DOI: 10.14232/suc.2023.291-307

Dominika Havas-Kovács
University of Szeged

Amor est passio: The Authorship and Dating of *De amore* by Andreas Capellanus

Andreas Capellanus' treatise on love, De amore has been interpreted in many different ways. Scholars agree on only one thing: this work presents a scholastic understanding of love in a rigorous and structured way. We are not sure of the identity of the author from the surviving documents, but he wrote in Latin in a French context sometime in the 12th century. In my study, I will explore who Andreas Capellanus might have been, as well as the supposed date of the work.

Keywords: Andreas Capellanus, Marie de Champagne, courtly love, Hungarian King Béla III, *iuvenis*, Middle Ages

Andreas Capellanus' treatise, bearing the title, *De amore,* has been interpreted in many different ways. In analysing this theoretical treatise, scholars agree on only one thing about it: *De amore* presents a scholastic approach to the concept of love, with a thoroughness and structure characteristic to that school of philosophy.[1] In my essay, I would like to contribute to one aspect of the scholarly discussion: I summarize the scholarship on the authorship and the date of origin of the treatise *De amore* written by Andreas Capellanus.

The manuscript tradition and its introduction to scholarly discussion in the 19th century

The treatise was written in the 12th century, in the distinctly French context of the court of Marie de Champagne. It was written for a French audience,

[1] Kőszeghy (2012: 280).

but in the lingua franca of European culture, Latin. Andreas Capellanus' work consists of three books: the first book covers roughly two-thirds of the work, in which the author defines love as a concept, examines its origins, and considers between whom it can come about, how, and in what ways. In the second book, he talks about the preservation of love that has been acquired, its passing and its intensification. He discusses the question of infidelity and then lists the thirty-one rules given to him by the king of love, Eros. In contrast to all this, a kind of reversal of fortune appears in the third and concluding book, as the title (*De reprobatione amoris*) itself indicates. In this final book of *De amore*, the chaplain seems to completely retract his previous views, as if in a "palinodic" manner, and discusses the harmful effects of love as a veritable misogynist.

The critical reception of *De amore* started in the 19th century with Gaston Paris, who describes *De amore* as a codification of courtly love[2] in 1884, which certainly influenced Emil Trojel, who eight years later, in 1892 produces a critical edition of the treatise in Latin.[3] Through the twelve surviving manuscripts known at the time, Trojel shows that *De amore* had enjoyed unbroken popularity from the 12th century onwards. He describes the provenance of the manuscripts and provides a descriptive catalogue. After the introduction, he presents the text of the treatise on love, and the textual variants in each manuscript in the annotated appendix. However, the history of the rediscovery of the treatise needs some clarification: it was not Gaston Paris who, after the printed edition of the treatise in 1614, first mentioned the love treatise and called it the founding work of the genre of courtly love in the 19th century. In his monograph *Aussprüche der Minnegerichte*, the eminent German publicist, historian, librarian and lawyer Johann Christoph von Aretin in 1803 quotes at length from the chaplain's work, including the 21 love judgments, the letter to the Countess of Champagne and her reply, the story of the Knight of Brittany, and the 31 rules of love.[4] It was during

[2] Kim (2010: 589–606); Paris (1888a); Paris (1884b); Paris (1872c).
[3] Trojel (1892a).
[4] Aretin (1803: 61–162).

his stay in Munich that von Aretin acquired the work of Johannes Hartlieb, who translated the treatise into the vernacular in 1440.[5] At the beginning of the 19th century, the vernacular edition was much more popular in German-speaking areas.

Hartlieb's translation of the treatise incorrectly identifies the author as Albertano da Brescia instead of Andreas Capellanus. The misattribution happened due to the fact that Albertano also lived in the late 12th century, although not on French territory, but in northern Italy. Several *sermo*s and treatises are associated with his name.[6] For this reason, von Aretin raises the question whether the treatise was originally written in the vernacular or in Latin. Albertano's name suggests to him that the excellent lawyer wrote the love treatise in Latin because the vulgar language was still very primitive in the late 12th century.[7] In his monograph, von Aretin publishes Hartlieb's translation together with corrections to the Latin manuscript available to him, of the above-mentioned extracts of the treatise, all in nineteenth-century German spelling. At the end of the book, he also includes passages in Italian not yet in print, taken from *Vocabulario della crusca*.[8] Identifying the

[5] Aretin (1803: 3).

[6] Hartlieb's mistake is due to the Latin source. In the Capellanus's manuscript tradition, the author's name may either not appear at all or may appear incorrectly. The name Albertano da Brescia is only found in one manuscript, so this was presumably Hartlieb's source, the incipit of the now lost Treviso manuscript: *Item libellus qui dicitur amoris et cortesie Albertani* (Treviso, Biblioteca del Convento di S. Margherita, Cod. 139). In another case the name of Alanus appears in the title of the work: *Alanus de Arte amandi Et remedio Amoris* (Rome, Biblioteca Vaticana, Cod. Ross. 1097). The name of Pogius, a humanist from northern Italy, also appears in the title of one manuscript: *Pogius de amore et arte amandi et de remediis amoris*. (Wolfenbüttel, Herzog-August-Bibliothek, Cod. 71.20 Aug. fol.). Identification with Enea Silvio Piccolomini is found in the explicit tract of the Kremsmünster codex: *Explicit tractatulus de amoris arte et eius remedio editus ut fertur ab Enea Silvio poeta Laureato* (Kremsmünster, Stiftsbibliothek, Cod.) The Brussels manuscript, which only contains excerpts from the third book, identifies the author of the treatise as Boncompagno*: Liber qui dicitur amicitia magistri Boncompagni* (Brussels, Bibliothèque Royale Albert Ier, Cod. 1890-1892). In six cases, the name of Gualterius appears, to whom the chaplain dedicated a treatise on love: Montpellier, Bibliothèque de l'Ecole de Médicine, Cod. 217, Berlin, Staatsbibliothek, Preuß. Kulturbesitz, ms. lat. 4°239, Krakow, Biblioteka Jagiellonska, Cod. 5230, Prague, Universitätsbibliothek, Cod. XIV, E29, Brugge, Bibliothèque Publique, Cod. 479, Lüneburg, Ratsbücherei, Cod. Theol, folio 2°49).

[7] Aretin (1803: 5).

[8] Aretin (1803: 5–6).

source of the Latin manuscript does not seem difficult, as Aretin notes that the last chapter of the manuscript states that it was written in Berlin in 1451. This information applies only to one manuscript known today: the Munich manuscript, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Clm 416. The name of the chaplain does not appear in the incipit or explicit of this codex; however, the explicit ends with *finitus in Berlin in 1451*. On the other hand, the literature on the manuscripts (Emil Trojel, Alfred Karnein) uses the title and opening or closing line of the work to identify the author. The name of the chaplain, Andrew, is found in the text in two places. First, it appears in the sixth chapter of the first book: *Nam ea caecus continetur et amens, quos ab amoris curia penitus esse remotis amatoris Andreae aulae regnae capellani evidenter nobis doctrina demonstrat*.[9] The name's second occurrence is in the sixth chapter of the second book: *Sed non gaudeat Andreas de eo quod magis cupit in orbe* [...].[10] Both passages can be found in the Munich manuscript, therefore von Aretin's primary source must have been Hartlieb and not the Latin manuscript, which omits Albertano's name.

In 1817, Francois Just Marie Raynouard presented the fourteenth-century manuscript *De amore* in the Parisian codex ms. lat. 8758 in his anthology *Choix de poésies originales des troubadours*.[11] According to Raynouard, this treatise is one of the definitive works on courtly love.[12] In 1837, Arthur Dinaux reached a similar conclusion.[13] It is therefore incorrect to attribute the assertion that Andreas Capellanus' treatise *De amore* can be considered a codification of courtly love to Gaston Paris alone, since von Aretin and later Raynouard had already made the same claim more than eighty years before Paris. However, Paris only reads and refers to Raynouard's treatise with a critical eye, correcting what he believes to be the incorrect transcriptions of

[9] Trojel (1892a: 148) For it welcomes even the blind and the insane, who must be excluded from the camp of Love, as the teaching of Andrew, the chaplain of the royal court, who is well versed in love, makes clear.
[10] Trojel (1892a: 262) But Andreas should not long enjoy what he desires in this world.
[11] Raynouard (1817: 80–83).
[12] Raynouard (1817: 83).
[13] Dinaux (1837: 49).

the latter.[14] Thus, *De amore* occupies a prominent position in the literature of the early 19th century, but its introduction into scholarly discourse is still linked to the name of Gaston Paris.

Problems of identification of Andreas Capellanus

There are different views in the literature as to who Andreas Capellanus was. The author refers to himself as Andreas Capellanus, however in this period the word *capellanus* meant something more than chaplain.[15] In general, priests were called chaplains when they were ordained to perform priestly duties on secondment to a particular court. According to John F. Mahoney's 1958 study, Andreas Capellanus was the court chaplain of Marie de Champagne. Mahoney proves that the author is not a fictitious person through the seven occurrences of the name Andreas Chaplain in documents relating to the court of Marie de Champagne.[16] Mahoney examined eight documents, but he found only two of them relevant, the other six mentions being, in his opinion, of another or even several different persons called Andreas Capellanus. In several instances of the name of a witness being put forward as evidence, we find the names Andreas Capellanus and Andree de Lueriis. Mahoney assumes that these two names refer to the same person, which he claims is based on a document dated 1182. At the same time, a date is found in the treatise: Countess Mary's letter can be found in the fifth chapter of the first book. The date 1 May 1174 appears at the bottom of the missive. However, this date does not correspond to the document from 1182. There is no doubt that seven documents from 1182 to 1186 confirm that Marie de Champagne's chaplain was a person called name Andrew.

[14] Paris (1883d: 459–534; 525–526). These transcripts include the date of Marie de Champagne's letter. This is interesting because Trojel indicates in his critical edition that this manuscript is also dated 1174, just as Raynouard, misreading Gaston Paris, gives 1176 in his study. Although this is one of the most legible manuscripts, the fact cannot be ignored that it is not possible to determine the date with absolute precision: Ab anno M.C.LXXIIII R(?) Kal. mad. indictione VII.

[15] Borbély (2005: 306).

[16] Mahoney (1958: 1–6).

However, four years later, following Mahoney, John F. Benton refuted Mahoney's conclusion that Andreas Capellanus cannot be the same person as Andree de Lueriis. Some family-related documents of Andre de Lueris have survived. Benton contends that written records prove he was a poor man from a family of serfs who became a free man when he became a priest.[17] Benton argues that the author of the treatise must have been fluent in Latin, which implies a classical education. In addition, he must have been well versed in the works of the ancient authors, and he must have been able to present social differences with sufficient distance in the intertextual references in the dialogues. A man due to his social standing, Benton writes, could not write about his own social situation with the irony and humour of the author that is known as Andreas Capellanus. Benton concludes by saying that Andreas, the author, was certainly a chaplain, although it is not at all certain that he lived and served at the court of Countess Mary.[18] Benton raised his doubt about the position of Andreas Capellanus in the court of Countess Mary due to insufficient documentation of her court in the 13th century.

According to modern secondary literature, the first mention of the work is in 1238, so the terminus ad quem of the work is 1238, and the terminus a quo is 1174, i.e. the date of Countess Mary's letter in the second book of the treatise.

In his monograph, Alfred Karnein argues that it was written in the 1180s, in the court of Philip II. Karnein makes four arguments in support of this hypothesis: (1) in three surviving manuscripts, the author refers to himself as the chaplain to the French king; (2) Gautier le Jeune, to whom the chaplain dedicated the work, was a *iuvenis* at this time; (3) some royal documents between 1190 and 1191 mention two names as witnesses: *Andreas cambellanus* and *Andreas capellanus*, which, Karnein argues, shows the advancement in rank of the chaplain, so he must have written his work earlier; (4) two royal documents from the middle of the 14th century also make reference to the treatise.

[17] Benton (1962: 471–478).
[18] Benton (1962: 471–478).

A closer look at Karnein's arguments reveals the following. In order to identify the author, Karnein cites the three manuscripts in which either an incipit or an explicit part of the name of the chaplain of the King of France is found: one is in Rome, one is in Paris and the third one is in Florence. The earliest of the three manuscripts is the 13th-century manuscript in Rome,[19] which according to the above mentioned Trojel, is also the oldest surviving copy of *De amore*. It is likely that this version was also the model for the 14th-century manuscripts of Paris and Florence, where the term *andrea francorum aule regie capellano* is also found. On this basis, Karnein argues that Capellanus was never at the court of the Countess Mary, the designation at the beginning or end of the manuscripts being evidence that he served as royal chaplain at the court of Philip II.

However, it is important to note that the author of *De amore* has hidden his name in the work: "Nam ea caecus continetur et amens, quos ab amoris curia penitus esse remotos amatoris *Andreae aulae regiae capellani* evidenter nobis doctrina demonstrate."[20] The name 'royal chaplain' appears in all the manuscripts that include the first book, so Karnein's argument does not seem to be fully justified. It is clear from the quotation above that the author calls himself 'Andrew the lovelorn', which links him to the royal court rather than to Champagne, but this would not guarantee that the chaplain served in Paris.

Several theories have been put forward about Walter himself. Walter is the Latin equivalent of Gualterius, to whom Andreas dedicates his work at the beginning of the treatise. Two 15th-century manuscripts, one of which is the Paris manuscript not known to Trojel, name Walter as the king's son,[21]

[19] "Incipit liber amoris et curtesie ab andrea capelano regis francie compositus."
[20] The following text is used:
http://www.thelatinlibrary.com/capellanus/capellanus1.html
http://www.thelatinlibrary.com/capellanus/capellanus2.html
http://www.thelatinlibrary.com/capellanus/capellanus3.html,
which follows this edition: Trojel (1892a). The Latin and French texts have been translated into English by the author of the present paper.
[21] "Incipit liber primus Amoris laxiviedictus ad preces Gualterii regis filii Andree sacri palacii capellano."

while in the Codex Gaddianus (in which a copy of the text can be found) he appears as the king's nephew.[22] Philip II had no child of that name, but the name Gautier is found in the family. The grandson of Peter Courtnay (1155–1219, the Latin emperor of Constantinople), who was a second cousin of Louis VII, was given this name, but he was too young to become the dedicatee of a love treatise. Walter must meet three requirements: he must be relatively young, have an excellent knowledge of Latin, and be somewhat well-known. Henri-François Delaborde (French historian 1854–1927) raised the third option. He has found evidence that a man called Gautier, nicknamed *chambellan* in the historiography, lived at the court of Philip II. However, he was born in Paris in 1125, too old to be the Gualterius of the work. His son was also called Gautier, who, continuing the family tradition, served as the king's chamberlain. The elder Gautier took part in the Crusade with Louis VII (1120–1180, King of France) in 1149, after which he served in Paris. His advancement in rank is indicated by the fact that he served as chamberlain for more than 50 years during the reign of Louis VII and his son Philip II. His political influence is also shown by the fact that in 1174 Louis VII appointed him to administer the chancellorship, a post he held for 30 years. The chancellery also the place where Capellanus fulfilled his duties and Gautier was therefore considered Andreas' superior. After his death in 1205, his son, the younger Gautier, took over the office of the chancellor.

Gautier le Jeune was born in 1163, and his surviving biography tells us that he successfully reconstructed the royal chancellery files that were lost in the Battle of Fréteval against the English, he intorduced an administrational reform of archiving documents in the court of Paris. This information is also of interest because it reveals that Walter was not only educated, but he also knew Latin. In addition to his age and literacy, Karnein argues that Capellanus calls Walter a *iuvenis*: *qualiter sibi tua imperita poterit obstare iuventus?*, which is not a biological but a social term for the age at which a man has reached the age of majority (around 18) and has completed his military

[22] "Explicit liber sapientissimo Andrea regis francie capellano compositus ad precum instantiam Gualterii nomine regis memorati nepotis."

training or initiation ceremony but does not yet have a family of his own to support.[23] The age of adulthood from individual to individual, but for the younger Gautier the *iuvenis* period began in 1181 and lasted until 1186, when he married Elisabeth de Mondreville and had a son, Adam.[24] Capellanus' work could not therefore have been dedicated to the elder Gautier, since the wide interval between the period of supposed production of De amore (1174–1238) and the *iuvenis* age of the elder Gautier would certainly precede this period. Another scholarist, George Duby believes that Capellanus dedicated his work to Walter only because he could not dedicate it directly to the king.[25] The person of Gautier le Jeune therefore supports the appearance of the name Andreas on the documents from the period 1182–1186 since his iuvenis age fits the dating of *De amore*.

Karnein was not the only one to see the substitution of the word *cambellanus* for *capellanus* in royal documents as a promotion in rank, since Pio Rajna an Italian philologist, literary critic and senator in the beginning of the 20th century also held the same view, as mentioned above. Peter Dronke, who was one of the 20th century's leading scholars of medieval Latin lyric, however, draws attention to an interesting fact: the author may have been a chaplain, but the word capellanus was not only used to refer to ecclesiastical persons, it was also used in a metaphorical sense, referring to something/someone who believes. Thus, for example, around 1200, the Archbishop of Salzburg says of Gebehard's *Vita* that Gebehard served the Virgin Mary with such zeal (*obsequium*) that he was rightly called *capellanus* - her believer. Furthermore, in a similar record from the 10th century, Hrotsvitha *Gallicanus*, the emperor calls the devil's worshipper his admirer, *diaboli capellanus*.[26] It is possible that Andreas was a chaplain to the French royal court, but it must also be taken into account that in the *capellanus* sense this epithet merely represented his attachment to the royal court.[27]

[23] Karnein (1985: 32).
[24] Karnein (1985: 32).
[25] Duby (2000: 313).
[26] Dronke (1994: 55).
[27] Dronke (1994: 55).

Andreas as a possible fictional name

Before the publication of the three-book work, Trojel briefly noted in the journal Romania in 1889 that a trouvère and a chronicler (Lambert d'Ardres) made references to a novel in the late 12th century, written in the vernacular about Andrew of Paris and the French queen—although unfortunately this novel has not survived.[28] Martín de Riquer a Spanish medievalist in the 21st century has collected the thirteen troubadours who mention this work. In these records, Andreas (who was then also known as Andreas the Frenchman) was celebrated as a hero by the people after he died for love. In one of his poems, Uc de la Bacalaria lists passionate lovers, including Andreas of Paris:

> Qu'eu jur pels sans evangelis
> Que anc **Andrieus de Paris**,
> Floris, Tristans ni Amelis
> Ne foron d'amor tant fis.[29]

Another troubadour also refers to the chaplain. Gaucelm Faidit, a poet from the late 12th century, tells his chosen mistress:

> Car cel Andrieus, c'om romanssa,
> non trais anc tant greu martire
> per la reïna de Franssa
> cum ieu per vos cui desire;
> mas tant aut etz, per q'ieu m'albire,
> que ja non aurai jauzimen
> s'Amors vas mi no lo dissen…[30]

[28] Trojel (1889b: 473).
[29] Auguis (1824: 282).
[30] Mouzat (1965: 323–324).

> [For Andrew in his romance never suffered so great torments for the Queen of France as I have for you, but you are so exalted that I believe I shall never have pleasure unless Cupid brings you down to me...]

This extract bears a strong resemblance to that of chapter six of the second book of *De amore*, where the author deals with the question of infidelity and even names himself again:

> Sed dices forte: Adeo talis mulieris amore languescit amator quod eius nullis potest artibus oblivisci vel suam ab ea retrahere mentem; huic ergo, magister, liberationis praesta remedium." Sed non gaudeat Andreas de eo quod magis cupit in orbe, sine quo etiam diu non potest corporali vita beari, si suum unquam ediderit homini tam infortunato remedium. Magis enim videtur hominum utilitatibus expedire, si proprio illum relinquamus arbitrio et eius tanquam mortui vulnera negligamus intacta, quam amoris eum remedia doceamus. […] Quam regulam nostri quidem experimento cognoscimus esse verissimam. Nam et nos excellentissimi amoris concitamur aculeis, quamvis inde nullum sumpsimus nec speramus assumere fructum. Nam tantae altitudinis cogimur amore languescere quod nulli licet exprimere verbo, nec supplicantium audemus iure potiri, et sic demum compellimur proprii corporis sentire naufragia.
>
> [But you may say, "This lover is so desirous of the love of that woman that he cannot forget her or take his mind from her. Master, then give him some remedy that will free him." But Andreas should not long rejoice in what is desirable for him in this world, and without which this carnal life would not be beautiful for him, if he had ever given such a wretched man a remedy. For we think it more profitable for this man to be left alone, and like a dead man, not to touch his wounds, than to teach him the cure of this love [...] And our experience has judged this statement to be very apt. For we ourselves are burning with the wound of the arrow of love for a very excellent lady, though we can neither receive nor even hope to receive any

> of the fruits of that love. For we think that the word cannot express it, and dare not even beg to be heard. And so we feel that we ourselves are drifting towards shipwreck.]

In this extract, according to Dronke, the author recalls the story of Andreas of Paris, who was desperately in love with the Queen of France, and she exalted him to win at the game of chivalry. The result is that the character in the treatise takes the name of meaning that the name Andreas in itself is an intertextual reference to a lost literary work.[31] The passage presented above, in which the author refers to himself as King Andrew's chaplain, suggests in Dronke's interpretation that the author appeals to the authority of the king's chaplain, who is passionate about love (*amatoris Andree, aule regie capellani*),[32] writing the treatise in his name and exploring the issue of love in detail. The following quotation may support this:

> Sunt et alia amoris praecepta minora, quorum tibi non expediret auditus, quae etiam in libro ad Gualterium scripto reperies.
>
> [There are other, lesser commandments of love, which you don't need to listen to, as you will find them in the book written to Gualterius.]

In light of these examples, one might ask whether the name Andreas is merely a *nom de plume* rather than a literary device, and whether the author intended to use the name of a known lover, which had already been embodied in the form of an existing love figure and was later used by the troubadour. If this were the case, there is no need to look for the person of the historical Andreas Capellanus. However, the historical facts and the name on the documents suggest that this is not a fictional character but a real historical figure. The documents show that the chaplain took part in important events with the Countess in 1185 and 1186. He was present with Margie Ca-

[31] Dronke (1994: 54).
[32] Dronke (1994: 54).

pet when the Countess founded the church of Saint-Étienne in Troyes and ordered the chaplain to say a daily mass for herself and her son. He accompanied Mary to Paris with her almoner William and one of the clergy to the funeral of her brother Geoffrey with Odoval of Sézanne, and he was present when the Countess donated the Saint-Sauveur Cathedral in memory of her late husband.[33] All these historical facts narrow down the date of the work to 1182-1186, but to be certain of this, the arguments relating to the terminus a quo date of the work must also be examined.

As mentioned earlier, the author himself links the writing of the treatise to the year 1174. This date appears in Marie de Champagne's letter, at the end of the sixth dialogue of Book I (1 May 1174). It is interesting to note that the first day of May in 1174 was considered to be the feast of love, since the publication of Chrétien de Troyes' *Lancelot* was linked to this day.[34] It is also safe to say that the author of the work must have been familiar with Chrétien de Troyes' *Lancelot*, written in the mid-1170s, which tells of the love between the adulterous queen and the young knight, since the chaplain refers to it in his work.

Another theory, like the author, the dating of the work is a work of literary fiction, more likely to have been written between 1186 and 1190. The year 1186 marks the marriage of Béla III and Margaret of Capet. However, there are two references in the work that have a Hungarian historical relevance and are of particular importance in establishing the date.[35] The figure of King Béla III, the Hungarian king mentioned in Capellanus' work, may be based on the person and historical background of the Byzantine Béla-Alexios (1148-1196) who lived at the time the work was probably written.[36] In 1163, Emperor Manuel took Prince Béla III to his court and appointed him his successor, betrothing her daughter, Mary to the young Hungarian prince. He offered the thrones Croatia and Dalmatia as wedding presents.[37] However,

[33] Evergates (2019: 59).
[34] Duby (2000: 314).
[35] Egedi-Kovács (2013: 52).
[36] Egedi-Kovács (2013: 53).
[37] Magdalino (1993: 79–81).

Manuel's second wife gives birth to a son and thus he becomes the heir to the throne instead of Béla. The engagement between Béla-Alexios and Mary is broken off. So in 1172, to compensate for the marriage and the loss of the imperial title, the Emperor helped Béla win the Hungarian throne. In addition the new wife of Béla (Agnes of Châtillon daughter of Rajnald of Châtillon) became the half-sister of the wife of Emperor Manuel (Maria Komnénos (Antiochian)).[38]

Béla was crowned King of Hungary in 1173, which date would support the putative date of composing *De amore*, 1174.[39] Béla-Alexios appears on Capellanus's work twice: first, unlike his Italian contemporary, the Hungarian King's defective apperance does not correlate with is excellency as a ruler.:

> Fertur etenim quendam in Italiae finibus degere comitem habentem subtilia crura et ab optimis parentibus derivatum et in sacro palatio clarissima dignitate pollentibus omnique decoris specie coruscantem, cunctisque fertur abundare rerum divitiis, omni tamen probitate, ut dicitur, destitutus est, omnesque ipsum boni mores ornare verentur, pravique omnes dicuntur in eo domicilium invenisse. Et econtra rex est in Ungaria intensa plurimum habens crura simulque rotunda, prolixosque et aequales pedes et omnibus fere decoribus destitutos. Quia tamen nimia morum invenitur probitate fulgere, regalis coronae meruit accipere gloriam et per universum paene mundum resonant eius praeconia laudis.
>
> [For it is said that somewhere in Italy there lives a count with a rabbit's foot, and that he comes from one of the best families, whose members hold high offices in the Holy Palace. He himself boasts every edge of external beauty, and is said to abound in earthly goods. Yet he is reputed to be destitute of all merit, and while good morals fear to shun him, evil ones take up residence in his soul. On the other hand, there is a king in Hungary, who has a king's hooped leg, and a foot as broad as it is long, without a

[38] Magdalino (1993: 79–81).
[39] Egedi-Kovács (2013: 59).

> form, and he himself will be destitute of all ornaments. But because he shines with his excellent virtues, he deserves to be adorned with a royal crown, and almost the whole world resounds with his far-reaching praise.]

Second, a lady expresses her opinion that she does not want to live a subjugated life, enriched by Hungarian money, she prefers to stay in her homeland instead:

> Malo igitur aere modico Franciae contenta adesse et liberum eundi quo voluero possidere arbitrium quam Ungarico quidem onusta argento alienae subiici potestati, quia tale multum habere est nihilum habere
>
> [I would rather, therefore, remain in France with vile money, and go where I please, than be subjected to foreign power with a rich supply of Hungarian silver, for even if we get much, we end up with nothing.]

Some scholars, taking into account both historical and philological elements, show that these two references to Hungarians may indeed indicate Béla III, although the scene mentioning the wealth of the Hungarians does not refer to Béla's second marriage to Margaret of Capet, but to his earlier marriage to Agnes of Châtillon, which supports the early dating of *De amore* mentioned by the author. However, an incorrect date is used, 7 May 1174 instead of 1 May 1174, which date could indeed come from the author. That being said, as explained above, on the one hand, the author uses a symbolic date in the letter; on the other hand, this is not a typo, but also a material error, since the end of the letter reads: *Ab anno MCLXXIIII Kal. maii. Indictione VII.*

Conclusion

In my opinion, it would be imprudent to accept an early date of composing, namely 1174 knowing that the historical facts concerning the persons of Capellanus and Walter, and the repeated occurrence of the name of the

chaplain as a witness in royal documents suggest that the work was written between 1182 and 1186. Of course, the work should not be taken as a clear source, since the real life author's name is also the name of the fictitious author in the text, which is perhaps part of the author's fiction.[40] However, as explained above, the date given in the treatise, the person of Béla III, and the age of the intended reader, as well as his role at the royal court, suggest that Andreas Capellanus was an educated chaplain, highly trained in Latin, who served at the court of Marie de Champagne at the time of writing, but who, after a promotion, was already serving at the court of Philip II upon the completion of the work, as is shown in the royal documents. The exact date of the work cannot be determined, but in my opinion the late dating, the period between 1190 and 1238 is clearly refutable, and along the lines of the above arguments, the work can be shown to have been written between 1182 and 1186. There is no conclusive argument in favour of the date of 1174 stated in the first book, so, like the ironically written work itself, this date is merely part of the author's craftsmanship.

Bibliography

Aretin 1803 — J. Aretin: *Aussprüche der Minnegerichte: Aus alten Handschriften herausgegeben und mit einer historischen Abhandlung über die Minnegerichte des Mittelalters begleitet*. München 1803.

Auguis 1824 — P. Auguis: *Les Poètes françois, depuis le XIIe siècle jusqu'à Malherbe*. Paris 1824.

Benton 1962 — J. Benton: *The Evidence for Andreas Capellanus Re-Examined Again*. Studies in Philology 59, 3 (1962) 471–478.

Borbély 2005 — Borbély G.: *Természetfilozófia, teológia, szexualitás, Andreas Capellanus De amoréja az 1277-es elítélő határozatban*. In: Nyíri K. – Palló G. (ed.): Túl az iskolafilozófián. A 21. század bölcseleti élménye. Budapest 2005, 298–316.

Dinaux 1837 — A. Dinaux: *Trouvères, jongleurs et ménestrels du nord de la France et du midi de la Belgique*, 3. Téchener 1837.

Dronke 2010 — P. Dronke: *Andreas Capellanus*. The Journal of Medieval Latin 4 (1994) 51–63.

Duby 2000 — G. Duby: *A nő a középkorban*. Budapest 2000.

[40] Németh (2014: 312).

Egedi-Kovács 2013 — Egedi-Kovács E.: *Béla-Alexiosz emléke a 12. századi francia irodalomban*. In: Györkös A. (ed.): Francia-magyar kapcsolatok a középkorban. Debrecen 2013, 49–64.

Evergates 2019 — T. Evergates: *Appendix 2*. In: Marie of France Countess of Champagne, 1145-1198. Philadelphia 2019, 87–88.

Karnein 1985 — A. Karnein: *De Amore in volkssprachlicher Literatur*. Heidelberg 1985.

Kim 2010 — P. Kim: *L'Amour courtois*« de *Gaston Paris: une lecture décadente du »Chevalier de la Charrette?*. The French Review 83, 3 (2010) 589–606.

Kőszeghy 2012 — Kőszeghy P*.: Utószó*. In: A szerelemről. Budapest 2012, 279–330.

Magdalino 1993 — P. Magdalino: *The Empire of Manuel I Komnenos 1143-1180*. Cambridge 1993.

Mahoney 1958 — J. Mahoney: *The Evidence for Andreas Capellanus in Re-Examination*. Studies in Philology 55, 1 (1958) 1–6.

Mouzat 1965 — J. Mouzat: *Les poèmes de Gaucelm Faidit*. Paris 1965.

Németh 2014 — Németh Cs.: *Koholni szerelmet (Andreas Capellanus: A szerelemről)*. Buksz (2014) 312–318.

Paris 1884b — G. Paris: *Une traduction d'André le chapelain au 13iéme siècle*. Romania 13 (1884) 403–404.

Paris 1884c — G. Paris: *André de France*. Romania 1 (1884) 105–107.

Paris 1888a — G. Paris: *La littérature française au moyen âge (XIe-XIVe siècle)*. Paris 1888.

Rajna 1891 — P. Rajna: *Tre studi per la storia del libro di Andrea Cappellano*. Studi di filologia romanza 5 (1891) 193–272.

Raynouard 1817 — F. Raynouard: *Choix des poésis originales des Troubadours*. Paris 1817.

Trojel 1892a — E. Trojel (ed.): *De amore libri tres*, Havniae: Libraria Gadiana 1892.

Trojel 1889b — E. Trojel: *IV. André de Paris et André le Chapelain*. Romania 18, 71 (1889) 473–477.