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Introduction: Words and/as Images

Portrayals take many forms. Take, on the one hand, a stipple engraving from 1724 by the artist and performer Matthias Buchinger (Fig. 1). It shows the physically disabled German, who was born without hands and legs, sitting on a cushion. An oval portrait supplemented with biographical details, its depiction of the artist’s hair has become famous because the curls are made up of so-called micrography—minuscule lettering—that spells out seven Psalms. Or, on the other hand, a collection from 1788 of frontispiece portraits titled British Autography: A Collection of Fac-Similies of the Hand Writing of Royal and Illustrious Personages, with their authentic Portraits, which was the first volume to include the sitters’ autographs below their pictures (Fig. 2). Its publisher, the print-seller and engraver John Thane, provided no additional information on this peculiar choice, but he was aware of an audience for reproductions of handwriting, an audience that valued traces, marks, and vestiges of illustrious persons.
At first glance, the two forms of portrayal seem to belong to different groups, both in terms of representation and the individual contexts of their creation. One is a self-portrait intended as such, adorned with calligraphy and, together with its author, hailed as a curiosity. The other is an autograph, a conventional proof of authorship, which, while meant to act as a mark of one’s self, is usually not assumed to constitute a self-portrait in the narrower sense, that is, a document or image produced by an individual as their representation (i.e., depiction and substitution).[1] One has been undertaken by an artist in pursuit of art, the other by non-artists to serve a primarily certifying function. Despite their differences, however, they converge in the fact that they reproduce and exhibit the singular trace left by each individual in the world, a trace that simultaneously represents and authenticates the presence of the author.[2] Bringing them together
provides, as this article will argue, an opportunity to explore the intersections between self-(re)presentation and self-portrayals, which both pose questions about the mark as evidence of former presence.[3] In the case of their printed reproduction, this original mark, at once an authenticating trace and a representation, becomes a representation of a trace, and a reproducible one to boot.

In signatures, the link between indexical and authenticating functions is especially powerful. Accordingly, artists' monograms and signatures, especially from the Middle Ages to the Renaissance, have received much scholarly attention because they merge individual expression with artistic self-marketing, thus guaranteeing a personal style and functioning as a form of pre-modern branding.[4] As Charlotte Guichard has observed, “during the eighteenth century, signatures retained this authorial function because of the development of an art market based on the aura of artists’ names. But they also emerged as autographic traces, modifying notions of the artist's presence and performance on the canvas.”[5] Autographs or monograms became tools by which artists inscribed themselves into the pictorial realm, reflecting and reaffirming the boundaries between the non-artistic and the artistic world, all while partaking of the latter.[6] Guichard has further argued that, whether as text or image, autographs indicate presence (of text, image, artifact) and point to the moment of their genesis and the wider context of their production.[7] Similarly, Philip Sohm has identified palettes in self-portraits as “potent sites of self-declaration: this is who I am; this is my style; this is how I make paintings; this is who I aspire to be.”[8]

By virtue of their producers and the places where they appear, artists' signatures oscillate between being word and image. But, going beyond categorizing them as “brandings,” “inscriptions,” or “descriptions,” what does it mean to understand words as images?[9] or even, as John Wilmerding has written, as “concentrated glimpses of self-portraiture”?[10] Compared to signatures, which have an identifying function,[11] autographic writing poses different problems because it is concerned with revelations—maybe even unintended—of the self rather than with the self-portrait proper. In eighteenth-century English language, autographs and autography denoted the handwriting of a specific person or the original manuscript,[12] and only later came to signify a person's own signature. The term “self-portrait” did not exist at all.[13] Broaching the issue of resemblance and thematizing the representative function of the genre, (self-)portraits that do not depict the face, body, or some kind of mimetic representation of the sitter's appearance have often been identified as modern.[14] However, scholarship has increasingly drawn attention to the multimedia and multilayered aspects of portraying the self, and to metonymic,[15] non-mimetic, and non-iconic forms of self-representation in the early modern period.[16] As Stuart Sherman has noted: “In seventeenth- and eighteenth-century writing, the story of the self operates everywhere—in diaries, autobiographies, memoirs, confessions, letters, essays, travel books, fiction.”[17] Nigel Hamilton writes that for most of the early modern period, (auto-)biography was understood to comprise both writing and drawing—as indicated by the common morpheme “graph”—and to denote the act of working with biographical information, regardless of the medium.[18]
Self-portrayals that stand at the threshold between the verbal and the visual, or even the non-mimetic and non-iconic, allow us to engage with questions of referentiality and likeness more broadly and to look at how visual expressions of character relate to the author’s identity. Because it derived from the emblematic tradition, replete with symbolism, and often mysticism, the idea of words as images was controversial in eighteenth-century England, where hybridity of visual and verbal media and visual encroachments on the literary were discouraged. And yet, taking into account the pictorial aspects of lettering as well as engaging with handwriting from the viewpoint of portraiture studies, can offer insights into words beyond their textual meaning. This in turn facilitates an understanding of self-portrayals as representations, showing what is characteristic of a person, in contrast to mimetic portraits, which aim for visual resemblance. It also draws attention to the fact that self-portrayals are not only representations, but often also serve as a historical source, in that the genre of self-portraiture—including its retrospective denomination—is one way of engaging with a historical subject and his or her subjectivity.

Self-Portrayal through Micrography: The Case of Matthias Buchinger (1724)

Matthias Buchinger’s self-portrait (Fig. 1) with micrographic hair, for which the original drawing is lost, was published in 1724, seven years after he had come to Britain, where he would remain until his death. The portrait shows Buchinger seated on a cushion
and dressed in contemporary fashion, wearing a vest, a cravat, a curly wig, and a coat whose loose sleeves indicate that his hands are missing. He wears no trousers, making the stumps of his legs visible. His face bears a slightly disgruntled expression and he has a prominent forehead, but his hair is the highlight of the picture. Seven Psalms in English (nos. 121, 127, 128, 130, 146, 149, and 150) and the Lord’s Prayer, written in minuscule characters, wind rhythmically and in continuous curls to form his wig, its turns and curves mirroring the floral ornaments surrounding the oval portrait (Fig. 1a). A brief biography below the portrait states that “This is the Effigie of Mr. Matthew Buchinger, being Drawn and Written by Himself” and that Buchinger, among other things, could play the flute, write, and draw “Pictures to the Life.”
Born without hands and feet in 1674 near Nuremberg, Buchinger was an apparently self-managed traveling artist, earning his living by performing music and magic tricks and, most importantly, drawing coats of arms, family trees, calligraphy, and micrography on commission. He belonged to a group of non-normative individuals who were exhibited, or exhibited themselves, in seventeenth- and eighteenth-century Europe, and who were classed as “curiosities” or “wonders” by nineteenth-century writers. However, Buchinger’s case is more complex as he seems to have exhibited not his bodily differences—which were noteworthy, but not unique—but what he could do despite his apparent physical limitations. He could not only write, but write artistically, his missing
hands running counter to ideas of penmanship being necessarily related to a particular conception of the physically able body. He used micrography, calligraphy, and other techniques, writing words forward, backward, large and small, in cursive and block form (Fig. 3). A broadsheet of 1726 stated: “For Hair Stroaks to the Eye they Pass | And yet they’re Letters thro’ a Glass.” From early in his career, he also performed his writing skills to audiences. Among his earliest preserved work is a supplication to the city of Nuremberg (1708), introducing himself as “a person born without hands and feet, endowed by God Almighty,” written in calligraphy and requesting permission to set up a booth on the market at New Year to show his artistry. His viewers would later include European royalty, and he drew micrographic portraits of Queen Anne and King George I.

Fig. 4. Matthias Buchinger, Calligraphic Trompe-l’œil Calendar, 1709. Pen and red, brown, and black ink, brush and grey wash, 14.3 x 10.3 cm. Metropolitan Museum, New York. © Available under CC0 1.0 Universal (CC0 1.0) Public Domain Dedication.
The peculiar rendering of his wig, which both deflects and redirects attention to his limbless body, thus showcased Buchinger’s skill at calligraphy while also encapsulating evidence of his performance, making it both a representation of himself and his particular profession. Micrography and calligraphy, straight or patterned, was an intrinsic part of Buchinger's identity as an artist and as a social individual, regardless of his corporeal differences. According to the description beneath, the self-portrait was notably “drawn and written by himself,” indicating that, in this work, self-presentation was a visual-verbal enterprise. Most works by Buchinger included the explanation that the image was “written by me [or ‘by Buchinger’], born without hands and feet” in one of his various handwriting styles, along with the place and the date in the respective language of the country: a Dutch inscription made in Amsterdam dates from 1704, a calligraphic trompe-l’œil includes a cartellino in German on which is written Winterthur and 1709 (Fig. 4), and many English inscriptions exist, including one on the inside of a ring.\[29\] Vouching for Buchinger’s writing abilities, these inscriptions also serve as forms of life writing, as they testify to his travels and emphasize that any representation of or production by him was intrinsically linked to writing, its smallness additionally playing on his reputation as “The Little Man of Nuremberg” or “The Greatest German Living.”\[30\]

In its production of iconic forms, micrography very closely approaches pictoriality; and by using quotes from the Bible, Buchinger recalled the religious belief in the potency of words, which had created a world and a people in God's image, including those like him who diverged from the physical norm. By using the Psalms, he also drew on parts of the Bible, which allowed for first-person expressions: Psalm 121, the one commencing the letter-curls on the lower left of the wig, and thus the first, begins with “I will lift mine eyes unto the hills” (Fig. 1b); Psalm 130, starting on the upper right side of the head, reads “Out of the depths have I cried unto thee, O Lord” (Fig. 1c); and Psalm 146:2, a bit further down on the right side, states “While I live I will praise the Lord: I will sing praises unto my God while I have any being” (Fig. 1d). In contrast, the Lord’s Prayer, starting with the collective enunciation “Our Father,” is relegated to the part of the wig that extends on the back (Fig. 1e). While the selection criteria for the Psalms are unknown, there would seem to be some intentionality in using these linguistic self-declarations to become the very form of the artist's self-portrait.\[31\]
Images created from micrography (minuscule lettering) or calligraphy (beautiful lettering) are rooted in religious culture. Dating back at least to antiquity, they are best known from Jewish and Muslim communities, where they made it possible to make images, including those of humans, while technically observing religious commandments against idolatry. Early modern western or gentile examples of handwritten or printed letters arranged into images, nowadays known as “pattern,” “concrete,” “visual,” or “iconic” poetry, are mostly ornamental, such as the lover’s knot or George Herbert’s famous poems *Easter Wings* and *Altar* (1633), whose forms often mirror their content. Micrographic portraits, in contrast, were rare, probably existing mostly in manuscripts. Johann Michael Püchler, who may have influenced Buchinger, produced several micrographic portraits of, among others, Martin Luther (*Fig. 5*), John Calvin, and King Gustav of Sweden; the library of St. John’s College in Oxford holds a micrographic portrait of King Charles, the hair made of Psalms, which has been linked to the autobiographical account *Eikon Basilike. The Pourtraicture of His Sacred Maiestie in his Solitudes and Sufferings*, often called his literary self-portrait.
While patterned writing enjoyed some popularity, visual-verbal hybrids were not highly regarded in late seventeenth- and eighteenth-century England.\[36]\ In 1711, Joseph Addison devoted his *Spectator* essay no. 58 to denouncing such writings as an “obsolete kind of wit” that demonstrated industry rather than genius. Addison approvingly cited baroque poet and theorist of translation John Dryden's (1631-1700) assertion that it was wrong to “torture one poor word a thousand ways,” and he derided Buchinger's works, quipping that he “has transcribed all the Old Testament in a full-bottomed Perriwig.” Preceded by the motto “Ut pictura poesis erit,” or “painting is like poetry,” essay no. 58 was written “to establish among us a taste of polite writing.”\[37]\ Addison especially disliked the fusion of modes of representation as any micrographer “was first of all to draw the Out-line of the Subject […]. The Poetry was to contract or dilate it self according to the Mould in which it was cast.”\[38]\ Addison apparently thought that micrography
took the idea of pictures’ resemblance to poetry too far: instead of language and images subscribing to common ethics of virtuous politeness, but not to common modes of expression, micrographic image-making or pattern poetry produced a cross-breed of genres. This truly intermedial product was therefore believed to be, as Dick Higgins writes, “unable to stand on its own and was thus inherently mediocre.”[39]

While Buchinger was seen as a spectacle at the end of the eighteenth century (sufficiently well-known that Horace Walpole could casually refer to him in a letter of 1796[40]), considering his work merely as the product of an idiosyncratic mind does not do justice either to his singular engagement with self-representation, or to his treatment of words as form. In his self-portrait, he shows his bodily particularities, but the micrographic hair belongs to an established tradition in which Buchinger situates himself not only by executing an art form, but also by using it to produce a self-image. Here, the typical (the expression of an art form) joined the incidental (the body of the artist). His most representative feature was his writing skill, which is corroborated by the fact that facsimiles of his hand-writing were often included in his engraved portraits. In Buchinger’s self-portrait, the intertwining of the hand as a metaphor for style and the hand as a literal extension of the body occurred on various levels: the artistic, the aesthetic, the social, and the physical. The hand, understood as style, represented the artist Buchinger, but it also substituted for the hand as a limb, producing rather than reproducing an artistic identity within the self-portrait.

**Self-Portrayals by Auto(bio)graphy: John Thane and Lucy Hutchinson**

Buchinger was a rather unique case in England, capitalizing on his individual circumstances. However, the very idea that autographic writing—both signatures and letters—was a self-presentation bordering on, if not becoming, a form of self-portraiture increasingly took hold during the eighteenth century. It was read as an inimitable form of self-expression for both artists and laypeople alike. Importantly, and hence the link to Buchinger, the specifically visual qualities of autography played as much into this concept as its material qualities, as both were traces of historic individual(itie)s. The fashion for including facsimiles in collections of letters, portrait prints, or in memoirs and biographies toward the end of the eighteenth century implied that the image of handwriting remained telling beyond the original. Even as a reproduction, it made readers “almost contemporaries with York and Canterbury, Salisbury and Warwick,” as the first book to employ facsimile autographs, John Fenn’s *Original Letters* of 1787, explained.[41]
Following Fenn, John Thane’s *Autography* of 1788 was the first English book devoted solely to a combination of portraits with signatures or a few sentences written by the sitter (Fig. 6). Words of illustrious persons were seen as representing past ages and were made visible in their original state. Autographs therefore played their part in processes of nation-building, bolstering national genealogy by making history almost palpable. Paradoxically, the individual trace also became part of processes of homogenization: embedding autographs into a canon of like-minded individuals and a unifying common—albeit often invented—tradition ultimately diminished their chronological and personal specificities. Thane, for instance, presented all the signatures collected in the volume in a similar fashion, placing them underneath the print portraits and thus passing over their potentially different contexts, such as letters, certificates, records, or diaries. This treatment selectively exhibited certain particularities while leaving out others.
One of the first biographies to include autographs were the *Memoirs of the Life of Colonel John Hutchinson*, written by John's widow Lucy in the 1660s and 1670s, but only published by their descendant Julius Hutchinson in 1806.\[42\] Containing a preface by Julius, an autobiography by Lucy, and the biography of John, as well as two print portraits (John's prefacing the entire book, Lucy's her autobiography), this multimedia family history also included two autographs: a page in Lucy's hand, concluding “The Life of Mrs. Lucy Hutchinson, Written by Herself. A Fragment,” (Fig. 7), and John’s signature, placed on a plan of Nottingham Castle following page 134 (Fig. 8).\[43\] Autographic writing was the only form of original self-expression handed down to the heirs. Throughout the book, Julius let it be known that Lucy’s writing was much more telling than her picture because it showed her character and gave “a faithful image of the mode of thinking in those days of which it treats, an interesting and new specimen of private and public character, of
general and individual biography.” Julius repeatedly emphasized Lucy’s peculiar spelling. While acknowledging that orthography in general was “in a most unsettled state” in her time, he also noted that “she herself varies it so frequently, that it many times differs within the same page.” In Lucy's autobiography, writing and piety emerge as her two particularly important personal characteristics. Accordingly, the autobiography concluded with the “FAC-SIMILE OF MRS. HUTCHINSON’S HAND-WRITING; TAKEN FROM HER THEOLOGICAL REMARKS,” which exemplified the inconsistent orthography, gave evidence of her enthusiastic religiosity, and created a counterpoint to the portrait with which the life-narrative had opened, ending with this alternative self-portrayal-in-handwriting.

Fig. 8. “A Plan of Nottingham Castle, Taken in 1617”, with the autograph of John Hutchinson, in Lucy Hutchinson, Memoirs of the Life of Colonel Hutchinson (S.I. 1806), following p. 134. © Available under CC0 1.0 Universal (CC0 1.0) Public Domain Dedication.

The different forms of autographs raise the question of intention in self-representation. Between Buchinger’s conscious self-portrait, the self-declaration contained in the identifying and authenticating function of signatures, and a (possibly random) page of writing, the difference between intentional self-presentation and accidental self-revelation seems to differ markedly. While intention is, most certainly, not negligible, Hutchinson’s autographs, Fenn’s Letters, and Thane’s Autography also address questions revolving around the category of self-portraiture: self-presentation in whatever form is not only about—as Joanna Woods-Marsden has described it—“the relations between an ‘I’ and its world,” but also about the boundaries of the self, its circumscription, its
autonomy, and accessibility to others.[46] Tellingly, in 1829, John Gough Nichols explained that autographs were the next best thing to a portrait because “we may place our hands on the spot where theirs once rested; and, in the studied or hasty letter, may pursue their very thoughts and feelings.”[47]

Collecting autographs dates back to the sixteenth-century *album or liber amicorum*. Especially popular in German and Dutch academic circles, these volumes assembled signatures, poems, dedications, emblems, drawings, and, later in the eighteenth century, silhouette portraits from friends and acquaintances.[48] Understood as hybrid and unorthodox forms of self-portrayal,[49] autographs became collectibles and were featured in paintings.[50] The significance ascribed to them corresponded to enlightenment ideas of individuality, personal style, and authorship and appealed to antiquarian interests in classifying history. A form of analysis later known as graphology posited that autographs revealed one’s personality because, as Johann Caspar Lavater wrote, handwriting was an index of the character of a person. Notably, this indexicality was supposedly not lost in reproductions such as the facsimile. Indeed, the very technique of the facsimile, the imitating copy that was distinct from the mediating print,[51] implied that it was possible for the individuality of the mediator to converge with that of the creator, the former’s original contribution showing in the degree of absolute imitation. Separating the depiction from the material upon which it was written, facsimiles of autographs implied that the visual-verbal interaction had a meaning beyond the original’s materiality, a meaning that is most forcefully articulated in the art that Buchinger represented, namely, the understanding that writing has visual qualities. Autography facsimiles thus both reinforced and undercut the genetically informed idea of lines as traces and imprints of the self: they are copies, but valid as representations of a unique combination of lines that conveys, if not all, then an essential part of the original.[52]
While the concept that handwriting could serve as a self-portraying practice drew on physiognomic ideas, in England, deducing character traits from letters was seen as an esoteric shenanigan. In an 1830 criticism of Nichols’s *Autographs*, which had endorsed Lavater, the critic stated that he aimed at “[s]weeping away with little ceremony all the nonsense that has been written from the time of Lavater, about the hand-writing marking the characteristics of the writer.” Still, from the moment they were published, Lavater’s *Essays on Physiognomy* (1775-1778; English, 1789) shaped ideas on character recognition, correspondences between the inner and outer self, natural dispositions, and unique individuality. His claims, moreover, were supposed to extend to one’s writing: “each of us has his own hand-writing, individual and inimitable.” Handwriting was an extension and effusion of one’s singularity, a singularity that was inscribed into every part of the body and expressed by the form and motion of one’s hands. Because “you never find on two different persons, two hands which perfectly
resemble each other,” Lavater wrote, “the hand contributes its share towards unfolding the character of the individual.” Accordingly, his discussion on “Design, Colouring, and Writing” included “Engraved Writings,” namely, two letters and ten samples of other people writing his name that had all been taken from letters addressed to him (Fig. 9).

Hands were devices of individualization and because it consisted of lines, handwriting was akin to drawing, drafting, sketching. Whether printed or original, lines bridged pictoriality and literariness, joining image and writing as well as indicating an artist’s manner—from the Latin term for hand, manus—or their peculiar artistic style, which was also verified by their signature. However, “manner” could also refer to one’s social deportment, indicating that the norms and regulations of the social realm in which hands and bodies moved were shaping what they produced on paper or canvas.

**Conclusion: Inscriptions and Ascriptions**

Artists’ signatures are tied to the ideas of mastery and masterworks, but non-professional and non-artistic writings were (and still are) likewise approached with ideas of self-portrayal in mind, particularly with an eye to deliberate as well as non-intentional elements of self-presentation. It has been argued that each form of life writing is a form of self-life writing and, at least since Giorgio Vasari, every visual depiction could be seen as the artist’s self-portrayal because the artist’s identity is operative in the execution of the work. Such notions of unintentional disclosures come close to graphology’s promise of uncovering original experiences and personality traits through the study of autographs, peeling away the performed self to make its original state emerge. However, the method of treating handwriting as self-portrayal must itself be historicized to avoid reproducing historically determined artificial distinctions between the inner and outer self. In the case of Buchinger, handwriting played a major part in his negotiation of identity and selfhood as a social being, an artist, and a spectacle. But in the case of autographs and their facsimiles, the argument of life writing and portrayals being self-life writing and self-portrayals could be reversed: their employment and interpretation reveal as much, if not more, about the collector and editor (and maybe about the engraver) as they do about the writer. The implication is that self-portrayals involve viewers partaking in the construction of a person’s “self,” but at what point does self-presentation turn into self-portraiture? According to Pierre Vaisse, neither medium nor mode of depiction, but only the artist’s subjectivity can serve as criteria for categorizing a representation as a self-portrait. In contrast, Isabelle Oger has argued that during the Renaissance, resemblance was constituted as much via recognition as via representation, making it possible even to consider emblems as portraits.

With the self being as much discovered as displayed, showing rather than being shown, and embedded in a variety of media, forms, and formulas, the very idea of the self-portrait is a precarious concept, as self-representations may straddle the realms of the visual and the verbal. Employing letters for both their form and content, Matthias Buchinger’s self-representation(s) are charged with a referentiality that goes beyond the
textual meaning, showing how self-portrayals can take on forms that transcend the mimetic, the identificatory, and the semiotic. Eighteenth-century writers detected the self where authors had perhaps never aimed to place it, with writings, and especially autographs, serving as both traces and representations, synergizing the author's individuality with the ethical and social framework within which they were integrated. Understanding handwriting (including print versions) as self-portrayal not only draws attention to the different locations where the self can be expressed, it also underscores the way that self-portraiture was tasked with capturing a historical subject by being both its representation and its inimitable mark.
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