

## JÉRÔME DUQUESNOY THE YOUNGER: TWO STUDIES

The first article reprinted here was originally published in French in Magnus Hirschfeld's *Jahrbuch für sexuelle Zwischenstufen*, Jahrgang II, 1900. The author, Georges Eekhoud, was born in Anvers, Belgium, in 1854, and by the turn of the century was one of Belgium's most prominent writers, having produced poetry, popular naturalistic novels about working class life in Antwerp and rural life in the Campine, literary essays and art criticism. He had also edited literary magazines, been appointed professor of literature in Brussels, and had described himself as "le plus flamant" writer in French. This reputation was born out by the explicitness with which his work dealt with "sexual questions", including homosexual relations, the subject of his 1899 novel *Escal-Vigor*—for which in 1900 he was tried (and acquitted) on the charge of corrupting public morals—and which figure also in the stories in *Le Cycle Patibulaire*. The question of his own sexuality is less clear. In 1909 the German sexologist Iwan Bloch included Eekhoud's name in a list of prominent homosexuals, an identification against which Eekhoud strongly protested. However, a recent French critic suggests this denial was a tactical maneuver, like Whitman's denial of his homosexuality to Symonds, and remarks that Eekhoud's readers have always found that he dealt with homosexuality not with 'disinterested generosity' but with a 'profound sensibility'. Eekhoud died in Brussels in 1927.<sup>1</sup>

When Eekhoud wrote his article, Jérôme Duquesnoy's reputation had been suppressed, no less so than today. The sculptor had been eclipsed by his brother, François, also a sculptor, and his artist father, Jérôme Duquesnoy the Elder, though he was no less talented than either. It is Eekhoud's thesis that this was due to the sodomy charges on which Jérôme was convicted and executed. The lack of recognition, he believed, was due to his "crimes" and was not a reflection of the quality of his work. With the *Jahrbuch* as his forum, Eekhoud

proposed to resurrect his reputation before a sympathetic audience.

By 1900, the intentions behind the word "homosexuality", influenced as they were by the medical discussion, were different from the understanding given to the word "sodomy" in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. It was this understanding of, and reaction to, sodomy that shaped the trial of Duquesnoy, and it is important to understand the distinctions if we are to understand the strategy of Eekhoud's defense.

In the 17th and 18th centuries, sodomy was understood as specific acts, and not as a psychological category or identity. It referred to any acts that did not lead to procreation, including anal and oral sex, masturbation, bestiality—and could even be applied to sex between Christians and Saracens or Jews, the latter being regarded as less than human, making sex acts with them a form of bestiality. There is evidence to support the view that in the Low countries in this period specific sexual activities between adults and children were not treated differently than similar acts between adults.<sup>2</sup> Specifically, neither consent of the partners nor their ages seem to have been extenuating or aggravating circumstances in sodomy charges. By Hirschfeld's time, with the change to "homosexuality", and debate about "age of consent" laws, these factors could influence both attitudes and punishments. In the 17th and 18th centuries the punishments were very severe, and as in Duquesnoy's case often resulted in execution by barbaric means. It was, then, the acts themselves which were thought to be so horrific and threatening as to warrant maximum punishments.

Eekhoud makes a noble attempt to redeem Duquesnoy, but it is interesting to reflect on certain discrepancies in his article. It must be understood that in 1900 Duquesnoy still stood in disgrace. Though attitudes about sodomy were now converted into attitudes about homosexuality,

the courts and general populace were no less antipathetic. Eekhoud uses his opportunity in the *Jahrbuch* to present the artist's death as senseless and unjust, and his execution itself as a crime. While public hostility remained, punishments had become less severe, and Eekhoud was in a position to point up the relativity of attitudes and its consequence to human lives. The readers of the *Jahrbuch*, themselves very much still a persecuted minority, were exactly the audience needed for the process of redemption to begin. If Duquesnoy's death could be seen in a different light, and the onus removed, the reevaluation of his artistic career could also take place.

In order to accomplish this, Eekhoud uses certain facts which he either knew were incorrect, or did not bother to check. The court records were available in the Ghent archives, and in summary form in Brussels. He writes that the boys Duquesnoy was convicted of seducing were "two of his young pupils or apprentices, not children but adolescents."<sup>3</sup> In actuality, the trial records clearly show that Constant de Somere was 8, and Jacobus de Sterck was 11. Was this ignorance on Eekhoud's part, or was it a dissemblance directed toward public feelings, or more particularly to Hirschfeld and other readers of the *Jahrbuch*, who for political reasons disapproved of and condemned sexual acts, consenting or not, between men and young boys?

There is also dissembling as to the actual details of Duquesnoy's offences. Here again the records make it clear that the court went out of its way to accuse the artist of the worst possible deeds, that would necessarily carry the death penalty. Why the authorities wanted to prosecute him to the utmost—whether it had only to do with the attitudes about sodomy at the time, or whether Du-

quesnoy had incurred their disfavour in other ways, or that they hoped with such a famous person to show their own power and make an example of him—we can only speculate. The authorities used torture to extract statements, not uncommon, but they also refused the petitions of the sculptor's influential family, and his patron Bishop Triest, which was unusual. Although they had the option of life imprisonment, they went ahead with the execution. The details of the indictment are glossed over by Eekhoud, who merely quotes an earlier source which said that Duquesnoy was accused of "misusing two boys". In his desire to present his subject in the best possible light, did he omit certain facts that might have seemed repugnant to the *Jahrbuch's* readers, or perhaps Hirschfeld himself?

Within the last decade a thorough study of the trial record by the Belgian gay scholar Geert Debeuckelaere appeared in Flemish,<sup>4</sup> which remedies the omissions, and commissions, of Eekhoud, and also raises pertinent issues about the changing concepts of sodomy and paedophilia. His article is the second of those translated here.

The caveats about Eekhoud's glosses aside, his article is a courageous attempt to resurrect Duquesnoy. That a reassessment of Duquesnoy's reputation still has not occurred<sup>5</sup> suggests that the narrow attitudes of which Eekhoud complained are still with us today.

*Editors' Note:*

*The Eekhoud article was translated from the French by Leo Adamson; the Debeuckelaere article from Flemish by G.-J. Cobelens. The introduction was written by Joseph Geraci. Research assistance by D.H. Mader.*

**NOTES**

1. The "official" view of Eekhoud's career, which ignores the episode of *Escal-Vigor*, can be found in standard works such as the *Dictionnaire biographique des Sciences, des Lettres et des*

*Artes en Belgique* (Brussels: l'avenir, 1935), pp. 434-5. As an art critic, Eekhoud was the first to discuss the fascination the St. Sebastian image has for homosexual sensibility: see Wayne R. Dynes, *Homosexuality, a Research Guide* (New York: Gar-

land, 1987), entry 1600, p. 242. *Escal-Vigor* was first issued in Paris (Mercure de France, 1899), and has been reissued with an introduction by Jacques Brenner, which discusses its importance in French homosexual literature (Paris:

Persona, 1982). The novel has also appeared in English, both under its own title (Brussels: Gutenberg Press, 1909) and as *Strange Love* (New York: Panurge Press, 1930). The account of Eekhoud's controversy with Bloch, and Brenner's own assessment of Eekhoud's homosexuality, are found on pps. 10-11 of his introduction to the 1982 French edition.

2. For the history of the concept of sodomy, see the comprehensive study *The Pursuit of Sodomy: Male Homosexuality in Renaissance and Enlightenment Europe*, edited by Ken Gerard and Gert Hekma (New York: Haworth Press, 1989); in particular see

the essay "The Persecutions of Sodomites in Eighteenth Century Amsterdam: Changing Perceptions of Sodomy" by Theo van der Meer, pp. 263-310. Regarding the role of age and consent, see also van der Meer's *De Wesentlijke Sonde van Sodomie en Andere Vuyligheeden* (Amsterdam: Tabula, 1984).

3. The original French text reads, "deux de ses jeunes élèves ou apprentis, non des enfants mais des adolescents."

4. *Tijdschrift voor Homogeschiedenis* 1:5-22, 1984.

5. Recent studies are at least mentioning the "crime", as in Manfred Leithe-Jasper, *Renaissance Master Bronzes* (Washing-

ton, D.C.: Smithsonian Institute, 1986), p. 275, where the author acknowledges that a sculpture by Duquesnoy was not attributed to him "perhaps... in view of the scandalous circumstances" of his death. This is scarcely a reevaluation. Mention of Duquesnoy is also made in Herbert Keutner's *Sculpture-Renaissance to Rococo* (Greenwich, Ct.: New York Graphic Society, 1969), pp. 327-9. An illustration of the tomb of Bishop Triest, on which Duquesnoy was working at the time of his death, can be found there on page 328, illustration 205.

## A Distinguished 17th Century Uranian: Jérôme Duquesnoy: Flemish Sculptor

Georges Eekhoud

Jérôme Duquesnoy, born in Brussels in 1602, died in Ghent, 28 September 1654, under circumstances of exceptional atrocity, was one of the greatest sculptors of the 17th century, equal if not superior to his brother François Duquesnoy, whom vulgar critics, moved by that narrow-minded puritanism with which our own age is still cursed, feign to prefer because Jérôme admitted himself guilty of the so-called crime that led to the destruction of Sodom and Gomorrah.

Like his elder brother François, Jérôme was taught by their father, Jérôme Duquesnoy the Elder. In 1621, at the age of just 19 years, he joined his brother François in Rome, where the latter was studying with fervent enthusiasm the great masters of the Renaissance, and there acquired that harmony of form needed to round off his robust, hearty Barbançon<sup>1</sup> talent. Up until then the younger brother had been a simple apprentice in his father's workshop but, endowed with dauntless spirit and a taste for adventure, he set off full of ardour, intent on perfecting himself in his chosen profession, in which one of his immediate family had already excelled, and another promised to distinguish himself in turn. Guided by his brother's advice, he began by making copies of the masterpieces of Antiquity and the Renaissance. But soon he felt himself strong enough to try his own hand at original work, and at carving wood, ivory and marble, at the contours of flesh, at the play of muscles and joints, at the joy of motion, at the expressiveness of feminine beauty, but most of all at the innocent brightness and chubby gaucheness of putti. He was destined to equal and even to surpass his brother François, creator of the delightful Manneken Pis in Brussels,<sup>2</sup> so much so that there has often been confusion between their baby Jesuses, their little Saint John the Bap-

tists, their angels and their cupids.

Much as they were alike in their aptitudes and artistic tastes, and even in the conception and execution of their work, just as much, or so it seemed, did they differ in mood and character. Frequent quarrels arose between them. According to some biographers whose partiality is slightly suspect for reasons which I touched upon briefly as I was beginning, Jérôme's character was stormy, quick-tempered, envious and grasping. Legend even has it that finally, revolted by his bad morals, his brother drove him out, and that later on, to gain vengeance and also to appropriate his estate, the younger brother poisoned the elder. But there exists no evidence of such hatred nor of such a crime.

Whatever the reason, the two Duquesnoys parted some time after the visit to Rome by the celebrated Antwerp painter Anton van Dyck.<sup>3</sup> Rubens' favourite disciple struck up as good a friendship with Jérôme as with François. Their concern for grace and truth was pleasing to him, and he must have valued the talent in each. The details of their friendly relations would be of the greatest interest to us; sadly we know almost nothing about van Dyck's time in Rome. It is claimed that he hastened from the Eternal City shocked by the Flemish artistic colony's triviality and villainy. Everything—not least the nobility of their art itself, not to mention van Dyck's esteem—leads us to suppose that like the supreme aristocracy's future portraitist, the Duquesnoys were an exception in this world of drunks, thugs and low tricksters. Indeed, van Dyck painted his two friends: he shows François Duquesnoy holding in his hand an antique faun's head, while to Jérôme he gives as attribute the contemporary bust of a beautiful child.

The same lacuna which appears in van Dyck's biography occurs at this point in what has reached us concerning the life of the younger Duquesnoy. While the elder brother remained in Rome and entered friendships with Nicolas Poussin and Algardi and even shared their house, we lose all trace of the younger up to the point where we find him in Spain, where he has been summoned by Philip IV, who granted him his favour and showered him with commissions. But, once again, we do not know what events marked his life during this Spanish period.

Our sculptor returned from Madrid around 1641, and spent nine months living in Florence at the house of a compatriot, the Brussels goldsmith André Ghysels, when in 1642 news reached him of the serious illness of François, still in Rome. Jérôme hastened to his brother's side and, as the doctors had prescribed for the invalid a more temperate climate than that of Rome, the two brothers left together to return once more to the North. But at Leghorn they were obliged to stop: the invalid had a relapse, the fever had taken hold once more with renewed violence, the illness was getting worse, and three weeks later *Francesco il Fiammingo* succumbed in the arms of his younger brother and their friend Ghysels.

Jérôme longed to reach his home country, most of all at the time when he had lost that person who to him symbolised and embodied the best. So he busied himself gathering the deceased's works and effects and set off for the Low Countries by way of France.

He settled in Brussels, the fine city of his birth, and after some time spent in legal strife with his brother's other heirs, he obtained judgement in his favour: all the cartoons, drawings, castings, works in ivory, marble and polished wood in François' collections were made over to him as "material to his profession." He set resolutely back to work and displayed not only a prodigious level of activity but also an impulsive and incomparable talent. In his brother's passing, Jérôme had lost his only rival. From now on he is considered the most skilful sculptor of the Low Countries. The complete artist, from this point of view like his masters the Renaissance Italians, he was not only a sculptor but also a medallist, engraver, goldsmith and architect—in short, a Flemish Cellini.<sup>4</sup>

Overwhelmed with commissions, he worked ceaselessly, but also without diminution of his standards, never contenting himself with improvisations or rough drafts. This is not the place to draw up a catalogue of his works. Let us restrict ourselves to citing but a few: the four great statues of the holy apostles Paul, Thomas, Bartholemew and Matthew in the nave of Ste. Gudula's collegiate church in Brussels; the Christ on the cross, carved from a single piece of ivory, at the Béguine convent at Mechlin; the statues of saints commissioned by the Abbey of St. Michael of Antwerp; and finally the celebrated *Ganymede* and *the Eagle of Jupiter*, which Jérôme offered to his fellow artist, the sculptor Luc Faid'herbe of Mechlin, and which was involved in an accident that is quite remarkable, especially considering Duquesnoy's reputation and his tragic and infamous end.

Luc Faid'herbe gave Duquesnoy's *Ganymede* to his son. In 1704, the sculpture fell on the young Faid'herbe, causing his death. Those whose minds inclined to superstition and the supernatural found in this event—which was, to be sure, out of the ordinary—a parallel with Swedenborg. They attributed to this *Ganymede*, as a masterpiece of the brilliant Uranian, a malign and expiatory influence. Had the wretched Jérôme bestowed a soul upon his creation, or at the very least a mission? Did the sculpture bear a grudge against Faid'herbe? Or was this statue of Jupiter's beloved, having become a sentient idol, taking its opportunity to avenge upon the son of a Christian the abominable treatment inflicted upon any pagan straying into our centuries of intolerance and guilty of imitating the lord of the gods in his passion for ephebic mortals...?<sup>5</sup>

However, during this period, Jérôme Duquesnoy, who was at the apogee of his talent, was also reaching the summit of honours. Archduke Leopold William of Austria, at that time Governor General of the Low Countries under King Philip IV of Spain, appointed him sculptor to the court. His style was pure and correct, but its elegance and grace in no way impeded a natural electric movement; even a touch of the pleasantly morbid and vaguely sensual, which is set free in his most highly praised works, led to Jérôme Duquesnoy being known as the Albanus<sup>6</sup> of sculpture. This

was the period when he created his suave and impish goatherd boys, and his no less gentle *Children and the Young Faun*.

He was prepared to rise to even greater heights by executing a masterpiece, the mausoleum of Antoine Triest, bishop of Ghent, which was erected in 1654, during the prelate's lifetime, in the choir of St. Bavo's cathedral. The venerable bishop's statue lifesize, half-reposing on a black marble sarcophagus, lifts its eyes to the Christ, who shows him His cross. Opposite the Redeemer appears the Virgin Mary. Six little angels or spirits, delicately treated, bearing torches or water-clocks, support the frame of the monument.

"Jérôme Duquesnoy arrived in Ghent on July 6th, 1654," says Edmond de Busscher, one of the great Flemish sculptor's more interesting and impartial biographers. "He set himself up with his assistants in one of the cathedral's chapels, there to lay out and prepare the sections of this tomb, which could have been for the master the finest jewel in a new sculptural crown, had he not come to a sad end. In the last days of the month of August a strange rumour circulated in the city of Ghent: the sculptor Jérôme Duquesnoy was incarcerated in the Castle, accused of misusing two young boys in the chapel where he was working."

Nothing was truer than this imprisonment upon this accusation, the most sinister there could be in those days when bloody and ferocious penalties sanctioned the power of iniquitous prejudice. Was the accusation justified, and to what extent? Was there violence and abuse of authority? Did it really involve acts of sodomy, brutal assault on children? The indictment in this lamentable prosecution, written in Flemish, preserved in the Ghent city archives and marked Hieronimus Quesnoy, keeps reproachful and scandalised silence on these delicate but essential points. Nonetheless it falls to us now to focus upon the extent of the alleged erotic abuse for which a great man was strangled. It seems to be established that the accused had not committed any sadistic or malevolent act. What is more, there is no guarantee that he was not the victim of some cowardly revenge, some trap, some machination of those who hated and envied what he had made of himself by his independence of character, his singular and non-conformist life, and above all his genius and his

glory. So many points of uncertainty, or rather so many probabilities!

At his first two interrogations, on 31 August and 1 September, he vigorously denied the transgressions with which he was charged, despite the admissions of the others involved. The latter were two of his young pupils or apprentices, not children but adolescents. Duquesnoy claimed he had only received them in his workshop in order to draw a pencil study of their arms and breasts. The poor wretch did not even dare mention their hips and legs! Yet had not these parts too, like all the others, claimed his attention and his admiration as an artist, not to speak of any other ardour? One mystery continues to hang over these young favourites. Who knows whether the young figures decorating the bishop's mausoleum do not record the features and beauty of shape of the two enigmatic models?

Unable to wrest from him any further confession, for the third interrogation on 3 September the judges (civil judges, a common court, not inquisitors) fell back upon torture, and naturally, the investigators obtained his word of agreement—or rather, his cries of suffering—to everything they needed to send him to his death.

Meanwhile, on 2 September, the artist had addressed a petition to the King of Spain and his Privy Council of the Low Countries, presided over by the Governor General. In this application Jérôme Duquesnoy, entertaining (and with good reason, one can believe) more confidence in the discernment and wisdom of a court of the elite than in the competence and fairness of an assembly of narrow-minded, vulgar bourgeois, rejected the municipal jurisdiction of Ghent under whose auspices he had been apprehended and was being interrogated. But these crusty bourgeois, whom the poor wretch had every reason to distrust, had no intention of letting go of this audacious worshipper of masculine beauty. On 10 September the Grand Bailiff and the sheriffs of Ghent sent the Privy Council an unfavourable opinion regarding their prisoner, along with extracts from the prosecution's case, and a request for the right to pronounce sentence.

On the other hand, the sculptor's parents, friends and admirers did not abandon him in his distress, and addressed a petition in Latin directly

to Archduke Leopold William, in which they pointed out the scandal which would ensue from the unfortunate artist's condemnation, because the shameful deeds with which he was charged would have to be disclosed. They also begged the Archduke to consider the family's honour, until then unblemished; they deplored the blot which would reflect upon a name distinguished by others in addition to this great transgressor; but foremost, and with most reason, they emphasised Jérôme Duquesnoy's high artistic worth, and the loss that sculpture would suffer in the person of this artist, whose morals might be eccentric but whose genius was rare, if he was abandoned to the mercy of the honest but unbending city magistrates of Ghent. In consequence, they implored the Archduke to rescue Jérôme from his prison in Ghent and have him brought under escort to Brussels, and there let him appear before the Privy Council. Finally they beseeched the Archduke, in the last resort, should the necessity arise, to use his absolute power to commute the death penalty to detention in perpetuity. In this manner, the petitioners concluded, even while atoning for his transgression the sculptor could continue to produce masterpieces.

Against the expectations of Jérôme and his friends, the great lords of the Privy Council proved to be just as prudish and implacable as the ignorant and ponderous merchants on the municipal bench of Ghent. They did not even delay their pronouncement so that the accused might be brought before them, but, having taken note of the dossier sent by Ghent, they hastened to reject the signatories' observations in the petition to the Archduke, and in their "Advice" to him they approved the original judges conclusions and asked that it should please him to let justice take its course.

They also declared themselves against the accused's petition, because "even though the artist has the right to decline the jurisdiction of the Ghent magistracy, there is sufficient matter in terms of justice to declare him forfeit and unworthy of that right..." They concluded, "Therefore, as it is proper and needful to subject him to exemplary chastisement in order, were it possible, to sever at the root this evil which goes creeping and worming its way through the

world, it has seemed to us that Your Highness would do well to refuse the pardon that is requested and, what is more, to leave the whole matter to the discretion of the Magistrates of Ghent, where the crime and the slander were committed, and the proceedings instituted."

This ruthless opinion was approved by the Archduke in the following peremptory terms: *me conformo in tutto*.

Alas, Jérôme Duquesnoy was no longer under the clement and radiant sky, counsellor of tolerance, help-meet to every passion, of magnanimous Italy! Moreover, the age was already far distant from that of the princes and popes, philosophers and artists, powerful heterodox patrons, or even protestant absolvers, accomplices of passionate lovers of all Beauty. Long past and finished was the century of Leo X and Julius II!<sup>18</sup> Europe had become orthodox and austere once more and especially Flanders, in thrall at the same time to Spain and to protestantism, under the government of a sanctimonious and narrow-minded prince whose greatest artistic admiration was for the grotesqueries of Teniers the Younger!<sup>19</sup>

Nonetheless, it must be said to the glory of the true Christians of the time and the shame of the city magistrates, so-called guarantors of freedom, that the venerable Bishop Triest stood by his artist and was first to sign the petition addressed to the Governor!

But nothing would have had any effect. The rabble, the prejudice, the will of the majority, prevailed.

Following the sovereign assent, the Privy Council, at its meeting of 22 September, set out in a decree its definitive resolution, with confiscation of goods to the profit of the Crown. To start with, an inventory was made of everything Duquesnoy possessed in his sumptuous residence in the Place de Wallons in Brussels. A Brussels goldsmith even went, on 26 September, to Ghent Castle with a delegation from the Marshall of the Court, to lay claim to the mould for an image of Our Lady which Duquesnoy was to cast in silver for his Serene Highness.

Finally, on 28 September, 1654, the sentence of death was pronounced at a special assembly in the Ghent Hall of Justice. Jérôme Duquesnoy, convicted of sodomy, was condemned to be bound to

a stake in the Grain Market of said city, strangled, and his body reduced to ashes. The execution took place the same day, with the usual trappings. The Bailiff of Ghent, two delegated sheriffs and the Mayor presided, along with the Prosecutor, the Clerk of Blood, various judicial functionaries and municipal secretaries. The Officer of Public Works, Gerard van Wassenburgh, with his staff, acted under the protection of the Bailiff's halberdiers.

The Ghent historian Dierickx maintains that a pardon for Jérôme Duquesnoy arrived the day after his ordeal, with the result that the confiscation of his goods was not carried through. But Dierickx is wrong. Documents show that Duquesnoy's heirs pleaded for long afterwards for said goods to be restored to them, and for access to the arrears due to their unfortunate kinsman for Bishop Triest's mausoleum.

A portrait of Jérôme Duquesnoy after van Dyck, engraved in chiaroscuro by the English ar-

tist Richard Brookshaw<sup>10</sup> in 1779, bears this inscription:

*Hic ille est quondam fratri vit dispar in arte,  
Felix! In felix altamen igne perit.  
Non perisse, abisse scias; sua foma celebris  
arte, manet: redit; nam redivimus adest!*

Indeed, the tortured and tainted artist's glory shimes purer and purer in spite of all reticence, prudery and pharisaic conspiracy.

The time is near when, far from considering as a work of infamy and cause of anathema the acts for which he was brought to his death, we shall see in them evidence of that perfect love of beauty which, to a judiciary of rude bourgeois like that of the Low Countries in the 17th Century, would earn the stake for the noblest artists of the Renaissance, starting with Sodoma, da Vinci and Michelangelo!

## NOTES

1. The artistic school of Brussels, which takes its name from the province (formerly duchy) of Brabant, in which Brussels is situated (*ed.*).
2. Eekhoud is incorrect in this attribution; the "Manneken Pis" was first cast in bronze in 1619 by Hieronymus Duquesnoy the Elder, to replace an earlier stone fountain; his original has been recast three times following damage or theft. However, to this day, art historians refer to François as the "King of the Putti" (*ed.*).
3. Anthony van Dyck (1599-1641) was Rubens' most famous pupil, and one of the most significant portraitists of his age (*ed.*).
4. Benvenuto Cellini (1500-1571), Italian goldsmith and

sculptor. As Eekhoud clearly knew in citing him, the parallel was more than just in their talents; see the discussion of Cellini's work and sexuality in James M. Saslow, *Ganymede in the Renaissance* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1986), Chapter 4 (*ed.*).

5. Emmanuel Swedenborg (1688-1772), Swedish mystic, posited that material objects were imbued with spirits. Lukas Fayd'herbe (or Fay d'Herbe; 1617-1697), was a regionally important artist of the time; his son and pupil, Jean-Lukas Fayd'herbe (1654-1704) was an artist in his own right, though less important. Though it is curious that Jean-Lukas should have been born less than a month before Duquesnoy's execution, the imputation that the sculpture attacked a youth

is an example of Eekhoud's novelistic heightening of the story; the younger Fayd'herbe was 50 when killed by the falling artwork (*ed.*).

6. Francesco Albani (or Albano) (1578-1660), Italian painter. His "St. Sebastian" was one of his best known works (*ed.*).

7. *Bibliographies Nationales* (l'Académie de Belgique), Vol. II. (This reference, as given by Eekhoud, is not to the same de Busscher article used by Debeuckelaere and others, nor have we been able to verify it, leaving open the question of whether it is a second article on the same subject by de Busscher which has escaped research, or an error on Eekhoud's part. *ed.*)

8. Julius II (originally Julian de la Rovere, 1443-1513), Pope from 1503 to 1513, was the builder of St. Peter's in Rome

---

and patron and protector of Michelangelo. His successor, Pope Leo X (originally Jean de Medici, 1475-1521), reigned from 1513 to 1521, was famous for his fondness for beautiful youths (*ed.*).

---

9. David Teniers the Younger (1610-1690), Flemish painter, influenced by Breughel, who painted caricatures of peasants, and interiors in a grotesque, comic manner (*ed.*).

10. Richard Brookshaw (fl.

---

1767-1804), English mezzotint engraver who worked in London and Paris. This engraving is reproduced in the *Tijdschrift voor Homogeschiedenis* with Debeuckelaere's article (*ed.*).

## “For the reason that thou, Hieronymus Duquesnoy...”

Geert Debeuckelaere

These are the opening words of a court judgment regarding sodomy accusations, pronounced by the Ghent sheriffs' court. The sentence was carried out on 28 September, 1654, and none other than Hieronymus Duquesnoy, one of the foremost representatives of Flemish Baroque sculpture, was led towards the stake.<sup>1</sup> His masterpiece, the mausoleum of Bishop Triest in the Saint Bavo Cathedral, had not yet been completed.<sup>2</sup>

In the Treaty of Munster in 1648, Spain finally recognized the Dutch Republic and accepted the closure of the Schelde river, which was detrimental to the prosperity of Southern Netherlands.<sup>3</sup> However, the districts that later became Belgium were past their greatest calamities. Because of the wars and emigration caused by the Reformation and the Counter Reformation, the economy now had to provide the necessities of life for fewer people. For some cities—and Ghent was one of them—one might even speak of a certain economic recovery, thanks to the luxury textile industry.<sup>4</sup> The Saint Bavo Cathedral would enjoy this relative prosperity, thanks to the foundation of a special redesign fund, established by Bishop Triest.<sup>5</sup>

### The Duquesnoy Family

Hieronymus Duquesnoy was the youngest of three sculptors from the same family. Hieronymus senior was the creator of the well-known “Manneken Pis”. His son François, the most talented of the three, rose to fame in Italy under the name “Il Flamingo”, and died in Leghorn while setting off to France to work at the French Court.<sup>6</sup>

For a long time his biographers have wronged the younger Hieronymus. It is obvious that his

death at the stake affected their evaluations of his life. While accusations concerning his murder of his brother have been refuted for over a century, biographers still try to discredit the quality and originality of his work. Both E. Dhanens in *De Sint-Baafskathedraal*<sup>7</sup> and M. van Roose in *De Beeldhouwkunst in de 17de eeuw*<sup>8</sup> reach back to this tradition, disproven since 1949, suggesting that he merely completed a work originally commissioned from his brother François.

Hieronymus Duquesnoy was born in 1602 in Brussels, and grew up in his father's atelier. Hieronymus, like his brother François, was very much attracted towards sculpture. Though he did not receive any specific training, he made rather swift progress. Around 1621, his brother having established some reputation in Italy, Hieronymus himself decided to go there. He started to work under his brother's guidance. Their early works show so much resemblance that experts still tend to confuse them, and simply call them “works by Duquesnoy”. Their personalities however were very dissimilar, causing occasional frictions. Sometime after Anton van Dyck's stay in Rome, where he painted their portraits, the brothers decided to split up, and we lose track of Hieronymus. For several years he lived in Rome, and travelled from there through Italy. Various times he went to Spain as well, receiving assignments of Philip IV. But the specific dates are doubtful. He was back in Italy around 1641, living in Florence with a fellow countryman, the goldsmith André Ghysels from Brussels. In 1642 Hieronymus got a message that his brother, preparing for his journey to France, had fallen seriously ill. The doctors claimed that François was in desperate need of a different climate and subsequently, in June 1642, the brothers began their journey to the north. In

Leghorn François was once more attacked by the fever. He died there on 12 July, 1642, and was buried in the Franciscan Monastery.

One tradition, based on a letter of Aydama to Mariette<sup>9</sup> written in 1766, accuses Hieronymus of poisoning his brother out of jealousy. This accusation was repeated by a number of biographers, and finally refuted by Edmund de Busscher in 1877.<sup>10</sup>

Hieronymus sent his brother's luggage and four chests containing various works of art to the Netherlands; he himself traveled through France. Arriving in Brussels, he refused to share the legacy with his half-brothers and -sisters. He claimed that the four chests merely contained professional materials. Since Hieronymus was already an "elderly bachelor" (40 years old), his family renounced all further claims. After all, they could expect to receive his inheritance as well.

#### **In the Netherlands**

Once settled in Brussels, Hieronymus, by now recognized as an important sculptor, received one assignment after another. In 1645, when Jacques Franquart, court architect of the Governor General, fell ill, Hieronymus was appointed as his assistant. He succeeded Franquart after his death in 1651. Between 1643 and 1654 his talents flourished. His works from this period can still be seen in Brussels, Antwerp and Ghent.

On 8 August, 1651, Hieronymus signed a contract with Bishop Triest, concerning his mausoleum. This makes it clear that the assignment was given to Hieronymus, and not to François, as the Aydama-Mariette tradition claimed. The work had to be carried out within two years, starting on 1 January, 1652.<sup>11</sup>

Antonius Triest, the seventh bishop of Ghent, was a fascinating character, containing many contrasts. As a patron he provided the Saint Bavo Cathedral with entirely new furnishings, paid for out of personal donations and the establishment of a special fund. He was a benefactor of the Counter Reformation Baroque style.<sup>12</sup> As a prelate he was a diplomat and a politician. As a philanthropist he was the founder of the "Berg van Barmhartigheid" (Mountain of Mercy).<sup>13</sup> In the last

years of his life he attempted to deprive the Jesuits, the preeminent propagandists of the Counter Reformation, of the confirmation classes, and refused to publish the papal denunciation of Jansenist principles.<sup>14</sup>

On 6 July, 1654, Duquesnoy arrived in Ghent and hired a room at the "Reep". During the next two months he and his assistants would be working on the construction of the mausoleum. The not yet fully completed statues were put up in a side chapel of the choir. The chapel was separated from the church by a curtain.<sup>15</sup>

#### **Constant**

Shortly after his arrival in Ghent, Duquesnoy, while working alone, met Constant de Somere.<sup>16</sup> The boy, eight years old, was the son of a cobbler. Hieronymus took him to the chapel and bared the boy's arms in order to draw them. He handed him some small change as well.

The next morning Constant returned. Duquesnoy led the boy's hand to the front of his pants, "ordering him to grope and fumble the afore-mentioned sculptor's thing with his little hand, which he did, and that afore-mentioned sculptor touched and groped his thing as well...". Further, Duquesnoy asked Constant to take down his trousers and bend forward, and sodomized the boy. When the boy complained about the pain, Duquesnoy told him that it wasn't that bad. Before the boy left, he gave him three pennies and asked him to return the next day. He also told the boy not to speak about the occurrences of that morning.<sup>17</sup>

For a period of five weeks Constant was able to guard their secret, and returned regularly to the Saint Bavo Cathedral. He ran little errands for the artist, and often the boy himself made the first move toward sexual contact.<sup>18</sup> About a dozen times the boy allowed himself to be sodomized by the artist. Once he even joined Duquesnoy in his lodging, where they had sexual contact as well. As a rule he collected two or three pennies each time.<sup>19</sup>

#### **Jacobus**

After five weeks Constant brought a young

friend along: Jacobus de Sterck, eleven years old and a choir boy at the Saint Niklaaskerk. From now on the boys regularly visited the chapel together, but they paid separate visits as well. Duquesnoy, it would seem, preferred his contacts with Jacobus, as indicated by the wider variety of sexual activities listed in the complaint, but also by overt displays of affection as, for instance, French kissing. Jacobus is cautioned to silence even "if he should be put in a dark well or whipped or hanged on the gallows."<sup>20</sup>

One time Duquesnoy put both boys over a bench and sodomized them in turn,<sup>21</sup> but most of the time he sodomized just one boy, even if they visited him together. If by chance someone came into the church, he would hide the boys in a large closet.<sup>22</sup> During a period of three weeks both boys continued to visit the artist, either alone or together.

How the whole matter came to light isn't quite clear yet, though some indications seem to point in the direction of Constant's mother. She was well informed about her son's financial transactions with the sculptor. The boy told her, however, that he got the money for permitting himself to be drawn by the artist. By 30 August, however, she was completely convinced that Duquesnoy had had sexual contact with Constant. Preceding her statement to the court, the archives inform us that she had been directed by the pensionary Van De Vijvere to "examine the dirty vests that her afore-mentioned little son Constant wore on his body three or four months ago," and returned with the report that "among the aforementioned vests, two vests, in my judgement, appeared to show spots of human sperm on their backtails ..."<sup>23</sup>

However, since Duquesnoy had been arrested on 31 August, and since the interrogations for which she was asked to provide this evidence had already begun, it is not clear if Constant's mother was the only complainant.<sup>24</sup> Considering the conditions under which the sexual contacts with the boys had taken place (in a side chapel, only shut off by a curtain), other regular attendants of the church might have detected them. Both curate Jan Van de Velde and canon Robert Vander Muelen paid daily visits to the cathedral.<sup>25</sup> Constant's statement also shows just how easily they

could have been found out by others. Before the arrest, the boy said, he had often visited the chapel and witnessed Hieronymus' and Jacobus' sexual activities, without being noticed by either of them<sup>26</sup>.

### The Trial

On 31 August, Constant and Jacobus were interrogated. They confessed immediately. Thereupon the two boys were confronted with one another, to determine whether their statements agreed. During his first interrogation on 31 August, at nine o'clock in the evening, Duquesnoy categorically denied all sexual contacts. He only admitted to once having asked Constant to take off his jerkin, in order to draw his chest. On that day statements of a doctor and Constant's mother were also recorded.

On 1 September, 1654 the second interrogation of Constant and Jacobus took place. During his second interrogation Duquesnoy continued to deny all accusations. Confronted by the artist, both boys accused him of having sodomized them. During the third interrogation on 3 September, Duquesnoy finally confessed under torture to all the charges.<sup>27</sup>

Duquesnoy sought to question the jurisdiction of the Ghent sheriffs' court. As His Majesty's architect, he took the view that he should be summoned before the Royal Magistrate in Brussels. Subsequently, on 2 September, 1654, he sent a similar request to the King by way of his Privy Council. On 4 September, he renewed his appeal and complained about the Ghent magistrate, who had confiscated all of his furniture and other belongings. The Privy Council ordered the Ghent magistrate to officially release the artist's possessions, but then the Privy Council itself confiscated all of them, including his chest in Ghent.

On 10 September, the Ghent magistrates sent a counter recommendation to the Privy Council, stating that such a crime could not possibly remain unpunished, even if it was just to set an example. But Brussels' decision was not forthcoming, so a delegation from the Ghent sheriffs' court set off for Brussels to speed the matter, with a request to be allowed to proceed with the sentence.

Meanwhile, on 4 September, some of the sculptor's friends appealed directly to Archduke Leopold, the Governor General, in a letter, to ask him to have Duquesnoy brought before the Royal Court. On 17 September they renewed their request in a second letter, supported by Bishop Tricast. But this time they acknowledged his guilt, and asked the Governor General that, after a verdict from whatever court had proper jurisdiction, "his deserved death penalty would be commuted to life imprisonment, so his crime would be kept a secret, without remaining unpunished, and that the talent of this extraordinary artist would be saved for Art, and that he would be in service of His Serene Highness for the long period of his imprisonment."

Regarding jurisdiction the Privy Council returned an unfavourable opinion to Archduke Leopold. Because of the heinous nature of his crime, they advised that Duquesnoy be denied access to the Royal Magistrate. Furthermore the Council recommended that the Archduke not reprimand the artist, and allow the Ghent sheriffs to have their own way. The Governor General approved their recommendation. On 25 September, the official decree arrived in Ghent: the Ghent sheriffs' court was allowed now to carry out the sentence and to confiscate Duquesnoy's property for the benefit of the King.

On 28 September, the sheriffs' court pronounced judgement: "... and, considering all, doing justice, we sentence you to be tied to a stake and to be burned to ashes in the Corn Market of this town, seizing and confiscating all your goods, wherever they may be, without any exception, all costs of the process of justice to be charged against the same." The artist was executed the same day, somewhere around noon. Hieronymus Duquesnoy was strangled at the stake. They burned his body afterwards. The Franciscans celebrated twelve requiem masses to secure the repose of the victim's soul.<sup>28</sup>

### Sodomy and Paedophilia

In a previous article<sup>29</sup> we have seen that, in earlier centuries, the term 'sodomy' referred to a much wider concept. It meant, among other things, any sexual activities between two persons

of the same sex, and not just anal sexual intercourse. Even if Duquesnoy had not had anal intercourse with the boys, he could have been charged with sodomy and sentenced anyway.

Nowadays we would describe the occurrences in terms of paedophilia or paedosexuality. In the 17th century, however, such terminology was utterly unknown. It was between the 16th and 18th centuries that the idea of separate age groups, each possessing special qualities, began to emerge. The category of 'children' was beginning to emerge: children were classified as 'child' until higher ages, and 'adult', on the other hand, became a more rigid category separate from 'child'. However, the separation between these two age groups was not nearly as rigid as our modern concepts might prejudice us to believe.<sup>30</sup>

Nevertheless, even for those days Constant's and Jacobus' ages were considered to be low, and indeed in the various records they are often referred to in diminutives. Even so, the fact that the boys were categorized as children did not in and of itself constitute a separate crime. Apparently there was no specific law yet on sodomy with children, and Hieronymus Duquesnoy's sentence would not have been any less severe if his partner had been an adult man.

Courts in that period proceeded from the premise of the defendant's guilt. It was the duty of the accused to prove his innocence. So Hieronymus Duquesnoy found himself in an impossible position. The fact that the boys had visited him and returned regularly was not taken into account by the sheriffs' court. The court, however, did pronounce upon the competence and reason of the boys, and judged "that in the afore-mentioned children no trace of noticeable malice is found..."<sup>31</sup> The boys were thus judged to show insufficient power of discernment between good and evil.

The investigation must have been a traumatic experience for the boys. During the period of the interrogation they were lodged in the Alexian monastery.<sup>32</sup> The way the boys were questioned was sufficiently traumatizing. Constant's straightforward answering of the questions, even detailed ones about the artist's orgasms and seminal discharges, would suggest that the interrogation was not so difficult for him. Jacobus, on the

other hand, at first tried to equivocate,<sup>33</sup> which provoked even more detailed questions, and in his shaky attempt to pretend that he had not completely grasped the meaning of the occurrences, he provided even more information than Constant.

When the boys were told to reconstruct the occurrences and were forced to show the assembled sheriffs, how, bending over a table, Duquesnoy had sodomized them both, one might well expect the sheriffs to have vented their indignation, but one wonders what purpose was served by such a humiliating display, and how this demonstration could possibly have added to the investigation.<sup>34</sup> The medical examination of the "forcing of the fundamentals" of the boys must have been an humiliating experience as well. The purpose might have been, however, to verify the truthfulness of their statements. Once this was established, the testimonies were sufficient.<sup>35</sup>

In their answers, the boys tried to put all the blame on the artist. The sheriffs would not have raised the question of their complicity: all questions were focused on proving Duquesnoy's guilt. Even when the boys told that they returned after their first contact with the artist, the court waved

it aside. And when Duquesnoy confessed during his last interrogation, but pointed out that the boys had sometimes asked for the sexual contacts themselves—which he refused a few times<sup>36</sup>—this made, apparently, no difference to the sheriffs.

The legal costs were paid out of the artist's confiscated estate. The accounts which are attached provide some data on the boys' future course of life. Both of them were banished, Jacobus for a period of six years. To regulate the procedure, a contract was made with Gheraert De Somere, Constant's father, for which he received twelve pounds, to "keep him [Jacobus] out of the country." Another contract was made with Pauwels De Zaedeleer on "the least boy [Constant], who was sent to Spain."<sup>37</sup> Both banishments are punishments without judgement of guilt.<sup>38</sup> Nonetheless, the banishment indicates that the sheriffs' court, as well as Constant's parents,<sup>39</sup> attributed some responsibility to the boys, quite contrary to what the records seem to say about them "showing no traces of noticeable malice"! After all, their punishments were severe as well.

## NOTES

1. Stadsarchief Gent (hereafter S.A.G.) 215/2, Criminal Sentences. Sentence of Hieronymus Duquesnoy. All later sentences of the Ghent Sheriffs' Court have been examined, and there are no further sentences for sodomy.

2. J. Buntinx, "Jerome Duquesnoy en het praalgraf van bisschop Triest in de St.-Baafskathedraal te Gent," *Handelingen van de Maatschappij voor Geschiedenis en Oudheidkunde te Gent*, new series IV, 1949, pages 106-7. A part of the surface had yet to be polished.

3. *Winkler Prins Geschiedenis der Nederlanden* (Amsterdam/U-

trecht: Elsevier, 1977), vol. 2, pp. 250-4.

4. A.K.L. Thijs, "Nijverheid in de Zuidelijke Nederlanden," *Algemene geschiedenis der Nederlanden* (Haarlem: Fibula-Van Dishoeck, 1980), vol. 7, pp. 86-97, especially pp. 89-93.

5. M. van Roose, "De Beeldhouwkunst in de 17de E.," *Gent: Duizend jaar kunst en cultuur* (Ghent: Museum voor Schone Kunsten, 1975), vol. 1, pp. 491-6, especially pp. 492-3.

6. L. Hadermann-Misguich, "Les Duquesnoy," *Wallonie: Arts et Histoire* (Gembloux: J. Duculot, 1970) Nr. 4, pp. 37-ff.

7. E. Dhanens, *De Sint Baafskathedraal* (Ghent: Provinciebestuur van Oostvlaanderen,

1965), p. 121.

8. van Roose, op. cit., p. 492.

9. P.J. Mariette (1694-1774) was the foremost print dealer and private art collector of his era in France. In connection with his dealing and collecting he amassed an encyclopedic file on the lives and work of artists, which was published in six volumes after his death as the *Abece-darie de P.J. Mariette* (ed. P. Chennevières and A. de Montaignon; Paris: Demoulin, 1853-4; reprint ed. Paris: Nobelet, 1962). His entry for Hieronymus Duquesnoy (Vol. 2, pp. 137-ff) consists largely of the text of a letter from a correspondent, H. Eydama, written from Paris on 27 June, 1766.

While his report of the trial suggests familiarity with the trial documents, Eydama misses no opportunity to blacken Hieronymus' reputation with additional allegations of drunkenness and lewdness in Italy, murdering his brother, and stealing both François' estate from their family and his artistic legacy in the form of plans for Bishop Triest's mausoleum, which he asserts was commissioned from François (*ed.*).

10. E. de Busscher, "Les sculpteurs Du Quesnoy, Delvaux, Calloigne," *Annales de la société Royale des Beaux Arts* (Ghent, 1877), pp. 305-440, especially pp. 396-402. For general facts concerning Hieronymus Duquesnoy's life, this article will rely upon this biography, which is the most thorough account of his life and the source used by later biographers. Specific additions for this article are footnoted. De Busscher gives less information over the trial itself.

11. Buntinx, *op. cit.*, pp. 102-ff.  
12. van Roose, *op. cit.*, pp. 492-3.

13. R. Mathijs, *Iconografie van bisschop Triest* (n.p., 1939), pp. 28-31.

14. V. Fris, *Histoire de Gand* (Brussels: Van Oest, 1913), p. 250.

15. The tradition that the two boys served as models for the putti on the mausoleum cannot be born out. It would have been entirely impossible for the sculptor to have made the putti in the short time he was in Ghent. Further, boys of 8 and 11 would have been too old to

serve as models for putti. Regarding this tradition, see "Criminele sententiën," Centrale Bibliotheek, Rijksuniversiteit te Gent, Ms. 59. p. 129:

On 28 September in the Corn Market in Ghent justice was done to François Cannoy [sic], master sculptor, because he (producing the memorial of Bishop Antonius Triest in Saint Jan's Church, in a separate place, with the images upon which he worked) did commit sodomy on two servants, being choristers of the same church, one being about eight years of age, the other being about twelve, explaining he had made them naked in order to produce angels. The sentence being carried out about 12 hours, forenoon, this same Cannoy was strangled and thereafter burned to ashes on 28 Sept. 1654.

This handwritten 18th century manuscript contains many errors regarding the case of Hieronymus Duquesnoy, but is the oldest source to which the tradition that the boys were models for the putti can be traced. It is interesting that so soon after the execution the two Duquesnoys were being confused.

16. This is supported by the dossier in the Stadsarchief van Gent, S.A.G. 213/15. Both de Busscher and A. van Lokeren ("Jérôme Duquesnoy", *Mes-sager des sciences et des arts*, 1833, pp. 462-5) are mistaken about the name. Both the Dutch and French versions of the interro-

gations clearly give the name as "Constant" and not "Toussaint".

17. S.A.G. 213/15: first interrogation of Constant de Somere, 31 August.

18. S.A.G. 213/15: third and final interrogation of Hieronymus Duquesnoy, 3 Sept. 1654.

19. S.A.G. 213/15: first interrogation of Constant de Somere, 31 August.

20. S.A.G. 213/15: first interrogation of Jacobus de Sterck, 31 August.

21. S.A.G. 213/15: first interrogation of Constant de Somere, and first interrogation of Jacobus de Sterck, 31 August.

22. S.A.G. 213/15: first confrontation of Constant and Jacobus, 31 August.

23. S.A.G. 213/15: first interrogation of Kathelijne Dammans, mother of Constant de Somere, 31 August, 1654. Duquesnoy had usually wiped off his member on the boys' shirt tails: second interrogation of Constant and second interrogation of Jacobus, 1 Sept. 1654.

24. O. Roelandts, *De beeldhouwers Duquesnoy, vader en zoon* (Ghent: n.d.) suggests that Constant's mother was the complainant. But because her examination of Constant's shirt happened in response to a request from the magistrate, the investigation must have already been under way.

25. Buntinx, *op. cit.*, p. 106.

26. S.A.G. 213/15: first interrogation of Constant de Somere, 31 August.

27. S.A.G. 213/15: Dutch report: third interrogation of Hieronymus Duquesnoy, 3

Sept., 1654.

28. De Busscher, op. cit., pp. 368-80. As previously noted, this article relies on those portions of de Busscher's biography which were based on documents in the Algemeen Rijksarchief, Brussels. Identical documents and manuscripts are present in the Stadsarchief Gent, S.A.G. 103/8, and were examined for this article. They support the accuracy of de Busscher's work.

29. G. Debeuckelaere, "Verkeerd zijn in Beroerde Tijden: De Gentse sodomietenprocessen van 1578," *De Homokrante*, March, 1981, pp. 3-6.

30. M. W. van Ussel, *Geschiedenis van het seksuele probleem* (Meppel: Boom, 1968), pp. 132-3.

31. S.A.G. 213/15: after the final interrogation of Hieronymus Duquesnoy, 3 Sept. 1654.

32. S.A.G. 213/15: invoices appended to the case.

33. S.A.G. 213/15: first inter-

rogation of Jacobus de Sterck, 31 August. Jacobus first said that Duquesnoy had penetrated him with his finger. Under further questioning he admitted that it had been done with his penis.

34. S.A.G. 213/15: second interrogation of Jacobus de Sterck, 31 August 1654 and confrontation of the children with Hieronymus Duquesnoy, 1 Sept. 1654.

35. S.A.G. 213/15: declaration of Dr. Laureyns Manesse, 31 August 1654.

36. S.A.G. 213/15: final interrogation of Hieronymus Duquesnoy, under torture, 3 September 1654.

37. S.A.G. 213/15: invoices appended to the case materials. De Busscher, op. cit. p. 380, reports that Toussaint (i.e., Constant) was banned to Spain and that Jacobus was banned from Flanders. He gives no source for this. Roelandts, op. cit., p.

60, gives the details of the banning as in this article. In *Baratzearte* (2nd. ed., 1965, pp. 147-9) Johan Daisne mentions Duquesnoy's trial and the banning of the boys. He bases his account on an article from the *Wetenschappelijke Tijdingen* from 1961 by Dr. K. van Acker. Although he probably read through the files, the article is anything but accurate. Even the boys' punishments are stated incorrectly.

38. S.A.G. 215/2, "Criminal sentences" also shows no judgements under the boys' names.

39. Considering that the banning of Jacobus de Sterck was carried out through a contract with Gheraerd de Somere (Constant's father), and the fact that there were no witnesses on behalf of Jacobus at his interrogations, it is possible to conclude that Jacobus was an orphan.