THE mediæval conflictus, or poetic debate between representative or allegorical figures, has been the subject of occasional remarks by numerous scholars; and its origin as a literary type has been variously explained. The ease with which such forms arise and the extraordinary prevalence of dialogues of this kind, not only in Europe but in the Orient as well,¹ has naturally led to the conclusion that it is useless to look for an individual source for this mass of literature; that it should rather be regarded as the outcome of many tendencies, and as springing up independently in different countries and at various times. Some writers, on the other hand, have claimed for the conflictus, as it exists in western Europe in the Middle Ages, a more or less definite descent from classical antiquity. "Elle [l'altercation poétique] certainement appartient," says M. Gaston Paris,² "aux traditions des joculatores des bas siècles romains." And Moritz Haupt,³ speaking of the Judicium Vespae, a second or third century dispute between a cook and a baker, which bears a close resemblance to the typical mediæval debate, expresses the opinion that the ancient "streitgedicht," as represented by this poem, was not without its influence on Christian literature. A more recent opinion, based upon the existence of several of the conflicti in popular form, has tended to associate a large class of mediæval debates with the various forms of folk dialogue; and to make many of the poems but learned and academic echoes of the village green, with its flying, its riddle contest, its laughing amorous dispute between youth and maiden.⁴


⁴ In spite of the statement quoted above, Paris finds traces of association
Obviously the theories thus briefly outlined cannot each be wholly right. Taken in a restricted sense, however, they are not necessarily contradictory. Looking at the whole body of mediæval contention dialogue in prose and verse, even of an allegorical type, no one would think of assigning to it a single definite origin. It owes its popularity in general to the two strong mediæval tendencies of allegory and dispute, and it is derived from the widest variety of sources: from the amatory discussions and verse contests of the poets of southern France, from the controversial and didactic dialogues of early Christian times, from philosophical dialogue, from classical and Christian allegory, from the flytings and riddle contests of the folk. Within this general class of literature, however, there may be distinguished a smaller but still extensive group of poetic contests, marked by certain common characteristics and clearly belonging to a single literary tradition. To these pieces the term conflictus is best restricted, and for the literary type which they represent we may with confidence assume a fairly definite origin, bearing in mind the fact that the significant element in the conflictus, regarded as a literary species, is not the contrasts which are the bases of individual poems, but the form in which these contrasts are embodied. The materials of the allegorical debate exist everywhere; in the literature and thought of the Middle Ages they were particularly common. The eternal war of the virtues and the vices, the old altercation of synagogue and church, the divine controversy of the daughters of God, with a thousand rivalries, enmities, and contrasts in daily life—all these besieged the mind of the poet, particularly the learned poet, and readily submitted to treatment according to a conventional mode. It is in-

...with the popular celebration of the renouveau in several of the non-lyric debates; op. cit, pp. 156-8. Cf. also the remark of Professor Allen, below, p. 28; and Professor F. B. Gummere, Beginnings of Poetry, p. 307: "These flytings [i.e., those of the summer and winter type] came to be extraordinarily popular, and it is hard to draw a line between the volkspoesie and the volkstümliche; learned allegory, which was early on the ground, has the mark of Cain upon it and cannot be missed. Probably Böckel is right in looking on the winter and summer songs as originally communal, with those dialogues between soul and body, which one finds in nearly every literature of Europe, as a learned and allegorical imitation; a combination of the two kinds is not unusual. So one passes to all manner of debates,—riches and poverty, wine and water, peasant and noble, priest and knight, down to Burns's Two Dogs."
perative, therefore, in studying the genesis of the conflictus to
determine the influence or influences which crystallized the varied
medieval tendencies toward literature of this sort into the comparatively rigid form assumed by these poems in the Latin poetry of
the twelfth century and later.

The assertion that the medieval conflictus was a heritage from
antiquity rests upon the most unsubstantial foundation. That the
subject matter of many of the debates and that certain literary
influences, which were of importance in the development of the
type, did descend from the classics is undeniable. It is one of
these influences, indeed, which is the main theme of the present
study. But that an extensive body of dialogue literature, corre-
responding closely to the medieval debate, existed in either Greek or
Latin, and constituted the starting point of the medieval tradition
has yet to be shown. In one of Ovid's elegies the old idea of
the choice of Hercules, the contest between two ways of life, takes
a form which is not unlike that of the conflictus; and the Judicium
Vespae, already referred to, bears a still closer resemblance to the
medieval debate. But these two works stand practically alone,
and I can discover no trace of the influence of either. The possi-
bility that dialogues of this character formed part of the reperto-
naire of the joculatorum and were thus handed on to Carolingian
times, must be referred to the highly mysterious history of the
Roman mime. We know little of the Latin minstrels of the dark
ages, and it is more than doubtful, in spite of Reich, if any literary
tradition came down unbroken through their hands.

Of the relation of the medieval allegorical debate to popular
dialogue forms I shall have something to say in the course of this
eSSay. I do not pretend to dispute the established thesis that the
French lyric débats go back to and are a courtly modification of
the different varieties of chants de danse; nor should I hesitate

* For a survey of allegorical contention literature in antiquity see Otto Hense,
Die Synkrisis in der antiken Litteratur, Protektorats-Program, Freiburg, 1893;
and an unpublished Radcliffe dissertation by Miss Margaret C. Waites, entitled
De Disputationibus inter Allegoricas Personas habitis, etc.

* Amores, Bk. III, El. 1.


‡ See Jeanroy, Les Origines de la Poésie Lyrique en France, cap. II, "Le
Débat."
to count the folk debate, taking the term in its broadest sense, as one of the forms which contributed to the tradition of the conflictus. Occasionally evident in the Latin poems of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, such influences become increasingly important in the vernacular debates which continue and popularize the Latin tradition. What I do deny is that the process of development was the reverse of what I have suggested, viz., that the Latin poems were themselves preceded by similar dialogues in the vernacular, or that the vernacular debates sprang up in the main independently of the Latin out of the native soil of popular tradition. With the latter proposition I shall not much concern myself here. The existence of a continuous tradition from the Latin poems of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries into the various national literatures is obvious, and this is enough for my present purpose. With the conclusion that the Latin debates themselves rest upon a broad foundation of popular dialogue I shall take issue, endeavoring to show that the type to which these poems belong was developed in the main under literary and academic influences.

The earliest clear examples of the conflictus type in medieval literature are to be found in a little group of poems belonging to the general period of the Carolingian Renaissance, and bearing such marked resemblances to each other and to later poems of this class as to make it almost inevitable to consider them as the definite starting point of the tradition. A careful examination of these poems in their relation to the literary influences of their time will, I believe, make clear the fact that they owe little to popular dialogue models, and that the chief determining factor in their development was the classical eclogue.9

Before taking up these poems in detail it will be well to consider for a moment the debate elements inherent in the eclogue form,

9The existence of an important relation between the eclogue and the debate has long been recognized. It was first affirmed, I think, by Adolf Ebert (Allgemeine Geschichte der lateinischen Literatur des Mittelalters im Abendlande, Leipzig, 1880, vol. II, p. 69), following a suggestion made by Ludwig Uhland in his essay on the folk drama of the seasons (Schriften zur Geschichte der Dichtung und Sage, vol. III, pp. 17 ff.). The subject has recently been further developed by Professor E. K. Rand of Harvard University, to whose kind encouragement and generous help I am very deeply indebted. So far as I know no special investigation has ever been published.
and to glance at some later pastorals which show how easily the shepherd dialogue became debate in the mediæval sense.

The original theme of the pastoral is a contest between shepherds for the prize of rustic song; but the question of who is the better singer naturally resolves itself into the question of who can give the better reasons. The amœbean as employed by Theocritus, Virgil, and Calpurnius is essentially a contest of wit,—in the broadest sense of the term, a debate. It differs from the mediæval debate in general, as represented, for example, by the Provençal tenso, in that the dispute does not concern a single issue, but is constantly shifting from one thing to another. But the fact that the argument is largely personal brings the amœbean still nearer to the particular type of debate we are discussing, in which the characters are themselves the embodiment of the question at issue. In so far as the shepherds are not giving exhibitions of their art, but matching their own persons, qualities, possessions, etc., they are using the method of the mediæval allegorical debate. The difference is that the shepherds are individuals and the material of their dispute personalities, whereas the figures in the debates represent general ideas. Now when the pastoral ceases to be of interest for its own sake,—when the purely artistic motive is given over for panegyric or didacticism, it is natural that the shepherd interlocutors should often come to be representatives of different points of view or of contrasting lots in life. In the classical amœbean this is not often the case, although one singer may for the moment be the defender of winter, the other of summer, or there may exist a character contrast as in Virgil VII, where the modesty and good taste of one singer is opposed to the conceit and extravagance of the other. Where the dialogue is informal there is more likely to be an explicit contrast. Thus in Virgil I Tityrus and Meliboeus are typical instances, the one of a contented freedman, whose holdings have been confirmed by Augustus, the other of a shepherd who has lost his farm.

In the pastoral of later times the tendency to make the characters embodiments of opposing ideas or principles is very marked. The eclogues of Boccaccio and Petrarch,¹⁰ who wrote in the main

independently of the mediaeval pastoral tradition, and of their English successor, Edmund Spenser, show a clear consciousness on the part of their authors of the debate idea. The seventh "Æglogue" of the Shepheardes Calender, for example, embodies a contrast between two types of ecclesiastical pastors. Thomalin is a denizen of the valley, Morrell of the heights; the two argue the relative merits of their different positions and ambitions, the eclogue being made, as we are told by the commentator, E.K., "in honor and commendation of good shepheardes, and to the shame of proude and ambitious pastours; such as Morrell is here imagined to be." A striking example of the use of debate material in a formal amœbean contest is to be found in a Latin eclogue by Nicolaus Parthenius Giannettasius, a Neapolitan Jesuit of the time of Leopold I. The poem is pure pastoral, closely modeled on Virgil and full of borrowed phrases. Amilcon, the fisherman, comes upon Tityrus, the shepherd, piping contentedly in the shade. The latter declares that the life of the fisher has no such joys as these. The other promptly replies, and the contest begins.

"Versibus hinc ambo incipiant certare vicissim:
Tityrus et sylvas laudabat, littora Amilcon."

The single theme of the delights of land against the joys of the sea, in the varying seasons, is carried through the poem; in every other respect the dialogue conforms exactly to the form and spirit of the Virgilian amœbean. The presence of the debate element in this eclogue and in the others mentioned above, is, perhaps partly to be explained by their authors' familiarity with the mediaeval debate itself, though Parthenius apparently derives his material from the Greek rhetoricians. In any case the poems serve to show how easily the pastoral dialogue might be adapted to the subject matter of the debate.

---

13 Cf. also Aeglogues II and V.
11 The title of the poem, "Epaeneteria," clearly suggests the ἐραίον, of the rhetoricians. ἐραίον, ὑπόθεσις, and συμφλέγματα of sea and land are among the commonest of rhetorical themes. Cf. Waltz, Rhetorici Graeci, I, 365; this "synkrisis," curiously enough, was written by the rhetorician, Nikolaus. See also Alciphrion, Epist., I, 3 and 4, II, 4 and 13; and Moschus, Idyl V.
That the Carolingian writers should have made a similar use of the old bucolic form seems the more natural when we take account of the conception of the eclogue prevalent throughout this period. The eager desire of the court of Charles to revive the literary tradition of the Augustan age had led to a renaissance of the Virgilian pastoral, but there was little in the spirit of time to make the pastoral idea sought for its own sake. The dialogue form and the panegyrical trend of the Virgilian pastoral were elements for which the Carolingian writers could find use, and they preserved and strengthened them. But the pastoral setting is with them a mere formality, without intrinsic interest and tending to disappear. The speakers are prone to enter upon disquisitions and forget that they are shepherds. The conventional imagery tends to fall away from the dialogue and leave the latter to go its own way, as a vehicle for the expression of any new ideas to which it may seem adapted.\(^{14}\)

In this transfer of interest from the setting of the pastoral dialogue to its content, the debate elements of the Virgilian eclogue are, as might be expected, greatly emphasized. In the *Ecloga* of Naso,\(^{15}\) vaguely modeled on Virgil I, a “Puer” and a “Senex” (they have pastoral names as well) contend in lengthy harangues. The youth felicitates the old man on his happy condition under the royal favor as contrasted with his own wretchedness without it, and declares that he will seek patronage with his songs. The other is inclined at first to oppose the idea, but the boy convinces him that he will succeed, and the two engage in a duo of praise. More significant is the eclogue of Paschasius Radbertus,\(^{16}\) for here the singers, Galatea and Fillis, are avowedly allegorical, the one representing New Corvey, a monastery founded by Adalhard, and the other, the parent institution, over which he was abbot. The two lament alternately the death of Adalhard, in a kind of rivalry of grief, which is further suggestive of the debate.

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{“Non me tu lacrimis vinces aut fletibus umquam,} \\
\text{Non cantus resonare leves non pandere vota.”}
\end{align*}
\]

\(^{14}\) See below.


The contrast between the old and new foundations is occasionally brought out.

I pass now to a consideration of the Carolingian poems, referred to above, in which the debate element is not incidental but explicit, whether obviously imported into the eclogue amœbean and retaining the pastoral setting, or existing independently of the pastoral imagery but, as I hope to show, not the less dependent on the eclogue for its dialogue framework. Among these Carolingian poems the one which lends the strongest support to the theory of a popular origin for the literary debate is the Conflictus Veris et Hiemis. This dialogue has been ascribed with some show of probability to Alcuin, and most authorities are agreed that the piece is a product of the literary activity of the little circle of Latin poets who were attached to the court and palace school of Charles the Great. If so, it is the earliest example in mediæval literature of a formal dispute in verse between allegorical figures who are themselves embodiments of the principles at issue.

The poem opens with a modification of the conventional narrative introduction of the eclogue. The shepherds have come down from the hills with their flocks to sing the praises of the cuckoo. Spring was there and Winter, and between these two there arose a great contest.

"His certamen erat cuculi de carmine grande."

Without more ceremony Spring begins "in threefold verses," praising the most welcome of the birds and bidding him come soon. Winter answers scoldingly, with reproaches for the cuckoo, bringer of hunger, labor and strife, disturber of land and sea with his harsh note. At length the quarrel becomes more personal, Spring turning against Winter and upbraiding him for indolence, and the latter boasting of his wealth and comforts. At last the old reprobate is put to shame. Palaemon, the judge, and the whole throng of shepherds clamor their assent to the words of Spring and hail the cuckoo with one accord.

The pastoral connections of this poem are obvious at first

glance. What is really significant, however, in the present discussion, is the fact that it is not so much the pastoral imagery of which the author of the Conflictus makes use, as the external form and framework of the eclogue. The model is such a poem as Virgil's seventh eclogue,\textsuperscript{19} opening, like the Conflictus, with a narrative introduction, passing quickly to the song contest, and ending with more narrative, in which judgment is pronounced and the winner duly praised. In length the Conflictus comes close to the average for the Virgilian eclogue. To the contest itself the technical term ("certamen"), used in the Bucolics of the formal amœbean,\textsuperscript{20} is applied; and the rules of the game are followed with precision, the contestants carrying on their argument in alternate stanzas of three lines each. The verses themselves are frequently reminiscent of the classical pastoral.\textsuperscript{21}

From this discussion it will be clear that the Conflictus follows the eclogue in everything but the characters of the dialogue and the nature of their contest. In view of the freedom with which, as we have seen, the Carolingians used the eclogue form as a mould for the expression of new ideas, such a change is not surprising. The question which now presents itself, concerning the source of this new material, raises at once the issue of the popular origin of the debate; for practically every scholar who has mentioned this conflictus since Grimm and Uhland,\textsuperscript{22} has referred it without hesitation to the Teutonic folk drama of the renouveau, in which figures representing spring and winter meet and chide each other, until at length they fall to blows and Winter is driven out of the room or forced to acknowledge the supremacy of Spring.

Against this theory, as applying to the Conflictus Veris et Hiemis, I have little to urge. The traces of northern influence in the poem,—particularly the rôle played by the cuckoo,\textsuperscript{23}—are

\textsuperscript{19} Cf. also Eclogue III, where Palaemon is the judge.


\textsuperscript{21} In addition to the line just quoted, compare with the close of the Conflictus,—" Tunc respondit ovans," etc.—Ec. V, v. 19 and IX, v. 66; and with the opening lines Calpurnius, Ec. II.

\textsuperscript{22} The latest is Professor Philip Schuyler Allen, Modern Philology, vol. VIII, no. I, p. 27. See below, p. 29.

unmistakable, and the resemblances between the dialogue and the modern versions of the folk drama,—the introduction into the Latin debate, for example, of the question of which is master and which is man,—are certainly striking. Still I believe that the certainty of such popular influence is not quite so great as has been made out. We know that the personification of the seasons and at least the conception of their great conflict, together with some ceremonies representing the death of the old year and the coming of spring, are deep rooted in Teutonic tradition; that a mimic contest between the two formed a part of these ceremonies in very remote times seems highly probable. The folk drama as we now have it, cannot, on the other hand, he traced beyond the 16th century; and it may owe much of its present form to the learned debate. Furthermore there is nothing in the Conflictus Veris et Hiemis which cannot be explained by purely classical and rhetorical traditions, touched here and there by popular mythology. The contrast and war of the two seasons and the glorious victory of spring is a universal idea. It appears, for example, in a Greek fable, to which one might attribute an importance in connection with the present poem, if there were any evidence that the piece was ever translated into Latin. The praise of summer and the blame of winter were common themes with the rhetoricians. And finally the contrast appears, fleetingly, in one of the Virgilian amoebean contests, in a passage which is echoed in the Conflictus. Corydon prays for the protection of his flocks against the heat of summer, and Thyrsis replies with a defiance against winter, as follows:

"Hic focus et taedae pingues, hic plurimus ignis
Semper, et assidua postes fuligine nigri.

See the passages from the German poets quoted by Grimm, also the following from the English Bestiary:

"Til it cumeth the time
That storm stireth al the se,
Thanne summer and winter winnen."

The Latin has simply "Si sit tempestas, vel vadit estas."

A version of the "Streit," given by Uhland (Volkslieder, No. 8) from a print of 1580, shows marked verbal resemblances to the modern version. The drama itself (apparently pantomime) is mentioned in Sebastian Franc's Weib-buch (1542), quoted by Uhland, III, 18.

χειμων και θαυμα ed. Halm, no. 414.
Hiems, in the *Confictus*, uses the same motive:

"Sunt mihi divitiae, sunt et convivia laeta,
Est requies dulcis, calidus est ignis in aede."

To personify the seasons was no less natural than to contrast them, and one need look no further than the classics for a precedent. It is, indeed, to a passage in Ovid that the author of the *Confictus* seems to have gone for the literary attributes, at least, of the two figures of his dialogue.

With this abundance of literary precedent in the writings with which the author of the *Confictus* was most familiar, it would seem unnecessary to go to the hypothetical folk drama in order to explain the poem. I am prepared, however, to admit the possibility, even the strong probability (for all argument aside, the impression lingers with one on repeated reading of the piece), that the author of the *Confictus* derived his fundamental conception from popular sources, the actual origin of the material in any particular poem being, as I have already suggested, of small account in the development of the form. If the idea was suggested by the folk drama, the process of putting the eternal opposition into debate form was already partly accomplished. But even so, the poem can owe few of its literary features to a popular source. Narrative introduction and conclusion the folk drama cannot have had. The presence of an official judge is not more likely to have been a popular feature. As for the substance of the debate, one motive, as we have seen, is clearly derived from Virgil; and the rest smacks more of the schoolroom than of the field. Even the argument about overlordship is developed with a subtlety which removes

---

*Eclogue VII*, vv. 49 ff.

*Metamorphoses II*, vv. 25 ff.:

"Verque novum stabat cinctum florente corona,
Et glacialis Hiems canos hirsuta capillos."

*Cf. Confictus*, vv. 6, 7:

"Ver quoque florigeri succinctus stemmate venit
Frigida venit Hiems, rigidis hirsuta capillis."
it far from popular speech into the atmosphere of mediæval dialect. It seems to me exceedingly unlikely that the author of the Conflictus knew the folk debate otherwise than as a mimic combat, or that he derived from the springtime festival anything more than the suggestion of substituting Summer and Winter for the conventional shepherds of the amœbean contest, and the idea of the shepherds congregating from the hills to hail the cuckoo, first messenger of Spring. The form in which this conception was embodied, and the manner in which it was developed,—the very idea of giving it literary form at all,—were due to the classical eclogue.

If the Conflictus Veris et Hiemis stood alone at the beginning of the mediæval debate tradition, or if the other debate poems of the period immediately under discussion showed equal evidence of popular connections, the importance of the folk dialogue and drama in the development of the type could by no means be denied. This, however, is not the case. There are but few poems in the entire corpus of Latin debates which readily connect themselves with popular material; and the examples of the type which immediately follow the Conflictus can be shown, I think, in every case to be purely academic in their elements. In the poem most nearly contemporary with the Conflictus and to which I now turn, the debate is introduced in the course of a long panegyric; it forms, however, a practically independent unit and may be so considered. The piece is an address to King Pippin by Ermoldus Nigellus, then an exile, designed to gain the intercession of Pippin with the Emperor, Lewis, for his recall. Its date is fixed between 824, when Ermoldus was still in favor with Lewis, and 830, about the time of his return. The poet addresses his Muse, in elegiacs, bidding

* Spring: Who would heap up wealth for thee, lazy Winter, or gather thy treasure, if Spring and Summer did not work before thee?

Winter: Quite true; and since they work for me they are my very servants, subject to my rule. I am their master and they toll for me.

Spring: Thou art no master, but a poor and miserable beggar; thou couldst not so much as find food for thyself if the cuckoo did not come and lend thee alms.


* See Dümmler, op. cit., pp. 1-3; and Wattenbach, Deutschlands Geschichtsquellen, 7th ed., vol. I, p. 268. My attention was first called to this important
her go quickly to the king with his greetings. The king will ask where the exile now is; and Thalia must reply with a description of Alsace, introducing, episodically, a dispute between the Rhine and the Vosges. The poet rehearses the words she is to use.

"Wasace, das silvas, Rhenus opimat humum.
Experiere libet iam nunc quid possit uterque,
Quis popolo tribuat fertiliora suo."

Without further introduction the dispute begins. The Rhine proclaims his usefulness as a highway of commerce and for fishing, while the wretched Vosges produces nothing better than firewood. Vosges, in reply, boasts that palaces and churches are made from his wood. Kings come to hunt in his valleys. The stricken deer flees to his springs to drink. And as for commerce, Rhine owes all that it has to the products of his fields. To this last argument Rhine replies with clever sophistry, and not without a fling atalsacian habits. If the country used all its wine at home, its people would all lie drenched with it in the fields! His commerce brings wealth and comfort to citizen and foreigner alike. He clothes his people with garments of varied hues; for the wooden roofs of his rival he can boast golden sands; for the cut oak timber, lucid gems. And so the argument goes on. At last Thalia (or the poet, for the last lines of the debate are somewhat blind) puts an end to the contest by awarding equal honors:

"Parcite carminibus, sint vobis munera vestra."

The poem concludes with more description, much humble flattery, and an imaginary reply from the king himself.

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 arguments 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 poem by Mr. H. E. Hillebrand, in an unpublished dissertation on the pastoral in the age of Charlemagne.
dialogue. The formula with which the dispute is introduced is obviously borrowed from Virgil,\textsuperscript{32} while the conclusion of the contest is modeled on that of the typical amebean. The Muse refuses to pronounce judgment between the rivals and prays both, her words being again adapted from the \textit{Bucolics}.\textsuperscript{33}

For the subject matter of this debate the Latin verse familiar to Ermoldus affords abundant precedent. One is naturally reminded first of all of Ausonius's famous poem in praise of the Moselle. More significant, however, as including a comparison of two neighboring rivers, the one tributary to the other, is a work by Venantius Fortunatus,\textsuperscript{34} an author with whom Ermoldus was perfectly familiar, as is shown by frequent echoes in the poem we are discussing. It is quite possible that the opening lines of Fortunatus's elegy suggested to Ermoldus the idea of a rivalry between the Rhine and the Vosges.

\begin{quote}
"Laus tibi forte minor fuerat, generosa Garonna,
Si non exiguas alter haberet aquas:
Lubricat hic quoniam tenuato Egircius haustu,
Praefert divitiis paupere fonte tuas.
Denique dissimilem si comparat ullus utrunque,
Hic ubi fit rivus, tu puto Nilus eris.
Te famulans intrat, sed hunc tua regna refrenant:
Gallicus Eufrates tu fluis, iste latet.
Nam quantum Oceanum tumidis tu cursibus auges,
Iste tuas tantum crescere praestat aquas."
\end{quote}

The rest of the poem describes the Gers in time of drought and flood, and the comparison with the Garonne is carried no further. The language of the passage quoted strongly suggests the idea of a rivalry between the two rivers; and the description which follows of the destructive effects of the Gers when it overflows its

\begin{quote}
\textit{Eclogue} III, v. 29:
"Vis ergo inter nos quid possit uterque vicissim
Experiamur."
\end{quote}

\begin{quote}
\textit{Eclogue} VIII, v. 109:
"Parcite, ab urbe venit, iam parcite carmina Daphnis."
\end{quote}

\begin{quote}
\textit{De Egircio Flumine, Fortunati Opera,} Lib. I, Carm. xxi; \textit{Monumenta Germaniae Historica, Auctores Antiquissimi,} vol. IV (2).
banks, reminds us of the answer made by the Vosges to the boast of the Rhine that the people wait for his rising as the inhabitants of Egypt do for that of the Nile.\textsuperscript{35} The characteristic feature of Ermoldus's poem, viz., the fiction of an actual dispute, may possibly owe its existence to the \textit{Conflictus Veris et Hiemis} or to some other debate poem now lost. On the other hand it may have occurred to the poet independently of any other composition of the kind. The fact that the poem as a whole employs the fiction so common with the Carolingians of a dialogue between the poet and his Muse,\textsuperscript{36} made it easier to bring in an incidental discussion between two allegorical figures. The personification of the rivers was already present in Fortunatus's poem. But whether the conception of the poem was original or derived, two things are clear: first, that the piece belongs in every way to the rhetorical and panegyric literature with which it is surrounded, and contains nothing which can be called popular; and secondly, that its author thought of this dialogue as akin to the shepherd contests of the eclogue and looked to the \textit{Bucolics} as his classical original.

In so doing he was, as has already been suggested, but following the custom of the Latin writers of his time, with whom the classical eclogue often served as a model for poems from which the pastoral setting had been entirely discarded. We have two excellent illustrations of this in Walafrid Strabo's \textit{De Imagine Tetrici}\textsuperscript{37} and in the so-called Saxo's romance of Apollonius of Tyre,\textsuperscript{38} both of which clearly employ the eclogue method, though they have nothing pastoral either in setting or content. In the first poem Strabo urges Scintilla to take advantage of the present springtime and instruct him. The latter, after some demur, agrees. The dialogue fiction is kept up throughout the piece, although Strabo's part is limited to a few questions. In the other piece, which apparently is influenced in its method by the first, Strabo and Saxo, after the usual pastoral preliminaries of friendly exhor-

\textsuperscript{35} The Vosges bids the Rhein keep his pestilent waters to himself; for in attempting to irrigate he only drowns.

\textsuperscript{36} Ermoldus's model appears to have been the poem sent by Theodulfus in his exile to Moduinus. \textit{Poetae Latini}, vol. I, p. 563. The poet sends his Muse and instructs her what to say.


\textsuperscript{38} \textit{Poetae Latini}, V, p. 486.
tation, begin to sing alternately of the deeds of Apollonius. A slighter and more uncertain trace of eclogue influence is furnished by the much discussed bit of dialogue in which the dramatist Terence is mocked and made to defend his art by a "delusor." There is in the fragment a suggestion of the universal contrast between youth and age, between modernity and antiquity, which reminds us of the debate. The tradition to which the piece belongs is dramatic; still, the grouping of the lines into a kind of stanza suggests the eclogue in which "jurgia" of the kind were not uncommon, and the use of one familiar Virgilian motive in Terence's reply, illustrates again the Carolingian tendency to associate verse dialogue, especially when it is of a contentious nature, with the pastoral.

(To be continued)

JAMES HOLLY HANFORD

Simmons College

"Terentius atque Delusor," printed by Winterfeld in his edition of Hrothvit, Proemium, XX ff.; discussed as a mime by the same author in Herrig's Archiv, CXIV, 68, and by Professor Allen in Modern Philology, Vol. V, p. 160, and vol. VIII, p. 47. The significance of the piece in its relation to the debate and the pastoral was pointed out to me by Professor Rand.

* Cf. Virgil, Ec. III; and Calpurnius.

** "O iuvenis, tumidae nimium ne crede iuventae
Saepe superba cadunt, et humillima saepe resurgunt."