VI.—The *Bucolics* and the Medieval Poetical Debate

BETTY NYE HEDBERG

WASHINGTON, D. C.

The argument of this paper is summarized in the last paragraph.

One of the most popular types of poetry during the twelfth and thirteenth centuries is the Latin poetical debate or *conflictus*. This type of poem consists of a logical argument among several persons or personified abstractions. The argument may have to do with theology, philosophy, love, drink, or personal matters. Walther, who has made a detailed study of the genre, defines a *Streitgedicht* ("debate") as follows: [1]

Ich nenne hier Streitgedichte im eigentlichen Sinne Gedichte, in denen zwei oder seltener mehrere Personen, personifizierte Gegenstände oder Abstraktionen zu irgend einem Zweck Streitreden führen, sei es um den eigenen Vorzug darzutun und die Eigenschaften des Gegners herabzusetzen oder um eine aufgeworfene Frage zu entscheiden.

The origins of the poetical debate have been discussed by many scholars,[2] most of whom have stressed the importance of the eclogue in the development of the poetical debate. J. H. Hanford has been the most specific in pointing out the connection between the two.[3]

[1] H. Walther, *Das Streitgedicht in der lateinischen Literatur des Mittelalters* (Munich, 1920) 3. He also discusses the words used for titles of the debates.

[2] L. Selbach, *Das Streitgedicht in der altprovenzalischen Lyrik und sein Verhältnis zu ähnlichen Dichtungen anderer Litteraturen* (Ausgaben und Abhandlungen aus dem Gebiete des romanischen Philologie, veröffentlicht von E. Stengel [Marburg, 1886]) 57, and R. Hirzel, *Der Dialog* (Leipzig, 1895) 2.382, have connected the pastoral and the debate. W. Greif in *Zeitschr. f. vergleichende Litteraturgeschichte*, N.F. 1 (1887–88) 289–95, opposed this view without offering any constructive ideas. Walther, *op. cit.* 1–34, considered the philosophic diatribe, the Platonic dialogue, declamations, and the fable as sources of the debate and included the eclogue as a contributing factor. F. J. E. Raby, *A History of Secular Latin Poetry in the Middle Ages* (Oxford, 1934) 2.282, follows the discussion of Walther. E. Faral, "Les débats du clerc et du chevalier," *Romania* 41 (1912) 473–517, believed that the Phillis and Flora poem is connected with the pastoral singing contest. Ch. Oulmont, *Les débats du clerc et du chevalier* (Paris, 1911) 58–81, omitted any discussion of the bucolic. J. W. Atkins, ed. *The Owl and the Nightingale* (Cambridge, 1922) xlvii–xlviii, subscribed to the traditional view of the connection between the two types of poetry. More recently, G. Loziński, *La bataille de caresme et de charnage* (Paris, 1933) 90–93, note 1, while accepting the importance of the eclogue, has also stressed the influence of the *Psychomachia* of Prudentius with its series of combats between vices and virtues.

[3] J. H. Hanford, "Classical Eclogue and Mediaeval Debate," *RomR* 2 (1911) 16–31, 129–143. My paper is the result of work done in connection with my disserta-

I shall attempt to show that there was a classical tradition for the genre of the debate independent of the eclogue. The characteristics and origins of the vernacular poetical debates present problems distinct from those of the Latin *conflictus* and are not within the scope of this paper.[4]

The earliest mediaeval Latin debates known to us date from the Carolingian period. Alcuin's [5] *Conflictus Veris et Hiemis* tells of the debate between Ver and Hiemps over the return of the cuckoo. The shepherds assemble, hear the argument, and acclaim Ver the victor.[6] The second debate in Carolingian literature is embedded in the eclogue of Ermoldus Nigellus.[7] Here Thalia, the poet's Muse, pleads with King Louis for the poet's return from exile. In the midst of Thalia's description of Nigellus' place of exile occurs a debate between the Wasacus and the Rhenus, two rivers which flow through the country-side where Nigellus is staying. Thalia puts an end to the altercation by declaring them of equal importance. In the *Certamen Rosae et Liliae* of Sedulius Scottus [8] the flowers argue with each other, and Ver settles the quarrel by reminding them that they are sisters. A shepherd and a shepherdess, Pseustis and Alithia, debate about theology in a poem of Theodulus.[9] Having agreed upon stakes for the contest and having chosen Fronesis as their judge, the two vie with each other in verse. In his argument Pseustis uses mythology and Alithia biblical history. Pseustis concedes the match before Fronesis can make a decision. The poem of Warnerius of Basel,[10] which is a close copy of the poem

tion, "The Mediaeval Tradition of the Bucolic," now on file at Bryn Mawr College, Bryn Mawr, Pa.

[4] Scholars have not connected the vernacular debate with the Vergilian eclogue. *Vide* A. Jeanroy, *Les origines de la poésie lyrique en France au Moyen Age* (Paris, 1925) 45–60, G. Paris, in his review of Jeanroy, *JS* (1892) 155–161, G. Galvani, *Osservazioni sulla poesia dei trovatori* (Modene, 1829) 66, A. Jeanroy, "La tenson Provençale," *Annales du Midi* 2 (1890) 462, J. E. Wells, ed. *The Owl and the Nightingale* (Boston, 1907) liii–lxiv, J. W. Atkins in the *Cambridge History of English Literature* (New York, 1907) 1.265, and D. J. Jones, *La tenson Provençale* (Paris, 1934) 67–69.

[5] Although the authorship of the poem has never been definitely settled, Alcuin seems by far the most likely candidate.

[6] *Poet. Lat. Aevi Car.* 1.270–272.

[7] *Ibid.* 2.79–85.

[8] *Ibid.* 3.230–31. For a later imitation *vide* A. Tobler, "Streit zwischen Veilchen und Rose," *Herrigs Archiv* 90 (1893) 152–58.

[9] Ed. A. Beck (Sangerhausen, 1836).

[10] 1–439, ed. J. Huemer, "Warnerii Basiliensis *Synodicus*," *RomF* 3 (1887) 319–30; 440–580, ed. J. Huemer, "Der vollständige *Synodicus* des Warnerius Basiliensis," *WS* 14 (1892) 157–60.

of Theodulus, represents an argument between Thlepsis and Neo-
cosmos.   Thlepsis quotes examples from the Old Testament and
Neocosmos from the New.   Sophia, the judge, shows no partiality
but claims that the singing was a pleasure rather than a contest.
Scholars have variously interpreted the fragmentary dispute be-
tween Terence and the *Delusor* [11] and variously dated the poem from
the seventh to the tenth century.[12]   Whatever its connection with
the mime and with a Terentian revival, it is a debate.   The poem
consists of an attack by the *Delusor* upon Terence for writing tedious
poetry and of the latter's defense of his works.   The two argue in
insulting style, with Terence getting the worse of the debate,
although the *Delusor* in two asides pays tribute to the old poet's
ability.   The fragment breaks off before the conclusion.

The examples of twelfth and thirteenth century poetical debates
are so numerous that I shall discuss only a few typical poems.   In
the *Altercatio Yemis et Estatis*,[13] Winter and Summer talk in amoebean
verse, although their speeches are longer than classical usage allows.
The dialogue is continuous.   Theologia and Sophia, realizing that
an argument is taking place, come and stop it by declaring the
contestants equal in power and honor but different in function.
Another poem on the same subject, the *Conflictus Hyemis et Estatis*,[14]
is an appeal to Reason, beginning with a challenge of Hyems,[15] who
tells Estas to use reason in her answer:

> cur me iure spolias? ede racionem,
> Estas, factam breviter solve questionem.

There is no clear appointment of Racio as judge, but she fulfills
that office in the last stanza by declaring Hyems the victor.

The *Altercatio Carnis et Spiritus* [16] begins with the dialogue.
The poem is written in amoebean verse except that Spiritus sings

[11] *Poet. Lat. Aevi Car.* 4.2.1088–90; E. K. Chambers, *The Mediaeval Stage* (Oxford,
1903) 2.326–28; P. S. Allen and H. M. Jones, *The Romanesque Lyric* (Chapel Hill,
1928) 354–55 with a translation, 244–46.

[12] Ch. Magnin, "Fragment d'un comique du septième siècle," *BECh* 1 (1839–40)
516–23, W. Creizenach, *Geschichte des neueren Dramas* (Halle, 1893) 1.8, Chambers,
op. cit. 2.326, P. Winterfeld, "Hrotsvits literarische Stellung," *Herrigs Archiv* 114
(1905) 49, P. S. Allen, "Mediaeval Latin Lyrics, Part I," *Modern Philology* 5 (1908)
441–42, Walther, *op. cit.* 89, Raby, *op. cit.* 2.303, and K. Strecker, *Poet. Lat. Aevi Car.*
4.2.1088.

[13] Walther, *op. cit.* (see note 1) 191.

[14] *Ibid.* 203–06.

[15] *Ibid.* 205, verse 8.

[16] *Ibid.* 215.

five stanzas and Caro only four.   The last stanza introduces Racio, the judge, who, of course, declares Spiritus the winner.   In the debate between Corpus and Anima,[17] which begins without any introduction, each contestant speaks in stanzas of twelve lines. Corpus is defeated and asks the road to repentance.   In one of the most entertaining debates a Christian, a Jew, and a Mohammedan discuss their beliefs.[18]   The three are reclining under a tree when a sad-faced traveler approaches, weeping because death hangs over him, and he knows not what comes after death.   He agrees to adopt whatever faith seems best to him from their arguments.   The contest is uneven and consists of dialogues, first between the Mohammedan and the traveler, then between the Jew and the traveler, and finally between the Christian and the traveler.   Each shows remarkable restraint in maintaining silence while the others speak. The sad traveler is persuaded by the arguments of the Christian and is converted to his faith.   Each time a speaker begins, he is carefully introduced by some phrase such as *respondit* or *ait cum fiducia maxima Iudaeus*.   The *Altercatio Fortune et Philosophie*[19] consists only of dialogue in perfect amoebean verse with no decision and no judge.   The *Dyalogus de Divite et Lazaro*[20] is a dialogue without amoebean verse, with no judge and no decision.   The *Altercatio Vini et Cerevisie*[21] presents the argument in a different fashion.   The two personified beverages do not speak for themselves, but the author discusses the advantages of each.   Wine is considered the better of the two.   The *Ganymede and Helen*[22] has a nature setting.   As in the spring poems mentioned in this section, the sensual delight in spring and the out-of-doors is comparable to the gay spirit of the *Carmina Burana*.   Here again Ratio is the judge.   Helped by Natura, she grants the victory to Helen.

The poetical debate is not, as is commonly supposed, of mediaeval origin.   The classical examples of this genre, however, have not been adequately discussed by scholars interested in its origins. From the beginning of Latin literature a type of poem very similar

[17] *Ibid.* 218–21.
[18] *Ibid.* 227–29.
[19] *Ibid.* 232–34.
[20] Johannes Bolte, "*Dyalogus de divite et Lazaro*," *Ztschr. f. d. Alter.* 35 (1891) 257–61.
[21] Bömer, "Eine Vagantenliedersammlung des 14 Jahrhunderts," *Ztschr. f. d. Alter.* 49 (1907) 199–202.
[22] W. Wattenbach, "Ganymed und Helena," *Ztschr. f. d. Alter.* 18 (1875) 124–36.

to the mediaeval *conflictus* existed.   Furthermore the Roman interest in declamation and the emphasis in the schools upon rhetorical debate and argument influenced the writing of poetic *contentiones* and increased their popularity.   Finally, there were in classical literature numerous poetical arguments well-known to the Carolingian writers.   Even if these poets had not read a single classical *contentio*, they would have found in Horace, Persius, Ovid, and others the pattern and model of the mediaeval versified debate. These classical debates have more elements in common with the mediaeval poetical debate than have the Vergilian shepherds' contests.

Personified abstractions arguing in verse are not mediaeval in origin.   Classical Latin furnishes examples of such debates, although these works may not have been known to the Middle Ages. According to Quintilian,[23] Ennius wrote of the strife between Mors and Vita in one of his satires:

. . . ut Mortem et Vitam, quas contendentes in satura tradit Ennius.

Nonius [24] tells of another early debate on the same theme, "Novius Mortis et Vitae Iudicio. . . ."   In the *Punica* of Silius Italicus [25] Virtus and Voluptas strive with each other for Scipio's allegiance.   Voluptas speaking first presents all the enticing arguments in her power to lure Scipio away from strict adherence to duty.   When she has finished, Virtus reminds Scipio of his obligations to Rome and to his family and holds up before him the hope of honor, praise, and glory.   Scipio is won over by Virtus.   Voluptas indignantly prophesies that imperial Rome will fall under her sway and the two goddesses vanish.

Catullus also wrote a debate, not between personified abstractions, but between a group of youths and one of maidens.   In one [26] of his epithalamia he uses the devices of argument and alternate

[23] *Inst. Or.* 9.2.36.

[24] 479.8–9.

[25] Sil. *Pun.* 15.18–58.   A manuscript of Silius Italicus is entered in the catalogue of St. Gallen in the ninth century.   Otherwise he seems to have been unknown from the time of Sidonius Apollinaris to the time of Poggio.   A similar contest between Virtus and Voluptas is recorded by Xenophon (*Mem.* 2.1.21–23) and mentioned by Cicero (*Off.* 1.32.118).   The conflict between vice and virtue was a favorite theme of mediaeval poets; *vide* C. S. Northrup, "Dialogus inter corpus et animam," *PMLA* 16 (1901) 503–25.

[26] Catull. 62.   *Vide* R. Ellis, *Commentary on Catullus* (Oxford, 1889) 241, note 1 for the tradition of amoebean verse in Sappho's epithalamia.

verse marked off by a refrain.   The opening lines serve to acquaint us with the time, the situation, and the contending parties.   The debate proper is initiated by the maidens.   They lament the coming of the evening star which brings misfortune.   The youths praise it as a token of happiness.   The girls go on to praise the flower which grows untouched and alone in the enclosed garden, while the boys speak of the vine wedded to the tree.   The maidens, however, are supporting a losing cause.   The bride is departing with the groom, and the youths conclude the poem with advice to her.   Here in alternate verse two groups defend certain ideas and give their opinions.

These ancient debates are not likely to have been widely known to mediaeval writers.   Nevertheless, in a study of the continuity of the poetical debate, it is significant that the poetic convention of a logical debate between abstractions or real persons was already found in classical Latin literature.[27]

In addition to these debates a third century poetical *contentio* is extant, the *Iudicium Coci et Pistoris*,[28] composed by an otherwise unknown writer, Vespa.   This probably represents a type of poetry well known to the Romans and frequently written by them.[29] The cook and the breadmaker argue about the relative importance to mankind of their respective functions.   Vulcan is the arbitrator. The poem begins with an invocation to the Muses requesting them to leave the hills of the Pierides.   The bread-maker speaks first, summoning Saturn and Ceres to his aid and claiming that bread is the most important part of the meal and that his functions equal those of the gods.   The cook responds by listing the various kinds of food he prepares and by remarking that bread alone could not be pleasing.   He too lists the functions of gods and his own parallel skills.   Vulcan compromises by ordering them to put an

---

[27] The anonymous *De Pica Dialogismus* provides an excellent example of a debate settled by Natura.   The poem is included by P. Burmann, *Anthologia veterum Latinorum epigrammatum et poematum* (Amsterdam, 1759–75) 2.445 and by H. Meyer (Leipzig, 1835) 2.1085.   A. Riese, *Anthologia Latina* (Leipzig, 1869) 1.2, praef. xliv, excludes it as not being ancient.   Walther, *op. cit.* 12, thinks it was written during the empire.   The uncertainty of date, however, makes it impossible to include it in this discussion.

[28] Ed. Riese, *op. cit.* 1, no. 199.

[29] Suetonius states (*Tib.* 43) that Asellius Sabinus wrote a debate in verse relating the contest of a mushroom, a figpecker, an oyster, and a thrush and was rewarded by Tiberius for it.   This kind of humorous dialogue was probably used by the Romans to enliven a dinner party.   Its very nature made preservation unlikely.

end to their quarreling or he will steal out from under their pots and neither will be able to cook. Here we have a debate very similar to those of the twelfth and thirteenth century contestants. Each contestant tells his superiority and puns cleverly in the course of his argument. They do not engage in short amoebean repartee, but each having been properly introduced speaks his piece. The *pistor* speaks almost twice as many lines as the *cocus*. The *Iudicium* is a part of an anthology compiled in the sixth century and preserved in the *Codex Salmasianus* dating from the seventh century or the beginning of the eighth.[30]

These poems are classical examples of pure debate. Most important in developing and popularizing this genre were the rhetorical schools of Rome during the Empire. Cicero had emphasized the importance of oratory, declamation, and argument and the usefulness of debates on definite "topics." Aristotle, he says, had taught young men to defend both sides of a question in order to make their style more elaborate.[31] These school exercises, with practice in the *reprehensio*, the "thesis", the deliberative *suasoriae* and the judicial *controversiae*, were explained and illustrated in the rhetorical tracts which became the textbooks of the Middle Ages. Juvenal,[32] in an attack on the rhetorical schools, refers to the schoolboys' attempts to argue as Hannibal presumably debated with himself after Cannae —a typical theme of the *suasoria*. The *Controversiae* of the elder Seneca furnish examples of the type of argument which was current in the schools of his day. It is not unlike the mediaeval debate.[33] Seneca presents arguments on both sides of each hypothetical case, as for example, the first *controversia* of the second book. A con-

---

[30] Schanz-Hosius, *Gesch. d. Röm. Litt.* 8.4.2.70–1. The *Iudicium Paridis*, a poem of the Latin anthology (Baehrens, *Poet. Lat. Min.* [Leipzig, 1882] 4.394–95) represents Juno, Minerva, and Venus advancing their respective claims and bribes; Paris, the judge, chose Venus. This poem, however, has been classed as a humanistic production by E. Baehrens, "Zur lateinischen Anthologie," *RhM* 31 (1876) 602–03; *vide* also L. Bertalot, "Humanistisches in der Anthologia Latina," *RhM* 66 (1911) 78.

[31] *Or.* 46. Even as late as the seventeenth century the school exercise of Latin "thesis" was practised. Sometime before 1628 Milton composed and delivered a Latin prose *Prolusium* entitled *Utrum Dies an Nox Praestantior sit?*; cf. E. M. W. Tillyard, *Milton: L'Allegro and Il Penseroso* (*The English Association Pamphlet* 82 Oxford, 1932) in the *London Times Literary Supplement*, Sept. 1, 1932. *Vide* also Tillyard, *The Miltonic Setting* (Cambridge, 1938) 14–21.

[32] 7.150–70.

[33] Seneca's work was epitomized in the fourth century and was well known in the Middle Ages. About the end of the thirteenth century, Nicolaus of Treveth wrote a commentary on the *Controversiae*. *Vide* Schanz-Hosius, *op. cit.* 8.2.339–40.

tinuation of the same kind of exercise is found in the *Declamationes* attached to the name of Quintilian.[34]   In the fifth century the rhetorical schools, still holding a dominant position,[35] made argument a commonplace of school poetry by their constant drill in the arguing of hypothetical cases.   This type of school exercise continued to be practised through the centuries, in both prose and poetry.[36]

The *Codex Salmasianus* furnishes an example of a poem modelled on a declamation, the theme of which is one suggested by classical treatises on rhetoric.[37]   It is the case of a man accused of stealing gold from the temple of Neptune.   The title summarizes the contents of the poem: [38]

"Sacrilegus capite puniatur."   de templo Neptuni aurum perit. interposito tempore piscator piscem aureum posuit et titulo inscribsit "de tuo tibi Neptune."   Reus fit sacrilegii.   contra dicit.

The defendant uses all the arguments he can muster.   He maintains that he gained the gold not by theft but by his skill at his trade. He asks that witnesses who saw him commit the crime be produced and points out that everyone had access to the gold.   He concludes with his most powerful argument stating that no thief would return the stolen goods to the temple.   Here we have the essence of the debate poem: a question which is to be decided after a series of logically given arguments.[39]   Dracontius, the fifth century poet, has written a regular debate in his *Orestes*,[40] the trial scene, in which Molossus accuses Orestes, and Orestes defends himself.   This is a

[34] *Declamationes* attributed to Quintilian were known at the beginning of the sixth century and occasionally during the Middle Ages.   *Vide* Schanz-Hosius, *op. cit.* 8.2.757.

[35] Raby, *op. cit.* (see note 2) 1.48–98.

[36] For a discussion of the prominent position of rhetorical study in the Middle Ages *vide* F. A. Specht, *Geschichte des Unterrichtswesens in Deutschland* (Stuttgart, 1885) 114–17.

[37] Cf. Arist. *Rh.* 1.13. 1374a, Quint. *Inst.* 3.6.41, *Auct. ad Her.* 1.12.22.

[38] Riese, *op. cit.* (see note 27) 1.71–81.

[39] Another example, very similar to the poetical debate of a later period, is the *Controversia de Statua Viri Fortis* (F. Vollmer, *Poet. Lat. Min.* [Leipzig, 1914] 5.118–30) written by Dracontius.   Although this poetic *controversia* lacks dialogue, only slight remodelling would make it a debate poem.   As it stands, it resembles the *Altercatio Vini et Cerevisie* (*vide supra*, 50), in which there is no dialogue, the poet himself giving the arguments pro and con.   Dracontius in his *Deliberativa Achillis an Corpus Hectoris Vendat* (Vollmer, *op. cit.* 5.162–71) presents the same kind of argument in monologue. If this, however, were made into a dialogue with personified generalities and abstractions, the popular duel between right and wrong would result.

[40] Vollmer, *op. cit.* 5.230–32.

type of debate which taxes the rhetorical and argumentative power of the poet. The same use of legal and dialectical reasoning is illustrated in the twelfth century by Peter Riga in his *Causa Regis Francorum contra Regem Anglorum* [41] and in his argument between Alexander III and Antipope Victor.[42] The Christian poems of Dracontius were known to the Middle Ages, although his collection of secular poems, the *Romulea*, was less familiar. The earliest manuscript of the latter dates from the fifteenth century. Manitius,[43] however, has pointed out the influence of Dracontius' secular poetry on the poetry of Fortunatus, and Meyer [44] has found quotations from the *Romulea* in a fourteenth-century *florilegium* from Verona.

The poems just mentioned are likely to have been known to the Carolingian writers and to have influenced them; but they were not perhaps as easily accessible to the Middle Ages as the writings of more widely read classical authors. In works known to the Middle Ages poems are found which are far more likely to have served as models for the later debate than Vergil's singing contests. The *Aeneid* and other epics, for example, portray the gods assembled and debating about worldly events in rhetorical fashion.[45]

Satire also contains one element of debate, for the author denounces individuals, groups, or ideas, although usually without any regular opponent to bring forth counter arguments. In the seventh satire of his first book, in what might be the germ of a debate, Horace relates how Persius outdid the rascal, Rupilius Rex. The poem is not strictly a debate, yet the two oppose each other in a court before Brutus, the judge. The ninth satire of the first book which relates the encounter of Horace with the bore, while essentially the record of a conversation, contains some elements of debate. The commentary of Porphyry [46] gives evidence that the satires were thought to contain the elements of "dramatic" dialogue:

---

[41] B. Hauréau, "Un poème inédit de Pierre de Riga," *BECh* 44 (1883) 7–11.

[42] K. Gillert, "Lateinische Handschriften in St. Petersburg," *Neues Archiv* 5 (1880) 611–13.

[43] M. Manitius, "Zu Dracontius Carmina Minora," *RhM* 46 (1891) 493–94.

[44] W. Meyer, "Die Berliner Centones der Laudes Dei des Dracontius," *SBAW* (1890) 267.

[45] R. Heinze, *Virgils Epische Technik* (Leipzig, 1915) 431–35. Ver. *Aen.* 10.1–117, Stat. *Theb.* 1.196–302. Further influence of Statius will be discussed below in connection with Prudentius.

[46] Porph. *in Serm.* 1.9.1. Cf. also Porph. *in Serm.* 1.4.14–15 and *Ep.* 2.2.63.

refert hac satura descendentem se via sacra incidisse in hominem molestum et garrulum neque se ab eo avellere potuisse, nisi adversarius supervenisset, a quo vadimonium sibi dictum sit.   et totum hunc sermonem dramatico charactere alterno sermone variat.

In the first satire of the second book, moreover, Horace records a real, although friendly, argument in verse.   In the dialogue between Horace and the lawyer, C. Trebatius Testa, the latter advises against the writing of satire, and Horace defends his choice of genre and, at the same time, his freedom of speech.   There a friendly discussion becomes a kind of debate in which the second speaker answers in a logical manner and refutes the points brought up by the first.

A similar method is used by Persius in the first satire, concerned with literary criticism, in which he attacks, and an unnamed friend defends, literary taste in contemporary Rome.   Here again, as in Horace, there is actual debate with each participant supporting his principle to the best of his ability.   In both these satires the contestants develop their argument logically and reasonably.   Poems such as these, containing both attack and defence of certain kinds of literature, may well have suggested to its author the idea of the debate between Terence and the *Delusor*.[47]   At any rate, all discuss literature as he does, in abusive and humorous dialogue.

Many characteristics of the mediaeval debate are also present in one poem of Ovid's *Amores*.[48]   Here the poet, strolling in the woods, meets Elegy and Tragedy, the first a comely maiden with one foot longer than the other, and the second a glowering, queenly figure.   As Ovid wonders what work to embark upon next, Tragedy upbraids him for always writing love poetry and tries to entice him to the greater task of writing tragedy.   Elegy defends herself by recounting what wonders she and love can work together. Ovid placates them both by begging Tragedy for more time before he follows her long verses and by announcing that for the present he will continue to write love elegies.   Here personified abstractions hold the stage and argue, each relating the benefits which she can bestow.   This seems far more in the nature of the *Conflictus Veris et Hiemis* and other mediaeval debates than Vergil's third or seventh eclogues.

---

[47] *Vide infra* 65 for a discussion of the prologues of Terence as a possible source for the *Terence and the Delusor*.

[48] 3.1.

Since the debate in both prose and verse was a well-known form in classical literature, there is no reason to assume that these two eclogues (the third and the seventh) are the source for the mediaeval debate. Hanford's theory of the relationship between the singing contest and the *conflictus* has been generally accepted and followed. An instance of the general assumption that the two types are con-nected is furnished by E. K. Rand [49] who remarks that the Caro-lingian eclogue, modelled on the Vergilian *Bucolics*, was an im-portant factor in the development of the debate.

Among the eclogues of Vergil only two, the third and the seventh, are in any way similar to the debate. Vergil's other bucolics were apparently more popular than these two and were more frequently imitated by later poets.[50] The classical singing contest is divided into three parts: the introduction, the actual contest, and the conclusion. The introduction contains three vital actions in addition to incidental stage setting: the setting up of stakes, the choosing of a judge, and the starting of the contest by the judge. The contest itself is characterized by strict adherence to amoebean verse, by a demonstration of skill rather than by the use of logical argument, by continuous dialogue uninterrupted by any kind of stage directions. The conclusion consists of the judge's decision. While the only characteristic common to all mediaeval debates is their use of argument in dialogue, the pastoral singing contest does not contain argument but is rather a match of poetic skill. Only a close comparison of the contests of Vergil and of Calpurnius, an imitator of Vergil in the Neronian period, with the later debates will show whether there are any definite connections between the genres, whether the one can be considered the source of the other, or whether only a superficial similarity exists between

[49] E. K. Rand, "The Mediaeval Vergil," *Studi Medievali*, N.S. 5 (1932) 424.

[50] Nemesianus, for instance, a writer of bucolics in the third century, wrote no song contests but adopted instead the technique of Vergil's fifth and eighth eclogues, in which each shepherd speaks only once, and there is no suggestion of a contest. Many mediaeval poets wrote eclogues modelled on the Vergilian bucolics, for example, Naso, Angilbert, Walahfrid Strabo, Ratbodus, and Radbertus Paschasius. Theirs, however, are not poetical debates and have no relation to the pastoral singing contest. The conception of the traditional Vergilian pastoral handed down to the Middle Ages through the commentators was that these eclogues consisted of a panegyric and that the shepherds were masqueraders. The motifs of lament, of prophecy, of a golden age, and of contests only appear when combined with some other theme. The elegiac lament (Radbertus) is used in combination with the panegyric; the prophecy of a golden age is used to further the poet's ambitions in his panegyric; the singing contest idea is used only in conjunction with the poetical debate.

them.   For, as I have shown, debate in dialogue is not peculiar to the classical singing contest.   A tradition of poetical debate existed from the classical to the later period, independent of the pastoral singing contest.   Since it existed, there is no reason to assume that the mediaeval versified debate was derived from the contests in the eclogue.

In Vergil's third poem, Damoetas asks Menalcas to put up stakes: [51]

> . . . tu dic, mecum quo pignore certes.

Menalcas offers beechen cups (*pocula fagina*), whose value he describes in detail, while Damoetas pledges a calf.   Palaemon, a passer-by, is made judge: [52]

> audiat haec tantum—vel qui venit ecce Palaemon.

Palaemon, having been duly appointed, starts the contest by indicating who shall begin and by ordering the shepherds to alternate their singing: [53]

> incipe, Damoeta; tu deinde sequere Menalca:
> alternis dicetis; amant alterna Camenae.

The ensuing contest covers many subjects.   After Damoetas has prayed for Jupiter's favor and Menalcas for Apollo's, the singers speak of their various loves and of other poets.   Eclogue VII has a slightly different plan, for Meliboeus relates a contest which he has heard and presumably judged.   He does not tell of any stakes agreed upon by the singers.   Daphnis asks Meliboeus to sit and listen to their song.   Meliboeus, in the customary formula tells how they began: [54]

> alternis igitur contendere versibus ambo
> coepere; alternos Musae meminisse volebant
> hos Corydon, illos referebat in ordine Thyrsis.

Corydon prays to be able to sing as well as Codrus, and Thyrsis boasts that he will be a new Codrus.   After this first mention of their singing art, they sing only of their loves and of nature. Corydon is declared the winner.

[51] 3.31.
[52] 3.50.
[53] 3.58–9.
[54] 7.18–20.

Calpurnius, following faithfully in Vergil's footsteps, adheres closely to the conventional contest.   In the second poem Astacus and Idas compete with each other in song, the one pledging the fleece of seven sheep and the other the produce of his garden. Thyrsis is appointed judge and in his first speech includes directions as to the manner of scoring.   The two contestants are judged to be equal in ability.   In Calpurnius' sixth poem Astilus tells of a contest which he judged, and he is also a participant in another contest.   Astilus relates how he had previously judged a contest between Nyctilus and Alcon.   The former pledged a kid with its mother and the latter a lion.   Alcon won the singing contest. Here also the two shepherds sing in alternate verse—"certavere . . . alterno carmine." [55] Lycidas, angered by the judgment of Astilus, challenges him to a contest and pledges a mare.   Astilus takes up the challenge, staking a stag.   Mnasyllus appears and is immediately drafted as judge.   Mnasyllus attempts in vain to start the contest, even suggesting that they sing of their loves. The two shepherds, however, instead of singing, insult one another, until Mnasyllus refuses to judge them at all.   The first of the Einsiedeln eclogues [56] pictures Mida and Ladas pledging a goat and pipe and choosing Thamyras as judge.   Thamyras directs Ladas to begin: [57]

. . . incipe, Lada
tu prior, alterius Thamyras imponet honorem.

The poem breaks off before the conclusion.

Thus, definite and characteristic stage business makes the shepherds' contest an organic unit.   In five of these six [58] classical singing contests we are told of the stakes.   In all six, judges are chosen, and in all six the judge begins the contest by indicating that the shepherds shall sing alternately and by appointing the one who shall begin.   The songs are amoebean.   The dialogue, once begun, is continuous.   The shepherds do not argue, do not debate, do not syllogize—they simply sing.   In four instances we have a decision.   One of the contests, however, never does begin,[59] and one of the Einsiedeln eclogues is incomplete.   Vergil set the for-

---

[55] 6.2.
[56] Two anonymous eclogues from the Neronian period.
[57] 1.20–1.
[58] I.e., Calp. *Ecl.* 6 has two contests.
[59] Calp. *Ecl.* 6.

mula [60] and Calpurnius followed him.   Thus, the pastoral singing
contest could easily have been imitated by mediaeval writers and,
in particular, by the Carolingian poets.

Yet only one mediaeval poet, the twelfth century Metellus of
Tegernsee,[61] wrote a pastoral singing contest according to the
classical formula.   This is his third eclogue which is modelled
closely upon Vergil's third.   Damoetas appears as the purchaser
of a stolen cow, while Menalcas is the original owner who had
vowed the animal to Quirinus.   Damoetas refuses to give up the
cow to its rightful owner.   They decide upon a contest in which
Damoetas pledges a bull and Menalcas two cups of wine.   Palaemon
is chosen judge and models his first speech upon his archetype: [62]

> dicite dum tempus vacat; audit amoena juventus:
> incipe Damoeta, tum rite sequerere Menalca;
> versibus alternae geminentur utrinque Camoenae.

In the interests of good sense we should have an actual debate,
as in a court of law, with each contestant trying to prove his
case.   If that were what Damoetas and Menalcas set out to do,
we should have the link, the transition from pastoral singing contest
to poetical debate.   But Menalcas and Damoetas are disappointing.
Like Vergil's shepherds, they range over a variety of topics but
none of the subjects they touch upon furthers the matter in hand.
God, Christ, and other Biblical figures fill their amoebean verses,
but as far as actually winning the disputed animal goes, they are
as nonchalant as the classical shepherds.   Palaemon settles the
case by compromise in pastoral tradition.   If it were true, as
Hanford argues, that Alcuin, in the ninth century, took the idea
for his debate in verse from the pastoral eclogue, we should not
expect an imitator of Vergil in the twelfth century to omit this
chance of all chances to write a real debate, particularly when by
not composing a sensible argument Metellus has transgressed the
natural needs of his story.   The fact is, he was writing a Vergilian
pastoral, and his third eclogue is a shepherds' contest, whether it
was fitting or not.   Now, if the poetical debate, which was at that
time a flourishing and popular form, were regarded as an offshoot
of the pastoral, Metellus would have had no scruples about incor-

---

[60] That he copied Theocritus has no relevance for mediaeval poetry.

[61] Ed. Canisius-Basnage, *Lectiones Antiquae* 3.2 (Amsterdam, 1725) 179ff.

[62] Met. *Ecl.* 3.67–9.

porating an actual debate,[63] for he adopted the mediaeval concep-
tion that the eclogue is a suitable vehicle for panegyric.   Instead
of a debate, he wrote a pastoral in the mediaeval tradition of Vergil.

It is not difficult to show that the debates of the twelfth and
thirteenth centuries have more in common with other types of
poetry than with the singing contest of the shepherds.   But the
fact that the earliest mediaeval Latin debate, the *Conflictus Veris et
Hiemis* is actually a combination of debate and pastoral has misled
scholars into thinking of the classical singing contests as the source
of the debate.   Thus, Hanford argues that because the earliest
clear examples of the *conflictus* belong to the Carolingian Renais-
sance and are imbued with the spirit of the classical eclogue, we
have in the eclogue the origin of the *conflictus*.   Hanford seems to
be confusing cause and effect.   He would have us believe that
Alcuin, drawing material and expressions from classical literature
and following the mediaeval penchant for personified abstractions,
appeared to write a pastoral, but actually originated a new literary
form—the poetical debate.   `Hanford thinks that, while the subject
matter of the poem may be an offshoot of Teutonic folk poetry,[64]
the language and treatment are derived from classical sources.
By "classical sources" Hanford means the pastoral contests of
Vergil and Calpurnius.

If no debate earlier than those of the twelfth century had
survived, the idea of connecting them with the amoebean songs
of the eclogue would probably never have occurred to any scholar.
But the Carolingian *contentiones* extant are not typical poetical
debates.   They are a mixed genre, in which a pastoral setting, an
artificial frame borrowed from the pastoral is added to the simple
debate.   A close examination of these Carolingian debates shows
that they contain certain inconsistencies and that their clumsiness
results from a conflation of the two types.   These inconsistencies
indicate clearly a fusion of the true pastoral and the simple poetical
debate.   The *Conflictus Veris et Hiemis*, the first example we have
of a mediaeval debate, retains some evidence of the joining of these

---

[63] Metellus carries out the mediaeval Vergilian tradition of allegory, panegyric,
and didacticism.

[64] The idea of a popular tradition in the conflict between the seasons and in the
role of the cuckoo is treated by Hanford, *op. cit.* 24–7 and by P. S. Allen, "The
Mediaeval Mimus, Part I," *Modern Philology* 5 (1908) 441.   L. Uhland, *Schriften zur
Geschichte der Dichtung und Sage* 3 (Stuttgart, 1866) 24–5, also discusses the folk ele-
ment in the *Conflictus Veris et Hiemis*.

two types.   The author tells us in the beginning that the shepherds gather together in the springtime, although summer is the traditional time for contests in the pastoral.   In true pastoral tradition a young shepherd, Dafnis, and an older man, Palaemon, are introduced.   The reader now expects a contest between the two shepherds, for "Omnes hi cuculo laudes cantare parabant."[65]   Yet despite the preparations of the shepherds, Ver and Hiems arrive and without waiting for a judge to be chosen begin to sing in amoebean verse of three-line stanzas, marshalling their arguments carefully, each trying to explain exactly why he is to be preferred by mankind to his opponent.[66]   The judgment of their argument is left not to the old man, Palaemon, but to the whole group of shepherds.   Thus, Alcuin introduces a group of shepherds prepared for a singing contest, but instead allows Ver and Hiems to argue, not in the manner of the shepherds' contest, but in the manner of the debate.   The dialogue is not continuous.   There is a plurality of judges who are not appointed but assume their roles spontaneously.   This is not the origin of a new genre, a phoenix rising from the ashes of the lifeless bucolic, but rather the learned Alcuin's attempt to handle the debate of the seasons in the manner of a Vergilian pastoral.

Hanford finds in Nigellus' debate of the rivers the link between the pastoral *Conflictus Veris et Hiemis* and the later debates, for in his opinion Nigellus conceived of his dialogue as akin to the *Bucolics*.   The debate, however, begins without introduction of any kind, without stakes, without a judge, and does not adhere to the rules of amoebean verse.   The rivers proceed in a logical manner, each telling how he is more important than the other. A judgment is given by Thalia when she orders them to stop their argument, but this judgment is more in the spirit of a transition from that almost irrelevant debate to the main theme of the poem. Alcuin's *Conflictus* and Nigellus' debate of the rivers are very different in theme and treatment.   The former is influenced by the revival of the pastoral, the latter is a simple and straightforward debate free from any bucolic elements.   Hanford notes this difference but discounts it: [67]

[65] Line 5.

[66] A suggestion of the old pastoral convention of setting up stakes is found in the emphasis on the cuckoo's return: if Ver triumphs, he will receive not a heifer, a mare. or wine, but the return of the cuckoo.

[67] Hanford, *op. cit.* 28.   The italics are mine.

This debate, it will be observed at once, differs from the *Conflictus* in being without the pastoral setting; the dialogue, too, does not consist of the quick sharp alternation of speeches like the amoebean, but of extended argument of irregular length, reflecting the dialectic of the schools. *Notwithstanding these differences, however, it seems clear that Ermoldus, like the author of the Conflictus associated his debate with the shepherd contests of the classical eclogue, and was consciously under the influence of the pastoral dialogue.*

"The influence of the pastoral dialogue" on Ermoldus is not evident in this debate between rivers but may rather be found in the main body of the poem which is written in dialogue form and which has adopted the pastoral as a vehicle for panegyric. Without any pastoral tradition, without any Vergilian revival, Ermoldus could perfectly well have written the debate of the rivers.

The *Certamen* of Sedulius is handled, like Alcuin's *Conflictus*, in the Vergilian manner. The flowers speak in amoebean verse, in uninterrupted dialogue until the entrance of Ver is described. The flowers actually argue,[68] although Lilia does introduce a pastoral motif in her claim, "Phoebus me amat." Each tries to show how and why she is superior to her sister. The introduction of a pastoral allusion by Lilia into the regular debate illustrates the mingling of the two types of poetry. Sedulius, a poet well read in Vergil, like Alcuin, composed his debate along the lines of an eclogue.

The poem of Theodulus is perhaps the most interesting example of the debate influenced by, though not derived from, the pastoral. The poem opens with a pastoral setting into which are introduced a shepherd and a sherpherdess, Pseustis and Alithia. They agree upon stakes, Pseustis offering his *fistula* and Alithia her *cithara*. In accordance with pastoral tradition they ask Fronesis to be their judge. Theodulus combines, in the course of the debate, the methods of logical arguments and of the pastoral by having the second singer attempt to outdo the remarks of the first. Thus, Saturn is set against Adam and Eve, Lycaon compared to Enoch, and Hercules to Samson. Pseustis concedes the match before Fronesis can make a decision.

---

[68] Hanford, *op. cit.* 133, finds the flowers' debate analogous to that of the shepherds: "The flowers do not syllogize; they match personal qualities: the rose vaunts her red, the lily her white." The flowers, however, match personal qualities to prove their superiority in a series of quasi-logical, if foolish statements, just as wine and beer "match personal qualities" in the later debate poems. The personal qualities of which the shepherds sing do not in themselves insure success in the contest but are rather subject matter for song.

The poem of Warnerius of Basel, which is a close copy of Theodulus, represents the same blending of debate and pastoral. The arguments between Thlepsis and Neocosmos are of the same type as those of Pseustis and Alithia, Noah being set against Peter, Abraham compared to Paul, and Moses to Matthew. Here the poet is faced with the problem of representing Sophia's attempt to judge between the Old Testament and the New. The necessity of having a judge is forced upon him by his model and because he writes his debate as a pastoral. Helped by Theodulus, Warnerius shows no partiality but makes Sophia compromise by refusing to admit that there is a contest. Here Warnerius betrays the dual nature of this type. Although he has written an argumentative debate, he terminates it by declaring the whole procedure one of song—a return to the pastoral conception.[69]

Not every early debate, however, is clothed in pastoral dress. The fragmentary dispute between Terence and the *Delusor* betrays no pastoral antecedents. Hanford [70] attempts to relate the poem to the eclogue by pointing out the grouping of some lines into stanzas. This does not necessarily show any connection with the eclogue since other types of poetry, too, consist of stanzaic verse in dialogue.[71] He also feels that the use of a familiar phrase in a reply to Terence "illustrates again the Carolingian tendency to associate dialogue in verse, especially when it is of contentious nature, with the pastoral." Hanford's argument based on the use of Vergilian phrases is weakened by the fact that the Vergilian lines are borrowed from the second eclogue which does not contain dialogue,[72] and also by the many reminiscences of the *Aeneid* [73]

---

[69] Debates concerning religious beliefs originate not in the pastoral debate but in treatises such as the pseudo-Augustinian *Dialogus de Altercatione Ecclesiae et Synagogae* (*MPL* 42.1136–40). The only element lacking in this work to make it a prototype of the later debate is expression through poetry. It has no stakes, no judge, no starting phrase to indicate alternate speech, no equality in lengths of speeches; the two debaters present their arguments one after the other with the author naming each speaker as she talks.

[70] *Op. cit.* 31.

[71] Cf. Hor. *C.* 3.9; Catull. 62; Sedulius Scottus, *Poet. Lat. Aevi Car.* 3.225–26.

[72] The lines in question are 62–3 and *Ecl.* 2.17–8. In another line (3) there is a reminiscence of the *Bucolics* (8.102), but this, again, is not a poem of contest. Alcuin, who most successfully covered his debate with pastoral trappings, uses some phrases from the eclogues of contest as well as from others. In the river debate of Ermoldus only one trace of the *Bucolics* is found and that from the first eclogue. Sedulius uses material from several eclogues including the seventh, a poem containing a contest.

[73] Cf. *Poet. Lat. Aevi Car.* 4.2.1088–90.

found in the poem, a fact which does not imply an association of
debate with the epic.   Indeed, many mediaeval poems, which cer-
tainly are not eclogues, abound in even closer reminiscences of the
Bucolics.[74]   A poem such as this one concerning Terence has, then,
little in common with the pastoral singing match or with the Caro-
lingian attempts to imitate the setting of Vergil's poems.   Its
origin seems rather to lie in the prologues of the *Andria* and of the
Phormio, wherein Terence defends his plays against Lanuvinus,[75]
or in ancient poems about other literary quarrels.[76]

Thus, of the six early debates extant, the *Conflictus Veris et
Hiemis* and the poem of Theodulus most successfully combine the
pastoral and the debate.   The debate of Ermoldus and that con-
cerning Terence are quite independent of the pastoral contest.

One of the most characteristic features of the pastoral dialogue
lies in its dramatic possibilities.   The dialogue, once it has begun,
continues in an unbroken sweep.   The pastoral eclogue could be
acted as it stands.   The poetical debates of the twelfth and thir-
teenth centuries, on the other hand, frequently, although not always,
devote one or two lines to introducing the speakers, thus interfering
with the continuity of the dialogue.   In those debates, however,
which are written as pastorals the continuous dialogue exists.

One of the most delightful features of the mediaeval bucolic
eclogues is their obvious and conscious debt to Vergil.   The authors
glory in quoting Vergil's actual phrases, adopting his refrains,
speaking of his rewards gained through praise of Augustus, and
remodelling his themes.   They also consider themselves, for the
most part, successors to the *fistula* of Tityrus.   They make no
secret of the model they follow.   From the almost childlike fidelity
of Metellus to the forced allegiance of Purchard,[77] the poets know

---

[74] Cf. Engelmodus, *Poet. Lat. Aevi Car.* 3.56–7 where Vergilian names and phrases
are used.

[75] *Vide* P. S. Allen, "The Mediaeval Mimus, Part II," *Modern Philology* 8 (1910–
11) 31 and Allen, "Mediaeval Latin Lyrics, Part IV," *Modern Philology* 6 (1908–09)
404.   In the prologue to the *Andria* Terence attacks his malicious critics.   Most of
the prologue is a defense of his method of composition and an attack upon those who
have assailed him.   Here, as in the prologue to the *Phormio*, Terence, the young poet,
is finding fault with an old poet.   In the mediaeval poem Terence has become the old
poet who is attacked by a younger man.   That these prologues suggested the *Terence
and the Delusor* seems far more likely to be true than that this debate is in any way
connected with the shepherds' contest.

[76] *Vide supra*, p. 56.

[77] *Poet. Lat. Med. Aevi* 5.260–79.

and acknowledge their master.   But the debates of the twelfth and
thirteenth centuries show no such allegiance.   They are written in
new meters, in the new spirit of logic and dialectic, in the new free-
dom of university training.   Their authors do not care for shep-
herds' singing nor do they write their popular songs to the tune of
the *fistula*.   Logic has arrived, capable of standing alone without
a classical dress to cloak her.   I do not deny, of course, the influence
of Vergil and of the Vergilian eclogue on phrases and even on the
method of these writers.   Schooled in certain of the classics, the
poets could not avoid reminiscences nor did they seek to avoid
them.   Vergil was always studied and admired.   Even in the *aetas
Ovidiana* he played his part.   The debates of the twelfth and
thirteenth century, however, are written in the tradition of the
Conflictus Veris et Hiemis without the Vergilian setting and manner.

One whole group of mediaeval poetical debates, dealing with
the dispute between body and soul,[78] has quite clearly no connec-
tion with the pastoral singing contest, but has its origins in the
allegorical epic, the *Psychomachia* of Prudentius.   Prudentius him-
self had drawn his conception of the allegorical battle between
vices and virtues not from Vergil's *Eclogues* but from the writings
of Statius and Philo.   In the *Thebaid* [79] Pietas moved by the horrors
of fratricidal combat descends to the field of battle to deter the
brothers and oppose Tisiphone and Megaera.   She is unable to
withstand their attack, however, and is forced to flee.   This is in
brief form a struggle between vice and virtue.[80]   Bloomfield [81] has
recently pointed out that in various writings of Philo the war of
vices and virtues is portrayed.   Philo's most ambitious allegory
dealing with vices and virtues concerns Abraham's victory over the
four kings of the East with their subject kingdoms.   Philo inter-
prets the incident as the triumph of reason in saving the five senses
from the four passions.[83]   Thus, Prudentius found models in Statius
and Philo for his descriptions of the allegorical battle between

[78] Walther, *op. cit.* (see note 1) 113–26.

[79] 11.457–96.

[80] C. S. Lewis, *The Allegory of Love* (Oxford, 1936) 48–56.

[81] M. W. Bloomfield, "A Source of Prudentius' *Psychomachia*," *Speculum* 18
(1943) 87–90.

[82] Philo, *Allegorical Interpretation* 2.20; 3.65–6; *Who Is the Heir* 58; *On Husbandry*
16–7.

[83] Philo, *On Abraham* 39–41.   Cf. also *The Preliminary Studies* 17 and *On Drunken-
ness* 27.

vices and virtues, and, in turn, his poem gave rise to later works dealing with the debate between the soul and the body.

Thus, contrary to general assumption, the pastoral singing contest and the mediaeval debate have only a superficial similarity. The mediaeval Latin debate does not adhere to the conventions of the Vergilian shepherds' contest. The mediaeval Latin debate is not a phase in the history of the Vergilian eclogue. The genre of the debate poem and the genre of the pastoral contest are two separate literary types of different origin, method, purpose, and development. The two merge only when a poet occasionally combines them. Furthermore, a tradition of poetical debate, quite independent of the singing contest, existed in antiquity while the popularity and influence of the rhetorical schools throughout the empire testify to an interest in debate among the Romans and occasioned the writing of school exercises in both prose and poetry. Finally, in classical authors known to and read by mediaeval writers debates or germs of debates are found which might serve as models for the mediaeval Latin *conflictus*. Thus, a long tradition of debate in verse existed in classical literature which may well have been the source of the mediaeval Latin poetical debate.