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ABSTRACT

This article compares the contents and language of the preeminent English Restoration newspaper, the London Gazette, with those of its French edition the Gazette de Londres. Founded in 1665, and coming out twice a week, the London Gazette was the sole periodical newspaper in England from August 1666 to February 1688. Unquestionably successful, the London Gazette formed an integral part of Restoration life in the capital and beyond. The analysis of eleven issues of both the English and French versions of the newspaper in the summer of 1669 shows that far from being a straightforward verbatim translation of its English counterpart, as has been previously thought, the Gazette de Londres presents significant differences from the London Gazette both regarding layout and contents which shed light on news translation generally in the early modern period as well as news management in Restoration England.
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1. Introduction

From the second half of the sixteenth century English print news played an ever-increasing role in forming the English reader’s knowledge and

---

1 The research for this article was funded in part by a PRIN grant (Prot. 2015TJ8ZAS) from the Italian government.
understanding of people, places, events and cultures. With domestic news the information was generally supplied by native English speakers whilst with foreign news the information was not just based on the speech or written texts of English speakers living or travelling abroad, but also on the translation of manuscript or print news that had originally been written, for example, in French, Dutch, German, Spanish, Italian or Latin. Translation had a fundamental role in the dissemination of foreign, mostly European, news among the English reading public. In some cases, as with the one-sheet corantos of 1620 and 1621, the English texts were very close translations of foreign news publications.

However, the role of translation in English news was not one-way. English print news was itself translated into other languages. In the case of serialised news published in London, Le Mercure Anglois (1644-1648) and Nouvelles Ordinaires de Londres (1650-1660) both contained not just news items written directly in French but also translations of news previously published in English (Frank 1961: 70-71; Peacey 2017: 243). These mid-century London-based foreign news publications were successful, and in November 1666 yet another French-written news publication was published in London. Its name was Gazette de Londres and it continued publication until 1705 (Fabre 1991: 516). The Gazette de Londres was the officially authorised translation of the London Gazette, the sole periodical newspaper in England to run uninterruptedly from August 1666 to February 1688. The government-sponsored two-page publication contained not only domestic and foreign news but also government announcements and, from 1671 onwards, regular commercial advertisements. Unquestionably successful, the London Gazette formed an integral part of Restoration life in the capital and beyond.

In this essay I shall examine the Gazette de Londres with regard to its status as an authorised translation of the London Gazette. By means of

---


3 Initially called the Oxford Gazette when it was founded in 1665, it became the London Gazette in 1666 and is published up to the present day. For studies on The London Gazette, and more generally on news management in Restoration England, see Muddiman (1923), Walker (1950), Fraser (1956), Sutherland (1986), Raymond (2003: 323-391), Fries (2015), and Peacey (2016).

4 The fact that the Gazette de Londres had primarily a political purpose is emphasised by the fact that according to Lord Arlington, Williamson’s fellow Secretary of State, the French translation of the London Gazette “always turned to loss” (Handover 1965: 20).
examining eleven issues of both the English and French versions of the paper in the summer of 1669, I shall consider the extent to which it can be considered a “verbatim translation” (Fraser 1956: 51) or a “straightforward translation” (Peacey 2017: 250). Where a close translation does not occur, I shall not only identify what it is substituted by but suggest why the alternative mode of translation should have been adopted. The study aims to contribute to the recent growing interest in the translation of early modern news while recognizing, as regards English news, the pertinence of Slauter’s comment: “although specialists know that the gazettes and journals of the early modern period contained mainly foreign news, the movement of this news across linguistic and political boundaries remains very little studied” (2012: 256). Despite work by Barker (2013, 2016), Brownlees (2014: 36-42; and forthcoming), McLaughlin (2015), Peacey (2017), Raymond (2013: 406-412) and Valdeón (2012), our understanding of how and why news translators have translated as they did is still sketchy. One major methodological issue impeding wide-ranging understanding of the question is the relative scarcity of clearly matching source and target texts. Occasionally the foreign source text is found in the same publication as the translated text, and sometimes it is possible to trace it through metatextual referencing, but in the vast number of cases where the news is either a translation into or out of English our understanding of the processes of translation is based on rare metatextual comment and other contemporary sources regarding professional practice.

In this respect the Gazette de Londres is of the highest importance in the history of English news since it was the longest-running news publication whose content was primarily and explicitly based on the translation of another extant news publication. As such, it merits study not only for what it tells us about the global and local translation strategies adopted by the official translator but how the process of translation reconfigured the original news publication. In using the terms ‘global strategy’ and ‘local strategy’, I follow Gambier (2010), who defines the former as the translator’s “planned, explicit, goal-oriented procedure or programme, adopted to achieve a certain objective” (2010: 412) and the latter, the local, as the procedures or

---

5. Dooley (2010, 2016), Raymond (2012), and Boerio (2016) also examine news flows across Early Modern Europe though their studies are more concerned with the concept of textual borrowings than with translation.

6. For an example of a news pamphlet containing both source and target texts, see A Relation of the Late Horrible Treason, intended against the Prince of Orange (19 February 1623).
techniques adopted in achieving the global strategy\textsuperscript{7}. Through this analysis, I aim to further our understanding of not just news translation but also news management in the first years of the Restoration.

2. *Gazette de Londres*

The *Gazette de Londres* was printed and published in London and even if mid-seventeenth-century news scholarship was hindered by “extremely perplexing issues relating to the intended and actual audiences for […] gazettes and mercuries” (Peacey 2017: 247), we can assume that the newspaper was not only addressed to the French equivalent of the English readership – merchants, gentlemen and all those interested in court affairs – but also English readers living in Europe who did not have access to the *London Gazette* as well as to all foreigners who read and communicated in French. As Dugard, the probable editor of *Nouvelles ordinaires de Londres*, wrote in the first issue of the publication, French was “la langue qui s’étend et s’entend dans toute l’Europe” (Fabre 1991: 516). Thus, for example, it is not surprising that a Tuscan envoy living in London occasionally enclosed the newspaper in his weekly diplomatic correspondence to the Grand Duke of Tuscany at the end of the seventeenth century\textsuperscript{8}.

For the first five years of its publication, the *London Gazette* was formally edited by Charles Perrott (Fraser 1956: 49; Fabre 1991: 516) although the person principally responsible for the running of the English newspaper and its French translation was Joseph Williamson, Under Secretary of State in the Restoration government (Handover 1965: 14). He maintained overall control of the two newspapers until his replacement as Secretary of State in 1679 (Fabre 1991: 516). The translation of the *London Gazette* into French was carried out from 1666-1678 by M. Moranville (Grey 1769: 149-173; Fraser 1956: 51; Fabre 1991: 516). We have details of this as a result of a very interesting parliamentary exchange in 1678 relating to a piece of news translated in the *Gazette de Londres*. The exchange took place at the height of the Popish Plot when anti-Catholic sentiment was running very high in London and the country as a whole. As Coward writes, “Letters of the time are full of rumours

\textsuperscript{7} See also Chesterman (2016: 85-114) for characteristics and terminological issues relating to the concept of translation strategies.

\textsuperscript{8} Francesco Terriesi, envoy to the Grand Duchy of Tuscany in London, enclosed twenty copies of the *Gazette de Londres* with his diplomatic post back to Florence between 1689-1690 (Archivio di Stato di Firenze, Mediceo del Principato, *filza* 4246).
that the French and Spanish had landed, that ‘night riders’ had been seen, that Catholics were arming themselves secretly, that bombs had been placed under churches” (1994: 327). In this febrile atmosphere Moranville was questioned by parliament regarding his translation of a news item regarding the Plot into French in the London Gazette.

[The Speaker.] There has been a great, and supposed wilful mistake, in the translation of the Gazette into French, viz. “that the Papists, refusans de se conformer a la Religion Anglicane”, “refusing to conform themselves to the Religion of England”, &c. “are commanded to go out of town”, without mentioning the present Plot, &c. to be the occasion, as is in the King’s Proclamation recited, &c. You are sent for, to know how this has been foisted in different from the Proclamation.

In the questioning Moranville admitted his mistake – an “omission by inadvertency” (Grey 1769: 7 November) – but his confession was not enough to prevent accusations of conspiring on behalf of the French against the Crown. The parliamentary cross-examination finished with an order “to search the Translator’s house for Papers” (Grey 1769: 7 November).

How the story eventually ended is not known, but what is clear is how seriously members of the British parliament took this errant translation of Moranville’s. In their view this was not merely some translator’s slip leading to partial loss in the transmission of knowledge but rather an example of how through translation the contents of the source text could be reconstrued and manipulated. The manipulation, however, did not lie in the translation of the English text into French but rather in what was not translated. By not translating the part of the London Gazette that reported the ongoing Popish Plot and King’s Proclamation expelling the Catholics, Moranville’s translation appeared in the view of the Parliament’s Speaker to make “a presumption amongst strangers, that persons may be under persecution here for Religion only” (Grey 1769: 7 November).

In light of Moranville’s questioning in 1678, I aim in the following analysis to see if elsewhere we also find cases of translation strategies that give new, different meanings to the source text. There are no extant copies of the Gazette de Londres of 1678, but a run of eleven issues of the French newspaper in the summer and early autumn of 1669 has survived. In examining these translations, I shall assess the degree to which Moranville translates the London Gazette so that what is found in the Gazette de Londres can be considered manipulation. As Fabre (1991: 516) writes, “Le problème
central pour la Gazette de Londres, que l’épisode Moranville mit en lumière, est celui de la fidélité de la traduction, et de la relation entre le texte anglais et français. Une étude comparative s’impose”.


The eleven issues examined run from 16 August to 20 September. The newspaper came out twice a week and each of the issues consists of two small folio pages where the news in both the English and French versions is laid out in two columns on both recto and verso. The news is introduced by a dateline providing the barest information relating to the source and date of news (e.g. “Plymouth, August 27”, “De Plymouth, le 27 Aoust 1669”; “Rome, August 10”, “De Rome, le 10 Aoust 1669. N.S.”). The four columns of news range from 65-78 lines each, amounting in all to approximately 2,600-2,800 words. In each of the issues news originated from 8-13 different places though from each location it was possible to find news relating to towns and countries elsewhere in Europe. This was especially true of news arriving from some of the larger cities in Europe. Thus, a news dispatch headed by the dateline ‘Rome’, ‘Venice’ or ‘Paris’, could include news which had reached that particular news hub from much further afield.

The English news typically regards either shipping, court and government affairs or the king’s hunting trip to the New Forest. The shipping news has the name of ports in the dateline (e.g. Plymouth, Falmouth, Weymouth), the court news is headed by “Whitehall” or “London” while the hunting trip includes “Southampton” in the dateline. The London Gazette almost always begins with at least one dispatch from a port and usually concludes the dispatches on the second page with news from London or Whitehall. The intervening dispatches do not appear to be arranged in any particular order either in relation to the date or location of the dispatch. Below the concluding dispatch on the second page, the English newspaper has a section entitled “Advertisements”, which contains government announcements and the occasional commercial advertisement giving details of the printer’s other publications.

9 London Gazette and Gazette de Londres, 2 September and 23 August 1669. In news publications of the period, the old Julian calendar and the new Gregorian calendar were respectively referred to as “veteri Stilo” (VS.) and “novo Stilo” (N.S.).

10 Only after 1671 did commercial announcements advertising products and services come to be regularly included in this “Advertisements” section.
and position of the ‘Advertisements’ (called here ‘adverts’) of three issues of the *London Gazette* (LG) and the *Gazette de Londres* (GDL).

Table 1. Contents of *London Gazette* (datelines and Advertisements section) and *Gazette de Londres* (datelines) 30 August-6 September 1669

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LG (30 Aug.)</th>
<th>GDL (30 Aug.)</th>
<th>LG (2 Sept.)</th>
<th>GDL (2 Sept.)</th>
<th>LG (6 Sept.)</th>
<th>GDL (6 Sept.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Falmouth</td>
<td>Falmouth</td>
<td>Plymouth</td>
<td>Plymouth</td>
<td>Falmouth</td>
<td>Falmouth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plymouth</td>
<td>Plymouth</td>
<td>Deal</td>
<td>Deal</td>
<td>Rome</td>
<td>Rome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moscow</td>
<td>Moscow</td>
<td>Genoa</td>
<td>Rome*</td>
<td>Genoa</td>
<td>Genoa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warsaw</td>
<td>Lisbon</td>
<td>Madrid</td>
<td>Madrid</td>
<td>Vienna</td>
<td>Madrid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lisbon</td>
<td>Cadiz</td>
<td>Vienna</td>
<td>Vienna</td>
<td>Hamburg</td>
<td>Vienna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cadiz</td>
<td>Warsaw</td>
<td>Hague</td>
<td>Hague</td>
<td>Hamburg</td>
<td>Hague</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rome*</td>
<td>Leghorn</td>
<td>Brussels</td>
<td>Brussels</td>
<td>Hamburg</td>
<td>London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leghorn</td>
<td>Madrid</td>
<td>Paris</td>
<td>Paris</td>
<td>Hague</td>
<td>Adverts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madrid</td>
<td>Venice</td>
<td>London</td>
<td>Whitehall</td>
<td>Southampton</td>
<td>Southampton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Venice</td>
<td>Hague</td>
<td>Adverts</td>
<td>London</td>
<td>London</td>
<td>Adverts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hague</td>
<td>Paris</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paris</td>
<td>London</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London Adverts**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The Rome news in the GDL of 2 September is a translation of the LG dispatch of 30 August

** ‘Adverts’ is an abbreviation of ‘Advertisements’

The most obvious difference between the *London Gazette* and *Gazette de Londres* lies in the non-translation of the Advertisements section since not only are the government notices in the section not translated but neither are the English printer’s occasional advertisements of other published works of his. We can presume that Williamson had decided that such news was of little interest to the French-reading readership.

However, apart from this difference, Table 1 also shows that while the datelines, and hence the news, generally concur in the two versions of the newspaper there is not always an exact correspondence. First of all, even if the news is the same, and with the same datelines, it is not necessarily placed in the same order. Of the three separate issues in Table 1, only the publication of 6 September maintains exactly the same order of news in the two versions. Secondly, some datelines and their respective news in the *London Gazette* are

---

11 For example, on 16 September the *London Gazette* finishes with the advertisement of the printer’s ‘newly Publish’d, An exact Designe of the City of Candia, with all its fortifications, Rentrenchments, Galleries, Countermines, etc.’.
not always present in the *Gazette de Londres* and vice versa. For example, the news datelined “Rome” in the *London Gazette* of 30 August is instead placed in the *Gazette de Londres* of 2 September while the news datelined ‘Whitehall’ in the French version of 30 August is not present at all in the English version of the same date nor in any of the other eleven issues examined.

Furthermore, the respective layouts of the *London Gazette* and the *Gazette del Londres* differ slightly. The London publication begins its news lower down on the first page, contains slightly more characters per line and has run-on datelines on the same line as the dispatch. This latter feature is different from that of the *Gazette de Londres*, where the dateline is placed above the following dispatch and spatially separated from the previous news item. In general the amount of news is the same or only slightly less in the *London Gazette* to what it is in the *Gazette de Londres*. The most significant exception to this general practice is in the issue of 26 August where at the bottom of page 2 the *Gazette de Londres* carries an extra 18 lines of news originating from Paris. This extra information corresponds more or less to the amount of space set aside for the “Advertisements” in the *London Gazette* of the same day.

A helpful methodological framework for understanding the modes in which the above aspects of the *London Gazette* news are reconfigured in the *Gazette de Londres* is found in recent studies on contemporary news translation (Conway – Bassnett 2006, Bielsa – Bassnett 2009, Schäffner 2012). The key concept to emerge in this research is that in modern day news translation the news editor and translator give absolute priority to domestication: “In news translation, the dominant strategy is absolute domestication, as material is shaped in order to be consumed by the target audience, so [it] has to be tailored to suit their needs and expectations” (Bielsa – Bassnett 2009: 10). As a result of this process of domestication the source text can be subjected to different modifications including “elimination of unnecessary information” and “change in the order of paragraphs” (Bielsa – Bassnett 2009: 64). In this respect the non-translation in the *Gazette de Londres* of the “Advertisements”, since the information was considered of little interest to the target audience, and the reorganization of the news dispatches in the French version, conform to present-day news translation procedures.

However, if we place this mode of reconfiguration of source text news within the context of seventeenth-century practice, we see that it differs from what usually occurs in those publications where extant source and target texts have been identified. Thus, the first English corantos of 1620-1621, which were translations of Dutch and German corantos, kept the same order of dispatches (Dahl 1952: 33-41). It was in the English publisher’s interests to maintain the same order of news so as to impress upon English readers and
English authorities that what was being sold was indeed the news already published in Dutch and German corantos. Likewise, no parts of the source text were left untranslated on grounds of probable lack of interest to English readers. Some news was left untranslated but not because it lacked appeal, rather, on the contrary, because it was considered too pertinent to English affairs. This was the news which in the Dutch and German corantos touched upon English matters and which as a result of various English censorship regulations was deemed unpublishable (Brownlees 2014: 33).

In contrast, the reorganization of news content in the *Gazette de Londres* probably reflects the newspaper’s position as a government-sponsored publication. As such, its news could be organised as wished. The *Gazette de Londres* was recognised as the official translation of the government-approved newspaper and its status would not have been affected by any internal reconfiguration of news previously published in its English counterpart.


In this section I examine the news content in the *Gazette de Londres* and what it can tell us about the translator’s specific translation strategies. I make a broad distinction between ‘close translation’, which, if not literal, contains all the essential information of the source text, and ‘manipulation’ that incorporates what apparently are intentional changes altering the message of the text. However, in referring to ‘manipulation’ I agree with Denton who asserts that “manipulation does not necessarily imply censorial, ideologically motivated intervention in the target text […] but could also be an attempt on the translator’s part to fill in gaps in his/her readers’ knowledge by incorporation of explanatory glosses or direct domesticating substitution” (Denton 2016: 10). In accordance with this definition, I distinguish below between cases of non-ideological and ideological manipulation.

4.1 Close translation

Much of the translation of the *London Gazette* is close. For example, this always occurs in the translation of shipping news originating in English ports.

1. *Deal, Aug. 23.*
Here lately arrived in the *Downs* four ships from the *East-Indies*, and the 21 instant the *Maderas* from *Bantam*, whose appearance was the
more welcome by reason of the hazard she was supposed to have run on her way home.

This day a Fleet of about 20 sail of Merchant ships outwards bound went out of the Downs in Order to their respective voyages. (London Gazette, 26 August 1669)

(2) De Dele, le 23 Aoust 1669.
Quatre Navires sont, depuis peu, arrivées des Indes Orientales aus Dunes: & un autre Vaisseau du nom de Madère, y arrive, aussi, de Bantam, le 21 de ce mois, dont l’Arrivée a été d’autant mieux reçue que l’on suppose qu’il a couru grand hazard à son retour. Une Flote d’environ 20 Navires Marchands, frotte a pour les Pais étrangers est partie, aujourd’hui, des Dunes, pour prendre la route des Ports où ils doivent aller. (Gazette de Londres, 26 August 1669)

(3) Plymouth, August 13.
Yesterday arrived here a new England ship bound hither from Barbados, and this day a ship of Yarmouth from the Caribby Islands, where they left all things in a peaceable and thriving posture. (London Gazette, 19 August 1669)

(4) De Plymouth, le 13 Aoust 1669.
Un Navire de la Nouvelle Angleterre arriça hier, de Barbade, où il avoit été frotte pour ce Port; & un Vaisseau d’Yarmouth, qui vient des Isles Caribes, où il a laisse toutes choses en bonne & florissante posture. (Gazette de Londres, 19 August 1669)

At the level of content, the above source and target texts contain the same information though the translation cannot be considered literal, at least not according to Chesterman’s definition by which source texts are not “maximally close to the SL form, but nevertheless grammatical” (2016: 91). In the above examples the sentence units in both the source and target texts are the same in that they both respectively consist of 2 and 1 sentences but within the sentences there are alterations at the syntactic level. These changes involve some of the categories set out by Chesterman (2016: 91) in his analysis of syntactic procedures in translation. Thus, we find clause

---

12 The categories are: “Literal translation; Loan, calque; Transposition; Unit shift; Phrase structure; Clause structure change; Sentence structure change; Cohesion change; Level shift; Scheme change”. Chesterman, however, refers to these alterations as
structure change in both (2) and (4), where the French begins with Subject while the English begins with Adverbial.

4.2 Non-ideological manipulation

Close translation is also adopted in the case of those European news items where the focus of the information is on matters unrelated to Great Britain and France. Manipulation occasionally occurs in these texts, but its instances do not allude to any specific overarching ideological translation strategy. Thus, in comparison with the source texts in (5) and (7) the translator in (6) and (8) provides extra detail about one matter while excluding detail about another which must have been considered less newsworthy.

(5)  
*Lisbonne, July 22.*
This Court is much satisfy’d with the safe return of the Fleet which was employd under the Command of the Count de Prado to the Castle of Angra in the Terceras their passage thither was long and tedious, being kept at sea above 27 days, coming to Anchor in the Bay of Angra […] (London Gazette, 19 August 1669)

(6)  
*De Lisbonne, le 22 Juillet 1669. N.S.*
Cete Cour est, grandemant, satisfaite de l’heureus retour de la Flote, qui étoit emplooiée sous le Commandemant du Comte de Prado, pour conduire le Roi Don Alphone au Château d’Angra en l’Isle de Tercere, pour où aller il a emploie jusq’à 27 jours. En moüillant à la Baie d’Angra […] (Gazette de Londres, 19 August 1669)

(7)  
*Madrid, Aug. 25.*
The New Guards continue their Duty at the Palace, but the People of the Town complain of great Disorders, several Persons having been lately kill’d in the Streets, and many Robberies committed. The Portuguese Ambassador having taken his leave is returned home […] (London Gazette, 9 September 1669)

(8)  
*De Madrid, le 25 Aoust 1669. N.S.*
Le nouveau Regiment des Gardes continue de faire sa function au Palais: mais les Habitans murmurent fort, a cause des exces des

“strategies” since his use of the term ‘strategy’ corresponds to Gambier’s ‘local’ strategy.
Soldats, plusieurs Personnes ayant été depuis peu, tueées dans les rues, & diverse vols s’erano commis de nuit. L’Ambassadeur de Portugal aint pris son Audience de congé s’en est retourné [...] (Gazette de Londres, 9 September 1669)

We also find instances of added material presumably inserted for the benefit of French readers. In one instance the additional text specifically regards the names of French soldiers who had taken part in, and in some cases been killed in, the French attack of Turkish-held Candia. The long list of French names clearly resonated with the French reading public but not with the English readers of the London version of the newspaper. In another case the translator inserts the name of a French envoy (“Chevalier de Mariva, Premier Gentilhomme Ordinaire de Monseigneur le Duc d’Orleans, en qualité d’Envoie [...]”) who had been received at a function at the English court. Here too the additional information conveyed is of interest only, or primarily, to French readers.

In contrast, in the London Gazette of 6 September the last paragraph of a ship-news dispatch from Leghorn is not translated in the Gazette de Londres. Either it was not considered important or, perhaps, there was insufficient space in the French version.

4.3 Ideologically motivated manipulation

Occurrences of ideologically motivated manipulation occur in news dispatches datelined “London”, “Whitehall” and “Paris”. In these cases, the translator adds words to the translation to underline a particular ideological point in the text. The additional material principally lets us see: a) how the English wish English matters to be perceived; b) how the English wish their reactions to French news to be perceived.

4.3.1 How the English wish English matters to be perceived

English court news is sometimes embellished and rendered grander or more magnificent in the Gazette de Londres. For example, the Danish ambassador’s procession from Greenwich to Westminster via the Tower of London is described in greater, more grandiose detail in the French version.

---

13 19 August. Candia, the early-modern name for Heraklion (Crete), was captured by the Turks in 1669.
14 16 September.
The celebratory, eulogistic description in the following French text has no parallel in the English newspaper.

(9) C’est en ce magnifique Apareil que son Excellence fut conduit depuis la Tour par les rues de Londres, & de Westminster, remplies de fort beau monde aux fenêtres, & d’une foule de people innombrable, jusqu’en l’Hotel. (Gazette de Londres, 19 August 1669)

The text has been added, as is also the case in the successive issue of 23 August, when once more the Danish ambassador’s visit is described. As with the issue of 19 August, in the French version of 23 August additional details enhance the grandeur of the Danish ambassador’s visit. It is likely that the intent behind the added text is political. The additional news regarding the ambassadorial visit underlines for the French-reading audience not just the importance of Anglo-Danish relations but the splendour of the English court. Through this additional text, the Gazette de Londres is being exploited to promote government policy for a foreign audience.

This political motivation may also explain the addition of “tristes” in (11). The London Gazette (10) merely states that Charles II’s mother, Henrietta Maria, youngest daughter of King Henry IV of France, had died whereas the French version inserts “tristes” in reference to her death which serves two purposes. First, the insertion suggests an empathy for the French queen consort of England (as wife of Charles I) amongst the English people which in fact was not common; second, it reflects French expectations of how the death of one of their own royal family should be received in the neighbouring country. 

(10) London September 5. Yesterday in the morning His Majesty by an Express from France received the news of the Death of the Queen Mother at Colombe. (London Gazette, 6 September 1669)

(11) De Londres, le 5 Septembre 1669. Hier au matin, le Roi reçut par un Exprès, qui avoit été dépêché de France, les tristes Nouvelles de la

However, while not excluding the political explanation, it is also possible that the insertion of “tristes” exemplifies what Chesterman (2016: 110) refers to as the “significance threshold”, that is, “the point at which a given message or meaning is felt to be worth uttering”. Thus, “tristes” has also been added because it was deemed culturally necessary since unlike in English, where it is implicit that a death is ‘sad’, in French such a fact has to be rendered explicit.
mort de la Reine Mere, décédée en sa Mason de Colombe. (Gazette de Londres, 6 September 1669)

The same desire to emphasise the impact of the French Queen Mother’s death on the English court explains why later in the same dispatch the translator deviates from a close translation of the English newspaper to add further description of the consternation the death had caused at the English court.

(12) [She died] to the great Regret of the French Court and infinite affliction of his Majesty and Royal Highness, who have thereupon put an end to their Diversions in New Forrest. (London Gazette, 6 September 1669)

(13) [Elle est décédée] au grand regret de la Cour de France, et une extrême Affliction de Leurs Majestez de la Grande Bretagne, ainsi que de Leurs Altesses Roiales, & de toute la Cour d’Angleterre: ce qui en a fait cesser les Divertissemens à Newforest. (Gazette de Londres, 6 September 1669)

However, there is also an instance in which the translator adds material related not only to the English court, and its connection to certain political questions, but also to a celebrated English institution. In (15) the translation of the installation of the new Chancellor of Oxford University includes evaluative terms (“fameuse”, “l’une des plus célèbres du Monde”) that are not found in the source text (14) and are clearly inserted to increase the prestige of the institution.

On Thursday last in the afternoon, Dr. Fell, Vice-Chancellor of the University of Oxford with a considerable body of the Doctors [...] and a great body of the Masters of Arts and other Members of their Convocation met at Exeter house, from whence they went in their formalities to Worcester house, where they held a Convocation for the enstallment of his Grace the Duke of Ormond in the Chancellorship of the University. (London Gazette, 30 August 1669)

(15) De Londres, le 28 Aoust 1669.
Jeudi l’apresdîner, le Docteur Fell, Vicechancelier de l’Université d’Oxford, accompagnè de quantité de Docteurs [...] et de grand nombre de Maîtres des Arts, et autres Membres de cete fameuse Académie se rendirent en l’Hôtel d’Exeter, d’où ils passèrent en celui de Worcester, revétus de leurs Habits de Cérémonie, où étant tous
assamblez pour l’installation de Monseigneur le Duc d’Ormond en la Dignité de Chancelier de cête Université, l’une des plus célébres du Monde. (*Gazette de Londres*, 30 August 1669)

Finally, in the case of English news, and how it was to be perceived by the French reading public, we have an interesting case of personal self-aggrandisement. Whereas in the English version a news dispatch may mention the presence of the Master of Ceremonies at an event without even specifying the official’s name, we see in the French editions of the newspaper that greater importance is given to the person of Sir Charles Cotterel, Master of Ceremonies. In those editions increased prominence is shown in some instances simply by the insertion of the Master of Ceremonies’s name, but in others Sir Charles Cotterel’s role in English court matters is actually enhanced. For example, in the “Whitehall” dispatch in the *Gazette de Londres* of 23 August his presence and role are mentioned twice in the celebrations of the Danish ambassador’s visit, whereas in the English version he has just one mention. Furthermore, in the French version of 20 September his name appears twice in a court dispatch from London while in the English publication there is a reference to the presence of the “Master of the Ceremonies” but no mention of the Master’s name. On the basis of these alterations we may presume that Cotterel himself had exerted pressure on Moranville or Williamson to tweak the translation so that in the eyes of French readers, especially those at the French court, his standing at the English court would be evident.

4.3.2 How the English wish their reactions to French news to be perceived

The additional material in the above cases regards English matters, but in the *Gazette de Londres* we also have examples of supplementary material relating specifically to French concerns.

(16) *Paris, August 31.*

The 27th instant Madam was happily brought to bed of a Daughter at the Pallace of *St. Clou*, and was the same day visited and complimented by their Majesties and several of the Great Ladys and personages of the Court. (*London Gazette*, 26 August 1669)\(^\text{16}\)

\(^{16}\) As datelines in news dispatches from France and other parts of continental Europe reflected the Gregorian calendar, they could sometimes refer to events which in England, that still followed the Julian calendar, appeared in the future.
By adding the positive evaluative terms “belle” and “délicieuse” in (17) in reference to the newly-born French princess and palace at which the birth took place, the translator is ingratiating the French monarchy. The political motivation is clear. The French court is led to believe that this explicitly positive report on the birth of the French princess had been published in the London version of the newspaper.

5. The Gazette de Londres and seventeenth-century news translation

The analysis of eleven issues of the Gazette de Londres in 1669 brings to light several points about not only the newspaper in question but also about news translation in general in the seventeenth century. As regards the Gazette de Londres itself, what is clear is that the translation is neither “verbatim” (Fraser 1956: 51) nor “straightforward” (Peacey 2017: 250). The French version of the London Gazette never includes material in the “Advertisements” section of the London newspaper, frequently rearranges the order of news dispatches, and not infrequently makes changes in the translation at word or phrase level. The non-ideological instances of manipulation in the Gazette de Londres can be seen as examples of domestication where Moranville (perhaps under the guidance of the Under Secretary) manipulates the text through deletion or addition, or both, to render it more pertinent to concerns of the French-reading audience. Those responsible for the Gazette de Londres wished the publication to be read and sold, thus, as with modern-day news translation, domestication procedures were adopted. The ideological manipulation in the texts, instead, reflects the extent to which Moranville (alone, or again under the guidance of Williamson) attempted to exercise news management even at a micro level. On the basis of these latter examples of manipulation we can see that the translator – perhaps under his superior’s command – was using the resources of translation to promote English policy. This form of news management appears intended to promote England’s status
and put a more positive spin on events relating to the French court. In this respect Moranville cannot be accused of conspiring through translation to promote a Catholic, anti-English agenda as he was accused of doing in 1678.

Comparing the above-mentioned translation strategies in Section 4 to what we already know of early modern news translation, we can see that the prevailing strategy of close translation in the *Gazette de Londres* conforms to what occurred in the translation of the Dutch and German corantos of the 1620s. On the basis of present evidence, this would appear to be the default strategy in those cases where the target text is explicitly stated as being the translation of an identifiable source text\(^{17}\). The same close translation was adopted with corantos and the *London Gazette* even if the publishers’ overriding aims were fundamentally different. Unlike the publishers of corantos, who were private individuals hoping to make a profit through their publications, the government officials in charge of the *Gazette de Londres* were above all motivated by political considerations. These differences in objectives did not lead to an overall difference in translation strategy but can help to explain those exceptions to the strategy. As Dahl points out (1952: 33, 45) many of the cases in which English corantos differ from their Dutch and German source texts regard the omission of news content. The English corantos omitted news published in foreign news publications regarding English politics. Such news ran up against motley censorship restrictions. These exceptions to close translation in the corantos can be contrasted with those in the *Gazette de Londres*, which far from involving the omission of text instead regard the inclusion of additional news content. As stated above, in these circumstances the additional material can be interpreted as having an ideological purpose.

Finally, it is important to note how different seventeenth century print news translation is from that of today. Modern-day news translation privileges absolute domestication and it is within this concept that we can also examine news translation of the past. By examining the level of domestication of early modern newspapers, and understanding why very often little domestication is found, we can gain insight into the respective significance of commercial and political considerations underlying the role and objectives of the publication in question.

\(^{17}\) Conversely, where the news writer does not mention translation as the source of their information, but nevertheless makes use of it, it is very possible that the translation is anything but a close translation.
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