Napoleon as Philoctetes: Military Masculinity, Sacrifice and the Image of the Wound

PHILIP SHAW

I

If, in one sense, sacrifice may be determined as ‘the destruction [...] of something valued [...] for the sake of something having [...] a higher or a more pressing claim’,¹ then we should not be surprised when, in times of war, a rhetoric of sacrifice should emerge to legitimize the forfeiting of individual liberty, the renunciation of domestic comfort and the yielding of one’s own body for the greater good of the nation. When, for instance, at the ceremony of the Distribution of the Eagles on 5 December 1804, the Emperor Napoleon invited his army ‘to swear to sacrifice [their] lives’ in defence of his ‘throne’ and his ‘people’, and later, at the time of his first abdication in April 1814, attempted to convince himself and the world at large of his great ‘personal sacrifice’ in acceding to the ‘interest of France’, he demonstrated a keen awareness of the resonant force of self-denial.² Personal loss and national interest are, of course, euphemisms for the innumerable ways in which bodies can be put to work in the service of the state; yet, as Elaine Scarry has indicated, there is a wealth of difference between a call for sacrifice that assumes the brute facticity of death and wounding by means of sword, club, cannon, bullet, or flame, and one which serves merely to dignify a renunciation of power. For Scarry, the ‘translation of the material fact of the body into a disembodied cultural fiction (the assertion of [national] impregnability)’ requires, precisely, ‘that someone be hurt’.³ A soldier who fails to display the requisite vulnerability to suffering, who returns from war without having suffered a wound, and who therefore cannot be *seen* (in the most literal sense of the word) to have made a sacrifice, cannot, on this understanding, be translated into a narrative of national cohesion.

For English commentators sympathetic to the French cause, the problem with Napoleon’s second proclamation resides, precisely, in the Emperor’s failure to signal a commitment to corporeal risk. Although the radical William Cobbett defended the claim to

‘personal sacrifice’ as a response to political, rather than moral, necessity, going so far as to praise the Emperor for demonstrating a ‘new’, truly democratic ‘species of courage’ in ‘obedience to the *sovereign will of the people*’, pro-Napoleonic Whigs, such as Lord Byron, regarded the Emperor’s failure to die, either in battle or by his own hand, as an unmanly betrayal of the classical ideals underpinning the French Revolution.⁴ In France, meanwhile, the belief that the scourge of Europe had betrayed the ‘sovereign will of the people’, not by failing to conform to classical precedent but, more prosaically, by evading the capital punishment that ought, logically, to have completed the sacrificial narrative inaugurated by the death of Louis XVI, took potent shape in the actions of the Provençal mobs who, urged on by royalist agitators, confronted the Emperor, as he journeyed into exile, with parodic displays of gibbeted and bloodied effigies, while other, less tangible feelings of disappointment with the Emperor’s surrender were portrayed in Jacques-Louis David’s *Leonidas at Thermopylae*, a challenging portrayal of masculine integrity and heroic self-sacrifice in the face of imminent defeat.⁵

Underlying this idea of betrayal we may detect some deeper anxieties concerning the origins of civil society; anxieties that, in addition to shedding light on a defining moment in the history of modern France, raise broader questions about the meaning of sacrifice in post-war societies, and about the relations between military masculinity and national unanimity. As Karen Hagemann points out, the French Revolution:

gave birth to the idea of the citizen-soldier, the male citizen who was willing to fight and sacrifice for the political community of which he was a full member [...] The French discourse of the citizen-soldier revolved around a powerful new notion of masculinity. This was a masculinity of radical citizenship. It was defined by identification with the revolutionary state, which was itself the embodiment of this masculinity.⁶

During the Empire, the radical character of the male citizen-soldier underwent a significant change, exemplified by the terms of the Imperial Catechism of 1808: ‘we owe our Emperor, Napoleon I, love, respect, obedience, loyalty, military service, the taxes ordered for the preservation and the defence of the Empire and his throne’.⁷ In offering his life to the Emperor rather than to the political community of which he had been a part, the citizen-soldier became a soldier-citizen: ‘a man who was a soldier first, and who earned the benefits of being a citizen through military service’.⁸ The political masculinity of radical citizenship was thus exchanged for a form of military masculinity determined by the virtues of honour, courage and love of glory that the Emperor himself was said to embody.

Characterised by his willingness to forego bodily integrity in the service of the Empire, the soldier-citizen stands as an exemplar of that ‘state of exception’ on which, according to Giorgio Agamben, the foundation of modern sovereignty rests.⁹ In his influential 1982 study, *Language and Death*, Agamben connects the exclusionary characteristics of the sacrificial act – the fact that, in times of crisis, certain classes of people, such as soldiers, are exempted from the protection of the state – with the constitutional violence of civil society. For Agamben, sacrifice ‘furnishes society and its ungrounded legislation with the fiction of a beginning: that which is excluded from the community is, in reality, that on which the entire life of the community is founded’.¹⁰ Thus, death or wounding of the male warrior figure may be conceived as a means of separating the sacred from the profane, to exclude the legal from the illegal, giving rise not only to the fiction of political authority but also to the violence that attends it. Unlike Scarry, for whom war is the expression of an ‘instance of political authority impatient of, or deserted by, benign sources of substantiation’, Agamben does not understand war as the symptom of political failure, but rather as an indication of the primary act of exclusion on which political society is established.¹¹ Indeed, far from seeing war as a deviation from communal life, Agamben has come in recent years to regard the maintenance of a state of war – whether conceived as foreign or internal strife – as a dominant paradigm of modern governance.

In this respect Agamben's thought appears to be in accord with Foucault's inverted Clausewitzian understanding of politics as 'the continuation of war by other means', and also with René Girard's anthropological account of the relations between political institutions and mimetic violence.¹² The connection between Agamben and Girard takes on additional force when their respective descriptions of the part played by the soldier-citizen in enforcing political authority are taken into consideration. Picking up on Joseph de Maistre's foregrounding of the soldier's liminal status in regard to the law ('an agent of cruelty and injustice [yet] so noble that he even ennobles what public opinion regards as the most ignoble, since he can exercise the functions of the executioner without debasing himself'), Agamben and Girard present seemingly complementary accounts of the soldier's social role.¹³ As *homo sacer* (Agamben: the person who may be killed yet not sacrificed), and as scapegoat (Girard: the one who bears the burden of societal violence), the body of the violated warrior both conceals and reveals the principle of exclusion on which civil society is founded.¹⁴

As this article goes on to argue, in Napoleonic France the relationship between the Emperor and the army is reciprocal: the identity of each is defined in relation to a pervasive ideology of sacrifice. While in no sense exposed to the kinds of risks experienced by front line soldiers, the Emperor Napoleon sought, nevertheless, to fashion himself as a sacrificial body, thereby exposing the principle of inclusion/exclusion in which the identity of the imperial soldier is forged. Central to the formation of this principle is the ambivalent status of the soldier-citizen's body: conceived as hard, impregnable and hypermasculine, once wounded the body is shown to be soft, vulnerable and emasculated. But while the figure of the dead or wounded soldier was potentially disruptive of imperial identity, it could also, if handled correctly, be used as a principle of support. To give one's body up to the Emperor meant that wounds could be seen as badges of honour.

That Napoleon took this lesson to heart and wished himself to become an emblem of heroic self-sacrifice is illustrated by two contrasting images: the first, a painting depicting a minor bullet wound afflicted on the military leader during a debatable victory in 1810, and the second, a satirical print showing an image of Napoleon as Philoctetes, the injured hero of

classical legend, dating from the period of the first abdication. The discussion that follows thus sets out to explore the extent to which the image of masculine vulnerability challenges or reinforces the sacrificial underpinnings of French national identity. By looking closely at these images, and by examining the cultural and historical contexts in which these images were produced, disseminated and received, the article works towards a more nuanced understanding of the social function of imperial woundedness, highlighting the numerous and subtle ways in which visual representations of the injured leader were used to advance distinct ideological ends.

II

Prior to engaging with the image of the wounded Napoleon, I want to look at the conventions informing artistic representations of wounded soldiers during the period of the First Empire. In Napoleonic France, where state intervention in the production and distribution of visual materials helped instil appropriate attitudes towards the economic and human costs of war, military-historical paintings were frequently displayed at the annual Salon exhibitions, to be circulated thereafter in the form of popular prints.¹⁵ Although not subject to stylistic prescriptions, the theme and content of these paintings were carefully managed, more often than not by the Emperor himself. The proposed topics for the 1808 Salon competition are illustrative of the ways in which the state conspired to transform history into myth: Napoleon as all-seeing god, located on the heights of Pratzen observing the retreat of the enemy below; the sudden and decisive attack on the bridge over the Danube; the gratifying sight of Austrian surrender at Ulm and Munich and the Emperor's related show of mercy. Although dead and injured soldiers of both sides are displayed in these canvases, the potential to shock is effaced by the dazzling light of imperial grandeur, which appears to stand, as it were, between the domains of the sacred and the profane, ensuring, in the sense identified by Agamben, that the destruction of the male warrior cannot be judged in violation of the law of gods or of men.¹⁶

Victories, no doubt, are easy to sell as fit subjects for visual representation. More difficult to promote are those unresolved actions or even, say it quietly, defeats in which the

sight of the opened masculine body remains stubbornly resistant to ideological transformation. To explain this point, we may consider briefly Antoine-Jean Gros's well-known painting *La Bataille d'Eylau* (1808). Gros's attempt to place a positive spin on the bloody and desultory outcome of Eylau is remarkable, not least because the picture contains numerous indicators of suffering that run the risk of distracting from the Emperor's display of magnanimity towards the enemy wounded. There is, as Christopher Prendergast has noted, a tension here between the affective claims of the suffering soldiers in the foreground and the display of imperial beneficence at the centre of the composition; but the picture works hard to soothe this tension through careful manipulation of the conventions of military-historical painting as, in a stock echo of Renaissance and Baroque religious art, Napoleon is depicted as the Redeemer, a benign presence directing his men to bring assistance to the wounded. Although the image of suffering is compelling, our eyes are ultimately directed to the benedictory gesture of the military leader by a combination of visual imperatives and the refulgent glow of the Emperor's mount. As Vivant Denon, Napoleon's *de facto* minister of visual propaganda pronounced in his brief for the painting, the 'consoling gaze' of the Christ-like victor at the centre of the composition seems 'to soften the horrors of death and respond to a milder day on this scene of carnage'.¹⁷ Those material realities that Scarry has described so well – 'the body in pain, the body maimed, the body dead and hard to dispose of' – are thus transformed in Gros's work; in what amounts to a double gesture, the painting disowns even as it acknowledges the terrifying costs of war.¹⁸

[Insert Figure 1 here. Landscape mode]

Charles Meynier, *Retour de Napoléon dans l'île de Lobau après la bataille d' Essling, 23 mai 1809* (1812). Oil on canvas, 473 x 529 cm. Image reproduced by permission of the Musée National du Château de Versailles.

A work offering a similarly complex vision of the sacralising process is Charles Meynier's *Retour de Napoléon dans l'île de Lobau après la bataille d' Essling, 23 mai 1809* (1812) (figure 1). At Aspern-Essling the Austrian forces under the command of Archduke Charles achieved a victory over the French, the first time the imperial army had been defeated in over a decade. By the end of the battle more than 20,000 French troops lay dead and dying in the field. Meynier nevertheless makes good on this loss by depicting Napoleon as the saviour of the wounded, directing, as with the Gros picture, the injured men's care. Once again, allusions to Renaissance and Baroque precedents help reinforce the image of Napoleon as Redeemer, offering benediction to a band of grateful casualties, their injuries tastefully concealed, their suffering effaced in expressions of love and devotion. But what makes Meynier's image faintly troubling is its juxtaposition of classical nudes and clothed, professional soldiers. In a subtle reading of the male nude in Gros's *Bonaparte visitant les pestiférés de Jaffa* (1804), Darcy Grimaldo Grisby ponders the effect of these contrasting images of masculinity that seem, simultaneously, to confirm and disconfirm the authority of the military leader. While Meynier falls short of the out-and-out questioning of gender distinctions that Grimaldo Grisby detects in Gros, the picture nevertheless works hard to harmonize evident tensions between hard-bodied displays of masculine integrity, feminized postures of languor, tenderness and supplication, and virile gestures of self-command.¹⁹

Just as Meynier and Gros endeavoured to convert the death and injury of common soldiers into the symbolic compost of victory so, in images representing the death or violation of the military leader, individual suffering is transformed into an image of sacrifice: the representative of the state gives up their life so that we, as subjects or as citizens, may be free. Thus, in Benjamin West's iconic portrayal of the *Death of General Wolfe* (1770), suppression of the open body, along with a gestural vocabulary of deference and decorum, ensures that

injury remains a private, even elite affair, and that sentiment is kept within proper bounds. In the French tradition there is no shortage of equivalents for this form of stage-managed suffering. In Jean-François Peyron's portrayal of the *Mort du Général Vaulhubert* at the Battle of Austerlitz on 2 December 1805 (figure 2), for instance, a related emphasis falls on the noble officer's stoicism in the face of death. Drawing on well-established visual motifs of pagan and Christian virtue under duress, as well as on journalistic accounts of the general's rejection of medical aid, and his insistence that his body not be removed from the field until after the battle, as would have been his right as an officer, Peynier's sanitized image, its rigid gestural vocabulary reminiscent of the stylized theatricalism of *tableau vivant*, provided audiences with a consummate example of self-abnegation in the service of the state.

[Insert Figure 2 here. Landscape model]

Jean-François Peyron, *Mort du Général Vaulhubert*. Oil on canvas, 512 x 418 cm. Image reproduced by permission of the Musée National du Château de Versailles.

But as with everything disowned, elided, or repressed, it is only a matter of time before the forgotten object begins to reappear, albeit in disguised form, in the self-representations of everyday reality. As such, the wounded male body has an unfortunate habit of lingering in the national imagination and, in Agamben's terms, of revealing the violent act of inclusion/exclusion in which political society is formed. Matters are exacerbated further when, as is the case with Napoleon, the wounded man turns out also to be the leader of a

nation. Here again, de Maistre offers a useful perspective on the relations between physical injury and political authority. Crucially, for de Maistre, the King is divided between a mortal, suffering body and a sacred, immortal body immune to degradation: the King, that is, can never die.²⁰ When Napoleon crowned himself Emperor in 1804 the act was seen, from a royalist perspective, as a perversion of this belief. Moreover, the fact that, in accordance with revolutionary precept, he was obliged to proclaim himself *Empereur des français* (Emperor of the French), rather than *Empereur de france* (Emperor of France), seemed to underline the sense in which the divinely sanctioned connection between the ruler's corporeal body and the incorporeal body of the state had come under strain. For Napoleon, therefore, with the odour of illegitimacy clinging to his title, the status of the corporate body had become questionable.²¹ In the absence of a theological guarantee of legitimacy, and with only one body to his name, the Emperor Napoleon could, in theory, die once and for all.

III

[Insert Figure 3 here. Landscape model]

Claude Gautherot, *Napoléon blessé au pied devant Ratisbonne le 23 avril 1809* (1810). Oil on canvas, 370 x 510 cm. Image reproduced by permission of the Musée National du Château de Versailles.

For artists seeking to negotiate the questionable legality of Napoleon's right to rule, the sight of the wounded leader presented a special challenge: how to acknowledge the Emperor's mortal body while, at the same time, providing assurance of an imperial body partaking of the divine? Napoleon was injured at least three times in battle, and there are a number of paintings and prints which focus on his stoicism in the face of pain, the best-known example of which is Claude Gautherot's painting, *Napoléon blessé au pied devant Ratisbonne le 23 avril 1809* (1810) (figure 3). Exhibited at the Salon in 1810 and then, along with its companion piece *Napoleon Harangue le 2ème corps de la Grande Armée sur le pont de Seckhausen sur la Lech avant l'attaque d'Augsbourg, le 12 octobre 1805*, at the gallerie de Diane in the Tuileries, the painting depicts an athletically posed and robust-looking Emperor receiving medical treatment for a minor foot injury – possibly the result of a bullet grazing the heel or swelling caused by compressed tendons during prolonged riding. But whatever the cause, there is something comedic about the way the image solicits concern for Napoleon's injury – a trivial incident when measured against the manifest suffering of those unnamed soldiers excluded from the picture's frame of vision.²² But if Gautherot's focus on the Emperor's stoicism in the face of pain borders on the risible, there may, nevertheless, be a sense in which the picture's comedic potential contributes towards a more serious purpose.

One of the earliest accounts of the event, that of Napoleon's valet, Louis Constant Wairy, makes great play of the Emperor's manly indifference to pain:

At Ratisbon, on the 23d of April, the Emperor received in his right foot a spent ball, which gave him quite a severe bruise. I was with the service when several grenadiers hastened to tell me that his Majesty was wounded, upon which I hastened to him, and arrived while M. Yvan was dressing the contusion. The Emperor's boot was cut open, and laced up, and he remounted his horse immediately; and, though several of the generals insisted on his resting, he only replied: 'My friends, do you not know that it is necessary for me to see everything?' The enthusiasm of the soldiers cannot be expressed when they

learned that their chief had been wounded, though his wound was not dangerous.

‘The Emperor is exposed like us’, they said; ‘he is not a coward, not he’.²³

Walter Scott, quoting at length from the *Memoirs of the Duke of Rovigo* (1828) in his *Life of Napoleon* (1839), places similar emphasis on the Emperor’s insouciance:

‘That must have been a Tyrolese’, said the Emperor coolly, ‘who has aimed at me from such a distance. These fellows fire with wonderful precision’. Those around him remonstrated with him for exposing his person; to which he answered, ‘What can I do? I must needs see how matters go on’. The soldiers crowded about him in alarm at the report of his wound; but he would hardly allow it to be dressed, so eager was he to get on horseback and put an end to the solicitude of his army, by showing himself publicly among his troops.²⁴

For Scott, the Emperor’s *sangfroid* is linked to the larger, thematic concerns of his narrative. His *Life* is a form of epic, with the epic hero portrayed accordingly. But while Wairy is no less concerned to portray the Emperor as a demi-god, he also shows a keen awareness of his subject’s concern with the control of information. ‘The papers’, he continues, ‘did not mention this occurrence’:

Before entering a battle, the Emperor always ordered that, in case he was wounded, every possible measure should be taken to conceal it from his troops. ‘Who knows’, said he, ‘what terrible confusion might be produced by such news? To my life is attached the destiny of a great Empire. Remember this, gentlemen; and if I am wounded, let no one know it, if possible. If I am slain, try to win the battle without me; there will be time enough to tell it afterwards’.

One reason why the injury did eventually enter the public arena is related to the immediate aftermath of Ratisbon. Widely proclaimed by the biographers as the zenith of Napoleon's career, the battle was followed swiftly by the embarrassing defeat at Aspern-Essling on 22 May. William Hazlitt, in an account of Ratisbon largely derived from Philippe Paul, Comte de Ségur's unfavourable *Histoire de Napoléon et de la grande armée pendant l'année 1812* (1824), marks this defeat as the beginning of the end of his hero's career.²⁵

Exhibited in the wake of a period of mixed fortunes for Napoleon, Gautherot's painting may be seen, therefore, as an attempt to convert the violation of the Emperor's body into a locus for assertions of martial cohesion, a point that Vivant Denon, in his *Compte rendu du Salon de 1810* was keen to stress: 'the greatest merit of this composition is to be found in a movement that has a unique interest, and this interest is fully focused on the person of Your Majesty. The whole army is occupied with you'.²⁶ So long, that is, as the collective gaze keeps the body of the Emperor in sight, questions of corporeal duality need not be addressed. Indeed, Gautherot's composition goes so far as to insist that the 'whole' army's unwavering show of concern be read as a guarantor of the Emperor's centrality to the body politic, as well as of his invulnerability not only to personal suffering but also to the cautionary influence of pagan and Christian tradition. For here, after all, is the resurrected man: a quasi-divine being impervious to fate and the wrath of the gods. Never one to shy away from depictions of defeat – the Emperor had, after all, a lasting admiration for Hector, seeing in this hero's fate a demonstration of courage transcending political expediency – Napoleon, who stressed in a letter to Josephine that the ball had 'barely grazed the Achilles tendon',²⁷ was thus wittily represented by Gautherot, as befits a student of Jacques-Louis David, as a hard-bodied Achaean warrior, an invulnerable demi-god whose epic career was in no immediate danger of termination.²⁸ The fact that Gautherot's image was reproduced as a print for mass consumption underlines the extent to which academic painting and state propaganda conspired to promote the Emperor as an immortal being, immune to human suffering.

With this allusion in mind, I wish now to focus discussion on a second image of wounding dating, in this case, from the end of Napoleon's career: *Nicolas Philoctète dans*

l'isle d'Elbe (figure 4). This anonymous graphic satire, copies of which can be found in the Bibliothèque Nationale and the Bodleian Library, depicts Napoleon as the ancient Greek hero Philoctetes, dwelling in latter-day exile on the island of Elba. Here, wearing laurels, military uniform and an imperial cape, yet with his right arm curiously sleeveless and a crudely fashioned sandal on his left foot, the fallen warrior is shown with a bandage on his left ankle, a bleeding wound clearly displayed on the corresponding calf, in the act of claiming a white bird from the branch of a nearby tree in which a snake can be seen lurking within the foliage. The bow and quiver of arrows implies that the bird has recently been shot by this composite figure. Most likely produced between May 1814 and February 1815, during the period of Napoleon's symbolic fall from grace, the sly allusion to Gauthier's documenting of the Emperor's wounding at Ratisbon appears self-evident; the significance of the allusion to Philoctetes is, however, more difficult to discern.²⁹

The *Bibliographie française* does not mention any related images of Napoleon as Philoctetes produced in this period or, indeed, at any point thereafter. When seeking to illustrate the baleful consequences of personal ambition, self-determination and divine transgression, satirical prints commonly compare the exiled Napoleon with more popular archetypes, such as Robinson Crusoe, Prometheus or Satan. How then should we go about understanding the meaning of this print's seemingly obscure allusion, and in what sense should the image be read as commentary on the relations between masculinity, sacrifice and the logic of the wound?

[Insert Figure 4 here. Portrait mode]

Figure 4. *Nicolas Philoctète dans l'Ile d'Elbe (n'a jamais passé la Manche)* (1814-15).

Etching and watercolour, 15.5 x 12.9 cm. Reproduced by permission of the Bibliothèque nationale de France.

In post-revolutionary France, classically educated audiences would most likely have been aware of the Philoctetes myth. In outline the story runs thus: the demi-god Heracles grants the Achaean archer Philoctetes a bow that never misses its mark. Thus equipped Philoctetes sets off to join the fight against Troy, but along the way is bitten in the foot by a venomous serpent as punishment for committing an offence against the gods (sources differ as to whether it is Hera, Apollo or the nymph Chryse whom Philoctetes has offended). The soldier's wound then becomes infected, making it impossible for him to perform his duties. Repulsed by his companions as a result of the wound's noxious smell, Philoctetes is left to die on the remote island of Lemnos. The Achaeans subsequently learn that the war against Troy will be won only if Heracles' bow is retrieved. Armed with this knowledge Odysseus returns to Lemnos where Philoctetes is discovered alive and still in possession of the weapon. At the conclusion of the story, Heracles persuades Philoctetes to return to Troy where his injury is healed, enabling him to defeat Paris in single combat.

The legend was described briefly by Homer, and also formed the basis of plays by Aeschylus and Euripides, both of which are now lost. A version by Sophocles does, however, survive.³⁰ In France, in the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, Sophocles' play, along with adaptations of the story by Châteaubrun (1755) and La Harpe (1781), was frequently performed at the Comédie-Française.³¹ Napoleon himself seems to have maintained a steady fascination with Philoctetes, overseeing the positioning of at least one sculpture of the hero in the garden of the Château de Compiègne, an imperial residence since 1804, and attending several productions of the play, including at least one performance of La Harpe's *Philoctète* at Saint-Cloud by the Emperor's close friend Talma.³² Napoleon would also have been familiar with contemporary paintings of Philoctetes, such as Jean-Germaine Drouais's *Philoctète* of 1788, Pierre-Paul Prud'hon's *Philoctète*, Nicolas André Monsiau's *Philoctète dans l'île de Lemnos*, exhibited at the Salon 1807 and 1810 respectively, and, most notably, Guillaume Guillon Lethière's *Philoctète dans l'île déserte de Lemnos gravissant les rochers pour avoir un oiseau qu'il a tué* on display at the 1798 Salon and from thereon in the permanent collection of the Musée Napoléon (figure 3).

[Insert Figure 5 here. Landscape model]

Figure 3. Guillaume Guillon Lethière, *Philoctète dans l'île déserte de Lemnos gravissant les rochers pour avoir un oiseau qu'il a tué* (1798). Oil on canvas, 440 x 783 cm.

Reproduced by permission of the Musée du Louvre.

From a compositional point of view this image has a special relevance for our understanding of the satirical print. Like the hero in Lethière's depiction, Napoleon, with a bandage on his injured leg, is shown reaching for a bird – possibly a white stork, symbolic of peace, but also, for the ancient Greeks, a protected animal, the killing of which is punishable by death – a detail that takes on special significance in light of the calls for the usurper to meet his just demise. The detail of the rolled-up sleeve together with the print's subtitle, *N'a jamais passé la Manche*, meaning either 'always sleeveless' or 'never crossed the English channel', could be read also as a sly commentary on the Emperor's failure to fulfil his historical destiny. In addition, mention should be made of the derogatory use of 'Nicolas' in the title, a term of opprobrium that, while recalling the chants of the crowds in Avignon ('*A bas Nicolas! A bas le tyran, le coquin, l'assassin des Français, le mauvais gueux!*'), serves also to deflate the comparison between the Corsican usurper and the ancient Greek hero.³³ But while it is tempting to interpret the caricature as anti-Napoleonic, there remains a sense in which it could be seen as at least sympathetic to the lost Emperor's condition.³⁴ To better understand this point, and to advance our understanding of the image of the wounded Emperor, we may consider the significance of Philoctetes as represented by Sophocles.

No longer associated with the dazzlingly terminal career of the Homeric warrior, Philoctetes appears in Sophocles' drama to have moved from the epic to the tragic mode or, perhaps, to be more exacting in light of the absence of a decisive act of violence, to the mixed genre of the political melodrama. In this genre, as the scenes focussed on the quarrels between Odysseus and Neoptolemus suggest, the rooted values of the ancient Greek warrior classes are pitted against the pragmatic, *realpolitik*-ing of the new governing elite. Yet, what *Philoctetes* retains of the pure sense of tragedy is the genre's emphasis on the ambiguous role of the scapegoat. As Brian Sudlow argues, the scapegoat is 'unholy or *sacer* because it is the target of the pent-up aggression of the community in mimetic crisis, and holy or *sanctus* because its death or exclusion is associated by the community with a return of harmony and the re-establishment of unity'.³⁵ As *pharmakos* the character Philoctetes thus inhabits the

hinterland between health and sickness, power and weakness, centre and margin;³⁶ his suppurating wound stands not only as an emblem of castrated authority but also as the disavowed embodiment of the nation's sins. In the light of this account of Sophocles' play the image of Napoleon as Philoctetes may be read as at once sacred and monstrous – terrifying, to be sure, yet also pitiable and, to some extent, perhaps even ridiculous.

Commenting on the failed outcome of the Russian campaign in 1812, Napoleon, echoing Thomas Paine, had coined the phrase 'from the sublime to the ridiculous it is only one step'.³⁷ If, as we have seen, Gautherot's portrayal of the wounded Emperor made light of its Homeric allusions, allowing audiences at once to smile knowingly at the modern military leader's remove from the constrictions of epic typology while, at the same time, conditioning them to marvel at his apparent impregnability and indifference to pain – the anonymous print draws a more troubled lesson from its classical sources. Here, in a reminder of the original play's tricky negotiation of the competing claims of political and moral justice, as represented in the disputes between Odysseus and Neoptolemus, the bifurcated image of the ragged classical warrior and elegant contemporary leader makes light of the vulgar impulse to substitute the enlightened pragmatism of the present for the benighted, and potentially fatal, heroism of the past. What the caricature underscores is precisely the impossibility of a straightforward resumption of ancient heroic values.

Yet, even as derision goes some way towards quelling the holy terror of the Napoleonic scapegoat, the image of the festering wound is a reminder of unfinished business, a recollection of all that remains unresolved in the fashioning of the modern state. As the rotting remnant of the aristocratic warrior class depicted in the *Iliad*, Philoctetes is in need of redemption: his inarticulate cries, heard at the beginning of Sophocles' play, point to the hero's exile from the realm of discourse. Unable to relay his suffering in meaningful terms, Philoctetes repels the claims of the symbolic order and, as such, stands as a material embodiment of that inert, excluded matter around which the idea of political society revolves and towards which it is fatally attracted. No wonder that Adam Smith, seeking to define the limits of sympathy in his *Theory of Moral Sentiments*, regards the attempt in *Philoctetes* 'to

excite compassion by the representation of bodily pain as among the greatest breaches of decorum of which the Greek theatre has set the example'. 'The man who', in Smith's words, 'under the severest tortures allows no weakness to escape him, vents no groan, gives way to no passion which we do not entirely enter into' is the one who 'commands our highest admiration'.³⁸ In an unheroic, instrumental age, Philoctetes' 'cascade of *changing* cries and shrieks', as Scarry has it, is a vexed reminder of what the state must exclude if it is to cohere.³⁹ Yet, at the same time, by virtue of its suppressed or exiled condition, the discordant cry, a cry regarded not only by Smith but also by Winckelmann and Schlegel as beyond the pale of dramatic representation, symbolizes no less than the failure of the state to conceal its founding contradictions.⁴⁰

How then, does Sophocles' play go about addressing Philoctetes' condition, and what bearing might this have on audiences' understanding of the exiled Napoleon? The classical scholar Josh Beer has noted that in *Philoctetes* 'the Achillean ideal', associated with moral integrity, 'is seen as almost moribund'.⁴¹ Its sole representative is a lonely, agonised, and half-crazed outcast. A central irony of the drama is that Odysseus, depicted as unabashed political schemer, has instructed Achilles' son, Neoptolemus, to trick Philoctetes into returning to Troy. That Neoptolemus' sophistry fails to persuade the exile into returning, and that the day is saved only by the divine intervention of Heracles, is a reminder to audiences of the supervening power of the gods and of the moral authority of the older warrior class. As in *Oedipus Rex*, the purpose of *Philoctetes* is to bring the audience towards an awareness of their obligation to the deformed outsider – indeed, to see in the scapegoat's disfigurement the very principle of their own restoration. Here, in a modification of Agamben and Girard's theorising of the exclusionary logic of society, the brute materiality of the wound becomes the embodiment of that which must be *included* if the state is to cohere. When, for instance, the swollen-footed Oedipus, whose name indicates both knowledge and monstrosity, arrives at Colonus, the *pharmakos* enters the *polis* with a full awareness of his reviled and abject condition: 'I come to offer you a gift – my tortured body – a sorry sight', he informs Theseus, 'but there is value in it more than beauty'. Oedipus' abject gift to the city is sustained in

Philoctetes; in both plays, the defiled exile is transformed into an instrument of salvation, his suffering is a reminder of the pain that society wrongly disavows in pursuit of fantasies of wholeness and completion.⁴²

So where does this Sophoclean reading of the Napoleonic career leave us? While in one sense the graphic satire may be read as a mordant commentary on the failure of Napoleon, at the same time, the image leaves open the possibility that the lost leader will recover from his wound and will, like Philoctetes, gain further military renown. The anonymous graphic artist, I would suggest, picks up on the sense in which the scapegoat is not merely reviled but is also sacred, a superhuman figure destined to be purged of ignominy – the symbolic significance of his wound – and returned to the fray. As a heroically resistant and, in this vision, pointedly silent Philoctetes, Napoleon's display of athletic masculinity demonstrates the superiority of self-command over political and moral compromise as well as over physical pain. The absence of graphic cries of suffering deflects attention from the implications of unmanliness that had troubled eighteenth-century commentators. Notably, unlike many contemporary royalist prints, which portrayed the Emperor either as ridiculously puny or as a bloated giant, Napoleon/Philoctetes, despite his wound, is presented in this print as manly and athletic, the striding pose suggesting the latent power and aggression of the professional warrior. Along with other, related images produced during the period of Napoleon's exile, the image of the *enjambée impériale* [imperial stride] acknowledges the dangerous proximity of Elba to France, and of the likelihood of the lost leader making a dramatic return.⁴³ In this, the image of the wounded Napoleon suggests something of the latent energy that, in Marina McCoy's analysis of *Philoctetes*, prompts the classical hero to find healing by 'becoming an active agent in the political realm'.⁴⁴

In this respect, the print bears the influence of eighteenth-century adaptations of the play where emphasis falls less on the supervening powers of the gods and more on the ability of individuals to determine their own fates.⁴⁵ Corresponding to this shift from the sacred to the secular, however, is a diminished emphasis on the moral significance of the hero's suffering. Through the omission of divine causation and the introduction of superfluous

romance elements, the versions of the story by Châteaubrun and La Harpe, with their insistence on the smooth resolution of the conflict between communal obligations and individual desires, were regarded by many critics as failed representations of the wound's exorbitant demand. Rather than presenting Philoctetes as the bearer of the knowledge of the state's investment in self-contradiction and primary violence, these contemporary French adaptations work instead to present reassuring narratives of personal and collective salvation.⁴⁶

Yet, for all its manifest staginess, *Nicolas Philoctète dans l'Ile d'Elbe* does nevertheless work to remind audiences of the political challenges posed by the wounded soldier. Like the Athenian military commander, Alcibiades, on whom the character of Philoctetes may be based, the caricature suggests that the French are not yet done with Napoleon.⁴⁷ In the classical sources Philoctetes' liberation from Lemnos results in a terminal clash of arms with Paris; might the print be pointing here to the disruptive consequences of the Emperor's return to the French capital? But whether the return of the hero will bring bitter self-awareness to the *polis* or provide it with an excuse to pursue dangerous fantasies of self-command remains to be decided. In *Le petit pèlerin de Parme et de Plaisance*, an anonymous fiction published early in 1815, an Italian diplomat attached to the Emperor recounts:

[...] how, at Fréjus, the captain of the French boat and the English captain, each charged with their government's orders, were debating the honour of driving onto the rocks of another Lemnos this new Philoctetes whom Hercules's arrows dipped in the hydra's blood had wounded.⁴⁸

On Elba itself the narrator moves from the historic to the prophetic mode, announcing that:

Those who like to make parallels and draw predictions (*augures*) have remarked that the empire's regeneration dates from the same moment when nature seems to

renew itself, when she adorns herself in her sweetest colour: this happy era is the first day of spring.⁴⁹

Specifically, with the spring comes the promise of the return of ‘these forever illustrious generals’:

[...] modern Pylades, Patroclus and Philoctetes worthy of the ancient world, and these old warriors, shiny with scars (*brillans de cicatrices*), all representatives of the French army, all faithful and incorruptible depositories of a treasure which only they could keep for the homeland, and for whom one day perhaps they will protect the blessed return.⁵⁰

Of course what the ‘old warriors, shiny with scars’ cannot know at this point is that the ‘treasure’ they labour to protect will be lost in the Battle of Waterloo on 18 June 1815.

But there, of course, the story does not end. In a post-abdication pamphlet of 1814 Chateaubriand drew an influential distinction between the protean inauthenticity of Napoleon – ‘He personates every thing [...] he is always on stage’ – and the inviolable ‘majesty’ of the Bourbon ‘character’, which is always and forever ‘legitimate’.⁵¹ In his acknowledgement of Napoleon’s shifting identity, Chateaubriand picks up on the disgraced Emperor’s recent displays of theatricality, veering from melodrama in the failed suicide attempt of 12 April to the lachrymose farewell to the Imperial Guard at Fontainebleau on 20 April, and then again from the image of the terrified, vulnerable figure, seeking respite from angry pro-royalist crowds in Provence by disguising himself as an Austrian officer to the sorrowful, Werther-like figure, conspicuously weeping on the evening of 25 April in a lowly public house.⁵² As a performer on the stage of history, Napoleon is thus presented by Chateaubriand as gratifyingly insubstantial: once exposed as a fake, so the logic runs, the body of the ruler can no longer inhabit the body of the man. Lacking the potent authenticity of Philoctetes, the

weeping exile can no longer be considered a sacrificial hero and, as such, can no longer be considered a threat to the restoration of Bourbon legitimacy.

What Chateaubriand failed to anticipate, however, is the sense in which the Napoleonic actor, by virtue of his very inauthenticity, could return to haunt the post-war imaginary. By way of illustration of this point, we may briefly, and in closing, consider the final act in the career of that other great Napoleonic actor François-Joseph Talma. In March 1817 reports reached London of Talma's retirement from the stage. Within weeks of this announcement stories began to circulate of the disruptive aftermath of a performance of *Germanicus* at the Comédie Française by the controversial royalist playwright Antoine-Vincent Arnault. At the end of the performance tensions between republican and royalist factions spilled over into open conflict, which Talma, in his role as manager, tried vainly to quell. The violence was sufficiently intense to alarm the correspondent of the London *Times*: 'if at that moment Buonaparte had been transported from his island by some evil genius to the rue de Richelieu, he would have found in that theatre a very complete *noyau* [group; cell] both of an army and of a civil administration'.⁵³ Later that month in a performance of *Hamlet* in Lille, Talma was again thrown headlong into a riot. At the close of the drama, the actor was called for and a crown and some verses were thrown on to the stage – an incident which prompted the ire of some republican military officers:

No! no! – no Crown! – they cried out – The public replied – *Down! down!* The officers immediately left their box with drawn swords and leaped upon the stage, crying out to the public to come on. Finding that nobody advanced, they repaired into the body of the theatre, which they cleared. Several blows were given and received the night following.⁵⁴

When, a month later, Talma arrived in London to perform scenes from the great tragedies, including *Macbeth* and *Philoctetes*, fears that related disturbances would occur in the West End were swiftly allayed. Since tickets for the performances at the King's Theatre were

retailing at a guinea a piece, the likelihood of mob violence, inflamed by stirring portrayals of regicide and insurgency, seemed unlikely. Of the production itself, Henry Crabbe Robinson, present on the night of 26 June, noted sourly that Talma ‘filled me with horror certainly as Philoctète, but it was mingled with disgust. Bodily pain is no fit or legitimate subject for the drama: and too often he was merely a man suffering from a sore leg’.⁵⁵ Here, with a recollection of Adam Smith’s objections to *Philoctetes*, Crabbe Robinson voices a characteristically British objection to the dramatic representation of prolonged suffering. That depiction of bodily harm, which, in Paris or Lisle, appeared provocatively sublime, in London seemed merely ridiculous. With the wounded Emperor jettisoned to the remote south Atlantic, there would be no prospect of a further return.

¹ ‘sacrifice, n.’. OED Online. January 2017. Oxford University Press.

<http://www.oed.com/view/Entry/169571?rskey=mHLPeD&result=1> (accessed January 06, 2017).

² Quotations taken from Louis Antoine Fauvelet de Bourrienne, *Mémoires de M. de Bourrienne, ministre d’état sur Napoléon* (Paris, 1829–1831), vol. 6, p. 239–40 and Napoléon Bonaparte, *Correspondence de Napoléon I publiée par ordre de l’empereur Napoléon III* (Paris, 1858–1870), letter n.21558 (11 April 1814), vol. 27, p. 361. Unless stated otherwise, translations from the French are my own with the assistance of Sarah Knight at the University of Leicester.

³ Elaine Scarry, *The Body in Pain: the Making and Unmaking of the World* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1985), p.126.

⁴ Quotations from William Cobbett, ‘Has Napoleon Fallen?’, *Cobbett’s Political Register* (16 April 1814), vol. 25, p. 495. On the responses of British radicals to Napoleon’s fall see Stuart Semmel, *Napoleon and the British* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2004), chapter 6. For detailed discussion of Lord Byron’s response to Napoleon’s failure to fulfil his symbolic destiny see Simon Bainbridge, *Napoleon and English Romanticism* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995), p. 142–52.

⁵ For discussion of British responses to Napoleon's abdication see Bainbridge, *Napoleon and English Romanticism*, p. 134–52. On French émigré responses see Simon Burrows, *French Exile Journalism and European Politics, 1792–1814* (Woodbridge, Suffolk: The Boydell Press, 2000), p. 179–221. The complex reactions of moderate liberals to Napoleon's fall are addressed by Denis Wood in *Benjamin Constant: A Biography* (London: Routledge, 1993), p. 219–24. For comparative commentary on French and English graphic satires produced in this period see Catherine Clerc, *La Caricature contre Napoléon* (Paris: Promodis, 1985). For a reading of the sacrificial origins and trajectory of the French Revolution relevant to this discussion see Richard D. E. Burton, *Blood in the City: Violence and Revelation in Paris, 1789–1945* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2001), p. 41–71.

⁶ Karen Haggeman, 'The Military and Masculinity: Gendering the History of the Revolutionary and Napoleonic Wars, 1793-1815' in *War In An Age of Revolution, 1775–1815*, ed. Roger Chickering and Stig Förster (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010), p. 331–52; 348. For further discussion of the formation of military masculinity in the Napoleonic period see Michael J. Hughes, *Forging Napoleon's Grand Armée: Motivation, Military Culture and Masculinity in the French Army, 1800–1808* (New York: New York University Press, 2012). See also *French Masculinities: History, Politics and Culture*, ed. Christopher E. Forth and Bernard Taihe (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2007) and *Masculinities in Politics and War: Gendering Modern History*, ed. Stefan Dudink, Karen Hagemann and John Tosh (Manchester: University of Manchester Press, 2004).

⁷ *The French Revolution and Napoleon: A Sourcebook*, ed. Philip G. Dwyer and Peter McPhee (London and New York: Routledge, 2002), p. 159.

⁸ Michael J. Hughes, *Forging Napoleon's Grand Armée*, p. 111.

⁹ See Giorgio Agamben, *State of Exception*, trans. Kevin Attell (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2005)

¹⁰ Giorgio Agamben, *Language and Death: The Place of Negativity*, trans. Michael Hardt (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1991), p. 105.

¹¹ Scarry, *The Body in Pain*, p. 62

¹² See Carl Von Clausewitz, *On War*, ed. and trans. Michael Howard and Peter Paret (Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1984), p. 87; Michel Foucault, '*Society Must Be Defended*': *Lectures at the Collège de France, 1975–1976*, ed. Mauro Bertani and Alessandro Fontana, trans. David Macey (New York: Picador, 2003), p. 15–16 and René Girard, *Battling to the End: Conversations With Benoît Chantre*, trans. Mary Baker (East Lansing, Michigan: Michigan State University Press, 2010). In this latter work, Girard appears to endorse a form of apocalyptic millenarianism akin to the 'romantic' anthropology of de Maistre (p. 170–1). For a counter view see Wolfgang Palaver, 'Abolition or Transformation? The Political Implications of René Girard's Theory of Sacrifice' in *Violence, Desire and the Sacred: René Girard and Sacrifice in Life, Love and Literature*, ed. Scott Cowdell, Chris Fleming and Joel Hodge (London: Bloomsbury, 2014), vol. 2, p. 20.

¹³ Joseph de Maistre, *St Petersburg Dialogues, or Conversations on the Temporal Government of the World*, trans. Richard A. Lebrun (Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1993), p. 207. For commentary see Owen Bradley, *A Modern Maistre: The Social and Political Thought of Joseph de Maistre* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1999), p. 71–9 and Carolina Armenteros, *The French Idea of History: Joseph de Maistre and His Heirs, 1794–1854* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2011). See also Ivan Strenski, *Contesting Sacrifice: Religion, Nationalism and Social Thought in France* (Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 2002), p. 37–41.

¹⁴ Giorgio Agamben, *Homo Sacer: Sovereign Power and Bare Life*, trans. Daniel Heller Roazen (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1998), p. 8. See also René Girard, *Violence and the Sacred*, trans. Patrick Gregory (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1977), p. 81–4 and p. 249. For a subtle and far-reaching reading of the soldier as Girardian scapegoat see Laura Wittman, *The Tomb of the Unknown Soldier, Modern Mourning, and the Reinvention of the Mystical Body* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2011), p. 98–9. See also Carolyn Marvin and David W. Ingle, *Blood Sacrifice and the Nation: Totem Rituals and*

the American Flag (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), p. 76–9. The connections between *homo sacer* and the scapegoat are examined in Bülent Dicken and Carsten B. Lautsen, *The Culture of Exception: Sociology Facing the Camp* (Abingdon, Oxon: Routledge, 2005), p. 20–2.

¹⁵ On Denon's role as visual propagandist see Jean Chatelain, *Vivant Denon et le Louvre de Napoleon* (Paris: Perrin, 1973) and Annie Jourdan, *Napoléon: Héros, imperator et mécène* (Paris: Aubier, 1998).

¹⁶ See Agamben, *Homo Sacer*, p. 96–100. Christopher Prendergast, *Napoleon and History Painting: Antoine-Jean Gros's La Bataille d'Elyau* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997) p. 84–5; p. 124–5.

¹⁷ Denon cited in Prendergast, *Napoleon and History Painting* 136; translation mine. Prendergast goes on to argue that Gros's unflinching representation of the dead and wounded ultimately wrecks Denon's schema.

¹⁸ Scarry, *The Body in Pain*, p. 62.

¹⁹ Darcy Grimaldo Grisby, *Extremities: Painting Empire in Post-Revolutionary France* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2002), p. 80–1.

²⁰ See Bradley, *A Modern Maistre*, p. 78–9. For commentary on the legal fiction of the king's two bodies relevant to this discussion see the essays collected in *From the Royal to the Republican Body: Incorporating the Political in Seventeenth and Eighteenth Century France*, ed. Sara E. Melzer and Kathryn Norberg (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1998).

²¹ For further discussion of Napoleon's claim to 'legitimacy' see Semmel, *Napoleon and the British*, p. 108–11.

²² For commentary on the frame as 'a strategy of containment' that, nonetheless, provides the resources for a melancholic, or 'haunted' rendering of war see Judith Butler, *Frames of War: When is Life Grievable?* (London: Verso, 2010) xiii-iv; p. 6–12.

²³ Louis Constant Wairy, *Recollections of the Private Life of Napoleon*, trans. Walter Clark (New York, 1895), p. 162.

²⁴ Walter Scott, *The Life of Napoleon Bonaparte* (London, 1827), p. 495.

²⁵ William Hazlitt, *The Life of Napoleon Buonaparte* (London, 1830), vol. 3, p. 340–1.

²⁶ Quoted in Satish Padiyar, *Chains: David, Canova and the Fall of the Hero in Postrevolutionary France* (University Park, Pennsylvania: Pennsylvania State University Press, 2007), p. 40.

²⁷ *Correspondence de Napoléon I*, letter n.15163 (6 May 1809), vol. 18, p. 538–9. Between February 1809 and 1815 Napoleon attended multiple performances of Luce de Lancival's *Hector*, featuring Talma in the lead role. See Louis-Henry Lecomte, *Napoléon et le monde dramatique : étude nouvelle d'après des documents inédits* (Paris: H. Daragon, 1912) and [Emmanuel-Auguste-Dieudonné comte de] Las Cases, *Mémorial de Sainte-Hélène* (Paris, 1842), p. 353.

²⁸ As befits a student of Jacques-Louis David, Gautherot's modelling of Napoleon is informed by his mentor's depiction of classical figures, echoing, for example, the poses depicted in *The Intervention of the Sabine Women* (1799) and anticipating his painting of *Leonidas at Thermopylae* (1814). It should be noted that Napoleon's pose also bears a striking resemblance to the depiction of the classical hero in Bon-Thomas Henry's painting *The Disembarkation of Achilles in Troy* (date unknown).

²⁹ The print is discussed briefly by Catherine Clerc in *La Caricature contre Napoléon*, p. 198.

³⁰ Ovid alludes to the story in *Metamorphoses* 13.45 ff. and 313ff. See Ovid, *Metamorphoses*, trans. Rolfe Humphries (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1983), p. 307; p. 316.

³¹ *Sophocles: Philoctetes*, ed. Seth L. Schein (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013), p. 48–50.

³² The play was performed on 1 September 1808. Eugène Laugier, *Documents historiques sur la Comédie Française* [...] (Paris, 1853), p. 126. Henry Milton comments on Talma's performance in *Letters on the Fine Arts, Written from Paris, in the Year 1815* (London, 1816), p. 235–6. La Harpe's version was performed sixty-eight times at the Comédie Française between 1783 and 1826.

³³ 'Down with Nicolas! Down with the tyrant, the rascal, the murderer of the French, the malicious beggar!' The nickname Nicolas was applied to Napoleon during his time as a student at Brienne, and became a term of abuse following his abdication. Quotation from Louis Marie Prudhomme, *L'Europe tourmentée par la Révolution en France* [...] (Paris, 1815), vol. 2, p. 402.

³⁴ As Barbara Ann Day-Hickman points out, graphic satires produced under the First Restoration were subject to strict controls that placed limits on the expression of pro-Napoleonic sentiment. See *Napoleonic Art: Nationalism and the Spirit of Rebellion in France (1815–1848)* (Newark, DE: University of Delaware Press, 1999), p. 41.

³⁵ Brian Sudlow, 'Agamben, Girard and the Life that Does Not Live', in *Intensities: Philosophy, Religion and the Affirmation of Human Life*, ed. Katherine Sarah Moody and Steven Shakespeare (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2012), p. 39–52; p. 48.

³⁶ For discussion of Philoctetes' marginal status 'as someone who is located between isolation and society' see Marina McCoy, *Wounded Heroes: Vulnerability as a Virtue in Ancient Literature and Philosophy* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013), p. 63–4.

³⁷ Dominique-Georges-Frédéric Dufour de Pradt, *Histoire de l'Ambassade dans le Grand Duché de Varsovie en 1812* (Paris, 1815), p. 215.

³⁸ Adam Smith, *The Theory of Moral Sentiments*, ed. Knud Haakonssen (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), p. 37.

³⁹ Scarry, *The Body in Pain*, p. 5

⁴⁰ In *Thoughts on the Imitation of Greek Works in Painting and Sculpture* (1755) Wincklemann lays stress on Philoctetes suppression of pain: 'Laocoön suffers, but he suffers

like Sophocles's Philoctetes: his misery touches us to the very soul, but we wish that we, like that great man, could bear that great misery'. Extract in Johann Joachim Winckelmann, *On Art, Architecture, and Archaeology*, trans. David Carter (Rochester, NY: Camden House, 2013), p. 42. See also A. W. Schlegel, *A Course of Lectures on Dramatic Art and Literature*, trans. John Black (London, 1815), vol. 2, p. 134–5. For discussion of the responses of German aestheticians to Philoctetes' cries in the context of a nuanced and subtle reading of Drouais's 1788 painting *Philoctetes on Lemnos*, see Thomas E. Crow, *Emulation: David, Drouais, and Girondet in the Art of Revolutionary France* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2002), p. 75–81.

⁴¹ Josh Beer, *Sophocles and the Tragedy of Athenian Democracy* (Westport, CT: Praeger, 2004), p. 137

⁴² My reading here is influenced by Terry Eagleton's suggestive account of the Sophoclean *pharmakos* in *Sweet Violence: The Idea of the Sacred* (Oxford: Blackwell, 2003), p. 274–84 and also by Marina McCoy's observations on Philoctetes' pain in *Wounded Heroes*, p. 68–9.

⁴³ On graphic satires depicting the 'giant stride' from Elba see Ian Haywood, *Romanticism and Caricature* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013), p. 86–9.

⁴⁴ McCoy, *Wounded Heroes*, p. 86.

⁴⁵ For apposite commentary see Christopher Todd, *Voltaire's Disciple: Jean-François Le Harpe* (London: the Modern Humanities Association, 1972), p. 121 and *Sophocles: Philoctetes*, ed. Schein, p. 47–8.

⁴⁶ See, for example, Lessing's comments on Châteaubrun: 'Chateaubrun gives Philoctetes society. He lets a young Princess come to him in the desert island [...] The whole excellent play with the bow he set quite aside. Instead of it he gives us the play of beautiful eyes'. From *Laocoon or On the Limits of Painting and Poetry* (1766), trans. W.A. Steel. Extract taken from *The Origins of Modern Critical Thought: German Aesthetic and Literary Criticism from Lessing to Hegel*, ed. David Simpson (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988), p. 38–9. Despite Talma's innovative attempts to breathe new life into *Philoctète*, in the

aftermath of the Empire La Harpe's once celebrated play was beginning to seem outmoded.

Compare Jean-Baptiste Gail's largely favourable comparative analysis, *Examen du Philoctète de La Harpe, rapproché du text de Sophocle* (Paris, 1813) with the tempered assessment of the *Dictionnaire de la conversation* (Paris, 1838), vol. 49, p. 373.

⁴⁷ See Michael J. Vickers, *Sophocles and Alcibiades: Athenian Politics in Ancient Greek Literature* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2008)

⁴⁸ Anonymous, *Le petit pèlerin de Parme et de Plaisance* (Paris, 1815), p. 68.

⁴⁹ From the book's *Avertissement*

⁵⁰ *Le petit pèlerin*, p. 111.

⁵¹ F. A. de Chateaubriand, *Of Buonaparte, and of the Bourbons, and of the Necessity of Rallying Around Our Legitimate Princes for the Happiness of France and That of Europe* (London, 1814), p. 47; p. 77. Chateaubriand makes the false but influential claim that Napoleon took lessons in acting from Talma. See Darcy Grimaldo Grisby's examination of a print produced in 1814, which, by juxtaposing images of Napoleon and Talma, offers a trenchant commentary on the constructed nature of heroic masculinity: *Extremities*, p. 80–1.

⁵² See Ludwig Friedrich Truchsess Von Waldburg, *A Narrative of Napoleon Buonaparte's Journey from Fontainebleau to Fréjus in April, 1814* (London, 1815), p. 34–5.

⁵³ *Times*, 28 May 1817, 10107: 2.

⁵⁴ *Examiner* 4 May 1817, 488: 1.

⁵⁵ Henry Crabbe Robinson, *Diary, Reminiscences, and Correspondence: In Three Volumes* (London: 1869), vol. 2, p. 60–1.