The mediaeval form of dialectical disputations known as *obligationes* was very popular in the fourteenth century. The disputation has two participants; an Opponent and a Respondent. The disputation starts with the opponent putting forward a proposition or thesis called *obligatum* which the respondent accepts as true, false or dubious for the sake of the disputation, unless it is contradictory in itself. The dialogue keeps on with the opponent introducing sucessively other *proposita* which respondent grants, denies or doubts on the basis of inferential relation between the thesis and the propositions previously introduced by the opponent. If there is no such inferential relation the respondent answers to the propositions on the basis of the background knowledge which is shared with the opponent. I will focus here on the best-known obligational disputation called *positio*. In nowadays reconstructions of the notion of *positio* it is quite often that only the general rules that determine the general course of the game and the role of each players are presented. Actually, according to my view, there are two kinds of rules: the general rules which specify the general organization of the game and the 'internal' rules, which describe the way a proposition can be defended according to its main connective. From this point of view, there is a striking similarity between the mediaeval and the approach of dialogical logic. The aim of my talk is to present in detail the general and the internal rules of the two main theories of *positio* namely those of Walter Burleigh and Roger Swyneshed. The presentation constitutes the first step towards a formal reconstruction of the theory of *positio* from a dialogical viewpoint. Important is to notice that *positio* seems to be a kind of a combination of the dialogical approach with the game theoretical one. Indeed postio are games in models.