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Abstract

Set against a contextual backdrop of contemporary British artists championing disability, this article explores changing attitudes to the self-fashioning of the disabled or impaired human body within emerging discourses of eighteenth-century sensibility, focusing on two contemporary self-portraits authored by ‘deformed’ individuals: an engraving by the celebrated entertainer, Matthias Buchinger (1674-1739) born a phocomelic – without lower arms and legs; and the autobiographical treatise, Deformity: An Essay (1754), by the self-declared hunchback, writer and politician, William Hay MP (1695-1755). Both these works, it is argued, represent landmarks in disability history, standing as pioneering models which continue to find resonance within disability culture today.

Figure 1. Matthias Buchinger (1674-1739). Matthias Buchinger, a phocomelic (1724).
Engraving after self-portrait. Etching and stipple; platemark 33.2 x 25.7 cm.
Wellcome Library no.195i. © Wellcome Library, London.

The lettering in the panel beneath the bust reads: ‘London, April the 29th. 1724. This is the effigies of Mr. Matthew Buchinger, being drawn and written by himself. He is the wonderful little man of but 29. inches high, born without hands, feet, or thighs, June the 2. 1674. in Germany, in the Marquisate of Brandeburgh, near to Nurenburgh. He being the last of nine children, by one father and mother, vizt. eight sons, and one daughter the same little man has been married four times, and has had issue eleven children, vizt. one by his first wife, three by the second, six by his third, and one by his present wife. This little man performs such wonders as have never been done by any; but himself. He plays on various sorts of music to admiration, as the hautboy, strange flute in consort with the bagpipe, dulcimer and trumpet; and designs to make machines to play on almost all sorts of music. He is no less eminent for writing, drawing of coats of arms, and pictures to the life, with a pen. He also plays at cards and dice, performs tricks with cups and balls, corn and live birds; and plays at skittles or nine-pins to a great nicety, with several other performances, to the great satisfaction of all spectators’. Transcription, courtesy of the Wellcome Library.
Figure 2. Title page to William Hay’s *Deformity: An Essay* (Second Edition), 1754. Photo, courtesy of ELS Editions.
Introduction: The heritage of ‘monstrosity’: problems in visual receptions of the disabled human body

Marc Quinn’s iconic sculpture, *Alison Lapper Pregnant* (2005), exhibited at Trafalgar Square in 2005-2007, represents the heavily pregnant, nude Lapper, born without arms and severely shortened legs (Figure 3). Such a colossal, publicly-sited artwork depicting an acutely disabled, expectant mother provoked wide controversy among critics, public and disability activists alike. Lapper’s own photographic self-portraits have continued to celebrate and exhibit images of her nude, phocomelic body publicly (Figure 4). Through these images, she explains, her art ‘questions notions of physical normality and beauty, in a society that considers me to be deformed, because I was born without arms’.

Such uninhibited displays of the ‘deformed’, disabled or impaired human body within the public domain in Britain have long challenged Western (and particularly classical) canons of ‘beauty’ and ‘physical normality’. Despite recent transformative disability legislation in Britain, Lapper states that society still considers her ‘deformed’. Her view is arguably founded on the notion that society has remained conservatively embedded within the binary attitudes to biological anomaly which have historically long divided the ‘monster’ from the ‘human’ – a controversial area of debate which has continually been presented, reinforced and challenged in theological, philosophical, scientific and aesthetic contexts in the West since antiquity.

---

Aristotle, for example, had argued that freaks were ‘jokes of nature’ – *lusus naturae*. Later, Ambroise Paré, in *Monstres et Prodiges* (1573) explained monstrosity in terms of divine or biological causalities (‘the wrath of God’; ‘the unbecoming sitting position of the mother’; ‘by demons or devils’). Francis Bacon’s psycho-philosophical essay ‘Of Deformity’ (1625) argued that, while deformity is not a divine curse, it ‘deforms’ a person’s character because ‘he has a perpetual spurre in himselfe, to rescue and deliver himselfe from Scorne’. All these receptions were variously alienating to the impaired or disabled person, representing a stigmatised view of disability as analogous with spiritual or biological imperfection. Many such attitudes to bodily anomaly remained arguably unchallenged by disabled people themselves until William Hay’s *Essay* appeared in 1754.

Definitions and receptions of disability during the first half of the eighteenth century in England remained negatively entrenched and focused around the term ‘deformity’. Samuel Johnson, in his dictionary (1755) equated ‘ugliness’ with ‘deformity’ [...] ill-favouredness; ridiculousness; quality of something to be laughed at; irregularity. The collection and exhibiting of anatomical specimens – sometimes human – both ‘normal’ and ‘abnormal’ (including amassing images from printed matter, such as popular broadsides and ballads) and their logical classification within the Natural Order, was viewed as a cultivated activity by such Enlightenment luminaries as Sir Hans Sloane.

David Turner’s recent research has demonstrated that the sight of displaced, disabled people – cripples, beggars and the ‘deformed’ – was a harsh reality in eighteenth-century England. He quotes Francis Grose, writing in late eighteenth-century London that there was nowhere on earth ‘where the feelings of humanity receive so many shocks. Every street, every alley, presents some miserable object, covered with

---

5 Fiedler, p. 231.
6 Fiedler, pp. 233-234.
loathsome sores, blind, mutilated, or exposed almost naked to the keen wintry blast’. As Turner summarises: ‘The presence of disability on the streets of eighteenth-century London therefore represented not just a shocking accumulation of personal misfortune, but was also regarded as symptomatic of a more general problem of dirt and disorderliness that impeded the progress of polite, commercial and refined society’. It is against this background that Matthias Buchinger’s self-portrait (1724) and William Hay’s *Deformity: An Essay* (1754) will be argued to represent significantly progressive landmarks.

**Matthias Buchinger’s self-portrait (1724) (Figure 1)**

Born in 1674 in Ansbach, near Nuremberg, without fully formed limbs, Buchinger never grew to more than twenty-nine inches tall. By 1709, he is recorded as exhibiting himself in Nuremberg, Stuttgart and Zurich. He arrived in England in the retinue of George I, having presented the King with a flute he had fabricated but was never given an official position at Court. Numerous surviving contemporary handbills (such as Figure 5) enumerate Buchinger’s array of skills including calligraphy; performing magic tricks with cup and ball; sword-throwing; shaving himself and powdering his wig; and giving musical performances on the flute, flageolet, hautbois and trumpet.

A virtuoso showman and successful entrepreneur, Buchinger attracted a wealthy clientele and toured as far as Scotland in the 1720s. He married four times and fathered eleven children. He eventually retired to Ireland where he died in 1739. As David Turner has commented ‘his [Buchinger’s] disabled body was a source of pride rather than embarrassment, and a lucrative source of income that propelled him up the social ladder. His shows, in which he ‘performed such wonders as have never been done by any but Himself’, were designed to challenge his audience’s expectations about the capabilities of a limbless person.

Buchinger’s self-portrait (Figure 1) was commissioned by the bookseller Isaac Herbert in 1724; the two men thus perhaps enjoyed some form of commercial relationship. The portrait is arguably ground-breaking for its time in seeking to self-fashion the image of a severely disabled individual as a successful member of early eighteenth-century polite society. Promotional in tone and content, Buchinger’s ‘advertisement’ bears stylistic affinities with the contemporary printed broadsides which popularly promoted freak shows and other entertainments. However, it appears much more socially aspirational in tone than a typical broadside; Buchinger’s self-fashioning here appears to be as much concerned with asserting his ‘polite’ status as a gentleman, as in advertising the range of his talents.

---

Recent scholarship has revealed how Buchinger actually ‘stage-manages’ the self-fashioning of his ‘polite’ status in this self-portrait by means of iconographic referencing of élite models of contemporary high-class portraiture.\textsuperscript{19} By setting his bust within an oval frame, for example, Buchinger is echoing typically ‘gentrified’ portraits of the period, including those commissioned by royalty (Figure 6).

As Turner reveals, the intricately-patterned background in Buchinger’s self-portrait (Figure 1) arguably serves to advertise Buchinger’s calligraphic talents; the dominant heart motifs seem suggestive of his widely-reputed skills as a card-player and gamer. Seated on an exquisitely embroidered cushion, he is elegantly attired in gentlemanly clothes – sporting a fine cravat, waistcoat and jacket. The compositional focus is on his kindly, satisfied face and imposing torso, which both radiate health and classical gravitas. Most remarkably, perhaps, Buchinger’s ‘disability’ is positively celebrated: his stumps are unashamedly depicted protruding from his sleeves – the proud tools of his trade. The accompanying text (see transcription under Figure 1) reinforces and enumerates Buchinger’s spectacularly outstanding talents, marital success and exceptional virility.

Overall, Buchinger, in this self-portrait, promotes himself as the model of a socially ‘polite’, industrious, successful eighteenth-century gentleman-entrepreneur – the ideal Enlightenment figure. Moreover, as Turner points out, ‘[Buchinger’s] physical impairment is presented as neither a barrier to commercial success nor to social advancement’.20 Such a ‘socially-inclusive’, productive and ‘polite’ perspective of disability constructed around the personal experience of an eighteenth-century disabled individual was to be more fully developed by William Hay MP, in his influential treatise thirty years later, discussed below.

William Hay MP, *Deformity: An Essay* (1754) (Figure 2)

William Hay (1695-1755) was born at Glyndebourne, Sussex, into an established provincial family, a hunchback dwarf from birth. Despite his severe disability, Hay rose to prominence as a man of letters and became a politician, after legal training at the Middle Temple which was curtailed on account of smallpox which damaged his eyesight. He married Elizabeth Pelham, whose father was a cousin of the Duke of Newcastle, and had three sons and a daughter. In 1734 he became MP for Sleaford, remaining in Parliament as a Whig until his death. Hay’s political interests included the field of prison welfare and poor relief. He was appointed keeper of records at the Tower of London in 1753 and died two years later. His numerous writings express the considerable width of his interests, spanning poetry, philosophy, politics and theology. However, he is now mostly remembered for his forthright account of the problems of disability in his day which he recounted from long, personal experience in the penultimate year of his life in *Deformity: An Essay* (1754).

The following critique of Hay’s *Essay* draws substantially on recent scholarly analysis. Hay’s *Deformity: An Essay* (1754) opens with an allusion to Montaigne, thereby indirectly referencing the *Essais* (1570-92) but also Montaigne’s status as a pioneer of the authorial self-portrait, famously encapsulated in Montaigne’s statement: ‘Authors communicate with the world in some special and peculiar capacity; I am the first to do so with my whole being, as Michel de Montaigne, not as a grammarian, a poet, or a lawyer’. Hay’s narrative, as in Montaigne’s *Essais*, is composed in the first person – a device which spontaneously de-medicalises both subject and subject-matter and immediately establishes a powerful intimacy between Hay and his readers – whether able-bodied or disabled. Stylistically, the *Essay* combines the ‘polite’ genres of memoir, literary critique and medical testimony. Hay calls it ‘my Apology’ – and speaks directly from his personal experience: ‘Bodily deformity is visible to Every Eye but the Effects of it are known to very few; intimately known to none but those who feel them; and they generally are not inclined to believe them’. He states his intention to treat the topic in a ‘philosophical Light’, albeit highly subjectively: to ‘anatomise’ myself – arguably nuancing Robert Burton’s *Anatomy of Melancholy* (1621). Hay anticipates that his publication would be of most interest to the educated class – those ‘so oddly (I will not say unhappily) distinguished’ but hopes that his *Essay* will be ‘not unentertaining to others’.

The first part of Hay’s *Essay* begins by introducing the personal circumstances of his disability and the treatment he has received from others – for example, in infancy, his carers had ‘out of Tenderness tried every Art to Correct the Errors of Nature’ but when this failed, they ‘taught him to be ashamed of my Person, instead of arming me with true Fortitude to despise any Ridicule or Contempt of it’. Describing his sympathetic treatment by close childhood friends but later his terrifying reception by a ‘mob’, Hay promotes a ‘polite’ concept of education for the disabled so they can rise above such anti-social, predominantly physical, behaviour.

\[^{22}\text{Turner, Disability in Eighteenth-Century England, pp. 116-123.}\]
\[^{23}\text{Quoted in Rewriting the Self: Histories from the Renaissance to the Present, ed. by Roy Porter (London and New York: Routledge, 1997), p. 54.}\]
\[^{25}\text{Hay, Deformity, ed. by James-Kavan, p. 24.}\]
\[^{26}\text{Hay, Deformity, p. 24.}\]
\[^{27}\text{Hay, Deformity, p. 25.}\]
Hay goes on to discuss the natural consequences of disability and stoically suggests that being ‘deformed’ can bring advantages to both the individual and society, such as providing the incentive for living a more temperate life. The disabled person might also, Hay suggests, be able to excel in occupations that engage the mind, if not the body.

The central thesis of Hay’s Essay, however, focuses on Hay’s forthright refutation of Francis Bacon’s assertion that deformed people are naturally ‘Scornful’ and devoid of affection or benevolence (Essays, 1597). Hay posits instead that deformed individuals are, in fact, deeply sensitive and caring human beings due to their exceptional emotional capacity to overcome the prejudice of others. Hay is of firm conviction that the disabled person develops qualities which can enhance society. For example, he states that stigmatisation of his own deformity did not antagonise him but, rather, prompted him to cultivate ‘higher’, more refined sensitivities, such as his personal revulsion at the sight of animal cruelty.

Finally, Hay ends with an unexpected personal medical digression – reporting his suffering from ‘bladder stones’, from which he claims relief by taking ‘Mrs. Stephens’s Medicine in the solid Form, three Ounces a Day, for about Five Years’. Hay aligns himself with a host of scientists and worthies, including the Prime Minister and the Speaker of the House of Commons, who also publicly supported the medicine when its recipe was purchased by Parliament in 1740”. James-Kavan has noted that this medical digression constitutes a concluding ‘polite’ self-fashioning: ‘Hay thus readjusts the pejorative historical analogy of ‘crooked’ with ‘deformed’, rendering the notion now respectable by embedding his argument within the fashionable field of contemporary aesthetics.

Hay concludes the Essay by acknowledging that Hogarth’s recently published Analysis of Beauty ‘proves incontestably... that [Beauty] consists in Curve Lines’. Hay thus readjusts the pejorative historical analogy of ‘crooked’ with ‘deformed’, rendering the notion now respectable by embedding his argument within the fashionable field of contemporary aesthetics.

A significant innovation, thus, in Hay’s text is the social ‘positioning’ of disability. The Essay arguably gives ‘deformity’ an entirely new subjectivity, refining the position of the ‘victim’ and furnishing him with a strong sense of human dignity. The narrative is firmly rooted within the confines of fashionable mid-eighteenth-century debates about sensibility and this is reinforced by the class-based positioning of its author. However, Hay’s ‘polite’ stance appears somewhat restrictive to the modern reader, as it does not attempt to embrace the wider mass of disability in eighteenth-century England nor ever address the situation of disabled women; they remain absent.

How successful and influential was Hay’s Essay in his day and subsequently? The Britannic Magazine of 1793 praised Hay’s ‘excellent essay’; an autobiographical essay by the disabled theatre-manager George Colman (1732-94) followed Hay’s, in 1761. A piece on ‘Deformity and Beauty’ appeared in The Sentimental Magazine of 1775. Publication of Hay’s collected works in 1794 led to further interest in his Essay. However, the social victimisation and exploitation of the disabled, particularly through their exhibition in ‘freak shows’ remained big business throughout the nineteenth century, attracting sharp satirical comment (Figure 7). ‘Modern’ disability legislation did not arguably arrive in England until the 1970s, being consistently refined and revised up to the present day: Disability discrimination only recently became a criminal offence under the UK Equality Act, 2010 – arguably only then elaborating on Hay’s tenet that the ‘deformed’ or disabled person can, in some instances, contribute as productively to society as the able-bodied one.

29 James-Kavan, p. 19.
30 All material in this paragraph sourced from Turner, Disability in Eighteenth-Century England, pp. 120-121.

Two examples of later eighteenth-century works of literary and artistic prominence (the second a self-portrait) might suggest that, subsequent to Hay’s *Essay*, representations of disability began to find increased expression within the mainstream British cultural consciousness: Sarah Scott’s *Millenium Hall* (1762) examines the relationship between a group of women and the disabled in society and Sir Joshua Reynolds’s *Self-portrait as a Deaf Man* (1775) (Figure 8) reveals the artist unashamedly cupping his hand to his deaf ear – Reynolds’s disability was indeed profound enough in his later years for him to have to resort to the use of a silver ear-trumpet.31

---

31 As depicted in the painting by Johann Zoffany (1733-1810), *The Academicians of the Royal Academy* (1772), currently in the Royal Collection, ref. RCIN 400747.
The full historical significance of William Hay’s *Deformity: An Essay* has only recently been recognised in modern scholarship. Helen Deutsch comments: Hay is ‘the first writer in the history of English literature to conceptualise and articulate physical disability as a personal identity’.

James-Kavan notes that Hay’s *Essay*, ‘offers a unique glimpse into the lived experience of a person with a disability in Enlightenment London’. David Turner remarks: ‘Hay’s text is seen as a landmark publication by modern disability scholars’.

---

33 James-Kavan, p. 10.
Conclusions

Buchinger’s self-portrait (1724) and Hay’s Deformity: An Essay (1754) represent innovative, aspirational attempts to forge ‘civilised’, productive identities on the part of their eighteenth-century severely disabled authors, challenging the prejudice of earlier ‘deformed’ stereotypes. Through the medium of the ‘polite’ self-portrait, Matthias Buchinger and William Hay successfully de-medicalise their disabled status by privileging and celebrating, instead, their outstanding ‘human’ capabilities – for example, remarkable physical dexterity, intellect or refinement of spirit. Fusing ‘disability’ with ‘respectability’ through the finely-tuned self-fashioning of these works, Buchinger and Hay construct the possibility for highly cultivated, enterprising but severely disabled individuals to be perceived as enthusiastic, pro-active participants in the vibrant social and commercial dynamic of Enlightenment London.

While separated by more than two centuries – Alison Lapper’s photographic self-portrait series (Figure 4), when aligned with Buchinger’s (Figure 1) and Hay’s pioneering eighteenth-century works outlined above (Figure 2) – suggests that, while leaps were made by two isolated individuals in Enlightenment London to validate the status of disability within the confines of a new and emerging sensibility, aesthetic variables still surround perceptions of bodily anomaly today which prompt challenge from cultural practitioners.

Lapper’s striking celebration of her own phocomelic form, as powerfully expressed in such works as her self-portraits (Figure 4), arguably stands as evidence that the progressive achievement and enlightened spirit of Matthias Buchinger and William Hay continue to find resonance in the self-fashioning of disabled artists celebrating their humanity today.
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