ‘Abstract’ numbering system), and one which begins in the ‘Adjunct’ (the ‘Adjunct’ numbering system) (fig. 3).

To begin let us consider the ‘Abstract Numbering System’. The first folio of the ‘Abstract’ is numbered both 1 and 4. It is folio 4 of the completed manuscript but was originally the first folio, or folio 1, when the ‘Abstract’ stood alone. From the fourth folio of the complete work onwards, the smaller of the numbers is crossed out with a single horizontal stroke. It is likely that this was done by the British Museum after rebinding the manuscript. What would have been folio 42 in the ‘Abstract’ numbering system, between the abstract and its index, is then either missing or numbered incorrectly as folio 43.

Then we come to the ‘Adjunct’ and its own numbering system. The ‘Adjunct’ by Etherington carries three separate numbers. Firstly the Adjunct’s own numerical identifier from 1 to 26, with an unlabelled 27th folio, then the ‘Abstract’ numbering system from 47 to 75, and then lastly the final numbering system. From this it seems that the 27th folio has been added after the numbering system was complete.

The index to the ‘Adjunct’, titled ‘A Svmmarie of th’Advnct’, also has all three numbering systems like the ‘Adjunct’. However it carries on the ‘Adjunct’ numbering system, not from 27 or 28 as would be expected, but rather at 32. Numbers 27/28 to 31 are therefore missing, which suggests that some folio pages have been removed from the final codex.

From this one would be forgiven for thinking that the various sections were written in reverse order. It seems that the ‘Adjunct’ was numbered first, then the ‘Abstract’, and finally the complete manuscript. However a closer look at the numbering systems shows this is not the case. Though we will discuss the handwriting of the manuscript further on, here we must look at the way in which the folio numbers have been written. Let us take the numbers ‘3’ and ‘4’. Throughout the manuscript we find these numbers in two forms. The threes are either opened or looped inwards. Similarly the fours are open or closed. From this we find that the ‘Abstract’ numbering system and the ‘Adjunct’ numbering system are written in the same hand. Namely we find open threes and closed fours (figs 4 and 5).

26 Note that the ‘Adjunct’ is split up into chapters using the first five letters of the Hebrew alphabet.

27 Compare figures 4 and 5. Note that the folio references added into both indexes also use open threes and closed fours.
When one turns to look at the final numbering system – the one presumed to be completed by the British Museum – we find looped threes and open fours (fig. 6).

What is interesting is that when we turn to the part of the ‘Abstract’ numbering system which carries on into the ‘Adjunct’, we find the same thing. These numbers have changed between the ‘Abstract’ and ‘Adjunct’. We turn over the closed ‘46’ to find the open ‘47’ (fig. 7). This is a trend that carries on throughout the ‘Adjunct’. It is also important to note that the first numbering systems in the ‘Abstract’ and the ‘Adjunct’ are not italicized, whereas the other numbering systems are.

Now we can see what has happened. The ‘Abstract’ and the ‘Adjunct’ were initially numbered separately. The ‘Abstract’ and its index were numbered from 1 to 46 and the ‘Adjunct’ and its index were numbered from 1 to 33. They were then brought together for presentation. Well after this someone then carried on the ‘Abstract’ numbering system to flow into the ‘Adjunct’. Then after this someone began their own numbering system to run throughout the manuscript. Sloane himself may be responsible for continuing the ‘Abstract’ numbering system and the British Museum responsible for creating the final one. Equally either may be responsible for both. Regardless what is clear is that Etherington had the ‘Abstract’ and the ‘Adjunct’ numbered separately. This was presumably so that they could be referenced separately. Indeed we find Etherington’s or his scribe’s closed fours and more open threes in both indexes. From this the numbering system is far less confusing. What is certainly evident is that the ‘Abstract’ and the ‘Adjunct’ were written as separate yet inextricably linked pieces of work.

The way in which the manuscript has been compiled is especially evident when one looks at the indexes. Here we see that Etherington or his scribe has written the folio-numbers in separately next to the relevant subjects and these are all in reference to each section’s original numbering system. The index to the ‘Abstract’ refers to the first crossed-out numbering system, from 1 to 41, and the index to the ‘Adjunct’ refers to the ‘Adjunct’s’ first numbering system, from 1 to 26 (27). On the final folio of the ‘Adjunct’ the same hand that has written in the relevant index numbers has added a further title (fig. 8). From this, it is certainly clear that these folio references have been added after the completion of the ‘Adjunct’s’ index.

---

Note figure 5 which shows the anomaly of 49.

BL, Sloane MS. 1065, ff. 76v-77r.
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These additions to the index also reveal why folios 28 to 31 of the ‘Adjunct’ are missing. At the bottom of the index it appears that Etherington or his scribe has added in the remainder of a sentence. This part of the sentence, ‘clusion comfortable’, looks to be in a different hand from the body of the text. Rather it seems to match the hand that added the folio references (fig. 9).\(^3\)

![Fig. 9. Folio 77.](image)

This tells us that the ‘Adjunct’ was formerly longer. Folios 28 to 31 were originally part of the treatise. When Etherington brought the sections together it seems that he then removed these folios. He then took out what would have been folio 78 of the index since this referred to the now missing folios. Finally he took what would have been at the top of folio 78 and wrote it in at the bottom of folio 77.

From this analysis of the numbering systems we have learnt that the ‘Abstract’ and the ‘Adjunct’ were both numbered separately by Etherington. Numbering systems were then added to the manuscript further along the chain of provenance – seemingly by Sloane and the British Museum. More importantly though we have learnt that Etherington significantly changed the ‘Adjunct’ before its presentation. He added in an unmarked 27th folio and removed folios 28 to 31 of the ‘Adjunct’. Having done this he then had to remove the latter half of the index to the ‘Adjunct’. Finally, he then added in folio references to the index – presumably so that one could easily reference or find the relevant sections in both parts of the manuscript. One could read the ‘Abstract’ and the ‘Adjunct’ alongside each other or one could read the two separately.

**Paper and Watermarks**

The conjugacy of the manuscript, or rather the way in which the different folios are connected, is also more fully understood when one looks at the paper Etherington and his scribe used. Given the distinct ink bleed-through we find in the latter half of the ‘Adjunct’ we would assume that at least two different qualities of paper were used. An examination of the watermarks, however, tells a slightly different story. Indeed three distinct watermarks can be found in the manuscript (fig. 10). The first is a flag with the letters ‘G’ and ‘B’ either side of its flagpole and can be found throughout the letter of dedication and the ‘Abstract’.

This watermark is exactly the same as that marked ‘FLAG.001.1’ in the Gravell Watermark Archive: at [http://www.gravell.org/img/flag FLAG.001.1.jpg](http://www.gravell.org/img/flag FLAG.001.1.jpg).

The second appears to be two twisted columns atop a horizontal cartouche and is seen in the index to the ‘Abstract’ and up to the 59th folio of the ‘Adjunct’.

The third, and final, watermark is harder to distinguish, given the amount of ink bleed-through, but it resembles a crown over a shield and runs throughout the rest of the ‘Adjunct’ and its index.

The difference in paper is also clear when one compares the edging of the paper. Though it appears the manuscript as a whole at one stage had gold edging the only section in which this is now clearly visible is the ‘columns and cartouche’ watermarked section. This is the only section which still prominently features gold edging; the rest have a few flecks and remnants of a once

\(^3\) See figure 9 – note the slightly different descender in the letter ‘f’ between ‘comfortable’ and the preceding lines.

\(^3\) This watermark is akin to ‘S LD.077.1’ in the Gravell Watermark Archive but lacks the ‘WR’ insignia and ‘4’ at the bottom of the shield though it does have a visible line trailing down from the shield. [http://www.gravell.org/img/shield/sld.077.1.jpg](http://www.gravell.org/img/shield/sld.077.1.jpg)

\(^3\) This watermark is akin to ‘SLD.077.1’ in the Gravell Watermark Archive; however the watermark in the Etherington manuscript has more layers to the design making it slightly more full and triangular. [http://www.gravell.org/img/name/name 006.1.jpg](http://www.gravell.org/img/name/name 006.1.jpg)
gold edge but have clearly been trimmed. This means that when the manuscript was rebound, the folios were trimmed to a uniform size, namely the size of the ‘columns and cartouche’ paper which is still gold. Similarly if we look at the bottom edge of the manuscript the section watermarked with a ‘flag’ has clearly distorted and become more warped than the other paper types. This, along with the watermarks, clearly indicates that the manuscript is comprised of three different papers.

Based on the watermarks it seems that the manuscript was written in order, starting with the title page, especially since the index to the ‘Abstract’ is on the same type of paper as the ‘Adjunct’. If the ‘Adjunct’ was written separately from the ‘Abstract’: why was the index to the ‘Abstract’ seemingly written alongside the ‘Adjunct’? The fact that the ‘Adjunct’ is split across two differently watermarked papers is also curious since it happens in the middle of a section regarding the purity of gold and silver. If this change had occurred between the first two sections we might suggest that Etherington merely modified the beginning of an existing treatise so that it would better accompany the ‘Abstract’. This is not the case however since the change appears two folios into the third section of the ‘Adjunct’, a section which clearly follows on from the second. It seems that Etherington’s scribe simply moved to a new paper, perhaps having used his supply of the previous type of paper.

We further find that although the 27th folio of the ‘Adjunct’, which has been replaced, does not have a watermark it is probable that it is on the ‘flag’ watermarked paper. The manuscript, as noted, is neatly ruled throughout using bright red ink; in the letter of dedication and the 27th folio of the ‘Adjunct’, however, it is clearly a light brown or a very faded red. The paper is also very different. Here the paper returns to being less absorbent after having suffered from ink bleed-through. Through the greater part of the ‘Adjunct,’ ink shows through the folios, whereas the 27th folio is extremely clear (fig. 11).

One would also be forgiven for surmising from this that the letter of dedication and ‘Abstract’ were written last. After all, if the 27th folio was replaced just before Etherington completed the manuscript and it is on the ‘flag’ paper, the ‘flag’ paper must surely have been used last? However this is not the case. The ‘flag’ paper was, in fact, used first. After his scribe had completed the manuscript Etherington wanted to replace the 27th folio and remove folios 28 to 31. To do this he separated the various gatherings towards the end of the ‘Adjunct’ so they were single sheets. He then used the manuscript’s wrapper as the new folio 27 of the ‘Adjunct’. This is especially evident when one looks at the ‘crown and shield’ paper used in the ‘Adjunct’. From folio 59 every other folio is lower than its preceding and succeeding folio.

---

34 For example the bottom of the section watermarked with the ‘crown and shield’ is more obviously gold on its bottom edge than its fore edge.
Fig. 11. Image of ff. 26v and 27r of the ‘Adjunct’ (ff. 74 and 75).
Fig. 12. The manuscript’s original codicology (using the ‘Abstract’ and ‘Adjunct’ original numbering systems). In the final codicology, the gatherings from folios 7 to 34 of the ‘Adjunct’ are taken apart. Here, the ‘e’ becomes the unmarked folio 27.
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The paper is still the same size – it is just positioned differently. At first glance this might not seem to matter. However it is clear that the manuscript has been edited. This is confirmed when one looks at the watermarks of folios 56 and 59. They would appear to be conjugate; however, the first carries a columns and cartouche watermark and the latter carries a shield watermark. The ‘Adjunct’ has, indeed, been edited from this 59th folio and appears to be in single sheets, bound together, from this point onwards. This may have been to correct the scribe’s mistakes but what is important to note here is that Etherington was purposing the manuscript for presentation. Indeed it was Etherington who took the manuscript apart to replace this 27th folio of the ‘Adjunct’. The suggestion here is that the folio before the title page and the 27th folio of the ‘Adjunct’ are conjugate since they were at one point the manuscript’s wrapper (fig. 12).

Once again, what is unquestionably true about the manuscript is that it is a piece of work which Etherington gave great thought, time and effort to producing. Evidently, the piece is a presentation manuscript, at least in its final form. It seems that the piece was edited for the express reason of dedicating it to Sir Henry Hobart. Indeed, the only time Prince Charles, to whom Hobart was chancellor, is mentioned is in the letter of dedication and the 27th folio of the ‘Adjunct’.

**Hands**

Having looked at the manuscript’s physical and historical compilation one can turn to explore the text itself. The volume appears to be in two different hands differing between its various sections (fig. 13). The body of the manuscript is written in an italic hand with glosses on both left- and right-hand sides written in a humanist minuscule hand. These marginal glosses add an interesting component to the manuscript. The left-hand margin gives the subject that that specific part deals with while the right-hand margin gives Botero’s various historical examples. This means that the ‘Abstract’ works almost as a quick-reference guide for Botero’s treatise. The ‘Abstract’ itself gives the reader the most important points from Botero so that the reader is able to access his arguments more efficiently. The right-hand margin allows one to consult historical examples if one so chooses. The left-hand margin then allows the reader to quickly access certain points of Botero’s thought. Perhaps Etherington saw the ‘Abstract’ and the ‘Adjunct’ as not only a guide to state but one which could be quickly consulted to address matters at hand.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Hand</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Title Page &amp; Letter of Dedication</td>
<td>Hand A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abstract</td>
<td>Hand B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjunct</td>
<td>Hand B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjunct’s 27th Folio</td>
<td>Hand A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Fig. 13. The main sections of the manuscript listed with the corresponding Hands.*

Though the hands look similar at first glance they are in fact different. In the dedicatory letter (Hand A), as in the unnumbered 27th folio of Etherington’s ‘Adjunct’ (f.75), the letter ‘h’ is more universally looped in its ascending line. The hand of the ‘Abstract’ and most of

---

35 Here one should note that the printed catalogue simply states ‘in all probability the original presentation copy’ without explanation. The assumption most probably comes from the expensive look of the manuscript and the presence of a signed letter of dedication: see *Catalogue of Sloane MSS. I-1091*, vol. i, p. 215.

36 The titles in the indexes are also in this minuscule hand.
the ‘Adjunct’ (Hand B), however, typically does not have this distinct loop. Hand A is also more inclined to cross the descending points of the lower case letters ‘f’, ‘p’ and ‘q’ with more pronounced marks than those in Hand B. One can also note that Hand B pressed harder on the page when writing letters with ascending and descending parts. It is possible that a third scribe was responsible for the humanist minuscule script in the margins but it is more likely that Hand B was responsible for these. We might conjecture here that Hand A is Etherington himself whereas Hand B is most probably a professional scribe. This is especially appropriate since Hand A has written the title page reflecting Etherington’s process of bringing the pieces together. To confirm our suspicions with the indexes we might also ask in which hand the index references are written. Our best hope here is the added title on folio 77 (fig. 8).

Judging by the capital ‘E’s used we might suggest that this is a different hand to the rest of the index – indeed, Etherington seems to prefer this looped capital ‘E’ that we find in the added title. However Etherington’s scribe also used the looped capital ‘E’, in the middle of a sentence, as seen on folio 18. It is hard to conclude this point given that all one has to analyse for the index references are four letters. However, we might argue that more often than not the letter ‘b’ appears to have been written with a softer touch, as we would expect from Hand A. It would certainly make sense that Etherington, upon bringing the two pieces together, decided to write in folio references. This would also explain why the scribe did not simply write them in in the first place. One must also note that the scribe must have left space for a letter of dedication. Given that the manuscript was written in order and the dedication is Hand A this must be the case. What remains clear, once again, is that this is a manuscript which Etherington valued highly and a manuscript that he put much thought and expense into producing.

From this bibliographical analysis of the manuscript we have learnt a number of things. The manuscript was at one point bound with two others from the British Museum and the three carry a common numbering system. Three numbering systems were used throughout the manuscript. From this we see that only one numbering system and half of another are contemporary. From the three different papers used, and their respective watermarks, we see that the manuscript was largely written in the order in which it is now bound. After the manuscript was compiled it was then altered to suit Etherington’s wishes before it was ready for presentation. Etherington had a scribe copy the ‘Abstract’ and the ‘Adjunct’, as well as their indexes. After they were completed he then wrote a letter of dedication and replaced the 27th folio of the ‘Adjunct’ as well as removing folios 28 to 31 of the ‘Adjunct’. It is likely that he then also added folio references to the indexes. What remains abundantly clear, once again, is that this manuscript is something which Etherington invested much thought, effort, and expense into producing in order to present it to Sir Henry Hobart.

---

37 Namely ‘fo’ for folio and ‘a’ or ‘b’ for the page.
38 A summary of these findings can be seen in figure 14.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>‘Adjunct’ Numbering</th>
<th>‘Abstract’ Numbering</th>
<th>Final Numbering</th>
<th>Watermark</th>
<th>Paper Quality</th>
<th>Hand</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wrapper</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Flag</td>
<td>Clear</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title Page</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>f.1</em></td>
<td>Flag</td>
<td>Clear</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letter of Dedication</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>ff. 2 – 3</em></td>
<td>Flag</td>
<td>Clear</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abstract</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>ff. 1 – 41</em></td>
<td>Flag</td>
<td>Clear</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abstract Index</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>ff. 43 – 46</em></td>
<td><em>ff. 45 – 48</em></td>
<td>Slightly Absorbent</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjunct</td>
<td><em>ff. 1 – 10</em></td>
<td><em>ff. 47 – 56</em></td>
<td><em>ff. 49 – 58</em></td>
<td>Columns and Cartouche</td>
<td>Slightly Absorbent</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjunct</td>
<td><em>ff. 11 – 26</em></td>
<td><em>ff. 57 – 72</em></td>
<td><em>ff. 59 – 74</em></td>
<td>Crown and Shield</td>
<td>Absorbent</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjunct</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Folio</td>
<td></td>
<td><em>f. 73</em></td>
<td><em>f. 75</em></td>
<td>Clear</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjunct</td>
<td></td>
<td><em>ff. 32 – 33</em></td>
<td><em>ff. 74 – 75</em></td>
<td>Crown and Shield</td>
<td>Absorbent</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Fig. 14. Summary.*

Here bold indicates the original manuscript and italic indicates modern additions.
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**Etherington’s Italian Edition**

Let us now turn to consider the source for Etherington’s translation of Botero. By the late 1610s Etherington could have been using a number of different editions. However we can single out the 1589, 1590, 1596 and 1598 editions of Botero’s book as the editions in which distinct differences appear. By looking at these differences it is clear that Etherington was using a 1596 edition or the 1598 Milan edition. In the section titled ‘Present Witt’ in the manuscript we find the example of the Roman general ‘Cecinna’ (Caeccina) in the right hand margin detailing how his soldiers were prevented from fleeing: this example is present only in the 1596 editions and the 1598 Milan edition.

Further to this, in Book Two of the manuscript, we also find an example present only in the 1596 editions and the 1598 Milan edition; namely the example of Alcibiades taken by Botero from Thucydides (though Etherington does not cite Thucydides as the source). Similarly in Book Five one can note the example Etherington gives of Henry III and the Guises: this is also exclusive to the 1596 editions and 1598 Milan edition. Brief reference is also made in the marginalia of Book Ten to ‘Lisander’ which is another addition seen only in the 1596 editions and 1598 Milan edition of Botero’s treatise. Although Etherington’s ‘Abstract’ of Botero does not mention the examples of the King of Siam and King Solomon, found in the 1596 editions and 1598 Milan edition, it is clear that this is the version of the text he must have used. Here it is also important to note that the 1602 Latin translation has not been used. This Latin translation was itself taken from the 1589 or 1590 Italian edition and does not include the examples exclusive to the 1596 editions and 1598 Milan edition.

The 1596 editions and 1598 Milan edition, like most others after the original 1589 publication, had Botero’s *Delle cause della grandezza delle città* attached to them, but Etherington does not include a translation, or mention, this piece; perhaps he regarded Robert Peterson’s 1606 printed translation of this latter work as sufficient.

**II. The Dedication and Dedicatee**

The dedication to the manuscript makes Etherington’s objective clear. He endeavoured to ‘attire a stranger Boterus after our Country guise teaching him our Country language’ and in doing so extract the ‘marrow of his book and seuerall politiqe [sic] positions’.

---


42 BL, Sloane MS. 1065, f. 13v. Botero, *Della Ragione di Stato, Libri Dieci* (1596), p. 76; Giovanni Botero, *Della Ragione di Stato* (Milan: Pacifico Pontio, 1598), p. 77. Here we can also note that Lawrence appears to have used a 1596 edition or the 1598 Milan edition since he too uses this unique reference from Thucydidides.


45 Botero, *Della Ragione di Stato* (1596), pp. 247 and 248 respectively; Botero, *Della Ragione di Stato* (Milan: Pacifico Pontio, 1598), pp. 251 and 252 respectively. One would expect to find both of these examples at BL, Sloane MS. 1065, f. 35v.


48 BL, Sloane MS. 1065, f. 2r. Note that Lawrence states in his own dedication that he wishes to give more English examples to cater to an English reader. Interestingly, he also notes that he has ‘omitted some few things which favour’d the pontificate, and were too indulging to the Spiritual Empire’: BL, Add. MS. 88928, f. 1v.
the word ‘politique’ is telling since the term was firmly associated with Machiavellian reason of state. This book, states Etherington, is best used to ‘[bring] hony to the quiet Hive of the Commonwealth’ and he makes sure to state that where ‘diseases of the commonwealth’ are highlighted, ‘all Respective Cures therby politiquely provyding Harbour and quiet repose for Religion & Religious excercises’ will be given.\textsuperscript{49} Etherington is clearly keen to establish that this ‘politique’ treatise can be happily coupled with religion.

In concluding his dedication Etherington turns to compliment his dedicatee, Henry Hobart, and thanks him for ‘all undeserved fauour allready receiued by mee’.\textsuperscript{50} Etherington had perhaps already had some favourable contact with this prominent political figure. In turning to Hobart, we note that he held the position of Chief Justice of the Court of Common Pleas, the title by which he is addressed in the dedication to the manuscript, after serving as Attorney General from 1606 to 1613, and that he died in office in December 1625.\textsuperscript{51} Since he held this position between 1613 and 1625 we can date the manuscript’s presentation to the same period. We can narrow the date further given that the author also recognizes Hobart as ‘Chauncellor to the most excellent Prince Charles’. This means that one can date the piece to between 1617 and 1625. This is also the conclusion reached by the Sloane catalogue which lists the same date range. It would seem reasonable, however, to suggest that the piece was completed towards the beginning of this period. Firstly one might see the extended discussion on traitors and execution we find in the ‘Adjunct’ as a contemporary reaction to the trial and execution of Sir Walter Ralegh in 1618.\textsuperscript{52} The engagement with economic matters that we find in the ‘Adjunct’ might in turn be due to the fact that Henry Hobart, the piece’s dedicatee, became a member of the East India Company in 1617.\textsuperscript{53}

However it is likely that the ‘Abstract’ and the ‘Adjunct’ can be dated to before 1617. If one looks towards the end of the ‘Adjunct’ by Etherington we find that the last folio has been replaced with one which specifically refers to the education of Prince Charles.\textsuperscript{54} As we know the only other time Charles is mentioned is in the letter of dedication. The fact that he is specifically mentioned in the altered folio at the end of the work suggests that this piece was written before 1617 and then edited together to present to Hobart, the new chancellor to Prince Charles, sometime around 1617 to 1618.\textsuperscript{55} This means that Etherington had a completed manuscript before 1617 and then after this date decided that Sir Henry Hobart was the perfect person to dedicate it to – it only needed a letter of dedication and a closing note relevant to Hobart’s work.

In fact, if one turns to the proceedings of the House of Commons one finds that Hobart’s interests embraced both commercial disputes and reason of state; Etherington chose his dedicatee carefully. Hobart’s words even recall a number of Boteran passages. Hobart himself was either already acquainted with Botero or was aware of Boteran debates. On Friday 29 June 1610, after the speaker had left and the great committee for impositions continued their dispute, Hobart spoke regarding issues of trade in his position as Attorney-General. Hobart observed that ‘the king hath some things left in his power by the law, and some things out of his power, and those are within the four seas’ and accordingly argued that the king may not forbid men to pass between shires and markets. The prince may, however, restrain subjects from going out of

\textsuperscript{49} BL, Sloane MS. 1065, f. 2v.
\textsuperscript{50} BL, Sloane MS. 1065, f. 2v.
\textsuperscript{51} Similarly, Lawrence dedicated his translation to a high-ranking lawyer: Henry Lawrence. Henry Lawrence studied at Gray’s Inn and, when he received this dedication, was the President of the Council of State during the Protectorate.
\textsuperscript{52} BL, Sloane MS. 1065, ff. 70r–3v.
\textsuperscript{53} BL, Sloane MS. 1065, ff. 57v–65r.
\textsuperscript{54} BL, Sloane MS. 1065, f. 75v.
\textsuperscript{55} BL, Sloane MS. 1065, f. 2r. The fact that Hobart was one of the wealthiest individuals of the day would also explain why Etherington dedicated the manuscript to him especially if his goal was to gain employment: Hobart’s wealth is noted in Wilfrid R. Prest, The Rise of the Barristers: A Social History of the English Bar 1590–1640 (Oxford, 1986), pp. 129, 155 and 370.
the kingdom; ‘the reason, because he may have use of them at home. And so of goods, for the like reason’.  
This is a sentiment which is actually similar to a point we find in Botero. Botero believes that ‘it is very necesarie the Prince suffer not rude & unwrought things to be caried out of his dominion, Viz: neither Wooll, nor Silke, nor Timber, nor Mettal, nor any other such thing’ and that the prince may prohibit people from leaving the state if they take with them useful raw materials.  
Removed from the Della grandezza and placed in the Della ragion di stato upon its publication in 1589, this chapter ‘Of Industrie’ was included in the 1606 Robert Peterson translation of the Della grandezza and referred the reader back to the Ragion di stato.  
Perhaps Hobart had already read this printed translation of Botero’s Della grandezza.

Indeed Hobart’s language and examples continue to echo Botero’s own and suggest Hobart’s familiarity with Botero’s work and/or ideas. Hobart continues by declaring that ‘the king of England hath forbidden heretofore to trade with France, likewise the exportation of wool or of boards fit for the ships’, which is strikingly similar to what Botero says in the chapter ‘Of Industrie’. Botero gives the historical example that ‘the Kings of England, and of France […] not many years since made a law against the carrying out of Woules out of their dominions’ which although done for ‘their owne paticuler good’ was ‘good for the benefit of the whole countries’, or rather, one could say, was done for reason of state.  
Finally Hobart’s awareness of these concepts is confirmed when he concludes that ‘therefore he [the king] may by common law impose; and if he might not by law, yet sure he may by reason of state, in foro mundi if not in foro fori’.  
Hobart’s prince must not interfere in lawful trade unless for reasons of state. If Hobart had not already read Botero, he was certainly accustomed to Boteran thoughts on trade and reason of state. It is also intriguing to note that Sir John Dodderidge, who spoke later on in the same session, gives an example from Bodin. Crucially Hobart was a man accustomed to the debates which Etherington looked to present to him. We see here that he may have even read the Peterson translation of the Della grandezza since the Boteran chapter he appears to be referencing was also available in Peterson’s translation. Etherington chose his dedicatee very well.

III. The ‘Abstract’

We know, then, that the manuscript was a thoroughly considered piece of work by Etherington which he produced at some expense and effort in order to present it to Hobart. Etherington clearly believes that the Della ragion di stato is a piece that men in government should read.  
Furthermore, the piece remains our only English translation of, and supplement to, Botero’s book from the early seventeenth century. Thus with an exposition of the ‘Abstract’ and the ‘Adjunct’, we might gain insight into how Botero was being read in England during this period.

First we must turn to the ‘Abstract’. This translation of Botero’s Della ragion di stato runs from f. 4 to f. 44 of the manuscript and is accompanied by an index running from f. 45 to f. 48. As a result of this being an Abstract the translation is somewhat free. However it mostly retains Botero’s original meaning in his arguments. There is a discrepancy in the first part of Etherington’s ‘Abstract’ in that he summarizes Botero’s dedicatory letter by stating that ‘some haue grounded their reason in litle conscience’ and that ‘some haue mantled their tyranny with a cloke of barbarous lawe of Mai’er.  
The marginalia here refer to ‘Machiuell’ and ‘Tyberius Caesar’

---

57 Botero, A Treatise (1606), p. 52.
59 Hobart in Foster (ed.), Proceedings, p. 199.
60 Botero, A Treatise (1606), pp. 52–3.
61 Hobart in Foster (ed.), Proceedings, p. 199.
62 Lawrence clearly had much the same opinion given that he dedicated his translation to the President of the Council of State.
respectively, yet do not mention Tacitus, from whom Botero draws the example of Tiberius; nor does the ‘Abstract’ explicitly link Tiberius with Machiavelli, as Botero had done.\textsuperscript{64} This is not a direct or literal translation. Rather it is the translator’s own summary of Botero’s more detailed point in which he exclaims he has heard the names of Machiavelli and Tacitus brought up in discussions on ragion di stato. The way in which the abstract deals with Tacitus is telling. Etherington often excludes examples and quotes from Tacitus, or does not attribute them to him, but equally he does not ignore him completely. The translation completely omits the examples of Tacitus used by Botero in the fifth chapter of Book One but equally he chooses not to use the quotations from Livy and Aristotle.\textsuperscript{65} Overleaf, however, one does find the Tacitean maxim ‘patienda meliorum imperia’, and although this comes without context or any reference to the author, it is to be expected given that Botero himself does not cite his source.\textsuperscript{66} Indeed in Book Two Etherington keeps the quotation from Tacitus regarding Otranto and retains the preceding expression ‘Tacit[us] commends’ as is seen in Botero.\textsuperscript{67} Though it does seem that the ‘Abstract’ is greatly lacking the many references and quotations from Tacitus that one finds in Botero, Etherington only removes quotations as he does with any other author, if he believes they are not necessary to clarify the argument. Though Botero himself does not regularly cite or quote from his sources, the Ragion di stato does have numerous quotations from Tacitus and Livy, as well as sporadic references to other sources such as Aristotle, Sallust and Scripture.

There does not seem to be any political reason why the ‘Abstract’ excludes some of these references other than to exclude that which has already been said or that which is not wholly necessary to the argument. For example in Book Two, Chapter Six, ‘maxims of prudence’, Etherington excludes examples Botero uses from both Tacitus and the Orlando Furioso, but does include another, shorter, quotation from Tacitus, and another from Plato.\textsuperscript{68} Similarly, though most of the quotations from Tacitus appear without reference, most of these appear without citation in Botero as well. It is interesting to note that the quotations from Tacitus Etherington keeps are those used in discussions relating to prudence, reputation, military enterprise and avoiding unprofitable expenditure; some of the most important subjects for Botero.\textsuperscript{69} Etherington even begins Book Ten with a marginal reference to Tacitus,\textsuperscript{70} again, presumably because Botero himself names him.\textsuperscript{71} Though Tacitus plays a larger role in Botero’s original, it is evident that Etherington is not averse to using Tacitus and clearly does not wish to link him with Machiavelli, as Botero himself had done. This was of course a time in which Tacitus was beginning to be used on all sides of political debates and it is significant that the only clear political choice Etherington makes is not citing Tacitus’s name alongside Machiavelli’s; Tacitus was now an accepted authority.\textsuperscript{72}

The translation picks the most important points in Botero and translates them rather freely while still retaining the original meaning of the argument. For example when speaking of dominions in Book One, Chapter Two, Botero states there are many types of dominions: old, new, poor, rich, some powerful and some not and concludes that ‘altri [sono] naturali, altri d’acquisto’.\textsuperscript{73} It is only the last part here that is translated in the ‘Abstract’, as ‘Dominyon is either naturall or acquired’ (f. 4r). While this changes the original, Botero does go on to define what is meant by ‘natural’ and ‘acquired’. Thus Etherington sees this as the most important point of this chapter.

\textsuperscript{64} BL, Sloane MS. 1065, f. 4r.
\textsuperscript{65} Botero, Della Ragione di Stato (1596), pp. 1–2.
\textsuperscript{66} BL, Sloane MS. 1065, f. 5r. Botero, Della Ragione di Stato (1596), p. 9.
\textsuperscript{67} BL, Sloane MS. 1065, f. 5v. Botero, Della Ragione di Stato (1596), p. 22.
\textsuperscript{68} BL, Sloane MS. 1065, f. 11v. Botero, Della Ragione di Stato (1596), pp. 63: ‘Tacito loda’.
\textsuperscript{69} BL, Sloane MS. 1065, f. 11r. Botero, Della Ragione di Stato (1596), pp. 62 and 63.
\textsuperscript{70} BL, Sloane MS. 1065, ff. 12v, 15v, 18v, 30v and 40v respectively.
\textsuperscript{71} BL, Sloane MS. 1065, f. 40v.
\textsuperscript{72} Botero, Della Ragione di Stato (1596), p. 298.
\textsuperscript{73} Tuck, Philosophy (1993), p. 119.
Importantly, one must also note the fact that the Italian phrase *ragion di stato* is translated as ‘judgment of state’ as opposed to the more common translation of ‘reason of state’. This is perhaps because ‘judgement’ implies a more distinct set of criteria that one can study to gain knowledge of state affairs. One can attain a ‘judgment of state’. Indeed, given Etherington’s dedicatee, this ‘judgement of state’ could be acquired by Hobart in order to effectively understand the commonwealth. Etherington was certainly familiar with the more common term ‘reason of state’ since he translates ‘la ragione di Stato’ as such on the final folio of the ‘Abstract’. Thus he made a calculated choice to first translate ‘ragion di stato’ as ‘judgment of state’. It can also be noted that Etherington has taken the liberty of giving titles to the ten books that make up the *Della ragion di stato* which Botero himself did not do.

Certain word choices, and the syntax of the sentences, mean that the ‘Abstract’ occasionally does change the emphasis of the argument. When discussing military enterprise during peace the ‘Abstract’ adds more emphasis on the weakness of disarmed peace. Where Botero tells the ruler not to ‘have such faith in peace that you lay aside your arms, for disarmed peace is weak’ the ‘Abstract’ informs its reader that it is ‘the weakest peace, more dangerous then warres’. The addition of the superlative here changes the meaning only slightly but it does highlight Etherington’s concern for the military during peace-time. It is important to note here that Raab’s only remark on the manuscript is to state that Etherington concentrates on the more Machiavellian sections of Botero’s treatise and cites this folio as an example without explanation. Indeed, the translation of this sentence does make Botero slightly more Machiavellian, given the amplified position it gives to military concern in peace time, but of course Botero’s original is itself rather Machiavellian.

Despite this choice of Machiavellian wording, a further change that one notices in this regard is Etherington’s reluctance to translate ‘l’astutia’ as cunning and his failure to give the example of the lion and the fox we find in Botero. Perhaps he himself had recognized that this was too close to Machiavelli; indeed it bears resemblance to both *Il Principe* and the *Discorsi*.

We may also point to the issue of the Turks as treated in the ‘Abstract’ and Botero. When speaking of the worst subjects for a state being ‘the worse qualited the further they are from the truth’ Etherington chooses only to list ‘Iewes and Turkes’ in the margin as opposed to the list we find in Botero of ‘infidels, or Jews, or schismatics, or heretics; if heretics, they may be Lutherans, Calvinists, or followers of some similar impiety’. It is intriguing here that Etherington chooses to miss out other examples in favour of the ‘Jews and Turks’: clearly he wished to make the Turkish example more explicit while removing the protestant examples. Though Etherington probably wanted to remove the protestant examples it also highlights the contemporary concern with the Ottoman Empire. It is interesting to note that Etherington’s

---

74 BL, Sloane MS. 1065, f. 4r.
76 For the book titles, see figure 3 above.
77 BL, Sloane MS. 1065, f. 40r. Botero, *Della Ragion di Stato* (1596), Book 2 Chapter 6, p. 45.
79 Niccolò Machiavelli, *The Prince*, ed. and trans. by Quentin Skinner and Russell Price (Cambridge, 2000), p. 52; ‘A ruler should therefore always be concerned with military matters, and in peacetime he should be even more taken up with them than in war’.
rearranging of the eighth book means that the book ends with an indictment against the Turks instead of detailing the customs of the Chinese, Turks and Poles. Of course, the ‘Abstract’, like Botero’s original, also concludes with a condemnation of the Turks and a rallying of Christian princes, akin to Machiavelli’s call for an Italian prince to unite against foreign forces.

The most obvious change to Botero’s original text however, which exemplifies Etherington’s interests, is the change to Book Eight. He titles this ‘Of means how to increase people and forces’. Until this point the ‘Abstract’ had kept sequential order with Botero’s original. However Book Eight is rather different. The ‘Abstract’ skips from chapter 5, ‘of colonies’, to 14, ‘whether the king should engage in commerce’. Chapters 15–17 then follow. After chapter 17 it carries on from chapter 7 skipping over chapter 8. Finally, chapter 12 is followed by chapter 18. Etherington has clearly thought about these chapters more than any others since it is the only book where he significantly rearranges the chapters. Given that Book Eight deals with commerce and colonies Etherington was surely familiar with the contemporary discourse on the issues. He appears to be linking the issue of colonies directly with commerce since he inserts the chapters on commerce directly amongst those regarding colonies. Etherington’s major concern in this translation is commercial and colonial.

IV. The ‘Adjunct’

Etherington’s ‘Adjunct’ to the translation is also of great importance since it is the only known direct English commentary on the Della ragion di stato. The ‘Adjunct’ is split into five sections which are each denoted using the first five letters of the Hebrew alphabet from א through to ה. The ‘Adjunct’ is entitled ‘of the conservation of the State’ and it is clear that Etherington’s concern is firmly with Botero’s definition of ragion di stato. Namely, that ‘Reason of State is the knowledge of the means by which such a dominion may be founded, preserved and extended’, with preservation and extension being of the greatest importance. Intriguingly Etherington begins the piece with a definition of policy resembling Botero’s definition of the state. Here it is stated that ‘Policy[...] is a Civil Administration, signifying the State and Order, to which any City or Com[m]onwealth is prescribed’. From this we find that ‘politique discipline is said to be, a Modell of general precepts, for the well governning of the Com[m]onwealth’, clearly rephrasing Botero’s own introduction to the concept. Etherington takes the Greek πολιτεία to mean ‘policye’ and describes it as ‘Civil Administration’ and then defines ‘politique discipline’ as the good governance of the state. This mirrors the way in which Botero first defines unstato as the domino fermo, or firm rule, over a people and then Ragione di Stato as the knowledge by which one may found, preserve and extend a state. Here the concept of ‘the state’ has been replaced by ‘policy’ and ‘reason of state’ has been replaced by ‘politique discipline’.

Where Etherington differs is in his early inclusion of religion. Though Botero is ultimately trying to make ragion di stato acceptable for the Christian prince he does not include religion at this early stage of his argument. Etherington, however, sees that the precepts for governing amongst Christians must be sacred lawes’ and they are called sacred if they are from God’s
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word or ‘fux diuina lucis’ conserving the commonwealth. He then sees that ‘this politique discipline consisteth of right reason and power’; this version of reason of state must include divine law to be labelled as such. It is this ‘politicke discipline’ that is the ‘very Soule and life of the Com[m]onwealth Sollicitudo totius hominis making the whole Com[m]onwealth a Schoole of vertues to conserve it selfe’, without which honesty and religion would have no place to ‘retre’ and ‘Tempestuous, stirs, tumults and seditious will followe’. The commonwealth must include religion in order to properly conserve itself.

Before sacred laws are given, however, Etherington believes that ‘the meane actions being cause of conservation and ruyne of the Com[m]onwealth are fitt to be first learned’. In order to conserve the state one must know the causes of its ruin. This is similar to the idea that one must know evil to avoid it. The causes of such ruin are seen as both divine and human, and although Etherington understands that one cannot know or provide remedies against God’s providence, one can seemingly retract grievances to avoid ruin or simply worship God to ensure his love. Here Etherington comes close to excusing the disposal of a sovereign when he states that sometimes God allows a prince to escape justice and ‘sometymes he suffereth Rebellyons to make Princes know themselves, sometymes the wicked to Conquer and flourish in all prosperity, to make their fall the greater, and their punishment more exemplary’. This line of argument reflects contemporary discourse relating to tyrannicide and rebellion and places it within the context of God’s omnipotence and wisdom.

The importance of this passage in Etherington is its extensive use of Biblical passages. Though Botero can be seen to have begun this inclination to recover reason of state for Christianity he rarely uses Biblical quotations to demonstrate an argument or opinion. In fact, we find his first Biblical quotation in the twelfth chapter of the first book; Botero’s first reference is rather to Tacitus. Etherington, however, ensures his first reference is from Scripture. Although parts of the ‘Adjunct’ do not have as many Biblical citations it is clear that Etherington looks to firmly ground the argument in Scripture. Etherington’s expressed view here is that by worshiping God one ensures his protection as with I Samuel 2:3 and Psalm 125. In fact Etherington often makes numerous references to a number of Biblical books to support his argument. Intriguingly, however, though Etherington states that ‘Gods true worship is to be done without any tolleration of any that doe worship any other God’ he does believe that ‘for necessity sometyme it hath been suffered by Religious Prynces, thinking better to haue some Com[m]onwealth & Religion rather then none at all’. Thus he seemingly allows some toleration for reasons of state. This is, however, something which Etherington does not expand upon.

Etherington then begins a discussion regarding the human causes of conservation on more Boteran terms. The first human cause he gives is the site of a city which is best ‘neere the Sea, defended by stronge Portes’ or in ‘hilly & Rocky Countryes’. Better still is that ‘which most resembleth Punctum being all vnited in it selfe’. The concern for the location of a city is firmly within the Boteran tradition and such geographic notions appear in the *Della ragion di stato*. This might also suggest
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that Etherington had read the *Della grandezza* which deals with, among other things, the importance of a city’s location. Indeed the 1596 or 1598 Milan edition of the *Della ragion di stato* he used for translation would have included this treatise. Etherington continues by placing Botero more firmly within a theological framework. Here he speaks of the necessity of tributes, ‘for the honor of the Prince, or for Com[m]on good’, once again including a wealth of Biblical quotations in the margin.\(^{107}\) Though Botero does not speak of tributes in depth he does recognize them as an important source of revenue for the prince.\(^{108}\) What is important here, however, regarding Etherington is not only his substantial use of Scripture, but also the idea of the common good and necessity, which is linked to the idea of reason of state.

Given the confessional divides in Europe and the relatively new union of crowns between Scotland and England it is not surprising that Etherington calls for concord at home and abroad, ‘for that every Kingdome deuided in it selfe cannot stand’, something which Christ himself had said.\(^{109}\) In considering unity with foreign nations he concludes his first section with the belief that companions can act ‘as a guarde of the Com[m]onwealthe’, however, he does argue that the opposition of ‘strangers or friends doe good keeping the Subjectes in Order and good temper’\(^{110}\) War can actually be a positive experience for Etherington since it unites the populace, as with the examples he gives of the French against the Italians, the Moors against the Romans, the Turks against the Germans and, in the margin, an example from Judges of the Israelites.\(^{111}\)

Here the second chapter begins by determining the causes for the divine ruin of states. Etherington writes that it is God ‘to whome it onely belongeth to giue & take away Kingdomes’.\(^{112}\) God alone can decide the fate of states but by worshipping him it seems that one can ensure his support. This is, of course, given with references to Scripture but Etherington continues with a rather curious discourse concerning ‘Celestiall bodyes’ which seems to be an attack on judicial astrology. Here he declares that the mind is not subjigated to the heavenly bodies and thus that ‘the Com[m]onwealthe dependeth vpon the reason of the mynd’\(^{113}\). This idea of reason dictating one’s actions echoes the notion of ‘reason of state’ that propagates the idea that one must take action based not on morality but rather on reason. For Etherington, one should not overestimate the powers of such astrology since it ‘followeth that by the wisedome and Prudence giuen to man by God, man may conserue Kingdomes and preuent Ruynes’.\(^{114}\) This comment seems to suggest that man is in fact capable of controlling his own kingdom but Etherington makes sure that God’s influence is still included. Here he believes that many ‘abuse’ the term *fortune* and states that ‘neither must we attribute the Conseruation or Ruyne of any Kingdome to any secondary cause, as vice or vertue, and there rest, but rainge and looke higher returning all to the liueing God’.\(^{115}\) It is almost as if Etherington is actually removing blame from the ruler since he first claims that God gives us prudence and then that vice and virtue are fundamentally extensions of God’s providence. He does, of course, go on to denounce vice. Thus if one acts out of prudence or perhaps rather reason of state, and this happens to be in the realm of ‘vice’, then it is not against God. This, of course, does not excuse wicked action but it does wed the concept of reason of state more closely with Christianity. The divine causes of ruin are therefore paramount and human causes are ‘second or inferior causes w[eb] God holdeth in action and maketh them worke their effect not to be attributed to them primarilie but to the prime cause God himself’. God himself is responsible for these secondary causes of ruin.\(^{116}\)

---
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Naturally Etherington continues his discourse by beginning the next section with a discussion of the human causes of ruin. These ‘second’ causes for ruin are either from ‘home or abroad’, ‘from home as diseases of the Commonwealth force or warres’ and ‘Diseases of the Commonwealth brought in eyther by the Prynce or Subiect’.\(^{117}\) It is these diseases of the prince that Etherington deals with first. He understands that a state can be ruined by the prince’s ‘vices Cruelty luxurie, Couetousnes and perfidiousnes’ and highlights the adverse effects these vices bring about.\(^{118}\) He uses Aristotle’s *Politics* here as a reference point in regard to both cruelty and luxury, stating that ‘Cruelty in Prynces to doe their will and pleasure contrary to Justice is the very vlcer of the Soule’, and that luxury is even worse.\(^{119}\) More generally, Etherington sees that all ‘Wroges also done by Princes manytymes bring returns by ruyne’, the prince can seemingly lead to the ruin of his state through his own immorality.\(^{120}\) Interestingly Etherington here lists a possible wrong as ‘nouelties’ and then within this category includes ‘Descending into other Kingdomes by sending Colonies thither’ to satisfy man’s curiosity.\(^{121}\) This is a rather curious perspective given that on the next page Etherington goes on to give an extensive treatment of money and a positive evaluation of commerce; curious, given that in the ‘Abstract’ Etherington seemed to want to link commerce with colonies. The distinction Etherington is most likely making here though is between unoccupied land and already established states. His statement in this context means to advise the ruler to avoid occupying already occupied lands. Equally Etherington might simply be against the idea of a colony based solely on ‘curiosity’. He would prefer something more profitable. In either case presumably Etherington is pushing the reader towards the Americas. Similarly, Etherington believes that one should not change religion, laws or money and upon establishing the final point, gives a rather extended discussion regarding money and commerce. He once again cites Aristotle’s *Politics* and begins this subsection by stating that God ‘by necessity’ taught us the use of money ‘for more facility of commerce betwene man and man’.\(^{122}\) Here Etherington gives the reader an in-depth analysis of gold and silver and the various methods by which price can be changed; he clearly believes that such concerns are of great importance if the ruler wants to avoid the ruin of his state.\(^{123}\) We might note here that thus far in the treatise Etherington has spoken negatively about his subject. He titles the ‘Adjunct’, ‘of the conseruation of the State’, yet up until this point Etherington has spoken rather of what ruins a state and what to avoid as opposed to giving advice regarding what one should do to conserve the state. It is therefore important to note that it is when he turns to deal with commerce that his language becomes more positive. He advises that the ruler ‘should find better meanes then alteration of money’s to encrease the money’s in the land, both by Sea and land’, thus, commerce should be increased. Etherington’s belief is that by the sea, subjects might take to fishing and recommends that they also ‘traffique twixt forrayne & forrayne as they doe between home & forrayne’, for trafficking between foreign countries would increase profit threefold, a contemporary example likely taken from the Dutch.\(^{124}\) By the land commodities may be increased and exported and interestingly it is noted that profits might be ‘by the assistance and ioyning of the Prynce’. Presumably the prince should ensure the safety of trade and the money available to it as in the Boteran tradition.\(^{125}\) Similarly Etherington sees that subjects might labour the land in order to increase its commodities and use all that the earth has to offer.\(^{126}\) Idle expenses should therefore be avoided and moderation shown in regard to
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imports in order to fully advance the profits gained from such ventures.\textsuperscript{127} Likewise the good and honest tradesmen should be cherished whereas the ‘Idle loyetener, the Transporters and falsyfyers of money’s’ should be punished since they bring ill to the commonwealth.\textsuperscript{128} In order to prevent these economic ills it is therefore wise to provide laws which guard against such things as the ‘delay of suites’ and ‘unnecessary forraine comodities’.\textsuperscript{129} Here Etherington recommends penalties, fit magistrates and worthy preachers. This last point once again highlights the union of reason of state and religion since Etherington believes that ‘learned preachers’ can make subjects ‘groe faithfull and faire conditioned in all their Commerces’ and therefore obedient to God and the Sovereign.\textsuperscript{130} Though this section does include the discussion of other issues, it is the preoccupation with topics related to trade that dominates the piece, not least the affirmative call for commerce. Indeed this can lead to more money being gathered in peace time, ready for war, and this in turn is part of a ‘perfect politique peace and tranquility [which] may be hoped for on earth being the true parents of plenty and true glory of any Nation’.\textsuperscript{131} The true glory of nations is, therefore, their ‘polite peace’ which has its own origin in commerce and its proper execution.

The penultimate section then deals primarily with what Etherington terms ‘Diseases of the Com[m]onwealth’ which come from the subjects. Here we find discussions of ambition, division and conspiracy in the state.\textsuperscript{132} Division is an obvious inclusion given the context of a confessionally divided Europe. Indeed, Etherington gives an account of how discord, faction and sedition can ruin the state.\textsuperscript{133} It is here that we find the discussion of conspiracy and ways in which one could punish traitors. Given how we have dated the manuscript, this discussion on the punishment of traitors might be a reflection on Sir Walter Ralegh’s imprisonment, leading to his execution in 1618.\textsuperscript{134} The contemporary concern for treason is confirmed in the final section in which Etherington laments ‘how many ugly late practices of treason haue beene by Subiects against their gracious Soueraigne, as though they had noe other enemie’.\textsuperscript{135} Etherington’s thought here is discernible from his conclusion of the section in which he notes how civil wars ‘of any one Citty or Commonwealth maketh it two and therefore more quickly ruined’ and in the margin gives the example of the French.\textsuperscript{136} Further to this, war with foreign nations is undesirable, since it ‘consumeth any nation’.\textsuperscript{137} Here we might question whether this contradicts Etherington’s previous assumption that opposition keeps a populace in good temper.\textsuperscript{138} Perhaps Etherington did not prefer lengthy conflicts but rather short wars or even non-combative competition.

Here Etherington leads the reader into a short concluding chapter in which unity is once again stressed, especially the unity of the Christian religion. He concludes by expressing his hope that Prince Charles might be the defender of Christians and learned in ‘Bookes, studious in Histories and the Mathematiques’ and ‘a great linguist’.\textsuperscript{139} The importance of unity, both in religion and state, is very apparent in these sections which highlight the anxiety of the age.
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V. Conclusion

Sloane MS. 1065 is important insofar as it is the only known contemporary English translation of Botero’s most influential book. Indeed, it remains the only English work presented as an adjunct, or response, to the Della ragion di stato. The manuscript, with its gold edging and neatly ruled folios, is a carefully produced artefact and something which its author, Richard Etherington, clearly valued highly. In addition to this the scribe Etherington likely hired for the majority of the piece (Hand B) has taken great care in producing the beautifully written presentation manuscript. We have also shown that the manuscript was written in order and later slightly altered for the express reason of dedicating it to Sir Henry Hobart. In regards to its contents it seems that Botero was an author Etherington had considered deeply. Indeed, he thought Botero a suitable guide for the likes of Hobart. The nature of the ‘Abstract’ brings interesting conclusions. Etherington views the work as an important addition to a politician’s library, something that can be consulted regarding numerous issues. More importantly, when looking at the arrangement and editorial choices made within the ‘Abstract’ it is clear that commercial concerns were of great importance. Etherington appears to have given more thought to Book Eight in the ‘Abstract’ which is more fully concerned with commerce. The ‘Adjunct’ then offers our only known direct English response to Botero’s treatise and offers insight into concerns associated with Botero. As has been shown, ‘policy’ and politics were now clearly more firmly associated with reason of state. It was the diseases of commonwealth that needed to be avoided and reason of state seemingly held the answer: a reason of state more explicitly and firmly grounded in the Christian religion. It was also a reason of state more obviously tied to commerce and colonies. Ultimately, Etherington’s manuscript gives us an insight into how Botero’s Della ragion di stato was being read and understood in early seventeenth-century England. Etherington, a protestant lawyer, viewed Botero’s book as a treatise worthy of politicians’ attention. As early seventeenth-century England began to understand and accept reason of state, perhaps it was Botero who was instructing it in this new form of politics.