

### **PART III**

## **CONTESTED NARRATIVES: MEMORY, ATROCITY AND MASSACRE**



## CHAPTER 12

# MEMORIES OF MASSACRES AND ATROCITIES DURING THE REVOLUTIONARY AND NAPOLEONIC WARS

*Philip G. Dwyer*



**O**n 3 March 1799, the French army arrived before the walls of Jaffa in what was then known as Syria (now just outside Tel Aviv) and started to lay siege to the town. Four days later, after a breach in the wall had been made, Napoleon sent two emissaries to negotiate the surrender; the reply was the appearance of their heads on pikes behind the walls. That same day, the town fell and the troops gave themselves up to pillage, rape and murder for two, possibly four whole days (witnesses diverge on this point), indiscriminately killing anyone that fell in their way, regardless of sex or age, stopping only when exhausted.<sup>1</sup> Etienne-Louis Malus, a doctor who had accompanied the army, recalled what he saw many years later:

The soldiers cut the throats of men and women, the old and the young, Christians and Turks, anyone that had a human face fell victim to their [that is, the soldiers'] fury. The noise of the massacre, smashed doors, ruined houses, the sounds of shots and of the cleaning of swords, the shrieks of women, father and son one on top of the other (on the same pile of bodies), a daughter being raped on the cadaver of her mother, the smoke from the burnt clothes of the dead, the smell of blood, the groans of the wounded, the shouts of the victors who were quarrelling about the loot taken from a dying victim, angry soldiers who redoubled their blows the more their victim cried out in order

to finally sink, satiated by blood and gold, without further feeling, on top of a heap of dead.<sup>2</sup>

Once the sack of the town was over, the killing did not stop there. Over a three-day period, from 8 to 10 March, between 2,400 and 3,000 prisoners were marched to a beach a little over a kilometre south of the city and slaughtered.<sup>3</sup> On the second day, the soldiers were instructed not to waste ammunition, and to bayonet to death their victims.<sup>4</sup> The troops, it seems, only reluctantly obeyed the order – ‘extreme repugnance’ is the phrase used by one witness – but obey they did.<sup>5</sup>

\* \* \*

Most historians of the Revolutionary and Napoleonic Wars consider this type of massacre to be an aberration. One historian has recently argued, for example, that the two regions most renowned for their extreme violence, the Vendée and Spain, ‘are noteworthy because their atrocities were not typical of warfare in the period’.<sup>6</sup> The observation is shared by a French specialist of the civil war in the Vendée who believes that during the fighting there the ‘normal rules of war disappeared’ for some political and military authorities as well as for soldiers and rebels.<sup>7</sup> There appears to be a commonly held view that, with few exceptions, the wars were relatively civilized and that there is ‘little evidence that soldiers attacked civilians’.<sup>8</sup> But this is certainly not the impression one gets from a reading of the memoirs, journals and letters of the period. It is clear from the sources that massacres were not only widespread, but that they were an integral and possibly an accepted part of eighteenth-century warfare.

Most of what we know about Jaffa, and about massacres and atrocities in general,<sup>9</sup> is almost entirely due to the accounts found in memoirs, journals and letters, not entirely reliable and often considered by historians to be less than truthful. Memoirists in particular weave oral folktales into their anecdotes, and they distort and fictionalize events.<sup>10</sup> This chapter is not, however, particularly concerned with the accuracy or inaccuracy of specific atrocity stories, nor is it an attempt to categorize and explain the different types of massacres committed during the wars. Rather, it is an attempt to understand, from the French perspective, the manner in which massacres and atrocities were recollected and portrayed, as well as the reasons put forward by veterans to justify them. It also explores the reasons why veterans felt it necessary to mention particular atrocities at all, often many years after the event, and why they did so in a medium that was not always meant for public consumption, that is through private writings that took the form of memoirs and diaries. By focusing on the types of stories that are told, some light is thrown on the mechanisms behind the killings and the state of mind of the men who ordered and committed them.

## **The Frequency of Massacre during the Revolutionary and Napoleonic Wars**

The sacking of towns, during which soldiers committed murder and rape in what is often described as an uncontrolled ‘frenzy’, was part and parcel of eighteenth-century warfare.<sup>11</sup> It had indeed been that way for many centuries, although there is surprisingly little literature on the subject.<sup>12</sup> It was based on an unspoken understanding, namely, that the troops would be rewarded for the hardships, and often the lack of pay, they had endured during a campaign by being given possession of the town they were laying siege to. Jaffa therefore conforms in many respects to the sacking of countless numbers of towns in the seventeenth, eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries. And some were carried out on a vast scale, such as the sack of Magdeburg by Imperial troops in May 1631, which supposedly resulted in about twenty thousand deaths; or the fall of Warsaw in November 1794 to Russian troops, which reportedly resulted in between twelve and twenty thousand deaths in the space of a few hours;<sup>13</sup> the French storming of Tarragona in June 1811, which resulted in the deaths of around fifteen thousand civilians;<sup>14</sup> or the British capture of the Spanish city of San Sebastián in 1812, which saw half the population killed.<sup>15</sup>

But this is only part of the picture. Massacres and atrocities took place on a large scale outside of the sacking of towns when, for example, villages were occupied and looted by troops on the hunt for provisions,<sup>16</sup> or simply in reprisal against casualties incurred by local rebels. And those are just the massacres committed by armed troops against non-combatants. Without wanting to go into a taxonomy of massacre for the period, there is little in common, except the end result, between the execution (by guillotine and shooting) of five hundred-odd men and women who had fought with the British against French Republican forces in Guadeloupe in December 1794;<sup>17</sup> the burning alive of three thousand wounded Austrian soldiers in the village of Ebersberg in Germany in 1809 by troops of the Grande Armée;<sup>18</sup> and the massacre of around 320 French men, women and children in Valencia in 1808 by a small band of men led by a friar called Baltasar Calvo.<sup>19</sup>

Each massacre, in other words, is surrounded by a particular set of circumstances, and the perpetrators are driven by different reasons that have to do with the place and timing of the killings. Some of the most notorious massacres committed during the wars were carried out by republican troops in the Vendée – the so-called ‘infernal columns’ – that left a swathe of destruction as they marched through the French countryside.<sup>20</sup> But a similar tactic was used in southern Italy, if on a smaller scale, where in the summer of 1806 the French army killed hundreds if not thousands of locals and devastated dozens of villages in an attempt to wipe out local resistance.<sup>21</sup>

In these instances, the order to kill came from above, in this case, the general on the ground, but Napoleon was also known to urge the eradication of villages which resisted.<sup>22</sup> These brutal and openly public killings served a purpose – to reduce areas of resistance and to strike fear into the hearts of neighbouring populations in the hope that opposition would melt away. This did indeed occur on occasion. After the village of Longobucco in Calabria, for example, was pitilessly sacked, the neighbouring town of Bochigliero opened its doors without resistance.<sup>23</sup> More often than not, however, the harsh repression instigated against local populations was justified by the fact that the inhabitants had resisted or that they had committed atrocities against the occupying army. One often comes across accounts in the memoirs of comrades ambushed and killed by rebels, their bodies violated, as a justification for the killings that ensued. ‘Murdered [French] prisoners’, wrote an Italian officer serving in the Grande Armée in Spain, ‘were found torn to pieces with the most inhuman cruelty, their hearts, bowels, and brains gorged out, their private members stuffed into their mouths ... there was no form of cruelty that the insurgents did not perpetrate against our men who fell into their hands, even when they were already dying.’<sup>24</sup> Massacre as reprisal.

Other memoirists attempted to explain the excessive brutality with which resistance was put down by the fact that the locals had been ‘worked up into a religious frenzy’ by priests and monks who had convinced their people that they were fighting the forces of Satan, that is, the French.<sup>25</sup> Priests were classically described as holding bibles in one hand and weapons in the other.<sup>26</sup> Captain François entered the town of Manzaneres in Spain in June 1808 to find that over twelve hundred sick and wounded left behind had been killed by the inhabitants of the town and the neighbouring villages and their bodies cut into pieces and dispersed around the town and the surrounding fields. They were told by a number of Spanish that priests had counselled the inhabitants to commit the crimes. ‘One word from those ghosts [that is, the priests] with which the country is infested and all sorts of cruelties are committed by the people towards their enemies.’<sup>27</sup>

Of course, there is some truth in all of this, as the clergy often did play a role in stirring up if not leading the revolt against the French, but what is important is how those who resisted occupation were portrayed. Any form of violent resistance immediately led to those people being categorized as enemies of the Revolution, and as either counter-revolutionary and/or in the pay of the enemy. If rebels were anti-revolutionary, then the brutal suppression of regional populations in revolt was justified by that fact alone. Indeed, there appears to have been a concerted effort to portray some massacres not as the result of French repression but rather as an episode, difficult but necessary, on the road to bringing the Revolution to the peoples of Europe.<sup>28</sup>

## Recalling Massacres

If references to massacre, murder and rape are common enough throughout the contemporary sources, as a rule veterans tend to limit themselves to describing in the broadest possible terms the circumstances surrounding a particular atrocity. The memoirs dealing with the Spanish campaign, for example, are replete with (generally brief) descriptions of what Spanish guerrillas, invariably dubbed 'brigands', did to captured French soldiers – tongues torn out, ears and noses cut off, eyes and nails plucked out, captives slowly burnt alive, genitalia stuffed in men's mouths, victims sawn in half, limbs nailed to trees<sup>29</sup> – although there is far less detail when the French describe how they were given orders to sack villages and to spare no-one. François Lavaux recalled how 'We succeeded in entering the village [...]. We burnt [it down] and killed everyone we found there'.<sup>30</sup> Joseph de Naylies mentions, almost in passing, that two Spanish villages were burnt to the ground and hundreds of their inhabitants killed.<sup>31</sup> Charles-Pierre-Lubin Griois refers to the sacking of the town of Corigliano in Calabria in which 'soldiers smashed in doors, pillaged houses, killed and threw people out the windows, and the cries of the men who were being pursued and the women who were being raped was mixed with the noise of shots being fired from all sides'.<sup>32</sup>

The interesting point about these descriptions – any number of examples could be given – is that the act of recalling past campaigns and the horrors that went with them almost never equated to an individual admittance of having taken part in massacres, atrocities or rape. One veteran insisted, after talking about the frenzied killing of the inhabitants of a southern Italian town, that 'he had never killed anyone in that manner'.<sup>33</sup> Indeed, there are few direct references to killing in memoirs of the period, even in the course of battle.<sup>34</sup> This may have been a question of guilt and shame on the part of some, or it may have been because massacres and atrocities were such a common feature of eighteenth- and early nineteenth-century warfare, and were therefore so accepted, that they had to be particularly horrific to merit a mention at all. To cite one memoirist, 'If I were to list all the villages that we pillaged and burnt, I would never finish'.<sup>35</sup> Propriety no doubt played a role here too. Joseph de Naylies, a veteran of the Spanish campaign whose memoirs touch on the horrors committed by both sides in the conflict, nevertheless refused at one point to enter into the details of the exactions committed by some Spanish peasant women against the body of a French officer.<sup>36</sup>

Evident too is the difficulty many veterans experienced in writing about what they had witnessed.<sup>37</sup> General Bigarré served in Saint-Domingue in 1792. Writing about his experiences almost four decades later, he admitted being witness to an 'infinity of horrors' whose memory still afflicted him.<sup>38</sup> General Lejeune, who was captured by the *guerrilla* in Spain in 1810 and who witnessed the brutal killing of three French

prisoners in front of him, was still haunted thirty-five years later by the noise of sabres hacking into their heads and shoulders, '[it] has not ceased to reverberate in my ears and still makes me shudder with horror'.<sup>39</sup> Colonel Jean Trefcon described the retreat from Oporto in Portugal in 1809: 'We were obliged to abandon our artillery and the baggage train. The wounded, the women and children had to stay behind and were pitilessly murdered by the Spanish less than two minutes later, and God knows with what refined cruelty. It still makes me shudder.'<sup>40</sup>

One can assume that, for some at least, the act of writing, the translation of their experiences and emotions into some kind of comprehensible account, was a personal catharsis that may have helped them to exorcize their fears and anxieties.<sup>41</sup> This was the case for Sergeant Bourgogne, who declared in his memoirs that 'I should not, out of respect for the human race, write about all the scenes of horror, but I have made it a point of honour to describe all that I saw. It would be impossible for me to do otherwise, and as all of this would unsettle my mind, it seems to me that once I have put them on paper, I will no longer think of them.'<sup>42</sup> Others simply preferred silence, being unable or unwilling to dwell at any length on their experiences, or perhaps simply unable to put them into words. It is not uncommon therefore to find explanations such as 'It is impossible to give an account of all the atrocities to which they [he is referring to the Spanish] had resorted to in those mountains. It would make the hardest tremble. I would rather just leave it at that.'<sup>43</sup> 'I won't go into the details of the terrible event,' wrote one civilian witness of the sack of Soissons by Russian troops in 1814: 'I will simply say that the massacre of our poor soldiers and the pillage of the town lasted for a full hour.'<sup>44</sup>

## Mutilation and Atrocities

Writing as catharsis can only go so far and never entirely dissipates the trauma involved in witnessing massacres and atrocities. In Spain, captured rebels and soldiers alike were invariably tortured to death and their bodies mutilated. It is difficult to explain this particular 'logic of violence' and why the humiliation of the body was so widely practiced. One can speculate whether there was a hierarchy of cruelty, that is, whether the desecration of a particular body part was considered to be more frightful than another, whether some tortures were considered worse than others, or whether the types of mutilations carried out may have been tied to local custom and practices, not to mention religious culture as well as political and socio-economic factors. Let me give a few examples before talking about possible explanations.

The Grande Armée in Spain was composed of, among others, three Italian divisions. In one instance, Piedmontese troops exacted vengeance against monks caught after the capture of St Jacques of Compos-



tella, accusing them of inciting the people against them. It has to be said that French prisoners had been tortured and mutilated during the siege. On capturing two monks, described as 'among the fattest', the Piedmontese tied them back to back against a young oak which was then used as a skewer with which they were placed over a fire and roasted alive. The Italians called it an *auto-da-fé à la piémontaise*.<sup>45</sup> General Renée was captured in the gorges of Sierra Morena with his wife and child. He was supposedly sawn in half in front of his wife, who was first 'dishonoured' in front of him, after which the child was sawn in half in front of the mother before she too endured the same fate.<sup>46</sup> There were even reports of cannibalism. In one particular incident, ten Polish prisoners were found by the French after they had taken the town of Strongoli in Calabria in July 1806. According to the surviving Poles, each day one prisoner was taken to the town square, tortured to death, cut up and fed to the remaining prisoners.<sup>47</sup> On another occasion, a somewhat more symbolic form of cannibalism occurred in the village of Acri in Calabria when a brigand chief by the name of Spaccapitta is supposed to have roasted a number of pro-French officials in the public square. He is said to have taken a piece of bread and placed it on the body of one of the victims and then, to the delight of the assembled crowd, eaten it.<sup>48</sup>

In the past, ritualistic killings that involved acts of mutilation, disembowelling, and cannibalism have been interpreted as having religious overtones, so that if tongues were torn out it was an attempt to render mute the blasphemer, if hands and limbs were cut off it was an attempt to render inactive the desecrator, or if genitalia were cut off it was because the victim was perceived as being sexually aberrant.<sup>49</sup> Removal of the offending part is thus seen to be a symbolic purging of the (social) body.<sup>50</sup> The extent to which monks and priests were an integral if not inspirational part of the *guerrilla* in Spain lends some weight to the possibility that the repertory of atrocities committed by the Spanish against members of the Grande Armée could have been inspired by either the clergy or the Bible; however, this approach is rather restrictive and does not take into account local traditions of popular folk justice (intended to purify local communities and humiliate the enemy), or the extent to which these atrocities often involved public performances. It is, moreover, highly unlikely that the atrocities carried out by the French revolutionary and imperial armies, staunchly republican and secular, can be interpreted in this manner. One should not read too much into the killing by bayonet of fifty monks cornered in a church in Spain.<sup>51</sup> There was probably nothing symbolic or metaphorical about that incident; the monks were simply killed where they were found, no doubt held responsible, as we have seen, for inspiring the neighbouring villages to revolt.

Nor does this explain the extreme violence perpetrated by both regular soldiers and armed insurgents in certain theatres of war. In some respects, all torture and mutilation are public acts. They are performed in front of a group of witnesses (even if only other perpetrators), or the

corpse or body part is subsequently exposed in a public space, either attached to or hung from a tree, placed along the roadside, or displayed in a public square. Indeed, as we have seen in the case of the victims tortured in the village of Aciri in Calabria, it occurred in the public square – the centre of all cultural and economic activity – in front of an approving crowd.<sup>52</sup> In some instances, the victims were left with a warning note or a placard was hung around their necks.<sup>53</sup> This type of ‘public presentational torture’ was meant as a warning to those that might contemplate collaboration with the enemy, or possibly to communicate to the enemy the extraordinary lengths they were prepared to go to prosecute the war to a successful conclusion.<sup>54</sup> In these instances, the mutilated body was meant to elicit shock and horror and serve as a warning.

## The Plight of Women

Another theme present among accounts of the wars is the excesses committed against women.<sup>55</sup> It was not unusual for men even outside of the ‘normal’ atrocities that took place during the storming of towns and the systematized marauding of villages to assault women, including pre-pubescent girls. Some of the accounts found in the memoirs of the period were no doubt meant to titillate or to strike horror and loathing into the reader,<sup>56</sup> and hence were possibly exaggerated, but there is no doubt that assaults took place with monotonous regularity (although there is no evidence that rape was carried out in any systematic way, or indeed that it was used by the French imperial regime as a tool of terror to subdue recalcitrant populations). Indeed, it appears to have been so prevalent during this period that it was probably considered a ‘right of conquest’, a ‘reward’ of sorts, and should thus be considered a random act of (sexual) violence. This sort of behaviour was sometimes endorsed by the army. Some of the ditties distributed and sung by soldiers, for example, were virtual invitations to rape.<sup>57</sup> Rape nevertheless underlined the powerlessness of the communities concerned and the superiority, both physical and cultural, of the conqueror. The following passage from an anonymous book on the first Italian campaign gives an indication of just how widespread the practice was: ‘Debauchery is the epidemic evil of all armies. In that of Buonaparté, it was carried to excess. Almost every honest family has had to lament its dishonour. Age, state, condition, education, nobility, nothing guarantees the honour of the sex from the lust of the soldier. Altars, even sanctuaries, have not sheltered those who have devoted their lives to God. The examples have been frequent and horrible. I have even seen a number of these cannibals cruelly massacre those that had been abducted and dishonoured’.<sup>58</sup>

Similarly, the sack of Jaffa led to a ‘traffic of young women’ being exchanged for other objects looted in the town. When fighting broke out over them, Napoleon ordered his men to bring all the women back

to town, 'on pain of a severe punishment', where they were promptly executed by a company of chasseurs.<sup>59</sup> While campaigning in Portugal, Pierre Guingret described how women of all classes were abducted, bought and sold, or exchanged during card games for luxury items. Other, less fortunate women were obliged to 'satisfy the most unbridled passions' in order to avoid death, but were often killed anyway.<sup>60</sup> Sergeant Lavaux writes of several soldiers entering a convent in Spain where an unspecified number of nuns were raped and murdered; the whole incident is described in a few lines.<sup>61</sup> In a remarkably frank admission, Esprit Castellane, an officer of the general staff, described entering a house after the storming of Burgos in Spain to find a woman 'in the midst of fifty soldiers. Each one was waiting his turn'.<sup>62</sup> He says he went on to save her.

If rape committed by others was often described, it was much more frequent for officers to portray themselves as helping defenceless women, or taking steps to limit excesses and even to prevent massacres being committed. Jean Trefcon entered the Spanish town of Medina del Rio Secco shortly after it was stormed by the French and witnessed 'revolting scenes that he could not prevent because of the small number of men' he had with him.<sup>63</sup> He nevertheless managed to save a 'young person' who, without his intervention, would invariably have been raped. Georges Bangofsky describes fighting off soldiers in a house in order to protect a woman and her daughters.<sup>64</sup> Joseph de Naylies intervened to protect a young woman in Portugal who was about to become the victim of a number of drunken soldiers.<sup>65</sup> Charles-Pierre Griois supposedly intervened to prevent a group of nuns from being raped by Polish soldiers in Corigliano.<sup>66</sup>

These anecdotes are no doubt meant to offset the accounts of rape and murder with which they are often interspersed, as though officers were pointing the finger at the lower ranks, underlining just how horrible war was but at the same time intimating that this particular type of atrocity was common among the lower orders; it was not the kind of thing that a gentleman did. Captain Routier admitted that saving one peasant woman amid the general carnage that was taking place around him 'fed his heart for a long time with a sweet satisfaction', as though the one good deed helped to offset the atrocities he had been witness to.<sup>67</sup>

## **Some Preliminary Conclusions**

This chapter has focused on the French perspective, even though massacres cut across national armies. We know that they often occurred as a result of enforced hardships and privations; that they sometimes involved the loss of comrades before the killings took place; that they were often characterized by a 'frenzied' killing of the inhabitants without distinction of age or sex; that they often involved communities that

had risen in revolt against an army of occupation; that they generally involved a certain cultural disdain for the victims in question; that they demonstrated a certain lack of control by officers over the troops; and that they were an accepted if not expected part of the conduct of the soldier. It is safe to say there was not a region or country invaded by the French in which massacres did not occur, although they were more frequent in some areas than in others.

If this chapter is in part a reflection on the nature of (revolutionary and Napoleonic) warfare, it is also one from the perspective of the veteran, who sometimes assumes the voice of the perpetrator, consequently describing the horrors committed against others, combatants and non-combatants alike, but who more often than not assumes the voice of the victim, describing the horrors inflicted on French troops by rebels resisting the invading armies. It is possible that in doing so, French veterans were underlining just how difficult it was to campaign in these countries and the adversities they faced in bringing the benefits of the Revolution to the 'ignorant' peoples of Europe. A passage in the memoirs of Denis Charles Parquin underlined how thankful some Spaniards were, despite the horrors the French had brought in their wake, for putting an end to the Inquisition.<sup>68</sup> The message is clear; even when suffering was incurred the end goal was a noble one. If some veterans dwelt now and then on the crimes committed by their own side it served to underscore the horror of war. What is clear is that many had difficulty recalling what they had lived through even if there does not appear to have been any shame involved in recounting what they had witnessed. What is also clear is that the hatred in which the French were held by many occupied peoples and the narratives of the latter surrounding massacres and atrocities are entirely different from those of the French, that is, massacres are a much more contested history than is portrayed here. But that is an altogether different study.

## Notes

1. Pierre-Jean-Baptiste Millet, *Souvenirs de la campagne d'Egypte* (1798–1801) (Paris, 1903), 82; Charles François, *Journal du capitaine François* (Paris, 2003), 275 (7 March 1799).
2. Etienne-Louis Malus de Mitry, *L'Agenda de Malus. Souvenirs de l'expédition d'Egypte, 1798–1801* (Paris, 1892), 135–36.
3. According to Detroye, the number massacred over the three days came to 2,441 (S[ervice] H[istorique de l']A[rmée de] T[erre], *Mémoires et Reconnaissances*, *Journal de Detroye*, M1 527, f. 54 (20 ventôse an VII)). Bonaparte boasted of four thousand executions in a letter to the Directory (*Correspondance de Napoléon I*, 32 vols. (Paris, 1858–1870), vol. 5, n. 4035 (13 March 1798)).
4. Cited in Clément de La Jonquière, *L'Expédition d'Egypte*, 5 vols. (Paris, 1899–1907), iv. 271–72; Vigo-Roussillon, *Journal*, 83.
5. Jaques-François Miot, *Mémoires pour servir à l'histoire des expéditions en Egypte et en Syrie pendant les années VI, VII et VIII de la République française* (Paris, 1814), 145–48.

6. Howard Brown, 'Napoleon Bonaparte, Political Prodigy', *History Compass*, 5 (2007), 1392.
7. Jean-Clément Martin, *Violence et Révolution. Essai sur la naissance d'un mythe national* (Paris, 2006), 205.
8. Peter Browning, *The Changing Nature of Warfare: The Development of Land Warfare from 1792 to 1945* (Cambridge, 2002), 47.
9. For the purposes of this essay, an atrocity is characterized by the exactions committed against the victim's body, living or dead, such as torture or the hacking off of body parts, by the perpetrator. Rape also falls within this category.
10. On this point see David Hopkin, *Soldier and Peasant in French Popular Culture, 1766–1870* (Suffolk, 2003), 100; and idem., 'Storytelling, Fairytales and Autobiography: Some Observations on Eighteenth- and Nineteenth-century French Soldiers' and Sailors' Memoirs', *Social History*, 29 (2004), 186–98, which traces the influence of oral storytelling on French military and naval memoirs.
11. See, for example, Franco della Peruta, 'War and Society in Napoleonic Italy: The Armies of the Kingdom of Italy at Home and Abroad', in John Davis and Paul Ginsborg (eds), *Society and Politics in the Age of the Risorgimento. Essays in Honour of Denis Mack Smith* (Cambridge, 1991), 43.
12. For an earlier period, one can consult Elena Benzoni, 'Les sacs des villes à l'époque des guerres d'Italie (1494–1530): les contemporains face au massacre', in David El Kenz (ed.), *Le massacre, objet d'histoire* (Paris, 2005), 157–70.
13. Adam Zamoyski, *Holy Madness. Romantics, Patriots and Revolutionaries, 1776–1871* (London, 1999), 93; idem., *The Last King of Poland* (London, 1992), 429–30.
14. Rothenberg, 'The Age of Napoleon', 93.
15. Not to mention the British storming of the Spanish cities of Ciudad Rodrigo and Badajoz. See Charles Esdaile, *The Peninsular War: A New History* (London, 2002), 386–87; Jack A. Meyer, 'Wellington and the Sack of Badajoz: A "Beastly Mutiny" or a Deliberate Policy?', *Proceedings of the Consortium on Revolutionary Europe, 1750–1850* (1991), 251–57; Pat Hayward (ed.), *Surgeon Henry's Trifles: Events of a Military Life* (London, 1970), 43–44; Antony Brett-James (ed.), *Edward Costello. The Peninsular and Waterloo Campaigns* (London, 1967), 97–98; Louis-Gabriel Suchet, *Memoirs of the War in Spain, from 1808 to 1814*, 2 vols. (London, 1829), ii: 99–105.
16. A common occurrence during the wars and which often led to clashes and violence between civilians and the military. On this point see, T.C.W. Blanning, 'Liberation or Occupation? Theory and Practice in the French Revolutionaries' Treatment of Civilians outside France', in Mark Grimsely and Clifford J. Rogers (eds), *Civilians in the Path of War* (Lincoln, 2002), 111–35; and idem., *The French Revolution in Germany: Occupation and Resistance in the Rhineland, 1792–1802* (Oxford, 1983), 83–98.
17. Laurent Dubois, *A Colony of Citizens: Revolution and Slave Emancipation in the French Caribbean, 1787–1804* (Williamsburg, Va., 2004), 201.
18. Reported in Georges Bangofsky, 'Les Etapes de Georges Bangofsky, officier lorrain. Extraits de son journal de campagnes (1797–1815)', *Mémoires de l'Académie de Stanislas* (1905), ii.291.
19. Esdaile, *Fighting Napoleon*, 64. It seems that Calvo incited the crowd in order to further his own political ambitions. He was refused a position on the local Junta; the massacre was a means of persuading the authorities to change their minds. An English account of this event is in Enos Bronson (ed.), *Select Reviews of Literature, and Spirit of Foreign Magazines* (Philadelphia, 1812), ii.262–63.
20. The literature on the Vendée is too large to cite extensively here. One can consult: Jean-Clément Martin, *La Vendée et la France* (Paris, 1986).
21. Report by Berthier in S[ervice] H[istorique de l']A[rmée de] Terre, Correspondence, Armée de Naples, carton C-5, 4, 15 August 1806. See also Léon-Michel Routier, *Récits d'un soldat de la République et de l'Empire* (Paris, 2004), 87; Milton Finley, *The Most Monstrous of Wars: The Napoleonic Guerrilla War in Southern Italy, 1806–1811* (Columbia, S.C., 1994), 64–65; David A. Bell, *The First Total War: Napoleon's Europe and the Birth of Warfare as We Know It* (Boston, 2007), 273–74.

22. Maximilien Vox, *Correspondance de Napoléon. Six cents Lettres de Travail (1806–1810)* (Paris, 1943), 312–14 (7 February 1806).
23. Duret de Tavel, *Séjour d'un officier français en Calabre* (Rouen, 1820), 173–76.
24. Cited in della Peruta, 'War and Society in Napoleonic Italy', 43.
25. SHAT, Corr. Armée de Naples, carton C-5, 4.
26. The image dominated portrayals of the Spanish clergy. Examples can be found in della Peruta, 'War and Society in Napoleonic Italy', 40.
27. François, *Journal*, 570.
28. Annie Duprat, 'La construction de la mémoire par les gravures: Carle Vernet et les *Tableaux historiques des campagnes d'Italie*', in Jean-Paul Barbe and Roland Bernecker (eds), *Les intellectuels européens et la campagne d'Italie, 1796–1798* (Münster, 1999), 202–203.
29. Lavaux, *Mémoires de Campagne*, 137, 150–51; François, *Journal*, 567, 569.
30. Lavaux, *Mémoires de Campagnes*, 151, 152–55.
31. Naylies, *Mémoires sur la guerre d'Espagne*, 64–65.
32. Charles-Pierre-Lubin Griois, *Mémoires du général Griois, 1792–1822*, 2 vols. (Paris, 1909), i:326–27.
33. Routier, *Récits d'un soldat*, 87.
34. The same phenomenon has been remarked upon in First World War narratives (Hynes, *The Soldier's Tale*, 66). There are, however, exceptions to the rule. Captain François freely admits to killing and wounding enemy soldiers and peasants (*Journal*, 567, 568, 572).
35. Sergeant Lavaux, *Mémoires de Campagne* (Paris, 2004), 159.
36. Naylies, *Mémoires sur la guerre d'Espagne*, 94.
37. One can note a similar phenomenon with battlefield experiences in Alan Forrest, *Napoleon's Men. The Soldiers of the Revolution and Empire* (London, 2002), 112–17.
38. Auguste-Julien Bigarré, *Mémoires du Général Bigarré, 1775–1813* (Paris, 2002), 42. He went on to recount one incident in which two black rebels were caught by a black 'general', Couacou, aligned with the French, who pulled out their teeth and eyes, had them tarred, impaled with stakes and then set alight.
39. Louis-François Lejeune, *Mémoires du général Lejeune, 1792–1813* (Paris, 2001), 329.
40. Toussaint-Jean Trefcon, *Carnets de campagne du colonel Trefcon, 1793–1815* (Paris, 1914), 71.
41. Hynes, *The Soldier's Tale*, 16; Montroussier, *Ethique et commandement*, 147.
42. Bourgogne, *Mémoires*, 84.
43. Lavaux, *Mémoires de Campagnes*, 155.
44. Louise B. de Saint-Léon, *Mémoires et souvenirs de Charles de Pougens* (Paris, 1834), 262.
45. Thirion, *Souvenirs militaires*, 40.
46. François, *Journal*, 567.
47. Finley, *Most Monstrous of Wars*, 52–53.
48. Cited in Finley, *Most Monstrous of Wars*, 49.
49. Natalie Zemon Davis, 'The Rites of Violence: Religious Riot in Sixteenth-Century France', *Past and Present*, 59 (1973), 51–91. In an analysis of a massacre which took place at Machecoul in 1793, Jean-Clément Martin, *Révolution et contre-révolution en France de 1789 à 1995* (Rennes, 1996), 41, 47–50, looks at how peasants carried out 'vengeance fantasies' on the bodies of their victims. See also Edward J. Woell, *Small-Town Martyrs and Murderers: Religious Revolution and Counterrevolution in Western France, 1774–1914* (Milwaukee, Wis., 2006), 145–86. It is also possible that the infamous 'noyades' (drownings) that took place in the Loire, at Nantes, Angers and Saumur, can be interpreted in semi-religious terms; there is an obvious connection between water and the cleansing of the body, and revolutionary zealots used the metaphor with horrific consequences (Woell, *Small-Town Martyrs and Murderers*, 161).
50. Davis, 'Rites of Violence', 57–65.
51. Jean Duhut to his father, 16 July 1808, cited in Forrest, *Napoleon's Men*, 93.

52. An element underscored by Michel Foucault, *Discipline and Punish. The Birth of the Prison* (Harmondsworth, 1979), 59–60. See also Michael Humphrey, *The Politics of Atrocity and Reconciliation: From Terror to Trauma* (London, 2002), 1–10, 91–104.
53. If Goya's engravings on the subject are to be believed. On Goya see Robert Hughes, *Goya* (London, 2003), 261–319.
54. The phrase is from Daniel Rothenberg, "What We Have Seen Has Been Terrible". Public Presentational Torture and the Communicative Logic of State Terror', *Albany Law Review*, 67 (2003–2004), 465–99, although he examines torture as an element in contemporary governmental policy. A similar experience can be found in the public lynchings that took place in the United States, a kind of 'racial terrorism'. On this point see Christine Harold and Kevin Michael DeLuca, 'Behold the Corpse: Violent Images and the Case of Emmet Till', *Rhetoric & Public Affairs*, 8 (2005), 263–86; and Kirk W. Fuoss, 'Lynching Performances, Theatres of Violence', *Text and Performance Quarterly*, 19 (1999), 1–27.
55. There are no figures, and indeed no studies on the numbers of women that may have been raped during the wars. On legal attitudes towards rape in France at the end of the eighteenth century, see Georges Vigarello, *A History of Rape: Sexual Violence in France from the 16th to the 20th Century* (Malden, Mass., 2001), 87–102.
56. Some German examples are cited in Blanning, *The French Revolution in Germany*, 91, n. 27, and 98.
57. Michael J. Hughes, 'Making Frenchmen into Warriors: Martial Masculinity in Napoleonic France', in Christopher E. Forth and Bernard Taithe (eds), *French Masculinities: History, Culture and Politics* (Basingstoke, 2007), 62; and idem., "'Vive la Republique, Vive l'Empereur!': Military Culture and Motivation in the Armies of Napoleon, 1803–1808' (Ph.D. thesis, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, 2005), 229–31.
58. *Examen de la campagne de Buonaparte en Italie par un témoin oculaire* (Paris, 1814), 82–83.
59. Bernoyer, *Avec Bonaparte en Egypte* (19 April 1799), 147–48. We do not know how many were killed on this occasion.
60. Pierre Guingret, *Relation historique et militaire de la campagne de Portugal sous le maréchal Masséna* (Limoges, 1817), 123–27. The only explanation he could give for this was that there were a few 'wretches' (*misérables*) drawn by lot that had been introduced into the ranks from towns.
61. Lavaux, *Mémoires de Campagnes*, 152–53.
62. Esprit Victor Elisabeth Boniface Castellane, *Journal du maréchal Castellane, 1804–1862*, 5 vols. (Paris, 1895–1897), iv:33.
63. Trefcon, *Carnets de campagne*, 50.
64. Georges Bangofsky, 'Les Étapes de Georges Bangofsky, officier lorrain. Extraits de son journal de campagnes (1797–1815)', *Mémoires de l'Académie de Stanislas* (1905), ii.17.
65. Joseph-Jacques de Naylies, *Mémoires sur la guerre d'Espagne, pendant les années 1808, 1809, 1810 et 1811* (Paris, 1817), 99–100.
66. Griois, *Mémoires*, i.327. Other examples can be found in Lejeune, *Mémoires*, 144 and 146–47; and Routier, *Récits d'un soldat*, 87–88.
67. Routier, *Récits d'un soldat*, 88.
68. Denis Charles Parquin, *Souvenirs de commandant Parquin* (Paris, 2003), 257.