



Swansea University  
Prifysgol Abertawe



## Cronfa - Swansea University Open Access Repository

---

This is an author produced version of a paper published in:

Cronfa URL for this paper:

<http://cronfa.swan.ac.uk/Record/cronfa48254>

---

### **Book chapter :**

Turner, D. (2018). *Picturing disability in eighteenth-century England*. Oxford University Press.

<http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780190234959.013.20>

---

This item is brought to you by Swansea University. Any person downloading material is agreeing to abide by the terms of the repository licence. Copies of full text items may be used or reproduced in any format or medium, without prior permission for personal research or study, educational or non-commercial purposes only. The copyright for any work remains with the original author unless otherwise specified. The full-text must not be sold in any format or medium without the formal permission of the copyright holder.

Permission for multiple reproductions should be obtained from the original author.

Authors are personally responsible for adhering to copyright and publisher restrictions when uploading content to the repository.

<http://www.swansea.ac.uk/library/researchsupport/ris-support/>

The eighteenth century is often seen as a time when disability became increasingly marginalized in visual culture. However, a glimpse beyond the classical tastes of “high” art reveals not a disappearance but a flourishing of representations of physical and sensory difference. Eighteenth-century popular art and satirical prints examined the disabled body not just as a symbol of misfortune or target for medical intervention, but also as a source of pleasure or an object of satire that conveyed wider messages about the times. A rich and varied range of pictorial representations of disability in the long eighteenth century (ca. 1680–ca. 1830) contributed to social, cultural, and medical understandings of bodily difference in English culture. People with disabilities played important roles as artists, models, and critics in an era before modern “disability arts.”

disability; art; prints; eighteenth century; English culture; representation

## Part IV REPRESENTATIONS 19 Picturing Disability in Eighteenth-Century England

David M. Turner

On April 10, 1736, the *London Daily Post* reported that “the ingenious Mr Hogarth” had presented to St. Bartholomew’s Hospital a “very fine piece of painting, representing the Miracle wrought by our Saviour at the Pool of Bethesda” to be hung on the institution’s “great Stair Case.”<sup>1</sup> The painting was one of two produced by the artist William Hogarth free of charge for the hospital to which he had been elected a governor in 1734, depicting “ye charity extended to the Poor, Sick and Lame.”<sup>2</sup> It represented a scene familiar to Baroque history painting, with the figure of Christ, resplendent in red and blue robes, gesturing with his left hand to the “cripple,” reclining seminude at his feet, urging him to rise. At first sight, it is a highly idealized image, formal rather than realistic. The cripple’s impairment barely registers, with his muscular torso and arms giving him the appearance of a classical god rather than that of a body worn down through years of restricted mobility or malnourished poverty. Yet, the figures surrounding Christ present a much more recognizable set of impairments. There is an elderly blind man holding a stick, his sightless eyes pointing toward the heavens; a one-eyed man nurses an arm in a sling; a woman with a crooked spine supports herself with a crutch, while the attendant of a courtesan (possibly seeking a cure for venereal disease) tries to hold back a woman holding in her arms an emaciated child whose outstretched spindly arm betrays the symptoms of rickets.<sup>3</sup> By representing the contemporary diseases treated at St. Bartholomew’s, Hogarth sought to reimagine the story of Christ’s healing the sick and disabled poor in a modern context.<sup>4</sup>

Hogarth's painting of the Pool of Bethesda provides an intriguing starting point for examining representations of disability in eighteenth-century visual culture. In this period, stories of biblical healing had a strong moral purpose, emphasizing not just the duty of charity but also promoting a message of Christian stoicism, indicating that those who bore patiently with their bodily ills would eventually be rewarded with their cure.<sup>5</sup> As taste in high art came to be increasingly influenced by classicism in the eighteenth century, public representations of "deformed" bodies became limited to the kind of grand and moralistic history painting that Hogarth produced for St. Bartholomew's, in which the disabled were literally marginalized.<sup>6</sup> Yet, a look beyond the classical tastes of "high" art reveals not a disappearance but a flourishing of representations of physical and sensory difference. Eighteenth-century popular art and satirical prints examined the disabled body not just as a symbol of misfortune or as a target for medical intervention, but also as a source of pleasure or an object of satire that conveyed wider messages about the times. A rich and varied range of pictorial representations of disability contributed to social, cultural, and medical understandings of bodily difference in English culture.

## Historiography and Approaches

"Disabled people have had more images launched in their name than Helen ever had ships," noted David Hevey in his landmark study of disability in photography, *The Creatures Time Forgot*. Since its publication in 1992, social and art historians and practitioners in museum and heritage studies have made important strides in documenting and understanding disability's rich visual heritage.<sup>7</sup> Studies of disability imagery have moved on from simply documenting the presence of certain impairments in art and popular culture or examining how pictorial, cinematic, or literary representations have

perpetuated negative stereotypes of disabled people as pitiful, criminal, perverse, or “brave.”<sup>8</sup> Attention has turned to the “visual rhetorics” that inform the representation of disability and the ways in which images establish a relationship of power between the viewer and viewed.<sup>9</sup> The best of this work has examined the ways in which the development of visual media has had a direct effect on the lives of people with disabilities, charting the role played by photography in the medicalization of impairment since the mid-nineteenth century.<sup>10</sup> Cultural critics have examined the ways in which disabled artists and photographers have broken free from the oppressive cultural tropes in which disability has been represented to create a new “disability aesthetics.”<sup>11</sup>

Much of this work has focused on the modern era and has taken a rather whiggish view of history, charting the progression toward more challenging or affirmative imagery associated with the growing independence of disabled artists under the auspices of the disability arts movement.<sup>12</sup> For example, Rosemarie Garland-Thomson has argued that for a long time the most prevalent pictures of people with disabilities were those provided by freak show or charity advertising and medical photography, which “portray disability narrowly as sensational, sentimental or pathological.” Only in recent times with the increasing visibility of people with disabilities in the public eye have more “varied images emerged that tell a broader range of stories about people with disabilities.”<sup>13</sup> Richard Sandell and Jocelyn Dodd have similarly contrasted the negative images of disability produced by our ancestors with modern representations that are “undeniably more protean and nuanced in their portrayals than those which have tended to predominate in the past.”<sup>14</sup>

While the disability arts movement without doubt provided disabled people the space and artistic freedom to explore their own experiences, the view that representations of disability before the modern era were necessarily narrow is open to question. Although there have always been well-worn visual tropes in the representation of people with disabilities, images of physical difference produced before the modern era could also be protean and presented a variety of messages. Tom Nichols, for example, has argued that images of marginalized groups in the early modern period were characterized by a “challenging ambiguity” that engaged the viewer’s “mixed emotions of humour and mistrust, repulsion and attraction, hatred and sympathy.”<sup>15</sup> During the long eighteenth century, the visual portrayal of impaired bodies was not simply an iteration of damaging social stereotypes, but provided opportunities to map disability onto the social landscape of a rapidly urbanizing world and to explore responses to the “problem” of impairment. The visibility of physical and sensory impairment in various media provided a response to the troubling visibility of “deformed” and “disabled” bodies in society at large and was responsible for a rich variety of visual representations.

## Disability and Visual Representation in Eighteenth-Century England

The vast collection of prints and drawings amassed by the diarist Samuel Pepys provides a useful starting point for examining the range of representations of impaired subjects at the start of our period. A well-connected civil servant in the Navy Office, Pepys was an avid consumer of the print culture of Restoration London, amassing a collection of 3,000 books and manuscripts, hundreds of prints, drawings, and portraits, and a substantial collection of ballads. Where identifiable, Pepys’s pictures of people with nonstandard

bodies fell into two categories. In the first place, he owned at least seventeen prints depicting the miraculous healing of the sick, “lame,” and blind by Christ and the Apostles, many of them part of a much larger series depicting stories from the New Testament.<sup>16</sup> Such images dominated the market in images with “disabled” subjects in late-seventeenth- and early-eighteenth-century England, judging from the evidence of sale catalogs. For example, among the paintings sold at the Barbadoes Coffee House in Exchange Alley, February 20, 1690, was a picture of “Our Saviour Curing the Lame, Finely Done.”<sup>17</sup> The Auction Coffee House in Tunbridge Wells offered for sale a “Sketch of Christ Curing the Lame after Rubens” in August 1690, a copy of which could also be had in a sale at Tonson’s Old Tavern in Epsom at the same time.<sup>18</sup>

Pepys catalogued the rest of his images of “deformed” subjects as “Anticks and Drolls”—a broad category that also included images of peasants, musicians, dancing, costumes, and scenes from “low” or rustic life depicted in a variety of humorous or naturalistic ways, popularized by Dutch and other northern European artists in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. Among images categorized in this way were two prints of “cripples,” “fools,” musicians, and beggars after Hieronymus Bosch, a set of eighteen etchings of “dwarves” by Jacques Callot dated 1616, and a series of nine grotesque heads by Francis Le Piper, labeled “Le Pipe’s Anticks.”<sup>19</sup> Print sellers similarly listed for sale images of the disabled poor alongside other comedic subjects. For example, John Overton advertised among a variety of “sheets of stories, pot size” a print titled the “Lame Crew of Beggars” (possibly a version of *Les Gueux* by Jacques Callot) alongside other comic works, including “A New Years Gift for a Shrew,” “The Young Man Hugging the Old Woman,” and “A Silly Contented Cuckold in the New Fashion,” in

a sale of 1675.<sup>20</sup> Sale catalogs reveal a variety of other representations of disability.

Visual impairment, for example, was depicted via images of proverbs, such as the blind leading the blind, and via depictions of popular figures from folklore such as the blind beggar of Bethnal Green.<sup>21</sup> The titles of other pictures suggest a curiosity about different types of disease or bodily deformity. “A Woman’s Picture with a Lame Arm” was offered for sale in an auction at Smythers Coffee House in London’s Thames Street on March 12, 1691, and among the 170 or so pictures belonging to the connoisseur Sir Peter Motteux that were sold off between 1714 and 1717 was a portrait listed as “The Man with the Palsy”—possibly Aeneas, the man cured of paralysis by St. Peter (Acts ix.34).<sup>22</sup>

There was therefore no shortage of images of nonstandard bodies in circulation at the end of the seventeenth century, but the disabled body was frequently subsumed into other categories, such as divine healing or a broader set of images depicting comical or colorful views of “low life.” The “disabled” were not seen as a distinctive group in society. Rather, they were viewed as part of the mass of the poor or served to demonstrate broader moral messages about faith, patience, and the healing powers of Christ and the Apostles.<sup>23</sup> Many of these images were imports. During the eighteenth century, however, an influx of artists working around London’s Covent Garden, the growth of the domestic print industry, and the expansion of printed media such as periodicals and magazines led to new opportunities to represent the disabled body.<sup>24</sup> Popular genres such as the “Cries of London” depicted blind or “lame” street vendors alongside other images of the urban poor.<sup>25</sup> The contrast between “high” and “low” life, of ideal beauty and deformity, intrinsic to European art traditions, fed into political caricatures in which artists such as James Gillray and Thomas Rowlandson used the grotesquely distorted body as a tool of



political satire.<sup>26</sup> Advertisements for freak performances often included visual depictions of the person exhibited. The lives of such “extraordinary” individuals were captured in newspapers and magazines, many of which also included portraits of non-normative bodies.<sup>27</sup> Whereas popular broadsides had long illustrated “monstrous” births, publications such as the Royal Society’s *Philosophical Transactions*, which began in the 1660s, printed more anatomically precise drawings of anomalous births as a tool for explaining these aberrations.<sup>28</sup> Together, these images created a rich and varied series of “cultural fantasies of health, illness and the body.”<sup>29</sup>

### “Disabled” Artists, Models, and Critics

People with disabilities themselves participated in processes of artistic production and interpretation throughout Europe. In the Preface to *Vagabondiana* (1817), a collection of portraits of London’s “most remarkable” mendicants, John Thomas Smith noted that the use of the “lame” poor as artists’ models had a long history going back to Michelangelo, Carracci, and Rembrandt. He gave the more recent example of the “truly spirited painter, Mr Ward” who “made . . . overtures to a lame sailor” to sit for him, only for the man to rebuff him, preferring instead “his begging occupation.”<sup>30</sup> Furthermore, although the impairments of many artists may have gone unremarked, some artists were celebrated *because* of their physical difference. In the eighteenth century, the most notable were Matthias (Matthew) Buchinger (1674–1739), Thomas Inglefield (b. 1769) and Sarah Biffin (1784–1850), all of whom were born without limbs, yet went on to be well-known artists and engravers. All produced self-portraits that simultaneously displayed their “wondrous” extraordinary talents, while also challenging viewers to acknowledge their shared humanity.<sup>31</sup> For example, a self-portrait of Buchinger commissioned in 1724 by

the bookseller Isaac Herbert showed him sitting on a cushion, dressed in a genteel manner in waistcoat, cravat, and coat, and wearing a wig. There is little attempt to hide his stumps, but the viewer's eye is drawn to his face, which meets the viewer's gaze in a direct, unoppressed way. Buchinger's self-portrait resembles those of gentlemen and wealthy merchants that were becoming fashionable in the eighteenth century, indicating that bodily "deformity" was not a barrier to social or commercial success. But the portrait is more than a representation of the self; it is also an advertisement for Buchinger's many talents, supporting the work of his public exhibition. The self-portrait is framed in an oval, around which is an elaborate backdrop of hearts that advertises the artist's intricate penmanship. Beneath the picture, a text provides some biographical information and lists the many talents that Buchinger charged audiences to see, including playing various musical instruments, writing and drawing coats of arms, playing cards and dice, and performing magic tricks (Figure 19.1).

[Insert Figure 19.1 here]

For Buchinger, who had learned to write and draw by holding a pen beneath his chin, being born with a non-normative body did not limit his participation in the art world, but rather enabled him to earn a living in it.<sup>32</sup> Buchinger produced a variety of pictorial ephemera, including illustrated genealogies, engraved book plates, and coats of arms for his wealthy patrons during the 1720s and 1730s. Characteristically, he included accompanying text that drew attention to his remarkable physical characteristics and often included details of his family life. For instance, a magnificent drawing of an altarpiece that Buchinger made in Edinburgh in 1728 included an inscription explaining that "This was Drawn and Written by Matthew Buchinger, Born Without Hands or Feet,"

adding also that he had “been married Four Times and has had Issue 12 Children.”<sup>33</sup> In this respect, referring to his physical difference functioned as a mark of authenticity, which in turn added value to Buchinger’s work. The additional detail about his marital life and children asserted his masculinity and potency, serving as a further claim to legitimacy. When Buchinger’s original self-portrait produced on vellum was advertised for sale in 1795, it was puffed as a “very rare Curiosity, and really unique” and priced at £52 10s (approximately £5,000 in modern value).<sup>34</sup>

Although “armless wonders” such as Buchinger had long captured the public attention, other artists with less visible—or remarkable—impairments chose to emphasize them in order to gain a distinctive identity in the art market. For example, Benjamin Ferrers, a “Face Painter” (portrait artist), identified himself as “Deaf and Dumb” in an advertisement placed in the *Spectator* in December 1711, which advised the public that he still continued his profession of painting in spite of a “villainous” rumor to the contrary.<sup>35</sup> Deaf artists such as Richard Crosse (1742–1810) and John Brewster (1766–1854) were celebrated for their portraits, while Sir Joshua Reynolds, president of the Royal Academy, painted his “Self Portrait as a Deaf Man” ca.1775 to document his hearing loss in later life.<sup>36</sup>

One of the most celebrated art critics of the eighteenth century was significantly impaired. Georg Christoph Lichtenburg, who published a series of commentaries on Hogarth’s engravings between 1784 and 1796, described himself in self-deprecatory terms as occupying a body “that even an indifferent draftsman would draw it better in the dark,” having developed a curved spine as a result of a childhood accident.<sup>37</sup> Lichtenburg was drawn to Hogarth’s work through an interest in physiognomy, and his own

experiences of living with a nonstandard body seems to have made him particularly sensitive to the nuances of physical difference in the images and Hogarth's skill in representing them. However, this did not necessarily produce an empathetic response to the representation of disease or disability. Lichtenburg enjoyed Hogarth's depiction of the "somewhat old and palsied" Earl of Squander, the avaricious father in *Marriage A La Mode* (1743–1745) who married off his daughter to the highest bidder, noting the artist's satirical use of the decrepit body to symbolize corruption and lack of moral probity: "His Grace, though one would hardly believe it to look at him, is just as bankrupt as he is gouty, and his financial potency is, if anything, rather less than his physical."<sup>38</sup>

In his commentary on "Noon," the second plate in *The Four Times of Day* (1738), which depicts a congregation leaving the French chapel in Hog Lane, St. Giles, Lichtenburg focused his attention on a group of figures to the left of the composition, comprised of a lady with a dancing master and a boy "of diminutive size." The lady rests her hand on the dancing master's shoulder, while the boy uses a cane to steady his steps. Lichtenburg wove these details into a history of familial disability, suggesting that the expansive crinoline of the woman's dress was "meant to cover a slight abnormality in walking, which the little heir . . . cannot disguise so well." Speculating further whether the dancing master might be the boy's father, he noted that, were that the case, he "could expect little assistance in his business from his son's frame." Despite being of restricted growth himself, Lichtenburg was hardly sympathetic to the "dwarf" in the picture, commenting that his apparent fascination with the "silver facing of his sleeve" indicated a superficiality of character and "a spirit in keeping with the body."<sup>39</sup>

It is evident then that people with disabilities were not simply the subjects of images during the eighteenth century, but played a significant role in their creation and interpretation. Identifying as impaired contributed to artists' distinctiveness, adding in some cases to their fame and public appeal. Artists such as Matthias Buchinger were not simply "freaks of nature" whose talents contributed to an understanding of disability as "wondrous," but successful entrepreneurs who were adept at exploiting public interest in their physical difference in order to make a living and find patrons for their work. However, to view these artists—or people with disabilities more generally—as part of a "community" based on the recognition of a shared "disabled" identity in the eighteenth century would be anachronistic.

## Disability and the Human Landscape of Eighteenth-Century London

Historians have frequently examined the visibility of disability in the past through its more exotic manifestations such as "monstrous" births, or the "extraordinary freaks of nature" who publicly exhibited themselves at fairs or taverns. However, eighteenth-century artists were also interested in the presence of people with disabilities as part of everyday life. The sight of the displaced "crippled" poor on the streets of London and other large cities was not new to the eighteenth century, but as London developed as the center of polite sociability and as the commercial capital of an expanding overseas empire, the sight of the "unsightly" served as a "disruption of the visual field" and raised conflicting emotions of sympathy and revulsion.<sup>40</sup> For example, a correspondent complained to the *Spectator* in 1712 that the sight of so many "miserable objects" of suffering on the streets of London "affect the compassionate Beholder with dismal Ideas,

discompose the cheerfulness of his Mind, and deprive him of the Pleasure that he might otherwise take in surveying the Grandeur of the Metropolis.”<sup>41</sup> For artists such as William Hogarth, Thomas Rowlandson, and Paul Sandby, such subjects were fascinating as part of the rich variety of urban life, functioning as a “spectacle of difference” that exposed the underside of the Georgian ideal of polite decorum. As satirical chroniclers of urban manners, they wove the non-normative body into visual “narratives of delinquency and abjection that were being screened out of the polite ideal of the modern city.”<sup>42</sup> Images of the disabled poor took different forms, but the “dominant mode of representation was naturalistic rather than sentimental, comic rather than serious, and satiric rather than congratulatory.”<sup>43</sup>

The encounter between “disabled” and “non-disabled” on the streets of Georgian London was chiefly imagined through the activity of begging. In these images, disability was invariably associated with dependency, but it could also be threatening. Giving alms raised conflicting emotions between a Christian duty of charity and anxiety about the authenticity of begging performances, which wove sightless eyes, missing limbs, sores, and sorrowful tales into convincing narratives of need.<sup>44</sup> In “Pray Remember the Blind” (1801), for example, Thomas Rowlandson depicted a blind beggar demanding alms from two elegantly dressed young women, proffering a hat into which one of the ladies drops a coin. The theme of the print is the duty of charity, but the contrast between the women’s demure appearance and submissive posture and the barging presence of the blind mendicant dramatizes the anxieties bound up with this exchange. The beggar’s sightless eyes are raised to the sky as he cries out the commonly heard demand that gives the picture its title. Whereas eyes raised heavenward traditionally conveyed the idea that the

blind, being free from material distractions, were more focused on divine contemplation, here their wildness, combined with the man's dismal expression, seems to represent the beggar's body as lacking control, dangerously uninhibited by the mores of polite interaction. One of the women reads a paper tied round the beggar's neck, which relates the circumstances of his disablement in an effort to prove the veracity of his impairment.<sup>45</sup>

Concerns about imposture were prevalent in eighteenth-century accounts of the begging underworld; as this image shows, the narrative power of disability written on paper might be used as an extra form of authenticity, appealing to those suspicious of the reliability of disability written on the body. However, satirists also questioned the motives of donors. Rowlandson's earlier print, "Charity Covereth a Multitude of Sins" (1781), drew its title from a biblical adage against false charity and depicted a young man putting a coin into the hat of a lame beggar as he knocks to gain entry into a brothel. Here the disabled beggar serves as a representation of conscience and shows the continued importance of an idea prevalent during the Middle Ages, that benevolence toward the disabled poor was a form of exchange for which the donor received a prayer for his or her sins.<sup>46</sup>

Artists also represented people with disabilities as part of the urban throng, using their physical difference to convey the rich, sometimes chaotic, variety of city life. Certain beggars became well known in this period by their distinctive impairments, and artists included these characters in their work. Plate VI of Hogarth's *Industry and Idleness* (1747), a series of prints that contrasted the fortunes of two apprentices who embodied the virtues and vices of the title, included among a band of musicians who

raucously interrupted the industrious Francis Goodchild's nuptials a legless beggar sitting in a tub. He was identified as "Philip in the Tub," who was "well known in those days" and "constantly attended weddings, and retailed the ballad of 'Jesse, or the Happy Pair'."<sup>47</sup> Music was one of the "begging occupations" of the eighteenth-century urban poor and blind ballad singers and other disabled musicians were popular subjects of visual representation.<sup>48</sup> Paul Sandby's late eighteenth-century watercolor, *The Asylum for the Deaf*, depicts two wooden-legged musicians performing in a crowded London street, whose audience includes an elderly woman who listens from a window with the aid of an ear trumpet. Vic Gatrell has interpreted this image as a "celebration of an urban happiness," indicated by Sandby's sympathetic representation of the musicians and the pleasure that they give their audience.<sup>49</sup>

Sandby's work fits into a tradition of sympathetic representations of picturesque poverty that can be traced back to the seventeenth-century "drolls" collected by Pepys. However, while such images represented cheerfully the diversity of London life, other prints and paintings depicted the dangers of the urban environment for people with disabilities. Hogarth's *Gin Lane* (1751), which famously depicted the descent into barbarity of citizens engulfed by the midcentury "gin craze," portrayed a number of invalids on crutches being jostled and beaten by drunken attackers. Artists also portrayed physically impaired characters falling victim to accidents. The French visitor Jacques-Henri Meister noted that London streets were full of "small pitfalls that cause the pedestrian to take care, and there are numerous reports in newspapers and coroners' inquests of traffic accidents involving people with wooden legs or other mobility impairments."<sup>50</sup> Some artists depicted these incidents humorously, making the joke that



the breaking of a wooden leg was best put right by a carpenter than a surgeon.<sup>51</sup> However, for wooden-leg wearers, the consequences of street accidents could be much more serious. In February 1768, for example, the *Westminster Journal* reported that a “gentleman with a wooden leg” going along London’s Aldersgate Street had an accident when the “end of the leg went thro’ the holes of one of the stones” placed over a coal vault, breaking it in two and causing him to fall and “dislocate the opposite thigh bone.” Another man was bruised in “so violent a manner that it is thought he cannot live” after falling down a staircase when his wooden leg slipped.<sup>52</sup>

The vulnerability of the disabled pedestrian is captured most vividly in John Collet’s painting of a scene in a London street, more commonly known as *The Bath Fly* (1770). Collet depicts a brawl that has happened on the arrival of the stagecoach that gives the picture its title and on the disembarkation of passengers. The scene probably depicts the aftermath of a robbery. A man in green trousers is restrained by constables thanks to the heroic intervention of a tall man who stands center stage holding a pistol. To the left of the hero is a woman, probably the victim of the crime, who picks up items that have spilled from a basket. To the right is a man with one leg who has been knocked to the floor and tries to stop a woman from stealing a walking stick he has fashioned by attaching cork to the end of a sword—a crime unnoticed by the dashing hero and almost everyone else apart from a young woman emerging from a sedan chair who is unable or unwilling to intervene. The picture captures the risks faced by impaired pedestrians to accident or robbery and the ways in which it was easy to ignore the misfortunes of others in the busy metropolis.<sup>53</sup> The fate of the one-legged man stood for a failure of urban politeness in which pedestrians were advised to protect the “blind” and “lame” from

harm.<sup>54</sup> Characters with disabilities were not simply depicted as colorful or “freakish” features of everyday life; their presence registered a significant feeling of urban unease. They represented the disorderly underside to the Georgian city, and their treatment sometimes provided a powerful means of critiquing the values of mutuality, benevolence, and generosity that were so important to visions of an ordered society.

## Soldiers and Sailors

Of all the disabled types depicted by artists of late-eighteenth and early-nineteenth-century England, the mutilated ex-serviceman attracted particular attention. Images of wounded veterans proliferated against the backdrop of the American War of Independence and the war with France from 1793 to 1815. Literary representations of broken soldiers and sailors in later Georgian England frequently attempted to contain the disorderly threat posed by ex-servicemen by making them “familiar, safe, picturesque, deferential, patriotic or entertaining.”<sup>55</sup> Many visual representations similarly conveyed the view of the battlefield as a site of heroic sacrifice, depicting wounded veterans accepting their fate with a mixture of manly pride and gallows humor.<sup>56</sup> An etching by Isaac Cruickshank from ca.1791, for example, depicted an old sailor with a wooden leg and a man with no arms drinking in a tavern (Figure 19.2). The dependency of the armless man is manifest, as a woman lifts a tankard to his lips. Yet the physical losses of these men is offset by their merriment and good-humored acceptance of their fate, which allows the viewer to forget the horrors of the battlefield or the real hardships faced by returning maimed veterans.<sup>57</sup>

[Insert Figure 19.2 here]

Other images presented a darker, more critical view of warfare and the treatment of the maimed. In *The Disbanded Soldier* (1775), an engraving by James Caldwell after John Collet, the devastating effect of overseas conflict is illustrated by a picture of a double amputee and his family. The man, still dressed in his redcoat uniform and wearing two peg legs and clutching his head—his body broken physically and mentally by the battlefield—is led by his pregnant wife upon a donkey. Round his neck is a cauldron that carries an infant; his wife bundles another small child in her arms. The image, which parodies Christ’s entry into Jerusalem (and reverses Joseph’s leading of the pregnant Mary into Bethlehem), turns what should be a triumphant homecoming into a procession of human tragedy (Figure 19.3). The point is emphasized by the ironic accompanying quote from John Dryden’s *Alexander’s Feast* (1697), “So shall Desert in Arms be crown’d,” a poem that celebrated the glorious return of the brave. The horrors of disablement are emphasized not simply by the veteran’s missing limbs, but also by the sufferings of other family members. They act as a powerful reminder that disablement had effects beyond the broken body of the veteran, but also afflicted his nondisabled dependents. The idea of military disability as a badge of manly honor is savagely undercut by the message that war—and the meager provision for maimed veterans—robbed broken soldiers and sailors of their ability to perform their patriarchal duty of providing for their families at home.<sup>58</sup>

[Insert Figure 19.3 here]

## Categorizing the Disabled Poor

While the depiction of people with disabilities in recognizable social contexts was an important feature of eighteenth-century representations, some images extrapolated

impaired figures from their social context to subject their distinctive features to more taxonomic categorization. This reached its height in the early nineteenth century in visual series such as John Thomas Smith's *Vagabondiana* (1817) and Thomas Busby's *Costume of the Lower Orders of London* (ca. 1819).<sup>59</sup> *Vagabondiana* was produced against the backdrop of the Parliamentary Select Committee inquiry into the state of mendacity in the capital which published its findings in 1816. Hardening attitudes toward poverty in the wake of the Napoleonic Wars meant that "low life" was increasingly represented as a "terrain of anxiety and didactic moralization," yet Smith's images reflected a variety of modes of thinking about disability.<sup>60</sup> Its fifty-one drawings of "cripples," beggars, and street vendors seem to resemble natural history in that their human subjects are taken from recognizable contexts and depicted against plain backgrounds so that the viewer is invited to scrutinize their distinctive characteristics. Nevertheless, Smith humanized his subjects by giving them biographical information. The juxtaposition of text and image transforms the figures from objects to subjects, shifting them from archetypes of impaired poverty to characters in their own stories.<sup>61</sup>

Smith's choice of impairments, coupled with the biographical information he provided, created a hierarchy of representation. He was particularly interested in blind beggars, including thirteen in his collection, and also in "exotic" figures such as Charles M'Gee, a black Jamaican beggar whom he drew on August 9, 1815, aged seventy-three, "in the parlour of a public-house, the sign of the Twelve Bells, opposite to the famous well of St. Brigid."<sup>62</sup> The choice of these subjects reflected a scale of sympathy that street mendicants were able to exploit. "Black people," he noted, "as well as those destitute of sight, seldom fail to excite compassion."<sup>63</sup> Smith captured "disability" in the drawings as

a form of performance. He was interested not just in the circumstances of disablement, but in the ways in which it was presented to others. For instance, he noted how blind beggars would routinely make their impairment more manifest by deliberately turning up their eyeballs (Figure 19.4).<sup>64</sup> Other “props” of the disabled poor that received prominent attention in his drawings included crutches, canes, stools on which legless beggars sat, hats used to collect alms, and dogs. Smith was fascinated by the means by which people with physical disabilities moved around the city using a variety of devices. He therefore made portraits of “go carts,” “Billies in bowls,” and “Sledge Beggars,” those “cripples whose misfortunes will not permit them to travel in any other way.”<sup>65</sup>

[Insert Figure 19.4 here]

Furthermore, Smith documented the economic activities of the displaced disabled poor, such as the street sweeper Lilley who “lost his leg in some repairs at Westminster” and William Frasier, “deprived of both his hands in the field of battle” who, unable to support his large family on his soldier’s pension, was “obliged to depend on the benevolence of such of the public who purchase boot laces of him.”<sup>66</sup> Smith’s disabled poor may have been “vagabonds,” but they were not necessarily characterized by an unwillingness or inability to work. Harking back once again to seventeenth-century Dutch paintings of picturesque poverty, *Vagabondiana* represented disability as a form of eccentricity. For instance, Smith’s account of Jack Stuart, “the blind sailor” who had modeled for the sculptor John Flaxman, focused its attention not on the effects of his impairment, but on the “whimsical procession” of “three blind beggars in black cloaks” who attended his funeral in 1815.<sup>67</sup> The tone of the text and the images was also nostalgic; Smith believed that he was capturing a world about to be lost as the state’s

interest in the problem of poverty seemed destined to render street mendicancy a thing of the past. Accordingly, at the end of *Vagabondiana*, Smith described his subjects leaving the street and entering the workhouse, docile willing participants in institutionalization.<sup>68</sup> Smith documented the characteristics of the displaced impaired poor in early-nineteenthcentury London, in ways that went beyond regarding disability simply as a medical or a socioeconomic problem. He did not picture his subjects as diagnostic case studies indicative of particular “conditions,” nor did he delineate them in terms of levels of “need” or as requiring particular types of support. Rather, his categories focused on racial characteristics, individual circumstances, and daily life strategies as a means of differentiating his subjects, sympathetically documenting human individuality.

## Medicalization

Although Smith at no point refers to impairment as a medical problem, the potential of the visual image to classify different types of impairment and the characteristics of different “types” of disabled paupers is evident in his engravings. While the medicalization of disability over the long eighteenth century was an uneven and incomplete process, it is evident that practitioners, both professional and unorthodox, were beginning to utilize visual imagery to bolster their credentials in the diagnosis and “cure” of impairment.<sup>69</sup> Pictorial representation was important, for example, in the advertising of products to restore amputees to “wholeness,” or to correct or conceal various physical deformities that proliferated in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries. Trade cards for manufacturers of prosthetics or devices for straightening the “crooked” body used imagery that underscored the restorative power of their technologies in returning the body to symmetry, or freeing it from the burden of deformity. Often the

disabled body itself was absent from such designs, further emphasizing the efficacy of products to erase impairment. For instance, the trade card of the “Truss and Ladies Collar maker” J. Sleath of London dating from around 1800 depicted a female figure, barefoot and one breast bared wearing a winged headdress and carrying a torch in her right hand and ribbon in her left. This was a familiar representation of liberty, the winged headdress symbolizing freedom. Against the backdrop of the French Revolution and campaigns for abolition of the slave trade, the winged Phrygian cap—traditionally a symbol of emancipation from slavery—had powerful connotations at the turn of the nineteenth century. Carefully distinguished in appearance from the Jacobin “Bonnet Rouge,” the cap of liberty tarnished by its adoption by French Revolutionaries in the Terror of 1792–1793, Sleath’s use of the image of the winged headdress appeared to represent the promise of liberation from the prison of a “deformed” body through medical intervention. The implication that Sleath’s corrective devices emancipated their users from dependency and conferred on them full human status sent out a clear message that associated physical imperfection with social devaluation.<sup>70</sup>

One of the most distinctive examples of the subjection of the “deformed” body to the objectifying “medical gaze” in the era before photography is found in the illustrations in Dr. Edward Harrison’s *The Extraordinary Case of Sarah Hawkes* (1832), an account of the methods used to treat an extreme case of spinal deformity in a fourteen-year-old girl.<sup>71</sup> Hawkes, a servant from Dunmow in Essex, was “afflicted with a most extraordinary . . . contrition of figure, amounting to almost the highest degree of deformity,” brought on by a blow to the neck.<sup>72</sup> The two “before” and “after” images that

accompany the text serve to demonstrate the extent of her deformity and the ways in which her body was restored to a symmetrical aesthetic ideal. In the first image,

Hawkes's twisted body is laid bare, each individual contortion labeled (Figure 19.5).

Nude apart from a cap on her head, whose gesture to modesty simply serves to emphasize her nakedness, Hawkes is reduced to a medical specimen, her personhood stripped away.

In contrast, the picture of the recovered Sarah Hawkes resembles a classical nude. She stands tall and straight-backed, posed with her foot on a pedestal (Figure 19.6). Though

her physique has a masculine quality, the image proclaimed the power of Harrison's methods in spinal manipulation to restore his patient to physical and gender propriety:

The result happily is, that a young female, presenting the most hideous deformity has, by art, been restored to that beauty, symmetry and activity which Nature had originally bestowed upon her, but which she had for years been deprived by the consequences of violence.<sup>73</sup>

[Insert Figure 19.5 near here]

While Harrison described his motive for intervening in Hawkes's case as deriving from a humanitarian desire to alleviate the "miserable condition of these unfortunate persons, who ought to arouse our warmest sympathies," the mode of representing Hawkes indicates a more "medicalized" approach to disability and anticipates the intrusive gaze of later nineteenth- and twentieth-century medical photography.<sup>74</sup> The image was used as a diagnostic tool to indicate precisely the nature of her spinal deformity and to provide empirical evidence of the efficacy of Harrison's cure. Like medical photographs, the subject is shown undressed, demonstrating the medical expert's power over the patient's body and the body of the "deformed" subject as public property.<sup>75</sup> The representations of



Sarah Hawkes set a pattern that would eventually lead to the twentieth-century medical model of disability in which physical difference is conceptualized as a deviant pathology subject to medical intervention.<sup>76</sup>

[Insert Figure 19.6 near here]

## Conclusion: Visible and Invisible Histories

It would be tempting to view the long eighteenth century in terms of a progression from the miraculous to the medical in representations of disability, as indicated by the contrast between these pictures and the popularity of images depicting the miraculous healing of the lame and blind by Christ and the Apostles that provided the predominant images of disability in the late-seventeenth- and early-eighteenth-century art market. But images of disability are too complex to fit into a straightforward narrative of progression in which one model was replaced by another. There was considerable overlap between genres. Hogarth's *Pool of Bethesda* modernized the miracle narrative by alluding to the work of St. Bartholomew's Hospital in treating the "sick and lame" poor; Harrison's use of images of Sarah Hawkes evidenced the success of a process viewed by his contemporaries as "really miraculous."<sup>77</sup>

If images of miraculous cure and successful medical intervention had as a common theme the erasure of disability, eighteenth-century artists were just as much concerned with the troubling presence of people with visible impairments, especially in the city.<sup>78</sup> The range of responses was protean, ranging from grotesque distaste to sympathetic whimsy, but the individuality of disabled subjects was also recognized in the works of Hogarth, Collet, and Smith. The rich repertoire of images challenges any remaining misconception that disability was invisible in the premodern past, or that

images simply pandered to damaging stereotypes or slavishly conformed to established visual “rhetorics.” The “challenging ambiguity” that characterized images of the marginalized in eighteenth-century culture is particularly evident in diverse representations of disabled veterans, which served as both a validation and an indictment of warfare. Nor should the role of artists with disabilities be discounted in an era before modern “disability arts.” Identifying as impaired was important to artists such as Matthias Buchinger and gave a distinctive identity, even if they did not see themselves as part of a “disabled community.”

Visual imagery is therefore important to the task of “recovering” lost histories of disability. However, this visibility of bodily difference in eighteenth-century English culture did not lead to empowerment of people with disabilities or recognition of a shared identity. Images show the ways in which the disabled poor were frequently pushed into visibility, either through the social practice of begging, which involved the “forcing” of visible signs of bodily loss onto pedestrians to incite pity and alms, or by being subject to taxonomic investigation, for social as well as medical purposes.<sup>79</sup> The eighteenth-century disabled emerge through these images not as a homogeneous group, but as curious individuals, marked out as much by their circumstances and life strategies as their conformity to diagnostic categories or models of social or economic need. Reaching its fullest expression in Smith’s *Vagabondiana*, disability appears as a form of eccentricity in images that documented the colorful diversity of London’s impaired beggars.

Some people with disabilities were more visible than others. Smith was particularly interested in blind beggars, “exotic” racial types, and those who used mobility devices such as “go carts.” Elsewhere images of amputee soldiers and sailors

predominated. Perhaps most striking when examining the wealth of images depicting disability as part of the eighteenth-century social fabric is the relative absence of women even though, as Jacques-Henri Meister observed in 1799, there were “many females” among London’s population of wooden-legged amputees.<sup>80</sup> Although Smith occasionally included disabled women in his topographic prints of London and Westminster, they were notably absent from *Vagabondiana*.<sup>81</sup> It was the problem of the maimed male whose threat as aggressive mendicant or demobilized veteran called for most pressing control in eighteenth- and early-nineteenth-century England, and which interested artists most. While the most graphic image of physical impairment was that of the twisted body of Sarah Hawkes, the ideas accompanying this representation, that such deformity was socially as well as physically disabling, something shameful (as opposed to the amputee soldier whose wooden leg might be flaunted with pride), arguably made the disabled female body a more distasteful subject for representation. Visual representations of the impaired body scrutinized the values, anxieties, and contradictions of eighteenth-century English society in a public culture that overwhelmingly gendered the disabled body as male. Examining further the absences of people with disabilities, as well as their visibility, will shed further light on disability’s rich and varied past.

## Bibliography

Garland-Thomson, Rosemarie. “Seeing the Disabled: Visual Rhetorics of Disability in Popular Photography.” In Paul Longmore and Lauri Umansky, eds., *The New Disability History: American Perspectives*. New York: New York University Press, 2001, 335–374.

Gatrell, Vic. *The First Bohemians: Life and Art in London’s Golden Age*. London: Penguin Books, 2014.

Hallett, Mark. *The Spectacle of Difference: Graphic Satire in the Age of Hogarth*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1999.

Lane, Harlan L., and John Brewster. *A Deaf Artist in Early America: The Worlds of John Brewster, Jr.* Boston: Beacon, 2006.

Nichols, Tom. *Others and Outcasts in Early Modern Europe: Picturing the Social Margins*. Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2007.

Parkes, S. “Wooden Legs and Tales of Sorrow Done: The Literary Broken Soldier of the Late Eighteenth Century.” *Journal for Eighteenth-Century Studies* 36/2 (2013): 191–207. doi: 10.1111/j.1754-0208.2012.00501.x.

Shesgreen, Sean. *Images of the Outcast: The Urban Poor in the Cries of London*. Manchester, UK: Manchester University Press, 2002.

Turner, David M. *Disability in Eighteenth-Century England: Imagining Physical Impairment*. New York: Routledge, 2012.

Wind, Barry. *“A Foul and Pestilent Congregation”: Images of “Freaks” in Baroque Art*. Aldershot, UK: Ashgate, 1998.

## Notes

- <sup>1</sup> *London Daily Post*, April 10, 1736, in “The Art World in Britain 1660 to 1735,” at <http://artworld.york.ac.uk>, accessed February 5, 2014.
- <sup>2</sup> St. Bartholomew’s Hospital Minute Book, cited in Ronald Paulson, *Hogarth Volume 2: High Art and Low 1732–1750* (Cambridge, UK: Lutterworth Press, 1991), 86.
- <sup>3</sup> For a later print copy, see Simon Francois Ravenet after William Hogarth, *The Pool of Bethesda*, engraving (1772), Yale Center for British Art (hereafter YCBA),

B1981.25.1461, <http://collections.britishart.yale.edu/vufind/Record/2069879>,

accessed January 30, 2014.

- <sup>4</sup> Paulson, *Hogarth Volume 2*, 87.
- <sup>5</sup> David M. Turner, *Disability in Eighteenth-Century England: Imagining Physical Impairment* (New York: Routledge, 2012), 40–42.
- <sup>6</sup> Barry Wind, “A Foul and Pestilent Congregation”: *Images of ‘Freaks’ in Baroque Art* (Aldershot, UK: Ashgate, 1998), Chapter 6; Livio Pestilli, “Blindness, Lameness and Mendicancy in Italy from the 14th to the 18th Centuries,” in Tom Nichols, ed., *Others and Outcasts in Early Modern Europe: Picturing the Social Margins* (Aldershot, UK: Ashgate, 2007), 107–129; Livio Pestilli, *Picturing the Lame in Italian Art from Antiquity to the Modern Era* (London: Routledge, 2017), Chapter 5.
- <sup>7</sup> David Hevey, *The Creatures Time Forgot: Photography and Disability Imagery* (London: Routledge, 1997), 7.
- <sup>8</sup> Paul K. Longmore, *Why I Burned My Book and Other Essays on Disability* (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 2003), 131–146; Herbert C. Covey, *Social Perceptions of People with Disabilities in History* (Springfield, IL: Charles C. Thomas, 1998); cf. Robert Bogdan with Martin Elks and James A. Knoll, *Picturing Disability: Beggar, Freak, Citizen, and Other Photographic Rhetorics* (Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Press, 2012).
- <sup>9</sup> Rosemarie Garland-Thomson, “Seeing the Disabled: Visual Rhetorics of Disability in

Popular Photography,” in Paul K. Longmore and Lauri Umansky, eds., *The New Disability History: American Perspectives* (New York: New York University Press, 2001), 335–374.

<sup>10</sup> Martin Elks, “Clinical Photographs: ‘Feeble-Mindedness’ in Eugenic Texts,” in Bogdan with Elks and Knoll, *Picturing Disability*, 75–98.

<sup>11</sup> Tobin Siebers, *Disability Aesthetics* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2010).

<sup>12</sup> Carrie Sandahl, “Disability Art and Artistic Expression,” in Susan Burch, ed., *Encyclopedia of American Disability History*, 3 vols. (New York: Facts on File, 2009), I, 264–268; Susan Crutchfield and Nancy Epstein, eds., *Points of Contact: Disability, Art and Culture* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2000).

<sup>13</sup> Rosemarie Garland-Thomson, “Picturing People with Disabilities: Classical Portraiture as Reconstructive Narrative,” in Richard Sandell, Jocelyn Dodd, and Rosemarie Garland-Thomson, eds., *Re-Presenting Disability: Activism and Agency in the Museum* (London: Routledge, 2010), 23.

<sup>14</sup> Richard Sandell and Jocelyn Dodd, “Activist Practice,” in Sandell, Dodd, and Garland-Thomson, eds., *Re-Presenting Disability*, 7. See also Anne Delin, “Buried in the Footnotes: The Absence of Disabled People in the Collective Imagery of Our Past,” in Richard Sandell, ed., *Museums, Society, Inequality* (London: Routledge, 2002), 84–97.

<sup>15</sup> Tom Nichols, “Introduction,” in Nichols, ed., *Others and Outcasts*, 5.

<sup>16</sup> A. W. Aspital, ed., *Catalogue of the Pepys Library at Magdalene College Cambridge, vol. 3 i. prints and Drawings (General)* (Cambridge, UK: D. S. Brewer, 1980),

186 (nos. 172–173, 176–177); 187 (nos. 188–189), 239 (no. 18a), 293 (no. 55), 296 (no. 171) [Miracles of Christ]; 238 (no. 3b) [St. Paul curing the blindness of Ananias]; 238 (no. 3a); 239 (no. 19b), 268 (no. 2960 (1) plate 2) 273 (no. 7), 294 (nos. 90, 99), 295 (no. 108) [Miracles of St. Peter and St. John].

<sup>17</sup> *A Collection of Curious Pictures and Limnings by the Best Masters* (London, 1690), in “The Art World in Britain 1660 to 1735” at <http://artworld.york.ac.uk>, accessed February 5, 2014.

<sup>18</sup> *A Collection of Curious Pictures, viz. Paintings and Limnings by the Best Masters* (London, 1690) and *A Curious Collection of Original Paintings and Other Fine Copies of the Best Masters of Europe* (London, 1690), both in “The Art World in Britain 1660 to 1735,” at <http://artworld.york.ac.uk>, accessed February 5, 2014.

<sup>19</sup> Aspittall, ed., *Catalogue of the Pepys Library*, 219 (nos. 60b—61b) [Bosch], (no. 62 a-j, m-n) [Callot], (no. 63 a-j) [Le Piper].

<sup>20</sup> *A Catalogue of Books, Pictures and Maps . . . sold by John Overton* (London, ca. 1675), in “The Art World in Britain 1660 to 1735,” at <http://artworld.york.ac.uk>, accessed February 5, 2014; Alexander Globe, *Peter Stent, London Printseller circa 1662 to 1665* (Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press, 1985), 125. <sup>21</sup> For instance, *A Curious Collection of Paintings and Limnings of the Most Famous Ancient and Modern Masters in Europe* (London, 1691) [blind beggar of Bethnal Green]; *Aucto Davisiana, Pictuarum vere Originalium: Or, a collection of Valuable Pictures, Consisting of the Collections of Cardinal Antonio Barberini and Sir James Palmer* (London, 1691) [blind leading the blind], both in “The Art

World in Britain 1660 to 1735,” at <http://artworld.york.ac.uk>, accessed February 5, 2014.

<sup>22</sup> *A Curious Collection of Paintings and Limnings of the Most Famous Ancient and Modern Masters in Europe* (London, 1691); “Motteux’s Sale of Pictures,” circa 1714–1717; transcribed in Houlditch Manuscript vol. 2, p. 20, mid-eighteenth century, National Art Library, pressmark 86.00.18; both in “The Art World in Britain 1660 to 1735,” at <http://artworld.york.ac.uk>, accessed February 5, 2014.

<sup>23</sup> Henri-Jacques Stiker, *A History of Disability*, trans. William Sayers (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1997), 66.

<sup>24</sup> Vic Gatrell, *The First Bohemians: Life and Art in London’s Golden Age* (London: Allen Lane, 2013).

<sup>25</sup> Sean Shesgreen, *Images of the Outcast: The Urban Poor in the Cries of London* (Manchester, UK: Manchester University Press, 2002).

<sup>26</sup> Diana Donald, *The Age of Caricature: Satirical Prints in the Reign of George III* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1996).

<sup>27</sup> See, for example, *The New Wonderful Magazine, and Marvellous Chronicle of Extraordinary Productions, Events, and Occurrences, in Nature and Art*, 5 vols. (London: C. Johnson, 1793).

<sup>28</sup> Patricia Fontes da Costa, *The Singular and the Making of Knowledge at the Royal Society of London in the Eighteenth Century* (Newcastle upon Tyne, UK: Cambridge Scholars Press, 2009).

<sup>29</sup> Sander Gilman, *Health and Illness: Images of Difference* (London: Reaktion, 1995),



18.

<sup>30</sup> John Thomas Smith, *Vagabondiana; or, Anecdotes of Mendicant Wanderers Through the Streets of London; with Portraits of the most Remarkable* ([1817] London:

Chatto and Windus, 1874), vi.

<sup>31</sup> Buchinger and Inglefield are discussed in Turner, *Disability in Eighteenth-Century England*, 94–103; on Biffin, see Delin, “Buried in the Footnotes,” 90–92.

<sup>32</sup> For sketches showing Buchinger’s methods made by Peter Tillemans in 1731, see British Library, Cox Macro DD: Correspondence and papers, 1700–1764, Add.

Ms 32556, ff. 183–190.

<sup>33</sup> Matthias Buchinger, “An Altarpiece,” Department of Prints and Drawings, Scottish National Gallery, D4467. I am grateful to Rosemary and Peter Cook for this reference.

<sup>34</sup> Isaac Herbert, *A Catalogue of Books in Various Languages* (London: Isaac Herbert, 1795), p. 5.

<sup>35</sup> *Spectator*, December 18, 1711, in “The Art World in Britain 1660 to 1735,” at

<http://artworld.york.ac.uk>, accessed February 5, 2014.

<sup>36</sup> Harlan Lane, *A Deaf Artist in Early America: The Worlds of John Brewster Jr.*

(Boston: Beacon Press, 2004); Sir Joshua Reynolds, “Self-Portrait as a Deaf Man”

(ca. 1775), Tate Gallery, N04505,

<http://www.tate.org.uk/art/artworks/reynoldself-portrait-as-a-deaf-man-n04505>,

accessed August 29, 2014.

<sup>37</sup> <IBT>Georg Christoph Lichtenberg, *Lichtenberg’s Commentaries on Hogarth’s Engravings*, trans. Innes and Gustav Herder (London: Cresset Press, 1966)</IBT>,

xxiii.

<sup>38</sup> Ibid., 84.

<sup>39</sup> Ibid., 283.

<sup>40</sup> Lennard J. Davis, *Enforcing Normalcy: Disability, Deafness and the Body* (London: Verso, 1995), 129; Turner, *Disability in Eighteenth-Century England*, 82, 90–94.

<sup>41</sup> *The Spectator*, ed. Donald F. Bond, 5 vols. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1965), 4:307 (no. 509, October 14, 1712).

<sup>42</sup> Mark Hallett, *The Spectacle of Difference: Graphic Satire in the Age of Hogarth* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1999), 10.

<sup>43</sup> Shesgreen, *Images of the Outcast*, 182.

<sup>44</sup> Turner, *Disability in Eighteenth-Century England*, 90–94.

<sup>45</sup> Thomas Rowlandson, “Pray Remember the Blind” (1801), British Museum

Department of Prints and Drawings, museum number 1939,0215.2;

[http://www.britishmuseum.org/research/collection\\_online/collection\\_object\\_detail](http://www.britishmuseum.org/research/collection_online/collection_object_detail)

[.aspx?objectId=1654692&partId=1&people=109191&peopleA=109191-260&page=1](http://www.britishmuseum.org/research/collection_online/collection_object_detail.aspx?objectId=1654692&partId=1&people=109191&peopleA=109191-260&page=1),

accessed September 10, 2014.

<sup>46</sup> Thomas Rowlandson, “Charity Covereth a Multitude of Sins” (London: Hannah

Humphrey, 1781); Lindsey Row-Heyvald, “‘The Lying’st Knave in

Christendom?’: The Development of Disability in the False Miracle of St.

Alban’s,” *Disability Studies Quarterly* 29/4 (2009)

<http://www.dsqsds.org/article/view/994/1178>, accessed November 30, 2010. For

other

eighteenth-century discussions of this theme, see Turner, *Disability in Eighteenth-Century England*, 90–91.

<sup>47</sup> Smith, *Vagabondiana*, 26.

<sup>48</sup> Shesgreen, *Images of the Outcast*, 96.

<sup>49</sup> Paul Sandby, “The Asylum for the Deaf,” late eighteenth century,

<http://collections.vam.ac.uk/item/O125010/the-asylum-for-the-deaf-watercolourcollet->

[john](#), accessed December 1, 2016; Gatrell, *First Bohemians*, 234.

<sup>50</sup> Jacques-Henri Meister, *Letters Written During a Residence in England* (London: T. N. Longman, 1799), 184.

<sup>51</sup> See, for instance, the anonymous print, “A Broken Leg, or the Carpenter the Best Surgeon” (London: Laurie and Whittle, 1800), Wellcome Images

<http://wellcomeimages.org>, V0020433, accessed December 1, 2015.

<sup>52</sup> *Westminster Journal and London Political Miscellany*, February 13, 1768; *Daily Courant*, June 24, 1731.

<sup>53</sup> John Collet, *Scene in a London Street* (1770), YCBA B1981.25.110,

<http://collections.britishart.yale.edu/vufind/Record/1670556>, accessed December 1,

2015; Gatrell, *First Bohemians*, 231.

<sup>54</sup> Turner, *Disability in Eighteenth-Century England*, 87–88.

<sup>55</sup> Simon Parkes, “Wooden Legs and Tales of Sorrow Done: The Literary Broken Soldier of the Late Eighteenth Century,” *Journal for Eighteenth-Century Studies*, 36/2 (2013): 196.

- <sup>56</sup> Margarette Lincoln, *Representing the Royal Navy: British Sea Power, 1750–1815* (Aldershot, UK: Ashgate, 2002), 177; Turner, *Disability in Eighteenth-Century England*, 69–71.
- <sup>57</sup> Isaac Cruickshank, “An Old Sailor with a Wooden Leg and a Man with No Arms Drinking in a Tavern” (London: W. Fores, 1791), Wellcome Images, <http://wellcomeimages.org>, V0019561, accessed December 1, 2015.
- <sup>58</sup> J. Caldwell after J. Collet, “The Disbanded Soldier” (London: J. Caldwell, 1775), Wellcome Images, <http://wellcomeimages.org>, V0020359, accessed December 1, 2015. For a similar message, see James Gillray, “John Bull’s Progress” (1793), British Museum Department of Prints and Drawings, museum number 1851.0901.654; Parkes, “Wooden Legs,” 204.
- <sup>59</sup> Shesgreen, *Images of the Outcast*, 6, 157–167, 181–185.
- <sup>60</sup> Vic Gatrell, *City of Laughter: Sex and Satire in Eighteenth-Century London* (London: Atlantic, 2006), 547.
- <sup>61</sup> Shesgreen, *Images of the Outcast*, 96.
- <sup>62</sup> <IBT>Smith, *Vagabondiana*</IBT>, 24.
- <sup>63</sup> *Ibid.*, 24
- <sup>64</sup> *Ibid.*, 20.
- <sup>65</sup> *Ibid.*, 26.
- <sup>66</sup> *Ibid.*, 28.
- <sup>67</sup> *Ibid.*, 19. <sup>68</sup> *Ibid.*, 35.

<sup>69</sup> For a detailed discussion of this theme, see Turner, *Disability in Eighteenth-Century England*, Chapter 2.

<sup>70</sup> London Metropolitan Archives, Trade Cards Collection, SC/GL/TCC/Sleath ca.1800.

For fascinating perspectives on the cap of liberty in political culture and abolitionist imagery, see James Epstein, “Understanding the Cap of Liberty:

Symbolic Practice and Social Conflict in Early Nineteenth-Century England,”

*Past and Present* 122 (1989): 75–118; Marcus Wood, *The Horrible Gift of*

*Freedom: Atlantic Slavery and the Representation of Emancipation* (Athens:

University of Georgia Press, 2010), Chapter 2.

<sup>71</sup> On the “medical gaze” see Michel Foucault, *The Birth of the Clinic: An Archaeology of Medical Perception*, trans. A. M. Sheridan Smith (London: Viking, 1975).

<sup>72</sup> <IBT>Edward Harrison, *The Extraordinary Case of Sarah Hawkes; One of Extreme Deformity Cured by a Method Founded upon Simple Principles* (London: Joseph Robins, 1832)</IBT>, 1.

<sup>73</sup> *Ibid.*, 52.

<sup>74</sup> *Ibid.*, viii.

<sup>75</sup> Elks, “Clinical Photographs,” 78–79.

<sup>76</sup> Garland-Thomson, “Seeing the Disabled,” 336.

<sup>77</sup> Harrison, *Extraordinary Case of Sarah Hawkes*, xi.

<sup>78</sup> Sharon L. Snyder, “Infinities of Form: Disability Figures in Artistic Traditions,” in

Sharon L. Snyder, Brenda Brueggemann, and Rosemarie Garland-Thomson, eds.,

*Disability Studies: Enabling the Humanities* (New York: Modern Language Association, 2002), 182.

<sup>79</sup> On “forced” visibility, see Garland-Thomson, “Seeing the Disabled,” 348; Patricia Hayes, “Introduction: Visual Genders,” *Gender and History*, 17/3 (2005): 522.

<sup>80</sup> Meister, *Letters*, 184.

<sup>81</sup> See, for example, the woman on crutches in John Thomas Smith, “Domestic Architecture: View of Part of Duke Street, West Smithfield” (London: J. M. McCreery, 1815), Wellcome Images, <http://wellcomeimages.org>, L0009753, accessed December 1, 2015.