The Wenshan Review of Literature and Culture · Vol 11.2 · June 2018 · 143-166.
DOI: 10.30395/WSR.201806_11(2).0007

Men, the Roles They Play and the Making of a Gentleman in Tobias Smollett's *The Expedition of Humphry Clinker*[*]

Di-feng Chueh[**]

ABSTRACT

This paper aims to explore various roles that Matthew Bramble and Humphry Clinker act in their interdependent relationship and then to examine why they need each other in order to respectively become a gentleman in Tobias Smollett's *The Expedition of Humphry Clinker* (1771). Examinations of Bramble's and Clinker's individual gentleman's lessons will at the same time reveal why Smollett adopts a different naming strategy when it comes to the title of his last novel. Unlike Roderick Random in *The Adventures of Roderick Random* (1748) and Peregrine Pickle in *The Adventures of Peregrine Pickle* (1751), Clinker is never the main narrator of *Humphry Clinker*. As a result, it can be confusing for some readers to find Clinker's name in the title of the novel. Smollett, as I will demonstrate, makes the right decision when naming his last novel in this way due to the fact that Clinker's transformation into a gentleman is arguably the main theme of the novel and the connection between Smollett's three major novels.

KEYWORDS: gentleman's education, oeconomy, interdependent, naming strategy

[*] I want to take this opportunity to thank the two anonymous reviewers for their constructive comments and suggestions. I also want to thank Dr. Bo-Yuan Huang for reading the early draft of this paper.
[**] Received: August 31, 2016; Accepted: February 27, 2017
Di-feng Chueh, Assistant Professor, Department of Foreign Languages and Literature, Feng-Chia University, Taiwan (difeng.c@gmail.com).

The aim of this paper is to look into various roles that Matthew Bramble and Humphry Clinker play and how their two relationships offer different lessons to educate Clinker to become a gentleman in Tobias Smollett's *The Expedition of Humphry Clinker* (1771). As I will argue, the roles that Bramble and Clinker play in their two relationships, master and servant and father and son, will disclose how Bramble and Clinker are interdependent on each other. I will examine the interdependent relationship between Bramble and Clinker by means of "oeconomy" theory in which responsibilities of different types of men's roles are clearly described.[1] Such examinations will be conducive to the revelation of Clinker's transformation into a gentleman. In order to explore the connection between Bramble and Clinker's two relationships and Clinker's gentleman's education, it is essential to point out an interesting difference between Smollett's *Humphry Clinker* and his two other famous novels.

In *The Adventures of Roderick Random* (1748) and *The Adventures of Peregrine Pickle* (1751), Smollett adopts the names of the respective main narrators to give the title to these two novels. This naming strategy is somehow different from that of *The Expedition of Humphry Clinker*. Instead of being the main narrator of the novel, Clinker makes his first appearance in the novel after almost two-thirds of the first volume. Even after his first appearance, Clinker is hardly granted a right to tell readers what happens in the novel, since the story is mainly unfolded by Bramble and his nephew, Jeremy Melford. If so, why does Smollett prefer the name of Clinker to that of either Bramble or Melford when naming his last novel? As I will argue, this title reveals the ideas of oeconomy theory in the eighteenth century and the different roles that Bramble and Clinker take according to this theory. Because of these different roles, an independent/dependent binary is formed. This, however, does not mean that either Bramble or Clinker is always on a particular side of these two extremes because they may take the opposite role at some point in the novel. No matter which role Bramble and Clinker perform, the binary will not be established until they both carry out their assigned duties. As I will point out, this prerequisite uncovers that the

[1] I choose to use the diphthong "oeconomy" instead of "economy" for several reasons. First of all, in *The Expedition of Humphry Clinker*, it is "oeconomy," not "economy," that Smollett himself uses. Second, the word "oeconomy" had a broader meaning in comparison to that of the modern "economy" in the eighteenth century. As I will argue in the first part of the paper, these meanings are crucial to our understanding of the relationships between Bramble and Clinker.

independent/dependent binary actually has an interdependent nature. The discovery of the interdependent nature of Bramble and Clinker's relationships also discloses why Bramble and Clinker need each other in order to help Clinker complete his gentleman's education in Smollett's *Humphry Clinker*.

In the first part of this paper, I will examine how the word "oeconomy" was conceptualized in the eighteenth century. The examination of the development of oeconomy theory paves the way to unravel what responsibilities are assigned to the roles Bramble and Clinker take in the family. In the second and third parts, I will look into how Smollett's portrayals of Bramble and Clinker respond to oeconomy theory and by that I want to argue that Smollett presents his readers with an ideal couple with whom they can have a glimpse of the possible mutual interdependence between men regardless of the class hierarchy. This possibility not only reveals the complex nature of the traditional notion of a man's necessary independence in the eighteenth century, but also shows the connection between Smollett's *Roderick Random*, *Peregrine Pickle* and *Humphry Clinker*. As I will conclude, Smollett's three novels are all about the title characters' transformation into gentlemen. This is why Smollett adopts Clinker's name instead of Bramble's or Melford's to be the title of this novel.

I. Oeconomy Theory in the Eighteenth Century

In 1751, Robert Dodsley, who was a famous English bookseller, editor and writer, published *The Oeconomy of Human Life* with 142 editions between 1751 and 1800, and 95 more from 1801. Dodsley's *The Oeconomy of Human Life* offers a set of moral precepts for the conduct of men as individuals and in various roles such as husband, father, son and brother. These moral precepts reveal the meaning of the word "oeconomy." With regard to how to behave like a dutiful husband to his wife, Dodsley claims that:

> O cherish her as a blessing sent thee from heaven; let the kindness of thy behaviour endear thee to her heart. . . . Oppose not her inclination without cause; she is the partner of thy cares, make her also the companion of thy pleasures. Reprove her faults with gentleness; exact not her obedience with rigour. (45)

The passage clearly points out that a husband should cherish his wife but at times gently object to her decisions if necessary. These two different types of treatment indicate both the tender and rigorous side of a husband by showing how a man acts differently in various situations with his wife. The multiple attitudes that a husband has to take illustrate how a husband should "manage" his relationship with his wife and by that we can find that the nature of the word oeconomy is associated with the idea of management.

In the first chapter of *The Little Republic: Masculinity and Domestic Authority in Eighteenth-Century Britain*, Karen Harvey gives a thorough examination of the word oeconomy and its relation to the development of the idea of patriarchy in the eighteenth century. Harvey argues that:

> Oeconomy was the practice of *managing* the economic and moral resources of the household for the maintenance of good order. . . . With regard to the house, the most significant gendered distinction was not between the "inside" and the "outside" or even between men's and women's specific household tasks; instead, the most significant gendered distinction existed within the house and between the nature of men's and women's engagement with different levels of task. (24, 32, emphasis added)

If Dodsley's definition of "oeconomy" is related to the personal, emotional management of a man's relationship with other people, Harvey's is closer to the management of a man's household affairs. In the first line of her argument, Harvey makes it clear that oeconomy was a kind of activity referring to good maintenance and management of household affairs in the eighteenth century. This practice was not assigned either to men or to women exclusively. Instead, both men and women were involved in this practice, albeit with differences between the degrees of their engagement in various tasks.[2] The connection

[2] Harvey is not the first critic to notice the different and overlapping roles that men and women had in the family life in the eighteenth century, even though she probably is the first one to use the word "oeconomy" to develop her argument. In *Gender in English Society, 1650-1850: The Emergence of Separate Spheres?*, Robert Shoemaker argues that "[w]hat differentiates prescriptions for male and female social roles is not so much that they were told to inhabit separate spheres of actions defined spatially, but that they had separate duties and were expected to behave differently: both at home and in public, men were to be involved in governing and as the primary breadwinners, while women were

between "oeconomy" and household affairs is not a modern concept. In the eighteenth century, Thomas Sheridan, an influential dictionary editor, actor and educator of the elocution movement, defines the word "oeconomicks" as "[m]anagement of household affairs" (594). Samuel Johnson, Sheridan's contemporary, also arrives at the same definition, "Management of household affairs" (100), in his *A Dictionary of the English Language*.[3] Unlike Harvey's argument, Johnson's and Sheridan's definitions are without definite indication with regard to men's and women's roles in the management of their household affairs. Nevertheless, Harvey, Johnson and Sheridan all clearly point out that "management of the household affairs" is the core value of the word oeconomy. This, however, does not exclude Dodsley's idea about a man's management of his personal relationships with others. In the next two sections, I will examine how both Bramble and Clinker manage their general household affairs and their personal, emotional relationship. Such examinations will unravel the general and personal sides of oeconomy theory and will then help us better understand the interdependent relationship between Bramble and Clinker. At the same time, these examinations will demonstrate how Clinker learns to become a gentleman in his two relationships with Bramble.

II. Bramble as an In(ter)dependent Oeconomist

If the word "oeconomy" has the connotation of management, Bramble's first and second letters to Dr. Lewis, Bramble's doctor, give us a clue regarding what kind of oeconomist Bramble is. In these two letters, Bramble

---

expected to be responsible for caring, 'in ever so humble a way'" (31). When talking about the importance of key in a family, Amanda Vickery, in *Behind Closed Doors: At Home in Georgian England*, observes that "[k]eys were emblems of authority. Church court cases suggest that ownership of the keys of the house lay with the male head of household. . . . In ordinary marriage, however, even while the master was technically the owner of the keys, the wife carried them. In fact, without these delegations of authority the work and rituals of the household would grind to a halt" (43-44). Harvey, Shoemaker and Vickery similarly indicate how both men and women shared domestic duties in a family in the eighteenth century.

[3] Johnson's *Dictionary* includes not only the entry of "oeconomics," but also that of "economy." According to Johnson's definition, "economy" means "the management of the family," "frugality; discretion of expence," "the disposition or arrangement of any work," and "system of emotions; distribution of everything to its proper place" (363). In comparison with Sheridan's definitions of "oeconomicks" and Dodsley's book, Johnson's definitions show that the meaning of "economy" is similar to that of either "oeconomicks" or "oeconomy." Thus, it is possible that the two words, "economy" and "oeconomy" were used interchangeably in the eighteenth century. Having said this, I choose to stick to the diphthong "oeconomy" with the reasons as I have explained in footnote 1.

talks about three things mainly: his health, family members and tenants. Instead of simply reiterating what has happened to either his family members or to his tenants, Bramble also presents himself to be a powerful and sentimental oeconomist. For example, Bramble tells Dr. Lewis that:

> Tell Barns I am obliged to him for his advice; but don't choose to follow it. If Davis voluntarily offers to give up the farm, the other shall have it; but I will not begin at this time of day to distress my tenant, because they are unfortunate, and cannot make regular payments: I wonder that Barns should think me capable of such oppression. (April 17; 14)[4]

Bramble behaves differently towards his two tenants, Barns and Davis. On the one hand, Bramble is a compassionate landlord who sympathizes with his tenants' distress, while on the other hand, he is dominant in the way of showing his authority to his tenant by refusing to listen to the latter's advice. No matter which position Bramble takes, he is definitely an oeconomist because he is in total control of managing the issues of the household.

When it comes to family members, Bramble behaves like a splenetic head of the family at first sight. Speaking of his sister Tabitha, nephew Jeremy and niece Lydia, Bramble says that:

> [M]y sister Tabby [is] the devil incarnate come to torment me for my sins; and yet I am conscious of no sins that ought to entail such family-plagues upon me—why the devil should not I shake off these torments at once? I an't married to Tabby, thank Heaven! nor did I beget the other two: let them choose another guardian: for my part, I an't in a condition to take care of myself; much less to superintend the conduct of giddy-headed boys and girls. (April 17; 12)

Bramble himself asks an interesting question here and by that question we can be certain about his role in the family. The reason why Bramble cannot shake off these "family-plagues" upon him is that he is the only eligible man to

[4] All the subsequent references, including the letter date and page number, will be made according to the Oxford World's Classics edition.

become the head of the family. As Bramble has mentioned, Tabitha is not married and thus there is no other man in the family who can possibly take on the job that Bramble is doing now. As for Jeremy and Lydia, they are under Bramble's care due to the fact that the brother and sister are without parents. In the letter to her governess Mrs. Jermyn, Lydia says that "Having no mother of my own, I hope you will give me leave to disburthen my poor heart to you, who have always acted the part of a kind parent to me, ever since I was put under your care" (April 6; 9). If the brother and sister are without a mother, where is their father? Neither Lydia nor Jeremy has mentioned in any of their letters about their father. It is thus arguable that Bramble is the only man who can act as the paterfamilias in the family inasmuch as we know nothing about Jeremy and Lydia's father and Tabitha is not married with a husband.

Bramble's complaint should not be interpreted at its face value, since Bramble has the other side of him when it comes to his family members. Peevish as Bramble is regarding his attitudes towards his responsibility to manage these domestic vexations, it is not impossible to find that his feelings of sentiment dominate his heart when it is necessary. Take Bramble's relationship with Lydia as an example. When Bramble discovers that Lydia is in a "dangerous connexion" with a man called Mr. Wilson, he "carried her off the very next day to Bristol" (April 17; 14). This decision attests to Bramble's status as the head in the family since he has a final say in decisions related to family matters. During the journey, Lydia becomes terribly sick due to the family's threats and expostulations. At this moment, Bramble says to Dr. Lewis that "You cannot imagine what I have suffered, partly from the indiscretion of this poor child, but much more from the fear of losing her entirely" (April 17; 14). Rather than being an autocratic decision-maker, Bramble makes it clear that his management is out of his concern for Lydia. In comparison with Bramble's different attitudes towards his tenants, Bramble's behavior towards Lydia makes him an authoritative and sentimental head of the family.

In his reading of the two letters, Michael McKeon contends that "[Bramble's] letters home express a familial and 'feudal' care for his tenants that evokes an organic community hierarchically stratified by relations of personal dependence. Status and gender distinctions are clearly marked, but they are represented as interdependent and inseparable components of a greater domestic economy" (680-81). There are two interesting ideas in

McKeon's argument. First of all, the phrase "domestic economy" echoes the idea that both letters explain how Bramble manages his household matters. This once again reveals the nature of management in the concept of oeconomy in the eighteenth century. Second, as McKeon rightly observes, the patriarchal power that Bramble exercises in the family is hierarchical and the relationship between people with different genders and statuses is both dependent and interdependent in this hierarchy. What is missing in McKeon's argument is that the interdependent nature of these relationships is not fully portrayed. This cannot be done until we look at how and why Bramble needs to become an "independent" man in the family. Before the examination of Smollett's construction of Bramble as an independent head in the family is carried out, I will first of all explain what it means to be independent for eighteenth-century men.

In her examination of how articles published in *The Gentleman's Magazine* offer a way to look into the theorization of masculinity in the eighteenth century,[5] Gillian Williamson argues that:

> British manhood was vindicated and the superior, active male citizen was reconfigured as the "independent" man. His virtue was generated by gendered personal attributes rather than inherited rank, for manly independence meant not only freedom from direct or indirect financial dependence on others but also the condition in which self-mastery, conscience and individual responsibility could be exercised. (2)[6]

[5] *The Gentleman's Magazine* was one of the most influential publications in the eighteenth century. It was founded in London in 1731 by Edward Cave and the magazine ran almost 200 years uninterruptedly until 1922. Its contributors include Mark Akenside, Samuel Johnson, Jonathan Swift, Edward Young and many other famous eighteenth-century writers. It was also the very first publication which adopted the word "magazine" as the title in the eighteenth century. The content of the magazine is mainly related to news and commentary on any topic that the educated public might be interested in. As well as the news and commentary, many of the contributions are advice as to how to become a gentleman, a gentleman's life story and others connected with features of a gentleman.

[6] Compared to Williamson, Matthew McCormack arrives at a similar conclusion by arguing that "[f]undamentally, manliness and independence were within the reach of every man: they had to be earned through inner strength and mastery of one's circumstances" (18). Saying that every man can claim his independence means that a man is not born to be independent but is trained to be so and the training involves managing his life. On the basis of Williamson's and McCormack's arguments, it is possible to say that the examination of a man's independence can be conducted from the perspective of oeconomy theory since the latter is also concerned about a man's management of household affairs. Although McCormack shares a similar conclusion with Williamson in his discussion about the construction of a man's independent status in Georgian England, he mainly pays attention to how an "independent male householder could and should represent the rest of society in the public world.

Williamson's argument is important in two aspects. First, Williamson points out that an independent man was a superior, active male figure in the eighteenth century and by that it was possibly an ideal type of man which eighteenth-century men were desirous of becoming. Second, for an eighteenth-century male, the designation of an "independent man" was not innate or inherited but could be acquired by means of living up to "gendered personal attributes" in which "self-mastery, conscience and individual responsibility" are the key components. Williamson's close reading and examination of articles published in *The Gentleman's Magazine* are not only made at a general level but also are extended to different scenarios among which "family" is the one that I will pay special attention to. As Williamson argues, eighteenth-century men were expected to become "independent heads of households as husbands and fathers" in order to achieve esteem from other men (98). If so, what are the "gendered personal attributes" of an independent head of a household? How will these features reflect the idea of management in the theory of oeconomy? How independent is Smollett's portrayal of Bramble and how will this description reveal the dependent and interdependent implications of the sense of independence? In order to answer all these questions, I will focus on how Clinker becomes a family member to the Bramble family and the master-servant relationship between Bramble and Clinker.

As I have mentioned in the introduction, Clinker makes his first appearance after almost two-thirds of the first volume. In his first appearance, Clinker is described by Melford as follows:

> He seemed to be about twenty years of age, of a middling size, with bandy legs, stooping shoulders, high forehead, sandy locks, pinking eyes, flat nose, and long chin—but his complexion was of a sickly yellow: his looks denoted famine; and the rags that he wore, could hardly conceal what decency requires to be covered. (May 24; 81)

Although relationships between them changed, politics and the family were inseparable in Georgian England" (13). In other words, McCormack takes "independence" to be the prerequisite for a Georgian English man to enter the world of politics.

Clinker, at this moment, is the antithesis of an independent man considering that his physical appearance suggests his financial inability to support himself. Clinker's first appearance, however, reveals Bramble's sentimental feelings and his authority in the family, both of which function as an indicator to Bramble's independent image. After being informed about Clinker's history, Bramble "put[s] a guinea into the hand of the poor fellow" and considers "to take [Clinker] into [his] service" (May 24; 82, 83). Bramble's decision does not come as a surprise since he constantly shows his compassion to people in need, such as his tenants and his niece Lydia. This decision also uncovers Bramble's patriarchal power in the family especially when it is not welcomed by Tabitha.

Clinker is impudent and disagreeable from Tabitha's viewpoint owing to the fact that she is much offended and shocked by Clinker's "shewing [of] his bare posteriors" (May 24; 81) when he is first introduced to the family as the replacement to their previous postilion. This is why Tabitha opposes the proposal to take Clinker into the service of the family even after Clinker's transformation into a decent, well-dressed man with the help of Bramble's money. In the end, Bramble exercises his "authority and resolution [and] a most blessed effect" is achieved when Tabitha agrees to give in (May 29; 90). The dispute between Bramble and his sister Tabitha gives evidence to the gendered and overlapping responsibilities that a man and a woman have in a family. As I have explained in the first part and in footnote 2, men and women were both responsible for household management and their roles were sometimes different from and at times overlapping with each other in the eighteenth century.[7] In Bramble and Tabitha's example, they both have a say regarding whether they want to take Clinker into service or not. It is, nonetheless, far from being true to conclude that Tabitha can always overpower Bramble in relation to household management decisions, since she at some point has to obey her brother's orders such as the decision to take Clinker into the family. It is in fact not surprising to see this as due to the reason that "oeconomy equipped men to instruct wives and other dependents

[7] In the case of Bramble and Tabitha, the sister tells her brother that "[t]his is a bad return for all the services I have done you; for nursing you in your sickness, *managing your family*, and keeping you from ruining yourself by your own impudence" (May 24; 86, emphasis added). Obviously, Bramble is not the only oeconomist in the family, but so is Tabitha. It, nevertheless, will be far-fetched to conclude that Bramble and Tabitha have equal status in the family, since the idea of oeconomy is also gendered, a point which I have explained in footnote 2.

in managing the resources of the household" (Harvey 102). Of course, Tabitha is no wife to Bramble but she is indisputably a subordinate member in the family, whereas Bramble is the head and her subordination is presented in her obedience to Bramble's orders. In this way, the gendered difference, as Harvey terms it, or the "gendered individual attribute" in Williamson's words is presented as the essential authority that a man has. This authority also proves a man's independent status in a family, since a man's authority will enable him to carry out his individual responsibility in a family, a crucial feature of an independent man according to Williamson's argument.

So far, we have seen how Bramble becomes an independent head and an oeconomist of the family by managing his familial and household matters. If Bramble is a master to Clinker, what are his individual responsibilities? In *The Oeconomy of Human Life*, Dodsley talks about the respective responsibilities of master and servant:

> The honour of a servant is his fidelity; his highest virtues are submission and obedience. Be studious of his interests; be diligent in his affairs; and faithful to the trust which he reposeth in thee. And thou who art a master, be just to thy servant, if thou expectest fidelity; be reasonable in thy commands, if thou expectest obedience. (58)

This passage is important in two ways. First, it clearly outlines individual responsibilities of masters and servants. Second, it shows the interdependent nature of the supposedly independent/dependent relationship between the master and servant. As Dodsley argues, a master commands his servant and the servant should submit himself to such a command. In addition, Dodsley also reminds his readers that such a command has to be reasonable and a master has to behave in a just way with the intention of getting his servant's fidelity and obedience. The establishment of a master's independence and authority is thus "dependent on" his servant's obedience to his reasonable and decent orders because failing to live up to these criteria will result in the dissolution of this ideal relationship.[8] These criteria, in this case, account for

[8] *The Oeconomy of Human Life* is a conduct book in which Dodsley offers advice for his readers to emulate in their daily behavior. This advice can only be ideal at some point. For example, it is of course possible for a fair-minded master to encounter a rebellious servant or for a faithful servant to have an absent-minded or vicious master. Since the main concern of this paper is to unravel the

the interdependent nature of the independent/dependent binary, an idea also put forward by McKeon, but that is left unelaborated in his readings of Bramble's first two letters to Dr. Lewis. If a master is within his rights to command in a reasonable and just way, how does Bramble measure up to this criterion and how does Clinker respond to it?

The interdependent nature of the relationship between Bramble and Clinker is best shown in two interesting incidents. In his letter dated June 10, Melford records how his uncle Bramble reacts when they find that Clinker has taken the role of preacher holding forth to a congregation. As Melford says, the first thing that strikes Bramble is "the presumption of his lacquey, whom he commanded to come down, with such an air of authority as Humphry did not think proper to disregard" (June 10; 137). At this moment, Bramble is undoubtedly an independent head of the family to Clinker on account of his unquestionable authority over the latter. However, Bramble's authority does not come as a result of his tyranny but instead because of his sentimental feelings towards his inferior. For after inquiring why Clinker has been preaching, Bramble not only reasons with his footman about the ill consequences of such kind of behavior, but also "promise[s] to take care of him, provided he would mind the business of his place" (June 10; 139). Upon hearing this, Clinker says that "I'm bound to love and obey your honour . . . I will follow you to the world's end, if you don't think me too far gone to be out of confinement" (June 10; 139). Clinker is faithful to his words because in another incident in which he saves Bramble from being drowned. When Bramble decides to reward Clinker for his courage and fidelity, the footman answers:

> God forbid! your honour should excuse me—I am a poor fellow; but I have a heart—O! if your honour did but know how I rejoice to see—Blessed be his holy name, that made me the humble instrument—But as for the lucre of gain, I renounce it—I have done no more than my duty—No more than I would have done for the most worthless of my fellow-creatures. (Oct 4; 315)

---

interdependent nature of the relationship between Bramble and Clinker and its relation to Clinker's transformation into a gentleman, I will not go into details regarding the various possible forms within this relationship.

According to Dodsley's theory, it is true for Clinker to claim that what he has done is nothing more than his duty. Besides, from words and phrases such as "poor fellow," "humble instrument" and "worthless," Smollett seems to portray Clinker as a powerless figure. It is in fact arguable to say that Clinker at this moment fits into McCormack's idea with regard to the image of an independent man. In his analysis of the power relationship between the independence and dependence, McCormack contends that:

> Independence/dependence is a two-way relationship, but it is a hierarchical one that does not work the same both ways. According to republican theory, a person who has a dependant is empowered by the relationship, whereas the dependant is disempowered: only the independent person is free enough to pursue the general good, or that of their dependants. (27)

In the case of Bramble and Clinker, this independence/dependence is indeed a two-way relationship seeing that they take both positions at different times. In the preacher scene, Bramble is independent while Clinker is dependent due to the fact that Bramble superintends Clinker's behavior and gives him proper instruction or education when it is necessary. It is thus not wrong to contend that Bramble is empowered and Clinker is disempowered in that situation. This relationship is reversed in the drowning incident. At that moment, Clinker fulfills his duty as a faithful servant by risking his life to save Bramble's and by that he becomes independent owing to the fact that he is in power to prevent his powerless master from dying. These two incidents, thus, reveal how Bramble and Clinker can possibly be empowered or disempowered in different situations even though their roles remain the same. No matter who is in power, both Bramble and Clinker devote themselves to their respective responsibilities and by that the independent/dependent binary will remain intact. This possibility also echoes Williamson's and McCormack's statements that a man's independence is not inherited from his rank but is learnt from his experience. If a man's independence is something he is born with, Clinker will never be an independent man, while Bramble never needs to depend on others. As I have illustrated, this kind of absolute independence is only an illusion since Bramble and Clinker are interdependent

while they can keep their independence at the same time.

It is now obvious to see the importance of Clinker in this novel is firstly to reveal the master/servant relationship between Bramble and Clinker and the interdependent nature of this relationship. In the next section, I will argue that there is more than one kind of relationship between Bramble and Clinker. This relationship, along with the master-servant one, will reveal how Clinker becomes a gentleman by the lessons he learns in it.

III. Father, Son and a Gentleman's Education

Clinker is important to Bramble not only because he is an obedient, faithful servant, but also owing to his other identity, Bramble's bastard son. Soon after the drowning incident, Clinker, surprisingly, proves to be Bramble's biological son by presenting "an old wooden snuff-box" which contains "a small cornelian seal and two scraps of paper" (Oct 4; 317) to his then master Bramble. After examining them, Bramble confirms with the others in the room that "[h]ere is my direction written with my own hand, and a seal which I left at the woman's request; and this is a certificate of the child's baptism, signed by the curate of the parish" (Oct 4; 318). In her examination of a son's importance in a family, Harvey argues in *The Little Republic* that "for men acutely aware of the labour involved in establishing the family, it was imperative that sons continued the line" (167). If it is vital for sons to "continue the line," what are sons supposed to do? What are fathers' responsibilities? What kind of relationship do father and son have? Are father and son independent of, dependent on or interdependent on each other? The answers to these questions will reveal both the different responsibilities that Bramble and Clinker have as father and son and how Clinker can become a gentleman after his identity as Bramble's son is established.

In his last letter to Dr. Lewis, Bramble updates Dr. Lewis on what has happened and what will happen to the family:

> My niece Liddy is now happily settled for life; and captain Lismahago has taken Tabby *off my hands*; so that I have nothing further to do, but to comfort my friend Baynard, and *provide for my son Loyd*, who is also fairly joined to Mrs. Winifred

> Jenkins . . . . What you observe of the vestry-clerk deserves consideration. —I make no doubt but Matthew Loyd [Clinker's real name] is well enough qualified for the office; but, at present, you must find room for him in the house.—His incorruptible honesty and indefatigable care will be serviceable in *superintending the oeconomy of my farm*; tho' I don't mean that he shall interfere with Barns, of whom I have no cause to complain. (Nov. 20; 350, emphases added)

This passage is worth quoting at length for the following reasons. First, the passage once again reveals Bramble's two identities, an oeconomist and a father, in the family because of his management of different family members' matters. For example, the marriage arrangements of Lydia, Tabitha and Clinker are all settled. In addition, Bramble also communicates with Dr. Lewis regarding Clinker's future role in the family. Bramble's decision to replace himself with Clinker to become the oeconomist of his farm renders Bramble an ideal father figure. In *Gender, Sex and Subordination in England, 1500-1800*, Anthony Fletcher argues that "Fathers were expected to provide economic support, authority and discipline, then to take the lead in seeing a child into the world, either through finding a boy work or through involvement in a girl's marriage" (38).[9] Smollett's portrayal of Bramble functions as the best example to respond to both Fletcher's observation regarding responsibilities of a masculine head of a family and to reflect the oeconomic propensity of that head according to Dodsley's and others' oeconomy theory. In this sense, Bramble is without a doubt the best person in Smollett's *Humphry Clinker* to represent and to speak for the Bramble family.

The second significance of Bramble's last letter to Dr. Lewis is related to the interdependent relationship between Bramble and Clinker. Such a relationship can be discovered after we examine another duty that Bramble has. To Bramble and the family, it is important to find another oeconomist of the family inasmuch as Tabitha is going to marry Lismahago soon after the

[9] Dodsley advises his readers in a similar way: "Consider, thou who are a parent, the importance of thy trust; the being thou hast produced, it is thy duty to support" (46). Shoemaker arrives at a similar conclusion in his examination of a father's role in a family: "Fathers saw their primary role as providing economic support, authority, and discipline, and in preparing their children for a career" (124). Based on these arguments, it is obvious to see that an eighteenth-century father was not only entitled to authority over his family members but was also obliged to offer support to them.

expedition returns to Brambleton-hall in Wales. Before this, Tabitha, along with her brother, is an oeconomist in the family and both of them oversee the family management, even though Bramble is the person who is more in control of decisions concerning domestic issues.[10] After her upcoming marriage to Lismahago, Tabitha will not be an appropriate manager of the Bramble family since she will have another family to take care of. It is thus crucial for Clinker to be transformed from a servant into a future oeconomist of the family farm owing to the fact that he is Bramble's biological son. This transformation will probably allow the Bramble family to "continue the family line," a duty which is listed by Harvey in her discussion about a man's responsibility to his family.[11] This task, as I have demonstrated, can only be carried out by Bramble in Smollett's *Humphry Clinker* since he is the only qualified head of the family. Thus, Bramble's exclusive task reveals not only how Clinker needs Bramble's help in order to become a qualified oeconomist to superintend the family property but also shows how Bramble depends on Clinker in order to fulfill his last duty to the family. Other than the respective responsibilities as father and son, the interdependent relationship between Bramble and Clinker also uncovers the essential education that Clinker needs to receive from Bramble before he becomes a gentleman.

An eighteenth-century gentleman, as Williamson shows and as I have

[10] Tabitha's status as another oeconomist of the Bramble family can be discerned in various letters. For example, in her last letter to Mrs. Gwyllim, Tabitha says that "HEAVEN, for wise porpuses [sic], hath ordained that I should change my name and citation in life, so that I am not to be considered any more as *manager of my brother's family*; but as I cannot surrender up my stewardship till I have settled with you and Williams, I desire you will get you accunts [sic] ready for inspection, as we are coming home without further delay" (Nov. 20; 351, emphasis added). This letter clearly indicates that Tabitha shares part of the management duty in the family and by that she, as well as Bramble, is the oeconomist of the family. This is why I am not convinced by Vassiliki Markidou's argument when she contends that Brambleton-hall is under management by "a domineering matriarch" (68). There is no denying that Tabitha helps Bramble manage the family affairs, but I am more of the opinion that this duty is "shared" between the brother and the sister. My argument echoes Harvey's and other critics' observation, as I have explained in footnote 2, that eighteenth-century men and women had different responsibilities in their family. These duties might overlap with each other, but the levels would somehow be different between men and women in the eighteenth century.

[11] In *Man's Estate: Landed Gentry Masculinities, c. 1660-c. 1900*, Henry French and Mark Rothery similarly argue that "[o]ne of the chief responsibilities of fathers to their children was to ensure adequate financial provision for them, with men bolstering their own identity by emphasizing their 'dynastic' concern for the next generation" (220). The word "dynastic" in French and Rothery's argument implies a necessity for a family to continue to develop. Besides, this necessity should and will be carried out by a father figure in the family. If Harvey's target research group is eighteenth-century men without class distinction, French and Rothery focus on upper-class men. Regardless of their different class concerns, Harvey's and French and Rothery's arguments are alike in the way of revealing a male head's responsibility to make his family prosper.

quoted previously, is an independent man, and his independence means "not only freedom from direct or indirect financial dependence on others but also the condition in which self-mastery, conscience and individual responsibility could be exercised" (2). In this sense, Clinker can never become a gentleman until he resolves his economic plight and becomes his own master. By reading Bramble's last letter to Dr. Lewis again, we will find out how Clinker becomes a gentleman by fulfilling these two conditions with Bramble's help.

As I have quoted at the beginning of this section, Bramble makes it clear to Dr. Lewis that he will "provide for [his] son Loyd" by making him a "vestry-clerk" and the man to superintend "the oeconomy of [his] farm" (Nov. 20; 350). In his reading of the same passage, John Zomchick argues that "Clinker-Loyd finds a place on the paternal estate under the eye of a provident father who will 'provide for [his] son' by securing him a sinecure as a vestry clerk. Even the father's choice of occupation suggests that Clinker will be removed from the enthusiastic disturbances of lower-class methodism and placed within the established Anglican institution" (412). Zomchick clearly indicates that Bramble's choice of occupation will help Clinker rise from his current "lower-class" social status to a more "established" one. Besides this, Clinker will stand a better chance to become financially independent after being appointed to be the overseer of Bramble's farm. Once this happens, Clinker is one step closer to his transformation into a gentleman, since financial independence is a criterion for this title.

Clinker's education of self-mastery, conscience and individual responsibility can be best illustrated in his upcoming marriage with Winifred Jenkins. Speaking of marriage, Bramble tells Dr. Lewis that Clinker "is fairly joined to Mrs. Winifred Jenkins" (Nov. 20; 350). The word "fairly" in fact reveals how similar Bramble and Clinker are in terms of one particular masculine attribute and also indicates how Clinker exercises his conscience and individual responsibility. By looking into Clinker's conscientious and responsible side in his arrangement of marriage with Jenkins, we will see in what ways Clinker completes his gentleman's education.

In fact, the marriage between Clinker and Jenkins is initially an unpopular proposal to the family. Bramble tells Dr. Lewis:

> Mr. Clinker Loyd has made humble remonstrance, through the canal of my nephew, setting forth the sincere love and affection

> mutually subsisting between him and Mrs. Winifred, and praying for my consent to their coming together for life. I would have wished that Mr. Clinker had kept out of this scrape; but as the nymph's happiness is at stake, and she has had already some fits in the way of despondence, I, in order to prevent any tragical catastrophe, have given him leave to play the fool, in imitation of his betters. (Oct 26; 345)

Bramble indirectly reveals why he wants to keep Clinker "out of the scrape," meaning Clinker's possible marriage with Jenkins, by saying that "Tabby has consented, with great reluctance, to this match. . . . She declares she cannot think of retaining the wife of Matthew Loyd in the character of a servant" (Oct 26; 345). In other words, both Bramble and Tabitha are at first against this marriage proposal owing to Jenkins's status as a housemaid in the Bramble family, a status which is not compatible with Clinker's. Bramble's later consent to the marriage between Clinker and Jenkins is due to his feelings of sentiment for the despondent bride-to-be. As I have pointed out, Bramble is a sentimental man to his tenants and other family members. The sympathy that Bramble feels for Jenkins once again proves him thus. For Clinker, he does in fact inherit Bramble's compassionate feelings. Clinker's feelings of sentiment for Jenkins are made clear to us when Melford tells that Clinker "owned he had a kindness for the young woman, and had reason to think she looked upon him with a favourable eye; that he considered this mutual manifestation of good will, as an engagement understood, which ought to be binding to the conscience of an honest man" (Oct 14; 334). If social class is the main concern for Bramble and Tabitha when they consider the marriage proposed by Clinker, what matters the most for Clinker in choosing Jenkins to be his wife is the sentimental feelings he and Jenkins share with each other.

Clinker's "sentimental feelings" are important in two ways. First of all, they symbolize another kind of continuation between Bramble and Clinker apart from their consanguinity. Because of this continuation, Bramble behaves like a "provident father," in Zomchick's words, by rendering his son financially independent. Second, acting like a man of feeling by taking Jenkins to be his wife enables Clinker to present himself to readers as a gentleman for he makes such a decision based on the conscience and responsibility he has for a woman who loves him. Also, by insisting on

marrying Jenkins, Clinker proves to readers that he is his own master since he successfully persuades Bramble to accept his request and by that he completes his gentleman's education. This gentleman's education is, however, not without danger. The danger, as I will demonstrate, is related to the problematic side of a man's sentimental feelings.

In an earlier letter, Melford describes Bramble to his friend by saying that "His singularities afford a rich mine of entertainment. . . . He affects misanthropy, in order to conceal the sensibility of a heart, which is tender, even to a degree of weakness" (April 24; 28). Melford's description once again shows that Bramble is definitely a sentimental man, but Bramble's sentimental heart will possibly lead to his frailty at some point. So, how will Bramble's sentimental feelings weaken Bramble in all likelihood? What will be threatened as a result? In fact, Smollett includes portrayals of another two male characters, Dennison and Baynard, to offer his readers answers to these questions.

Both Dennison and Baynard are Bramble's friends and they are both depicted as sentimental men, even though their feelings of sentiment result in an opposite kind of life. While talking about the domestic problems that Baynard faces with his wife, Bramble says that Baynard " endeavoured to recollect himself, and act with vigour of mind on this occasion; but was betrayed by the tenderness of his nature, which was the greatest defect of his constitution" (Sept. 30; 288). As for Dennison, Bramble congratulates his friend on governing a family of happiness given that Dennison " is blessed with a consort, whose disposition is suited to his own in all respects; tender, generous, and benevolent" (Oct. 8; 320-21). Comparing Baynard with Dennison, we can find that their tender feelings similarly qualify them to be sentimental men. On top of that, the different kinds of life that Baynard and Dennison have originated from the same sentimental attribute. In his reading of Baynard's and Dennison's respective relationships with their wives, David Weed argues that:

> The novel's comparison between the Baynards and Dennisons particularly exploits the difference between the virtuous, assertive Mr. Dennison and the weak, passive Mr. Baynard to support the argument that only masculine male control of land and the household economy produces rational order and profit.

> The Baynards' marriage suggests that the husband who does not control his wife's desires invests her with the power to turn his real property into wasteland. (620)

Weed emphasizes the "masculine control" that Baynard and Dennison should have over their wives. This control is performed through Baynard's and Dennison's management of their household affairs, an idea which responds to the oeconomy theory discussed in the first section. The main reason for Weed to conclude that Dennison is a virtuous, assertive oeconomist, while Baynard is a weak, passive counterpart is that the latter loses his control to his wife. The seemingly contradictory roles both come as a result of Dennison's and Baynard's sentimental minds. By using Baynard's miserable life as an example, Weed further argues that "Bramble's own propensity toward sentimentality, then, in some measure explains his statements that he will not marry: an attachment to a wife like Mrs. Baynard could unman him and entail his estate, heart, and health in a similar sickening corruption" (622). I have no opposition to Weed's argument under the condition that it is indeed possible for a man of feeling to become emasculated by his sentimental characteristic. However, Weed overlooks the possibility that a sentimental man can be empowered by the same feature, especially when he consciously knows that Dennison is the best example of this possibility. It is thus not totally convincing for Weed to claim that Bramble's sentimental heart causes him not to marry considering that Bramble may arrive at a happy life as Dennison does.

It is, nevertheless, essential to find that feelings of sentiment are unstable and precarious in terms of the construction of a man's masculinity. As Weed indicates, Smollett is aware of this particular feature and his characterizations of Dennison and Baynard are the proofs.[12] In consequence, by rendering

[12] Smollett's *The Expedition of Humphry Clinker* is not the first eighteenth-century novel to reveal how a male character's sentimental feelings can sometimes empower and at times problematize the construction of his masculinity. In Oliver Goldsmith's *The Vicar of Wakefield* (1766), Laurence Sterne's *A Sentimental Journey* (1768) and Henry Mackenzie's *The Man of Feeling* (1771), the constructions of the three main male characters' masculinity are reinforced and challenged at different stages in the novel by their sentimental nature. The reinforcement and challenge that Dr. Primrose in Goldsmith's *The Vicar of Wakefield*, Yorick in Sterne's *A Sentimental Journey* and Harley in Mackenzie's *The Man of Feeling* experience are similar to what Bramble, Dennison and Baynard go through in Smollett's *Humphry Clinker*. The challenges are made clearer by onecontemporary of Goldsmith, Sterne, Mackenzie and Smollett. Anthony Ashley-Cooper, the third Earl of Shaftesbury says in his *Characteristics of Men, Manners, Opinions, Times*, published in 1711, that a man "must

Bramble and Clinker sentimental, Smollett's *Humphry Clinker* is associated with both characters' "expedition," as shown in the title. By adopting Clinker's name instead of Bramble's to be the title of the novel, Smollett makes it clear that Bramble's expedition ends at the last page of *Humphry Clinker*, while Clinker's is about to begin, since the former has fulfilled most of his responsibility as an oeconomist of the family, while the latter is about to embark on a similar journey. Clinker's journey, however, is an uncertain one due to the fact that readers are not sure whether the fate of Clinker's family will be similar to that of Dennison's or that of Baynard's. It is, however, not far-fetched to conclude that Clinker becomes a gentleman at the end of the novel considering the education he receives throughout the whole journey.

IV. Conclusion

This paper intends to explore how Smollett's characterizations of Bramble and Clinker reveal the different roles that these two men will play according to oeconomy theory, as well as the gentleman's education that Clinker needs to receive. As I have argued, Smollett has already given his readers some hints with regard to the issues I want to look into in this paper by naming this novel *The Expedition of Humphry Clinker*. The self-titled character Clinker is barely the main narrator and the reason he has no power to speak for himself or even for the other family members is that he is not a gentleman when he comes into the novel. Only after learning to behave like a gentleman can Clinker gradually become the focus of the narration in the novel. Clinker's gentleman's education will not begin until the father-son relationship between him and Bramble is verified. In fact, the roles that Bramble and Clinker perform include not only father and son but also master and servant. No matter which roles Bramble and Clinker play, the relationship between them is of an interdependent nature. The lessons that Clinker needs to

---

not become a person who has much of goodness and natural rectitude in his temper, but withal so much softness or effeminacy as unfits him to bear poverty or adversity" (95). The concern of becoming effeminate as a result of a man's sentimental feelings is also voiced by Vicesimus Knox whose *Essays Moral and Literary* was widely read and frequently reprinted in the eighteenth century. Knox contends that "[t]he only ill consequence that can be apprehended from [sentiment] is an effeminacy of mind, which may disqualify us for vigorous pursuits and manly exertions" (248). As indicated in Baynard's and Bramble's examples, it is possible for a sentimental man to become weak, powerless and effeminate. This possibility, as I argued, attests to the uncertain future that Clinker and the Bramble family face.

take in order to make his transformation into a gentleman possible are partly manifested in a man's sentimental mind. Both Bramble and Clinker are sentimental men and their feelings of sentiment are portrayed in their relationships with other characters. Since a man's sentimental characteristic is accompanied by some underlying threats, readers will experience some unexpected surprises, both good and bad, while reading Bramble's and Clinker's stories. All in all, it is appropriate for Smollett to name *Humphry Clinker* in this way for such a name indicates roles, responsibilities and the gentleman's education that Bramble and/or Clinker need to take on or receive in the novel.

Works Cited

Ashley-Cooper, Anthony, third Earl of Shaftesbury. *Characteristics of Men, Manners, Opinions, Times*. Vol. 2. Ed. John M. Robertson. Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill, 1964. Print.

Dodsley, Robert. *The Oeconomy of Human Life*. London: Printed by M. Cooper, 1751. *Google Books*. N.d. Web. 22 Jun. 2018. <https://books.google.com.tw/books?id=DxAUAAAAQAAJ&printsec=frontcover&dq=The+Oeconomy+of+Human+Life+1751&hl=zh-TW&sa=X&ved=0ahUKEwjYoczjx-fbAhXT7mEKHSexAhAQ6AEIMTAB#v=onepage&q=The%20Oeconomy%20of%20Human%20Life%201751&f=false>.

Fletcher, Anthony. *Gender, Sex and Subordination in England, 1500-1800*. New Haven: Yale UP, 1999. Print.

French, Henry and Mark Rothery. *Man's Estate: Landed Gentry Masculinities, c. 1660-c. 1900*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2012. Print.

Harvey, Karen. *The Little Republic: Masculinity and Domestic Authority in Eighteenth-Century Britain*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2012. Print.

Johnson, Samuel. *A Dictionary of the English Language*. London: Printed for W. Strahan, 1773. Print.

Knox, Vicesimus. *Essays Moral and Literary*. Vol. 3. Basil: Printed by James Decker, 1800. *Google Books*. N.d. Web. 22 Jun. 2018. <https://books.google.com.tw/books?id=YeybrL8T-gEC&pg=PA1&dq=Essays+Moral+and+Literary+1800&hl=zh-TW&sa=X&ved=0ahUKEwjxkqa5yOfbAhXTc94KHaLmCuAQ6AEIVDAG#v=onepage&q=Essays%20Moral%20and% 20Literary%201800&f=false>.

Mardikou, Vassiliki. "Gender and Space in Tobias Smollett's *The Expedition of Humphry Clinker*." *Critical Survey* 22.1 (2010): 58-73. Print.

McCormack, Matthew. *The Independent Man: Citizenship and Gender Politics in Georgian England*. Manchester: Manchester UP, 2005. Print.

McKeon, Michael. *The Secret History of Domesticity: Public, Private, and the Division of Knowledge*. Baltimore: John Hopkins, 2005. Print.

Sheridan, Thomas. *A General Dictionary of the English Language*. London: Printed for J. Dodsley, 1780. *Google Books*. N.d. Web. 22 Jun. 2018. <https://books.google.com.tw/books?id=mCY-AAAAcAAJ&printsec=frontcover&hl=zh-TW&source=gbs_ge_summary_r&cad=0#v=onepag

e&q&f=false>.

Shoemaker, Robert B. *Gender in English Society, 1650-1850: The Emergence of Separated Spheres?* London: Longman, 1998. Print.

Smollett, Tobias. *The Expedition of Humphry Clinker*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1984. Print.

Vickery, Amanda. *Behind Closed Doors: At Home in Georgian England*. New Haven: Yale UP, 2010. Print.

Weed, David. "Sentimental Misogyny and Medicine in Humphry Clinker." *SEL* 37 (1997): 615-36. Print.

Williamson, Gillian. *British Masculinity in the* Gentleman's Magazine, *1731 to 1815*. London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2016. Print.

Zomchick, John. "Social Class, Character, and Narrative Strategy in Humphry Clinker." *The Expedition of Humphry Clinker.* Ed. Evan Gottlieb. London: W. W. Norton & Company, 2015. 399-413. Print.