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Handel's Reputation

No composer in eighteenth-century Britain enjoyed the lofty reputation of George Frideric Handel (1685-1759). A German by birth, he came of artistic age in Italy and quickly moved to England in search of financial reward. Handel dominated London’s opera scene during the 1720s and 1730s before establishing a new type of musical entertainment, English oratorio. A favorite of the Hanoverian dynasty, he eventually commanded respect across the political gamut for his uplifting oratorios and their deployment for charitable aims. At the time of his death, Britons considered him a cultural institution and placed his remains at Westminster Abbey.

Handel's Orphean Image

The virtuosity of Handel as a keyboard player and the affective power of his music called for the highest praise. From an early age, he saw his name linked to Orpheus. His London debut in 1711, earned him the title “Orfeo del nostro secolo.” In the years to follow, he received eulogies as a master of harmony and even pleas for restoring civil order in the kingdom. By the 1730s, his admirers could readily portray him as “a man of the vastest genius and skill in music that perhaps has lived since Orpheus.” The culmination of Handel’s Orphean image came in the mid-1730s with a popular setting of Dryden’s Alexander’s Feast (1736) and the erection of a life-size statue of the composer in the Vauxhall Gardens (1738): “FAM’D Orpheus drew the Thracians with his lyre; / The Britons Handel’s sweeter power admire.”
A Chubby Orpheus

The legendary control of Handel over sound corresponded poorly, however, with his carnal appetites. Handel’s fondness for rich meals and good wine was common knowledge among his contemporaries. And so was his corpulence, through regular appearances in public as a performer of oratorios. The mental conflict between an Orpheus who charmed modern ears and a man whose unyielding body challenged the eye caught the attention of his admirers. None of his public images, including two statues by Roubiliac, offers a hint to his actual body size. And no biography acknowledges his corpulence without excuses. The paradox of a chubby Orpheus and contemporary exegetical efforts to sublimate it in public narratives make the subject of this essay.

Handel’s Physique

There is historical consensus on Handel’s appearance. Early biographers, who personally knew the composer or his friends, describe him as a “large made and very portly man” who was “somewhat corpulent, and unwieldy in his motions.” A contemporary satirist marveled: “How amply your Corpulence fills up the Chair? / . . . / Three Yards, at the least, round about in the Waist, / In Dimensions your Face like the Sun in the West; / . . . / Needs must that your Gains and your Income be large, / To support such a vast unsupportable Charge!” The unflattering description of Handel’s hand as foot and his fingers as toes is confirmed by Charles Burney, who explains that “his hand was . . . so fat, that the knuckles, which usually appear convex, were like those of a child, dinted or dimpled in, so as to be rendered concave.” Handel and corpulence would form a strong link in the historian’s mind; in 1770, Burney wrote that the Italian composer Jomelli, who “was then corpulent, . . . reminded me of the figure of Handel.” A large body, of course, may be genetically determined. However, biographers of Handel readily acknowledge his strong eating habits: “he had a great appetite”; “His chief foible was a culpable indulgence in the sensual gratifications of the table”; and he was “a person always habituated . . . to an uncommon portion of food and nourishment.”
Contemporary Reactions to Handel's Gluttony

Handel’s corpulence became a topic of anxiety for friends and admirers. In the spring of 1737, the composer had a major health crisis, variously mentioned as rheumatism, palsy, and stroke, which caused the temporary paralysis of his right arm. Modern studies have explained his condition as lead poisoning caused by drinking fortified wines from Portugal. In the following years, which saw relapses of his condition, close friends would vent their concern for his table habits: “Mr. Handel instead of going to Scarboroughe to drink the waters, drinks wine with Mr Furnes at Gunsbury[,] and I fear eats too much [sic] of those things he ought to avoid. I would fain methinks preserve him for a few years longer.” Protracting the life of a celebrated artist is a noble concern. But there may have been other, cultural and moral, reasons for this anxiety about Handel’s gluttony.

Gluttony as Vice

Like any sensual excess, overeating and heavy drinking were viewed as morally degrading habits at the time. An instruction manual for “The Young Gentleman and Lady” from 1747 summarizes contemporary views on the subject:

it is our duty to regulate ourselves in the indulgence of the loose pleasures of sensuality, the brutishness of gluttony, and the mad sallies of excessive drinking, and of other sensual appetites... each vice directly tends to blast our private character, and to render us unfit to be trusted in public; they cloud the understanding, and stupefy the judgment; they dissipate our fortunes, and dispose us to a general neglect of the duties, which we owe to our friends, our families, and our country; they are attended with miserable intervals of remorse and self-dislike, and at last bring on an untimely old age, with a long train of infirmities and diseases, which are seldom felt by the chaste, temperate, and virtuous liver.

For a society that put increased emphasis on civic duties, gluttony eroded one’s ability to properly function in the public sphere. Aside from being a superb artist, Handel was also a recognizable public figure. Each theatrical season, he would appear before audiences twice-a-week for a minimum of three months. And beginning in the late 1730s, he would accumulate social capital as a composer of morally uplifting music and a benefactor to charities. His evident corpulence provided a contrast with
a long-earned reputation as modern Orpheus and a recently acquired one as a philanthropist.

**The Conflict Visualized: Goupys Caricature**

The brewing conflict between a master of music and a slave of the palate found expression in a caricature by Joseph Goupys, an intimate friend of the composer.24 This satirical depiction of Handel survives in a number of versions.25 In the last and popular one, Handel “is delineated sitting on a hogshead, with the profile of a boar, a bill of fare, and other emblems of voluptuousness scattered round him,”26 or “symbols of gluttony.”27 A scroll by his left foot reads “I AM MYSELF ALONE.” Nothing makes the image more explicit than the stanzas at the bottom of the print:

THE Charming BRUTE

The Figure’s odd—yet who wou’d think?
(Within this Tunn of Meat & Drink)
There dwells the Soul of soft Desires,
And all that HARMONY inspires:

Can Contrast such as this be found?
Upon the Globe’s extensive Round;
There can—yo[n] Hogshead is his Seat,
His sole Devotion is—to Eat.28

Existing accounts relate that Goupys was reacting to a dinner party, in which Handel catered his friends with plain port while himself stealthily enjoying good wine in the adjacent room.29 Published in March 1754, at the peak of Handel’s oratorio season, this print must have affected the public image of the composer. Handel had been blind for at least a year,30 and the inevitable reduction in his physical activity must have rendered his corpulence even more visible to others.31 In 1760, his first biographer would admit that Handel’s eating habits “have been so much the subject of conversation and pleasantry.”32

The contrast mentioned in the Goupys print surely complicated Handel’s reputation. Conscious of his posthumous fame, the composer himself had requested a burial in Westminster Abbey, and he allocated £600 of his fortune for a commemorative monument.33 His friends and admirers, who had supported him for decades in a variety of ways,34 were even more eager to preserve his legacy. With Britain engaged in the most widespread conflict of the century (Seven Years War), the country
needed heroes and cultural models.\textsuperscript{35} The growing use of Handel’s oratorios for charitable purposes had cemented his moral reputation. Personal flaws like his gluttony had at least to be addressed, if not to be excused. A major shift in British aesthetics at this period would facilitate such an operation.

\textbf{A New Concept of Genius: Exceptionalism}

The amount of critical attention paid to the arts in Georgian England brought about a paradigm shift in aesthetics. For a country that had achieved liberation from Roman Catholicism and absolute monarchy, the concept of imitation was losing its appeal. Adhering to ancient models indicated a slavish attitude to the past and certainly clashed with England’s spearheading progress and becoming a global empire. Innovation was imperative; and originality comprised the engine of progress: “Something new may be expected from Britons particularly; who seem not to be more sever’d from the rest of mankind by the surrounding sea, than by the current in their veins; and of whom little more appears to be required, in order to give us Originals, than a consistency of character, and making their compositions of a piece with their lives.”\textsuperscript{36} In the course of half-a-century, English critics demoted imitation as plagiarism and championed originality as the highest force in artistic creation.\textsuperscript{37} A dictionary from this period is quite explicit: “\textit{If a Man has a bright Genius, he will excel, if he follows his Genius; but where the Genius is either poor or constrain’d, the best Instructions will never bring it to bear good Fruit; one might as well suppose it possible to make a RAPHAEL, a POPE, or a HANDEL, in Painting, Poetry, and Musick, by Education only.}”\textsuperscript{38} Learning to follow models was not enough; one had to embrace what is unique in one’s own self.

The vehicle for originality was genius, which loosely referred to one’s mental faculties.\textsuperscript{39} Around the middle of the century, this term acquired a very specific content.\textsuperscript{40} The work that helped establish the new understanding of genius was Edward Young’s \textit{Conjectures on Original Genius} (1759). An open letter rather than a structured treatise, Young’s publication is an ecstatic celebration of originality. “\textit{Originals are, and ought to be, great Favourites, for they are great Benefactors; they extend the Republic of Letters, and add a new province to its dominion: Imitators only give us a sort of Duplicates of what we had, possibly much better, before.}”\textsuperscript{41} Writing at the height of the Seven Years War, Young often frames his discussion in political and moral terms. “Hope we, from Plagiarism, any Dominion in Literature; as that of Rome arose from a nest of
Thieves? / Rome was a powerful Ally to many States; antient [sic] Authors are our powerful Allies; but we must take heed, that they do not succour, till they enslave, after the manner of Rome." He associates the glory of the original writer with "Caesar, who declared he had rather be the First in a Village, than the Second at Rome." And he finds that "Modern Writers have a Choice to make... They may soar in the Regions of Liberty, or move in the soft Fetters of easy Imitation; and Imitation has as many plausible Reasons to urge, as Pleasure had to offer to Hercules. Hercules made the Choice of an Hero, and so became immortal." The new understanding of genius was hinged on its stark contrast with learning: "Learning we thank, Genius we revere;... Genius is from Heaven, Learning from man... Learning is borrowed knowledge; Genius is knowledge innate, and quite our own." Not only is genius superior to learning, but it also can stand on its own. Young writes "I would compare Genius to Virtue, and Learning to Riches... As Virtue without much Riches can give Happiness, so Genius without much Learning can give Renown... so to neglect of Learning, Genius sometimes owes its greater glory. Genius, therefore, leaves but the second place, among men of letters, to the Learned." It follows that genius radiates in conditions of absolute independence, "For Rules, like Crutches, are a needful Aid to the Lame, tho' an Impediment to the Strong." Learning, on the other hand, presupposes dependence on the past: "Too great Awe for them [=the ancients] lay Genius under restraint, and denies it that free scope, that full elbow-room, which is requisite for striking its most masterly strokes." The new concept of genius demanded freedom from rules and maximum independence from earlier models: "Genius can set us right in Composition, without the Rules of the Learned; as Conscience sets us right in Life, without the Laws of the Land." Genius shines only as an exception to the rule.

Handel's Exceptionalism as Artistic and Social Independence

Handel matched this new aesthetic paradigm more than any other composer, if not artist, in Georgian Britain. His fierce independence was both a cause for celebration and a reason for his frequent troubles. "[Y]ou... scorn to be subservient to, or ty’d up by Rules, or have your Genius cramp’d," a satirical pamphlet from 1733 charged him. This tendency applied both to his life and to his art. Unlike most musicians of his caliber, Handel began his musical education against the wishes of his father. During a celebrated sojourn in Italy in the late 1700s, he firmly
resisted overtures to join the Catholic dogma. His decision to stay in England in violation of his contract with the Hanoverian court, led to his dismissal from the Elector’s service. During the 1720s, when he was composing operas for the Royal Academy of Music, his refusal to submit to the demands of spoiled singers brewed tensions that expedited the company’s downfall. Much more consequential was his rift with opera star Senesino in 1733. For the next four years, he was officially competing with a company supported by some of the most powerful members of British nobility. And in 1745, he would be brought on his knees after refusing to collaborate with the same forces and even ignoring the wishes of the Prince of Wales.

In his art, too, Handel was more often than not uncompromising. According to John Hawkins, “Mr. Handel declared that, after he became master of the rudiments of his art, he forbore to study the works of others, and ever made it a rule to follow the suggestions of his own fancy.” He also developed a dislike for older music: “he seems to have disdained all imitation, and to have looked with contempt on those pure and elegant models for the church style.” In 1719, actually, he wrote that, “as we have been liberated from the narrow limits of ancient music, I cannot see of what use the Greek modes can be to modern music.” This is not to say that Handel avoided borrowing material from other composers, a widely used technique at the time for generating a music piece. But unlike most contemporary artists, he retained full control over the production and dissemination of his works. Their frequent and successful performances in Britain and elsewhere confirm their originality and explain why in 1759 Handel was “allowed by all Europe to be the greatest Musical Genius that ever lived.”

Handel’s Gluttony as Prerogative of his Genius

The exceptionalism that characterized Handel’s life and art, and its centrality in the new concept of genius provided the exegetical framework to deal with the composer’s gluttony. The first instance appears in the Memoirs of the Life of the Late George Frideric Handel. Published anonymously in the spring of 1760, this was the first extensive biography of a composer. Evidently a celebration of Handel’s life and achievements, the book features on its title page an excerpt from Longinus: “I readily allow, that Writers of a lofty and tow’ring Genius are by no means pure and correct, since whatever is neat and accurate throughout must be exceedingly liable to Flatness.” Printed in the original Greek, the excerpt signals that the following narrative is more than a factual account; it is
also an effort to understand a great artist. Indeed, the biography ends with a reference to Handel's character:

Those who have blamed him for an excessive indulgence in this lowest of gratifications, ought to have considered, that the peculiarities of his constitution were as great as those of his character. Luxury and intemperance are relative ideas, and depend on other circumstances besides those of quantity and quality. It would be as unreasonable to confine HANDEL to the fare and allowance of common men, as to expect that a London merchant should live like a Swiss mechanic. Not that I would absolve him from all blame on this article. He certainly paid more attention to it, than is becoming in any man: but it is some excuse, that Nature had given him so vigorous a constitution, so exquisite a palate, and so craving an appetite; and that fortune enabled him to obey these calls, to satisfy these demands of Nature. They were really such.

As a genius, Handel stands beyond common humanity. Whatever his excesses may have been, we may not apply to him general standards. If a genius is by definition closer to Nature, then his uncommon appetite also relates to that Nature. By turning a violation of normal behavior into an emanation from the supreme nature of a genius, the author seeks to integrate both virtues and flaws under a common roof. This is the basis for the idea of a flawed genius: free from rules and human constraints, the genius can both reach the highest peaks of the mind and sink into the deepest recesses of depravity.

The second part of the argument is strictly utilitarian:

besides the several circumstances just alleged [sic], there is yet another in his favour; I mean his incessant and intense application to the studies of his profession. This rendered constant and large supplies of nourishment the more necessary to recruit his exhausted spirits. Had he hurt his health or his fortune by indulgences of this kind, they would have been vicious: as he did not, they were at most indecorous.

The fact that Handel remained creative was proof of his ultimate control over his carnal desires. Constant work and prodigious mental effort made it inevitable that he would require large quantities of food and drink. The argument is actually problematic, especially if one recalls that Handel is supposed to have written Messiah in only three weeks, while taking a minimum of food. More significant, here, too, there is a reversal of the evaluative polarity: what is by definition irrational (excessive food intake) turns into a rational reaction (the mental effort of a genius is prodigious, therefore it requires a prodigious amount of food).
The author of the *Memoirs* was not the first to make such arguments. About the same time, David Hume proposed that

These indulgences are only vices, when they are pursued at the expence [*sic*] of some virtue, as liberality or charity; in like manner as they are follies, when for them a man ruins his fortune, and reduces himself to want and beggary. . . . To be entirely [*sic*] occupied with the luxury of the table, for instance, without any relish for the pleasures of ambition, study, or conversation, is a mark of gross stupidity, and is incompatible with any vigour of temper or genius.\textsuperscript{66}

Since Handel died a very rich and widely celebrated man, it follows that his gluttony was not as vicious as one might initially have thought. The aims and achievements of a genius are of paramount significance and can justify whatever excessive behavior.

Placing Handel’s gluttony within the new discourse of boundary-free genius provided a compelling solution for this shadowy aspect of the composer’s life. It would be duly followed by subsequent Handel biographers:

His chief foible was a culpable indulgence in the sensual gratifications of the table; but this foible was amply compensated by a sedulous attention to every religious duty, and moral obligations.\textsuperscript{67}

The figure of HANDEL was large, and he was somewhat corpulent . . . but his countenance . . . was full of fire and dignity; and such as impressed ideas of superiority and genius.\textsuperscript{68}

HANDEL, with many virtues, was addicted to no vice that was injurious to society. Nature, indeed, required a great supply of sustenance to support so huge a mass, and he was rather epicurean in the choice of it; but this seems to have been the only appetite he allowed himself to gratify.\textsuperscript{69}

It is impossible to defend, or even to excuse, Handel [for his gluttony];—but we may extract from the fact some comfort for mediocrity of talent, by calling attention to the almost invariable truth, that, as if in mercy to the weakness of human nature, which cannot endure any pretension to entire superiority, the balance is generally pretty accurately adjusted between great excellence and great deficiency.\textsuperscript{70}
Concluding Reflections

There is little doubt that Handel’s corpulence was a biographical detail in need of cultural editing. Although his posthumous fame was secure, his position as a national symbol had yet to be fixed.1 Anecdotes of his difficult character were still in circulation and native composers like Thomas Arne were eager to unseat him from the throne of British music.2 Moreover, the victorious ending of the Seven Years War called for institutions and cultural heroes to solidify Britain’s global superiority.3 It is not difficult to understand the concern of Handelians for aspects of his biography that might complicate his canonization.

The existence of an editorial attitude towards Handel’s life should not, however, be taken as biographical distortion. Interpretation is a natural form of cultural editing and is part of how we constantly update aspects of the past for the needs of the present. Handel himself probably did not consider his gluttony a vice to be either suppressed or bemoaned. But given that most of his contemporaries could not reach the mental heights and creative aspirations of a genius, they were unable to properly evaluate his addiction to excessive food and drink. Far from excusing his gluttony, early biographers sought to apply a perspective that would render such indulgence understandable. They were translators of their own time as much as we aspire to be translators of their actions.
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