The Discourse of Power: The Lyrics of the Trobairitz

In "L'ordre du discours," Foucault postulates that there are two levels of contradiction: "that of appearances, which is resolved in the profound unity of discourse; and that of foundations, which gives rise to discourse itself." In twelfth-century Europe there is a contradiction of appearances between the historical fact of women's power through property ownership and the subordinate legal status of women as minors, a contradiction that is ultimately diffused in the representation of women in historical discourse as powerless, which they often were. There is, moreover, a contradiction of foundations in the contrast between the representation of women as powerful in the literary discourse of the male troubadours and the representation of women as powerless in the literary discourse of the female trobairitz, a discourse that in its very existence constitutes an act of empowerment.

Despite some historical evidence of women's economic and political power, the representations of women's powerlessness throughout historical discourse is preeminent. Philippe de Beaumanoir, the thirteenth-century French jurist who recorded the common law of Beauvais, reminds us of the inferior legal status of medieval women: "'The dumb, the deaf, the insane and the female cannot draw up a contract, neither alone nor through a representative, since they are subservient to the authority of others.'" Historically, by the twelfth century, however, women could and did inherit fiefs throughout Europe, either as inheritance or as dowry. As widows, they held the usufruct of one-third to one-half of their deceased husbands' estates as part of the dower. These fiefs included oaths of fealty, military service, and the exercise of any necessary government functions. In fact, there is evidence that in Provence, for a time in the eleventh and twelfth centuries, opportunities were somewhat improved for women. Diane Owen Hughes writes:

In Provence, where in the eleventh and early twelfth centuries daughters seem often to have shared the same familial rights as sons, almost exactly contemporary statutes
began to exclude dowered daughters. . . But they were not kept from the succession of grandparents or more distant collaterals.  

Although the exclusion of daughters from bilateral inheritance by means of dowries was ultimately to come to an end, for a brief time around the twelfth century, some women in Provence enjoyed the economic privileges that afforded them the education, the leisure, and the freedom to compose and sing songs in their own right. Indeed, the emergence of women's voices at the very moment of the decline of their economic rights and political privileges does not seem coincidental. 

Beyond the apparent contradiction between the historical fact of female property ownership in the twelfth century and historical discourse describing women as powerless, however, is a fundamental contradiction in literary discourse where male authors code women as powerful and sexual in a culture where women's sexuality was feared, denigrated and controlled. It is this profound contradiction that gives rise to a new discourse in which female authors depict their own powerlessness even as they are empowered through the discursive act itself. 

While it is clear that it is the contradictions in masculine literary discourse that give rise to the discourse of the trobairitz, it may actually have been a historical accident (in the sense of Foucault's "irruption") that formed the catalyst that enabled certain women to become trobairitz. Brian Stock posits in The Implications of Literacy that "[j]ust as the market created a level of 'abstract entities' and 'model relations' between producer and consumer, literacy created a set of lexical and syntactical structures which made the persona of the speaker largely irrelevant." Stock argues that the subjectivity of oral discourse was increasingly replaced by the model of the objective written text, particularly in the twelfth century. The trobairitz may have been in some sense the beneficiaries of an increasingly literate society that in its rising objectivity in law and philosophy accidentally provides a fissure through which the voices of women briefly emerge. 

An analysis of the literary code of the joc d'amor and the signs of feminine discourse within the lyrics of the trobairitz reveals the contradictions inherent in representations of feminine power. Paraphrasing Bakhtin, Cerquiglini writes that speech is the attempt "to master the discourse of others." It is hardly surprising, therefore, that in seeking a voice and a subject, the trobairitz should have adopted, or adapted, masculine troubadourial conventions. While the lyrics of the trobairitz contain signs about the historical and literary representations of women, they do not establish
a separate feminine discourse as do writers such as Marie de France and Christine de Pisan. That the trobairitz were unable to overthrow the paradigm of male-controlled discourse does not vitiate their importance to the study of women in the Middle Ages.

The lyrics of the trobairitz comprise a public poetry responding to the contradictions of the troubadour construct, the game of fin’amors. This public poetry is characterized by the participation of the trobairitz in the literary joc d’amor, though in the role of women who remain both subject and object of that game. As Pierre Bec puts it, “la domna, devenue adoratrice, . . . n’en cessait . . . d’être la dame dominatrice.” In this respect the trobairitz preserve the seignorial aspect of the troubadour tradition, while at the same time pointing to its limitations. Indeed, by speaking for themselves the trobairitz manifest the limits of male power and female subordination, exposing the fictions of the troubadours.

Duby, meanwhile, has argued that the troubadour lyric represents the socialization of a military class through the repression of violence and its sublimation into a game of conduct. If the courtly romance provided the ruling military class with its self-justification, the troubadour lyric crystallized this justification into legitimacy. Erich Koehler notes that “[l]a poésie des troubadours naît très précisément à l’instant où l’anoblissement de la chevalerie est de facto accompli, sans qu’il soit encore entré définitivement dans la conscience — ni des maîtres, ni des sujets — comme une donnée évidente dont on ne conteste pas la légitimité.” Particularly evident in the troubadour lyrics is the tension between the lower nobility and the older, established aristocracy.

Amors became a concept in which these social tensions were at once sublimated and deflected onto women. Love in the Middle Ages, and in particular the literary code of fin’amors, was a social construct that encompassed an entire web of relations and codified rules prescribing conduct in many areas of behavior for the upper classes: “L’amour est compris comme un facteur d’ordre dans la société.” That the medieval definition of love was indeed preceptive is particularly illustrated by one of the songs of Guillem VII, Count of Poitiers, IX Duke of Aquitaine:

Ja no cera nuils hom ben fis  
Contr’amor, si non l’es aclis,  
Ez als estranhs ez als vezis  
Non es consens,  
Ez a totz sels d’ailc d’azi  
Obediens.
Obediensa deu portar
A maintas gens, qui vol amar;
E cove li que sapcha far
Faitz avinens,
E que.s gart en cort de parlar
Vilamens.\textsuperscript{22}

[No man will ever be perfect toward love, if he is not submissive to it, and if toward both strangers and neighbors he is not obliging, and to all those of that realm obedient. He ought to render obedience to many people, he who wishes to love, and it is necessary that he know how to perform pleasing feats, and that he guard himself, in court, from speaking vulgarly.]

The ethics of love include congeniality toward strangers and neighbors alike, proper service, avoidance of vulgar speech, and above all, obedience. This insistence on obedience to rules carries over into the game of love, the \textit{joc d’amor}; after all, love is all a matter of how you play the game. Playfulness has always been a component of the troubadour tradition, even as Guillem VII sang:

\begin{verbatim}
Farai un vers de dreit niën:
Non er de mi ni d’autra gen,
Non er d’amor ni de joven,
Ni de ren au,
Qu’enans fo trobatz en durmen
Sobre chivau.\textsuperscript{23}
\end{verbatim}

[I shall make a verse of exactly nothing: there will be nothing of me nor of other people, there will be nothing of love nor of youth, nor of anything else, for it was composed earlier while I was sleeping on a horse.]

Among the funniest and most memorable examples of the game of flirtation is that of Bernart de Ventadorn, who pleads:

\begin{verbatim}
Domna, a prezen amat
autrui, e me a celat,
si qu’eu n’aya tot lo pro
et el la bela razo.\textsuperscript{24}
\end{verbatim}

[Lady, in public love the other one, and me in private, so that I may have all the good of it, and he the fine conversation.]
Perhaps one of the clearest instances of the seignorial relation between a troubadour and his lady, however, is to be found in the *tenso* between the trobairitz Isabella and the troubadour Elias Cairel, where Elias says:

\[
\text{e s’ieu en dizia lauzor} \\
en mon chantar, no.1 dis per drudaria, \\
mas per honor e pro qu’ieu n’atendia, \\
si com joglars fai de domna prezan;}^{25}
\]

[and if I have sung your praise in my song, I did it not for love, but for the honor and profit that I expected from it, just as a jongleur does with a lady of worth.]

The game is up when one gives it away, or is it? Not judging by Isabella’s response:

\[
\text{N’Elias Cairel, amador} \\
\text{non vi mais de vostre voler} \\
\text{qui cambies domna per aver,} \\
\text{e s’ieu en disses desonor,} \\
\text{ieu n’ai dig tant de be qu’om no.1 creiria;} \\
\text{mas ben podetz doblar vostra follia:} \\
\text{de mi vos dic qu’ades vau meilluran,} \\
\text{mas endreig vos non ai cor ni talan. (22)}
\]

[Sir Elias Cairel, I have never seen a lover more of your willingness to exchange a lady for property, and if I were to say dishonor of you, I have spoken so many good things of you that no one would believe it; but certainly you can double your folly: as for me I say to you that already I go on improving, but for you I have neither heart nor inclination.]

Isabella takes Elias’s frank admission in stride, and turns it to her own advantage.

In fact, the one common denominator in the surviving lyrics of the trobairitz is the literary *joc d’amor*—either in the sense of playing the game or in an analysis of how the game is played—from Castelloza’s dramatic extremism to the ironic use of religious language that Dronke finds in the *tenso* of Almucs de Castelnau and Iseut de Capio.\(^{26}\) By daring to speak on behalf of the silent Lady, the trobairitz reveal the contradictions inherent in the troubadour *topoi*; armed only with the authority of their own wit and their posture of powerlessness, the trobairitz play the game and often win.

The received critical view about the trobairitz is that they simply inverted
the conventions of the troubadours and were stylistically inferior. In fact, however, the gender of the troubairitz does not result in a corresponding shift whereby the male subject embodies an ideal of value or perfection, as Marianne Shapiro has pointed out. Moreover, the troubairitz all share a consciousness of their places as women in the game, both as artists and as ladies within the literary construct of fin’amors. This awareness leads to a doubleness in the poetry that highlights the contradictions of the game, as illustrated in the following lines from Clara d’Anduza, wherein the speaker is both active subject and passive object:

Ja no.us donetz, bels amics, espaven
que ja ves vos aja cor trichador,
ni qu’ie.us camge per nul autr’ amador,
si.m pregavon d’autres omes un cen; (26)

[Do not be afraid, handsome friend, that I would ever be unfaithful to you, nor that I would exchange you for any other lover, if I were wooed by a hundred other men.]

The troubairitz deliberately exploit the difference between their roles as artists and their roles as objects of the love game. Shapiro points out that “[t]he troubairitz demonstrate by omission their selection of those topoi that foreground the essential paradox of their femininity as poets within a male system.” She goes on to link the choice of topoi with the ways in which the troubairitz play the game within the rules while actually emphasizing their own status as objects. By doing so, the troubairitz demonstrate their intentions to play the joc d’amor according to its rules, and part of the game includes the women’s refusal to play.

Though “contre-courtoise” songs are legion among the troubadours, I would locate the works of the troubairitz in the tradition of the lyric wherein the women refuse to be seduced by the lines of their suitors. Women who play the part of pragmatists in the joc d’amor are particularly evident in the pastorelas of the troubadours, as in the following stanza from Marcabru where the peasant girl typically is not taken in by the nobleman:

—“Don, hom coïtatz de follatge
Jur’ e pliu e promet gatge:
Si.m fariatz homenatge,
Seignier, so.m dis la vilana;
Mas ieu, per un pauc d’inratge,
Non vuoi ges mon piucellatge,
Camjar per nom de putana.”
["‘Lord, a man tormented by madness swears and pledges and promises security: so you would do homage to me, Master,’ this said the peasant to me; ‘but I am not at all willing, for a little entrance fee, to exchange my virginity for the name of a whore.’"]

The pastorelas involves the additional element of class hierarchy, and, at least in the early pastorelas of Marcabru, the social realism of the traditional frame; the trobairets were presumably from the educated aristocracy, and therefore had to play a more subtle game, having more to lose.

If there seems a certain unwillingness in the extant lyrics by the trobairets to play the troubadours’ ornate word-games of trobar ric and the esoteric hermeneutical games of trobar clus, it is in keeping with their roles within the joc d’amor. The trobairets Lombarda addresses this issue in her tenso with the troubadour Bernart Arnaut d’Armagnac when she says: ‘car lo mirails e no vezer discorda / tan mon acord c’ab pauc no.1 desacorda’ (22) [‘for the mirror and not seeing so disrupts my rhyme that it almost interrupts it’]. In the context of the lyric, these lines imply that Bernart Arnaut is in love with his own image and almost disrupts Lombarda’s rhymes, which is to say that the troubadours’ self-projection onto the images of women that they have created and with which they then pretend to be in love has made life very difficult for the trobairets, both as artists and as women. That Lombarda’s lyric is the only surviving example of trobar clus by a trobairet—and one that incorporates the difficulty of composing trobar clus as a woman in its very subject—is particularly significant because it highlights the problem confronted by women trying to utilize the very troubadour models that require women as silent mirrors of narcissistic masculine desire.32

The posture of unsophistication is in fact an extension of the traditional female role in the game, one that is most clearly delineated in the pastorelas. In Marcabru’s ‘L’autrier jost’ una sebissa,’ when the poet says to the shepherdess that she is sweet and innocent and that therefore she should not be alone in the pasture, she replies:

—‘Don, fetz ela, qui que.m sia,
Ben conosc sen e folia;
La vostra pareillaria,
Seignor, so.m dis la vilana,
Lai on se tang si s’estia,
Que tals la cuid’ en bailia
Tener, no.n a mas l’ufana.’33
[""Lord,"" she said, ""whatever I may be, I certainly know sense and foolishness; your company, Master,"" this said the peasant girl, ""there where it is fitting let it stay, for many a one who believes to hold it in her power, has nothing but the look of it.""

Of this poem, Zink observes, ""Il faut dire que cette rusée bergère accentue à plaisir ses manières campagnardes et sa feinte simplicité pour se moquer du poète et finalement l'envoyer promener. . . ."" The fact that Marcabru underlines the shepherdess's so-called simplicity within the very means by which he signals her reported discourse (""so.m dis la vilana'"") suggests that a highly developed awareness of the manipulation of discourse is part of the genre from its earliest example.

Indeed, the trobairitz' lack of linguistic pyrotechnics is part of the refusal of women to engage in the joc, which in itself is a posture required of the game. This is particularly evident in the third song of Castelloza:

Mout aurai mes mals usatge  
a las autras amairitz:  
qu'om sol trametre messatge  
e motz triaz e chausitz,  
et ieu tenc me per garida,  
amics, a la mia fe,  
quan vos prec, qu'aiss.m cove;  
que.l plus pros n'es enriquida  
s'a de vos qualqu'aondansa  
de baisar o d'acoindansa. (24)

[I shall have set a very bad example for the other (female) lovers, because usually the man sends the message, words collected and chosen. Yet I hold myself protected, friend, by my faith, when I court you—because this is right for me; for the most noble lady is enriched if she gets from you any abundance of kissing or affection.]

In her declaration that only men send deliberate messages of courtship, Castelloza illustrates that the straightforward language of the trobairitz is part of the posture of artlessness women adopt as part of the game. The public awkwardness of female authorship is the subject, and the seignorial topos is inverted so that it is the lady, and the trobairitz, who is enriched from the friendship.

The trobairitz openly address fundamental contradictions faced by medieval women, especially those stemming from women's limited access
to power. Azalais de Porcairagues is particularly direct about the predicament of a woman who is chosen by a man of much higher rank:

Dompna met mot mal s’amor
que ab ric ome plaideia,
ab plus aut de vavassor,
e s’il o faï, il folleia;
car so diz om en Veillai
que ges per ricor non vai,
e dompna que n’es chauzida
en tenc per evilanida. (17)

[A lady places her love very badly who pleads with a wealthy man, one above the rank of vavassor: and if she does it, she is a fool; for in Velay one says that love and money do not mix, and the woman who is chosen by money I hold as debased.]

The implication here is that the woman chosen by a rich man in a love match is base because she must have used her sexuality to gain access to his wealth, prestige, and authority; yet the responsibility for the relationship is deliberately ambiguous ("Dompna . . . ab ric ome plaideia," "dompna que n’es chauzida"), emphasizing the double bind in which historically many medieval women must have found themselves. The social prohibitions against women’s acquisition of power were strong enough to be enforced by other women, as Azalais’s own use of “tenc” shows.

The partimen among Alais, Iselda, and Carezna, on the other hand, is remarkable for its direct treatment of the few options available to medieval women, namely marriage or cloister, and of a young woman attempting to choose between them. It is surprising too in its frank discussion of the effect of matrimony and childbirth on women:

Na Carezna, penre marit m’agenza,
mas far enfanz cug qu’es grans penedenza,
que las tetinizas pendon aval jos,
e.1 ventrilhs es cargatz e enojos. (28)

[Lady Carezna, it pleases me to take a husband, and yet having children I think is a great penance, for one’s breasts hang right down, and one’s belly is heavy and irksome.]

The sense of play in the language, from earthy to religious, demonstrates a freedom of literary form that is unusual. It is not the troubadour lyrics
but the long tradition of clerical exhortations to women on virginity that this song parodies. In reappropriating misogynistic language, the trobairitz also reclaim power over their own bodies, and celebrate this feat in a song about a young woman who herself has the power to choose her fate.

The explicit appropriation of religious and legal language in the tenso of Almucs de Castelnau and Iseut de Capio authorizes the power of the lady over her lover; at the same time, however, the temporary and borrowed nature of that power is made apparent by the condition of the final couplet:

Dompna n’Iseus, s’ieu saubes
qu’el se pentis de l’engan
qu’el a fait vas mi tan gran,
ben fora dreich que n’agues
merces; mas a mi no.s taing,
pos que del tort no s’afraing
ni.s pentis del faillimen,
que n’aja mais chauzimen;
mas si vos faitz lui pentir
leu podretz mi convertir. (25)

[Lady Iseut, if I knew that he repented of the great deceit he showed towards me, it would be right that I should have pity; but it is not fitting for me, since he does not diminish his wrong nor repent of his failing, that I should have more indulgence towards it; but if you make him repent, you can convert me easily.]

The lady Almucs cannot escape the confines of being at once the subject and the object of the game. The language plays in the cramped space between the constricted lives of women, the restrictions upon which are represented by the song’s borrowed legal and religious terms, and the empowerment of discourse, represented by the song itself. Here we see clearly the box in which the trobairitz find themselves, adopting the discourse of the troubadours but ultimately confined by the paradigm of that discourse.

In Maria de Ventadorn’s tenso with Gui d’Ussel, Maria highlights the power play between men and women in literary discourse by contrasting the hierarchical relations between the lady and the troubadour with the fiction of the equality of the sexes in love:

Gui d’Ussel, ges d’aitals razos
non son li drut al comenssar,
anz ditz chascus, can vol preiar
mans jointas e de genolhos:
‘dompna voillatq que.us serva francamen
cum lo vostr’ om’, et ell’ enaissi.l pren;
ieu lo jutge per dreich a trahitor,
si.s rend pariers ei.s det per servidor. (21)

[Gui d’Ussel, lovers do not have reasons of such a kind in the
beginning at all; on the contrary each says, when he wishes
to court, hands clasped and on his knees: “Lady, allow me
to serve you frankly as your man.” And she takes him thus;
I judge him by right a traitor if he renders himself her equal
after having given himself as her servant.]

Maria points out that suitors cannot have it both ways, insisting both on
service and equality. The trobaritz here is refusing the pedestal by herself
taking on the role of the pragmatist who is not mystified by the game, a
role often assigned to women in other genres, particularly the pastorela.
Gui d’Ussel’s response is interesting for its typical masculine insistence on
the fiction of a love that binds between ranks and incurs no obligations be-
yond itself: “pois ren no.lh deu drutz mas quant per amor” (21) [because
the lover owes her nothing more than that which is required by love]. The
tension between the actual relations of men and women and their literary
relations is the animating force behind this tenso.

The disparity between women’s lives and their images in masculine litera-
ary discourse is the explicit subject of the following stanza from Castel-
loza’s first lyric, where public disapproval of female “courting”—which
must in some sense also mean singing—creates a dilemma for the trobaritz
both as women and as poets:

Ieu sai ben qu’a mi estai gen,
si bei.s dizn tuich que mout descove
que dompna prei a cavallier de se
ni que.l teigna totz temps tan lonc prezic;
mas cel qu’o ditz non sap ges ben chausir,
qu’ieu vuoll proar enans que.m lais morir,
qu’el preiar ai un gran revenimen
quan prec cellui don ai greu pessamen. (23)

[I know well that it is becoming to me, although rightly they
say that it is very unsuitable that a lady plead for herself with
a knight, and hold him in such long conversation all the
time; but he who says this does not know how to discern at
all, for I want to try (to entreat him) before I let myself die, since in entreating him I get great recovery, when I entreat the one who gives me such grief.]

This stanza is extraordinary for the way in which Castelloza modulates its tone, from glee to mock high tragedy—what Paden et al. strangely mistake for masochism.\(^{37}\) Such a misinterpretation results from a failure to read the tone of the lyric correctly; the question of tone in any poem must take into account the relation between the poet and the audience as well as the literary context against which the poet is working.\(^{38}\) We know that troubadours often composed for their peers, and included many jokes, frequently at their own expense; there is no reason to suppose that the trobairitz might not have done the same. Castelloza's mock seriousness is even more obviously parodic in the last stanza of this lyric, where the tone evokes the emotional blackmail motif common in troubadour poetry:

Oimais non sai, que.us mi presen,
que cercat ai et ab mal et ab be
vostre dur cor, don lo mieus noi.s recrê;
e no.us o man, qu'ieu mezeissau.s o dic
que morai me, si no.m voletz jauzir
de quelque joi, e si.m laissatz morir,
faretz peccat, e serai n'len tormen,
e seretz ne blasmatz vilanamen.\(^{39}\) (23)

[From now on I do not know how I may present myself to you, for I have sought with bad and with good your hard heart, whence my own does not renounce you; and I don't send you this, but I say it to you myself: that I shall die, if you don't want me to enjoy whatever joy, and if you let me die, you will commit a sin, and I will be in torment, and thence you will be blamed vilely.]

The tone is very similar to that of Bernart de Ventadorn in the following passage:

A, can mal sembla, qui la ve,
qued aquest chaitiu deziron
que ja ses leis non aura be,
laisse morrir, que no l'aon.\(^{40}\)

[Ah, it does not seem to whoever sees her that she would leave this man, miserable with desire, who will have no good without her, to die because she does not aid him.]
Yet no one has suggested that Bernart is a masochist, but simply a reproachful lover (or an unappreciated troubadour); indeed, the poet who threatens his lady with his imminent death is a standard troubadour *topos*. Out of the context of the troubadour game, however, Bernart’s passage sounds much like Castelloza’s; Castelloza’s lyrics, removed from their social context, may be misinterpreted as the moanings of a masochistic female by those inclined to see women as masochists.

The trobairitz also point to the dichotomy of women’s lives and literary images within the context of their own artistic production. The relation between life and art is brought into question by Tibors, who says “ben vos posc en ver dir” (25) [I can indeed tell you truly], where “ver” suggests both “truly” and “in verse”; the poet thereby calls into question the veracity of verse through the disjunction between her playfulness and her assertion of sincerity. By undermining the truth of the verse with her word-play, Tibors skillfully underscores the mendacity of the game.

Similarly, in her second poem, the Comtessa de Dia not only confronts the discrepancies inherent in the game’s expectations of women but also those encountered by women who are caught between the fiction of sexual license and the reality of social proscriptions:

*A chantar m’er de so qu’ieu non volria,*
*tant me rancur de lui cui sui amia,*
car ieu l’am mais que nuilla ren que sia:
*vas lui no.m val merces ni cortesia*
ni ma beltatz ni mos pretz ni mos sens,
c’atressi.m sui enganad’ e trahia
*com degr’ esser, s’ieu fos desavinens. (18)*

[I have to sing of what I would not wish, so bitter do I feel about him whose love I am, for I love him more than anything there is: with him, of no use to me are grace or courtesy, nor my beauty, merit or understanding, for I am deceived and betrayed just as much as I would rightly be if I had been unwelcoming.]

The posture of the poet impelled by bitterness to sing is ironic in juxtaposition with the idea of her compelling love; it is especially so in the context of the Comtessa’s insistence upon her own attributes and her warning at the end: “Mas aitan plus voill li digis messatges / qu’en trop d’orguoill ant gran dan maintas gens” (18) [But so much more I want you to tell him, messenger, that in the case of too much pride many people have great harm]. This lyric is less “an attempt to persuade the lover”41 than a reversal
of the troubadours’ self-projections, one that emphasizes the contradiction between the literary invitation to sex and the actual opprobrium for women who would act upon it.

The trobaïritz present an array of rhetorical strategies through which women survive and surpass their limited options. In the first stanza of Castelloza’s first lyric, the transposition of name-calling and praising is ironic:

Amics, s’ie.us trobes avinen,
humil e franc e de bona merce,
be us amera, quan era m’en sove
que.us trob vas mi mal e fellon e tric;
e fauc chanssos per tal qu’ieu fass’auzir
vostre bon pretz, don ieu non puosc sofrir
que no.us fassa lauzar a tota gen,
on plus mi faitz mal et adiramen. (23)

[Friend, if I found you charming, humble, frank and compassionate, well would I love you, since now I remember that I find you bad, cruel, and false toward me, yet I make songs such that I make your good worth heard; whence I cannot endure that I cause you to be praised by everyone where most you cause me harm and hatred.]

Here the empowerment of women through subversive means, in this case that of the rhetorical ploy of altruism, is ably demonstrated. Castelloza further undermines her public statement of her lover’s worth by revealing her fiction, crowning it with an ostensibly inadvertent, private confession, thereby dramatizing a frequent strategy of women’s discourse.

Clara d’Anduza employs the rhetorical device of a poria: in her tornada, she discusses the difficulty of composing a song for a noncompliant man:

Amics, tan ai d’ira e de feunia
quar no vos vey, que quan ieu cug chantar,
planh e sospir, per qu’ieu non puesc so far
ab mas coblas que.I cors complir volria. (26)

[Friend, I have so much anger and wickedness because I do not see you that when I think to sing, I weep and sigh; because I can not make music with more stanzas than my heart would be willing to complete.]

The exploitation of the contradiction between the words that assert the impossibility of the creative act and the actual fact of the song’s composition
is part of the discursive strategy of the trobairitz. Indeed, what Ernst Robert Curtius calls the “inexpressibility topos” is one to which writers have always had recourse. Yet within the masculine discourse of the troubadours, silence is the primary space allowed women; we must not mistake the trobairitz’ exploitation of rhetorical aporia within masculine discourse for evidence of a separate feminine discourse.

Penny Schine Gold erroneously suggests that because women in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries did not engage in a feminist movement and did not overtly rebel against their devaluation, they passively accepted it. She writes, “[m]edieval women’s acceptance of these structures must be seen in the context of a value system that held hierarchy to be the dominant principle of social order.” To say as much is to confuse the myth of a male hegemonic class with the actuality of what people themselves believed. The fact that medieval women did not systematically revolt suggests merely that they did not enjoy the economic power that would have enabled them to do so. The surviving lyrics of the trobairitz give adequate testimony to the fact that, when they were able, women did protest the restrictions and the contradictory expectations of their lives.

Although some women in Provence had attained enough economic security to acquire education and find a public voice for themselves, this security was rapidly eroding. The twelfth century saw the decline of the custom of the morning gift from the husband to his bride, signalling the decline of bilateral inheritance in favor of the patrilinear, the latter effectively excluding women from inheritance by means of cash dowries. With the depletion of their economic base, women’s rights and power were severely curtailed, their voices silenced.

As Tavera suggests, “Si les trobairitz ont été mises ‘hors jeu’, ce n’est pas en leur temps: c’est au notre.” Ultimately, however, it is the contradiction at the foundation of the troubadours’ literary representations of women that gives rise to the discourse of the trobairitz. And when the historical moment had passed, so too had the voices through the cracks, Tennyson’s “flower[s] in the crannied wall.”

Eva Rosenn
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