I. 忘れられた流行小説『シャーロット・サマーズの物語』

[1] 15-18 世紀に主としてイギリス諸島および北アメリカで出版された刊行物の総合目録である The English Short Title Catalogue（ESTC）には、「シャーロット・サマーズ」の種類の書が掲載されている。1750 年にロンドンで刊行された初版に加え、同じ年に出版された第 2 版（ESTC #: N330064）、1753 年のダブリン版（ESTC #: N32712）など、ロンドンの別の出版者が 1758 年ごろに出した第 4 版（ESTC #: T126294）、さらに別の出版者が 1770 年に出した版（ESTC #: N17437）の 5 つである。

ESTC にはこれらに加え、1750 年代から 80 年代にかけて出た 9 種類のフランス語版（L'orpheline angloise, ou histoire de Charlotte Summers）も掲載されている。この物語は特に革命前のフランスで人気があったのだが、1740 年から 1760 年にかけてのフランスの個人蔵書カタログを調査したデニエル・モルネ（Daniel Mornet）研究を含む英文学研究者のメアリー・チームラモン（Mary Helen McMurran）が書いた論文によれば、フランス語版『シャーロット・サマーズ』は、リチャードソンの『パミラ』、フィールディングの『トム・ジョーンズ』、そしてリチャードソンの『クリッパーズ』に次いで 4 番目に人気のあった仮説イギリス小説である（Memurran, "National" 53; Mornet 461）。1763 年フランス語版から転訳されたロシア語版『シャーロット・サマーズ』（Сирота аглинская, или История о Шарлотте Суммерс）が、同時代のロシア人作家に多大な影響を及ぼしたことを語る研究もあり（Garn）。世界の主要図書館蔵書目録の統合検索サイト WorldCat によれば、1751 年と 1790 年に刊行されたオランダ語版（Historie van het verlatene en gelukkige weeskind, Charlotte Summers）も存在している。（内田 20, 下線は私、内田）

[2]【Charlotte Summers のあらすじ。】
A wealthy aristocrat, Lady Bountiful, adopts a lovely girl of unknown origin, Charlotte Summers, who grows up in her household together with her son, Sir Thomas, and the two fall in love. When Lady Bountiful makes it clear that she will never agree to this union, Charlotte runs away from her benefactress and goes through a series of perilous adventures, yet manages to remain virtuous and faithful. At the end of the novel she finds her long-lost rich father, turns out to be of noble origin, and marries Sir Thomas. (Garn 255)

[3] この小説全体に漂う二番煎じ感は否めない。男性の身勝手な欲望と暴力に囚われつつも自らの尊厳を守ろうとして闘う若い女性を主人公に据えたのは、当時の大作家サミュエル・リチャードソンの『パミラ』や『クラリッサ』を真似たのだろう。主人公が描かれて一時的に婚家で暮らすことになるという設定も『クラリッサ』からの借り物だ。そこでフィールディングの『トム・ジョーンズ』を思わせる貴種流離譚の要素を組み合わせ、やはり『トム・ジョーンズ』から主人公が投獄されるエピソードを混ぜ込んでいる。小説の構成もフィールディング的作品を真似たもので、各部（book）の最初の章は『トム・ジョーンズ』と同様に、作者が読者に直接語りかけて創作論をぶつ随筆的な文章になっている。 (内田 22)

[4]【Charlotte Summers 序文より。Henry Fielding の「詩的な面での私生児」であると自称する作者。】
You must know then, I am the first Begotten, of the poetical Issue, of the much celebrated Biographer of Joseph Andrews, and Tom Jones; I dare not pretend to be legitimately (sic) begotten; I believe I must content myself with the Honour of being only a natural Brat of that facetious Gentleman; . . . (History 1: 3)

[5]【英文学研究者 Thomas Keymer は、Charlotte Summers の作者の文才を評価していない。】
The History of Charlotte Summers, The Fortuneate Parish Girl (1750) . . . is the tale of a female Tom Jones, written by an unknown opportunist who claimed—with startling deafness to the evidence of his own style—to be in literary terms 'a right Slip of the F——gs, and as like him as if he had spit me out of his Mouth, as the Saying is.' (Keymer, Introduction, '下線は私)
【Charlotte Summers の自己言及性】

While this plot [of Charlotte Summers] is quite conventional, the novel’s discourse is refreshingly original. The most remarkable feature of the narrative frame . . . is the introduction of simple-minded readers of the book within the book itself, as well as dialogues between the narrator and these readers on various matters, including crucial elements of the novel’s plot and conclusion. (Garn 255)

【Tom Jones の自己言及性。読者に直接呼びかける作者。】

Reader, I think proper, before we proceed any farther together, to acquaint thee, that I intend to digress, through this whole History, as often as I see Occasion: Of which I am myself a better Judge than any pitiful Critic whatever. And here I must desire all those Critics to mind their own Business, and not to intermeddle with Affairs, or Works, which no ways concern them . . . (H. Fielding; bk. 1, ch. 2)

【Charlotte Summers の自己言及性。読者を「空飛ぶ馬車」でウェールズまで瞬間移動させる作者。】

Before I introduce my Readers into the Company of Miss Charlotte Summers, I must make them acquainted with some of her Friends, whose Character and Conversation I flatter myself, will give them no Scandal, for which Purpose, I must beg their Company as far as Carmarthenshire, in Wales. Tho’ the Journey is pretty long, and, in the ordinary Way of travelling, may take up some Days, yet we Authors are always provided with an easy flying Carriage, which can waft our Readers in an Instant, much longer Journeys than this we are now setting out on: We are Masters of a Kind of Art Magic, that we have only to speak the Word, and, presto, you are transported, in the very Position you chance to be in at the Time, to the Place where we would have you attend us. Don’t you find already the magical Effect? The Journey is over, and we are just alighted at the Gate of a stately old Building . . . . (History 1: 12–13; bk. 1, ch. 1, 下線は私)

【Henry Fielding 作品には見られない Charlotte Summers の特徴は、この小説が読者の何名かを小説の内部に登場させ、台詞まで与えていることだ。】

【老婦人 Lady Bountiful の話ばかりで肝心の主人公 Charlotte が出てこないので、読者たちが文句を言い始める。】

I fancy by this Time, my Readers are pretty well acquainted with the Lady Bountiful and ready to thank me for the Pains I have taken, to introduce them into such valuable Company, but I can hear Beau Thoughtless and pretty Miss Pert, whispering to one another, ‘Hang the old Woman [Lady Bountiful], I wish we were done with her, we have seen enough of her, I want to see the young Wench [Charlotte], there has been so much talk about, whereabouts can she be? sure she’s locked up in the old Lady’s Closet, the Devil take our Conductor [the author], after leading us such a Dance, from London to Carmarthenshire, to keep us so long from what we want to see;’ (History 1: 24; bk. 1, ch. 1, 角括弧内は私の補足)

【Lady Bountiful の性格の欠点を語ろうとしない作者に、読者の一人 Miss Censorious がしぶりを切らせる。】

You must know then, that this Lady amiable as she is in Person and Character has her Failings and some little Foibles; but pray Miss Censorious don’t run too quick upon a malicious Scent, her Faults are not such as your Imagination has fixed on. . . . ‘But why need you keep a Person in suspense? Tell us for God sake at once this mighty Failing in your old Heroine for I really cannot guess what it can be; it must be something very bad, you are so loath to tell. . . .’ (History 1: 25–6; bk. 1, ch. 1)

【この小説には、進行中の物語に感想を述べるためだけに登場する読者キャラクターが次々に現れてくる。】

Charlotte Summers brims with characters who exist only for the sake of their readerly interjections, made in accordance with their names: Beau Thoughtless, Miss Pert, Arabella Dimple, Dick Dapperwit, Mrs Sit-her-time. (Folkenflik 54, 下線は私)

【彼らのほとんどはただ一度きりしか登場しない。時には一度に何人もの読者が登場し、主人公の行動をめぐる議論が行われたりする。その様子は、まるで連続ドラマの放映直後にツイッターで喜々として感想を述べ合ったり今後の展開を予想し合ったりする視聴者たちを思わせる。現代のテレビドラマであれば、物語の内部であるドラマ本体と物語の外部であるツイッターでの反響に分かれているものが、『シャーロット・サマーズ』においてはどちらもテキストの内部に書き込まれているのだ。】

【Charlotte Summers においては、言わば「作品内ソーシャル・リーディング」が繋り広げられているのだ。】
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Perhaps the first novel after *Tom Jones* to show how Fielding was to influence succeeding narrative practice was *Charlotte Summers*, which is dominated by the presence of a persistently intruding narrator. Although most of his comments are closer to Fielding's style than to Sterne's they go farther than Fielding's in the characterization of the "readers," in the intimate portrayal of the narrator in his physical surroundings, facing his writing problems, and in taking in the descriptions of the 'young wench', who is, like Richardson's Pamela and Clarissa, continually exposed to unwanted sexual attention in the novel (and, for example, nearly raped by a man who adopts the same trick as Mr. B. in *Pamela* when he switches places with the heroine's maid and bedfellow one night). Similarly, the Widow Lackit’s demand for a conventional happy marriage at the ending is complied with in the final chapter of the novel. The passages evoking the reader figures thus... foreground how expectations on the part of the audience force authors to some kind of response, be it to deny or to cater to such expectations. (Birke 174, 下線は私)

Polly goes, and returns with the dull Book, and sets herself down by her Mistres's Bedside. —Pray, Ma'am, where shall I begin, did your Ladyship fold down where you left off? ——No, Fool, I did not; the Book is divided into Chapters on Purpose to prevent that ugly Custom of thumbing and spoiling the Leaves; and, now I think on't, the Author bid me remember, that I left off at the End of the Chapter you occupy, part of the mid-18th century British novel's love of addressing the artificiality of the chapter form. (Dames, note 42, 下線は私)

Polly, ——This Night is so intolerably warm, I shall not sleep this Age unless you can find some Means to lull me to Rest. ——Pray step down to the Parlour, and bring me up the first Volume of the *Parish Girl* I was reading in the Afternoon. I think I left it on the Spinnet. —— (History 1: 67–68; bk. 1, ch. 5)
the elaboration of conversations between them. The “readers,” for example, are not only more various, but also much more fully endowed with ridiculous characteristics than are Fielding’s… (Booth 181，下線は私)

[20] In recent years a consensus has arisen amongst scholars of the eighteenth century that fiction published in the 1750s—that is, after the first successes of Henry Fielding and Samuel Richardson, and before the heyday of Laurence Sterne, Tobias Smollett, Frances Burney, or Jane Austen—should be considered anew. Propelled by a general sense that the novels of this time were quirky and self-reflexive in ways that the celebration of realist fiction has eclipsed, critics have turned with some enthusiasm to texts like the anonymous Charlotte Summers, the Fortunate Parish Girl (1750), Francis Coventry’s Pompey the Little: or, the Life and Adventures of a Lapdog (1751), and John Kidgell’s The Card (1755). (Lupton, “Giving” 289)

[21] These are novels notable for their material experiments—for instance, with title pages and inserted illustrations—and for characterized narrators that anticipate Tristram Shandy (1759–67). They are, however, fairly derivative of Fielding in their style, and often more brazen than clever in their refusal to offer the rewards of plot development and reader immersion. (Lupton, “Giving” 289)

脱線：『クライ』の自己言及性

【The Cambridge History of Postmodern Literature (2016) でポストモダン小説の先駆けとなる18世紀イギリス小説を論じた Joe Bray は、18世紀イギリスの実験小説の例として、Tristram Shandy (1759–67) などとともに、Sarah Fielding と Jane Collier の The Cry (1754) を挙げている。】

[22][The Cry は自己言及的な実験小説であり、1750年代小説の多様な革新性を示す好例である。] When read free from the Richardson—Fielding rivalry that continues to dominate much modern criticism, The Cry demonstrates the diversity and innovativeness of the novel in the early 1750s; its ability to incorporate a wide range of genres while reflecting skilfully and wittily on the process. Fielding and Collier’s “new dramatic fable” is self-consciously experimental throughout, especially in the sense proposed by McHale; constantly lifting the curtain on its own mechanics, and the “operations by which [its] narrative worlds are constructed.” (Bray)

[23][Bray が言及している論文。ポストモダン小説は自らの物語世界を脱構築することで虚構性を前提化する。] Postmodernist fiction also foregrounds the category of world by laying bare the operations by which narrative worlds are constructed. It typically does so by deconstructing them right before our eyes. For instance, a narrated event can be unnarrated, rescinded or contradicted, or a character or other entity of the narrated world can be erased. (McHale 147)

[24][Bray 論文で言及される John Paul Hunter の論文より、The Cry の重層的語りの構造の解説。] The novel… has, effectively, four different (and competing) voices, each of which operates as a kind of chorus to comment on the narrative. There is (1) Portia who tells most of the story and is largely a reliable and sensible narrator, (2) the subjective voice of the “author” who feels free to intrude and sounds very much like Sarah Fielding, (3) the reliable Una who speaks Truth from a vantage point of past moral and literary tradition, and (4) the wrongheaded and inconsistent “cry” who nearly always gets things wrong and thus preempts incorrect or partial stances that contemporary readers might be tempted to take. The cry actually speaks with several different voices, for in addition to speaking chorally as the voice of fashionable contemporariness, it often features individual speakers or subgroups that represent particular segments of the reading public, women for example. Possible reader responses are thus represented bountifully in the text itself, most often foolishly through the cry as a way of suggesting the fate (in the reading public) of contemporary narratives, even when they are responsibly and effectively told. The Cry’s most interesting narrative strategy is, in fact, in representing hostile readers within its onstage framework and providing a corrective through competing voices of authority. (Hunter 235)

[25] The drama is further complicated by the need for the viewpoints of characters who cannot realistically be on stage at a particular point to be represented. This results in characters having on occasion to impersonate the voices of others. (Bray)

[26]【The Cry の一場面。主人公 Portia が別の人物 Melantha を演じながら語り始める。】

Portia. I will not pretend to discover more of Melantha’s heart than what may be fairly deduced from her actions. Shall I, O Una, relate only my own observations, or may I be permitted to suppose Melantha present, and speaking; by which means, in a more lively manner, I could paint all her sensations, and throw into action every motion of
her heart?

*Una.* It is the subject matter itself I seek; and to cavil about the manner of conveying it, is trifling and unnecessary. Take therefore that method, *Portia*, by which, in the most lively and intelligible manner, you can paint the real history of Melantha’s mind.

The *Cry*, although they were forced to submit, look’d full of dread, for fear what picture *Portia*, thus left at liberty, might draw, and who she might, by the force of truth, restrain to sit for that picture.

*Portia* [in the assumed character of Melantha], I danced in company with *Demetrius* at a ball. He was then the partner of my most intimate friend *Isabinda*, and was generally supposed to be her lover. (S. Fielding and Collier; part 3, scene 10)

[27] The minds of the *Cry* now all sympathized so strongly with the raptures of *Melantha* for this compleat triumph over *Portia*, that they could admit no other image. They fairly forgot in whose person *Portia* had been speaking; they imagined *Melantha* present before their eyes. (S. Fielding and Collier; part 3, scene 15)

[28] The pervasive presence of the collective authorial voice in *The Cry* relates to another preoccupation of late twentieth-century postmodernism which is also the subject of much debate in the eighteenth century, particularly in the novel. . . . In the earliest stages of its formation, the novel is similarly dominated by the intrusive figure of the author, whether it be in the form of supposedly “editorial” prefaces, obsessive revisions, or first-person metanarrative reflections. (Bray)

[29] If deployed judiciously, and not (pre-)cursorily, postmodernist theory can bring out more fully the literary practice of earlier periods, especially that with which it is most deeply imbricated: the eighteenth century. (Bray)

[30] **[Tristram Shandy]** より、語り手 Tristram Shandy とある女性読者との会話。]

——How could you, Madam, be so inattentive in reading the last chapter? I told you in it, That my mother was not a papist. ——Papist! You told me no such thing, Sir. Madam, I beg leave to repeat it over again, That I told you as plain, at least, as words, by direct inference, could tell you such a thing. ——Then, Sir, I must have miss’d a page. ——No, Madam, ——you have not miss’d a word. ——Then I was asleep, Sir. ——My pride, Madam, cannot allow you that refuge. ——Then, I declare, I know nothing at all about the matter. ——That, Madam, is the very fault I lay to your charge; and as a punishment for it, I do insist upon it, that you immediately turn back, that is, as soon as you get to the next full stop, and read the whole chapter over again. (Sterne; vol. 1, ch. 20)

[31] 【語り手 Tristram はあるエピソードを今ここで語るか後で語るかを、読者たちに選ばせようとする。】

[In order to conceive the probability of this error in my uncle Toby aright, I must give you some account of an adventure of Trim’s, though much against my will. I say much against my will, only because the story, in one sense, is certainly out of its place here; for by right it should come in either amongst the anecdotes of my uncle Toby’s amours with widow Wadman, in which Corporal Trim was no mean actor,—or else in the middle of his and my uncle Toby’s campaigns on the bowling green,—for it will do very well in either place; ——but then if I reserve it for either of those parts of my story, ——I ruin the story I’m upon, ——and if I tell it here, ——I anticipate matters, and ruin it there.

—What would your worshipships have me to do in this case?
—Tell it, Mr. Shandy, by all means. ——You are a fool, *Tristram*, if you do. (Sterne; vol. 3, ch. 23)

[32] 【文章とは作者と読者の会話なのか、読者も想像力を大いに働かせるべきであると語り手 Tristram は言う。】

*Writing,* when properly managed, *(as you may be sure I think mine is)* is but a different name for conversation: As no one, who knows what he is about in good company, would venture to talk all: ——so no author, who understands the just boundaries of decorum and good breeding, would presume to think all: The truest respect which you can pay to the reader’s understanding, is to halve this matter amicably, and leave him something to imagine, in his turn, as well as yourself.

For my own part, I am eternally paying him compliments of this kind, and do all that lies in my power to keep his imagination as busy as my own. (Sterne; vol. 2, ch.11)

[33] 小説史の文脈で考えれば、フィールディングや1750年代流行小説を通じて、近代リアリズム小説としての狭い意味の「ノヴェル」に徐々に入り込んできた、セルパンテスなどの喜劇的ロマンス、『桶物語』などの諷刺作品、同時代の架
Several years intervened... between the well-publicized retirements of Richardson and Fielding and the inaugural instalment of *Tristram Shandy*, and in the interim novelists had made further innovatory gestures while explicitly registering the new (and in some respects newly adverse) conditions of authorship and publication in the later 1750s. In this respect, forgotten experimental novels of this decade such as John Kidgell's *The Card*, the anonymous *Life and Memoirs of Mr. Ephraim Tristram Bates*, Thomas Amory's *The Life of John Buncle, Esq.*, William Toldervy's *The History of Two Orphans*, and Edward Kimber's *The Juvenile Adventures of David Ranger, Esq.*, constitute an equally significant body of precursor texts. Sterne not only adopts the episodic repertoire and formal reflexiveness of the subgenre represented by these novels. He [Sterne] also digests and reworks the most innovative feature they [the experimental novels of the 1750s] share, which is their tendency to push a literary self-consciousness inherited from Fielding into a more directly practical self-consciousness about the mechanisms and institutions of print culture: specifically, about the relationship between authorial production and its materialization as a printed object, and about the overdetermination of both by the forces of literary commodification, consumer fashion, and regulatory reviewing. (Lupton, *Knowing* 21)

In the years before and immediately after *Tristram Shandy* appeared, a significant number of lesser-known but equally self-conscious novels were published. Most of these contain only moderately interestingly romances, adventures, and life narratives. But they are framed and delivered by well-characterized narrators possessed of the disarming power to describe the flaws of novel writing and to reprimand and banter with fictional readers. (Booth 184, 下線は私)

Whether Sterne himself read *Captain Greenland* or not, there can be no doubt that the tremendous increase in intrusive material in comic fiction during the fifties had an effect on him. Although it is perhaps impossible to discover now which of these works after Fielding Sterne really knew and used, he must have encountered at least some of them, and in the interim novelists had made further innovatory gestures while explicitly registering the new (and in some respects newly adverse) conditions of authorship and publication in the later 1750s. In this respect, forgotten experimental novels of this decade such as John Kidgell's *The Card*, the anonymous *Life and Memoirs of Mr. Ephraim Tristram Bates*, Thomas Amory's *The Life of John Buncle, Esq.*, William Toldervy's *The History of Two Orphans*, and Edward Kimber's *The Juvenile Adventures of David Ranger, Esq.*, constitute an equally significant body of precursor texts. Sterne not only adopts the episodic repertoire and formal reflexiveness of the subgenre represented by these novels. He [Sterne] also digests and reworks the most innovative feature they [the experimental novels of the 1750s] share, which is their tendency to push a literary self-consciousness inherited from Fielding into a more directly practical self-consciousness about the mechanisms and institutions of print culture: specifically, about the relationship between authorial production and its materialization as a printed object, and about the overdetermination of both by the forces of literary commodification, consumer fashion, and regulatory reviewing. (Lupton, *Knowing* 21)

Lost in the crowd of other Fielding imitators, Charlotte Summers deserves to be rediscovered. (Moore 762)

* 付記：本報発表は、過去に私が発表した以下の論文の一部を抜粋・再構成して改訂を加えたものである。内田勝「『ジャーロット・サマーズの物語』—『トム・ジョーンズ』と『トリストラム・シャンディ』とをつなぐ忘れられた小説」『岐阜大学地域科学部研究報告』第38号（2016）pp.19-44。当該論文は https://www1.gifu-u.ac.jp/~masaru/uchida/charlotte16.html で公開されており、右のQRコードからもアクセス可能である。
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