

Norbert Rogosz
University of Silesia, Katowice
e-mail: norbert.rogosz@us.edu.pl

Marcus Antonius as the Tribune of the Plebs (49 year BC)*

Holding the tribunate of the plebs by Marcus Antonius in 49 was merely an episode in his rich public career, as he is mostly associated with performing other, more important public posts in the following years, when he was already one of the most crucial figures in Rome¹.

Even though the tribunate of the plebs was a less significant institution among the Roman offices, some of the Romans who held it were highly placed in public life, possibly due to the rights resulting from the function, their great activity and enterprise, as well as well organized base². This was also the case of M. Antonius, and mostly so, because he was granted this position just when the events determining the future of the Republic were taking place in the Republic³. The holding of the plebeian function let him take active part in those events and play a major role⁴. As a result, his tribunate was of far bigger significance than usually associated with this position. Another aspect making this matter interesting is the fact that Antonius did not hold this office for the entire term⁵.

There are numerous mentions regarding Antonius' activity on the plebeian post in ancient source texts, however, they only concern some of his initia-

* The dates in this article concern the times before Christ.

¹ This was especially noticeable since the year 44. For general information regarding the functions held by Antonius at that time, see: Index of Careers, in: Broughton 1952, 531; Idem 1986, 20. Matters connected to this subject have become significant research goals for many modern historians. Cf. e.g.: Matijević 2006; Pasquali 2009.

² This statement concerns particularly: Tiberius Gracchus, his brother Caius, Lucius Appuleius Saturninus, Caius Servilius Glaucia, Marcus Livius Drusus, Publius Sulpicius Rufus and Publius Clodius, who could even dominate the political life of the capital for some time while holding this function.

³ These were: the last, political stage of conflict between Caesar and Pompey with his allied optimates and the initial stage of the civil war.

⁴ Undoubtedly, this is how particularly the first stage of his tribunate, which was very intense before the outbreak of the civil war, needs to be assessed.

⁵ This state of affairs was the effect of the clashes with Lentulus and his fellow consul in the Senate's session in the first days of January 49, as well as the outbreak of the civil war several days later.

tives, including the most important ones. Generally, they can be seen rather as brief pieces of information on some detailed subjects. What is missing, though, is a more complete presentation of Antonius' tribunate, which would provide a general and fairly complex overview of his activity on this position. Therefore, a full and detailed reconstruction of his doings while holding this office is not possible.

Many pieces of information regarding the role of Antonius as a tribune come from contemporary letters included in the correspondence of M. Tullius Cicero, the Philippics written several years later, or other texts by this great orator⁶. Some data can be found in the slightly later sources by Caesar and Aulus Hirtius⁷. Also, important information is included in Plutarch's *Life of Antony* and *Life of Pompey*, as well as Plutarch's and Suetonius' *Life of Caesar*⁸, some *periochae* of Livy's work, and the reports of Appian, Cassius Dio, Orosius and Zonaras⁹. Less significant data can be also encountered in the texts by Varro and Pliny the Elder.

The already mentioned flaws of the source materials along with Antonius' disturbed fulfilling of the plebeian tribune's duties could also be the reason for the lack of studies in modern academic literature which would be dedicated to Marcus Antonius as the tribune of the plebs. There are more or less elaborate studies on this matter in the works devoted to the tribunate of the plebs¹⁰, the biographies of Antonius¹¹, Caesar and Pompeius¹², various aspects of the conflicts between the latter ones¹³, as well as some synthetic studies on last years of the Republic, or covering its whole history¹⁴.

In accordance with the contemporary norms, M. Antonius was elected tribune of the people in the year 50. Only Plutarch describes how it happened. According to this biographer, it was that year's plebeian tribune, Caius Scribonius Curio, connected to Caesar, who led to this. Antonius is said to have followed him after Curio had been won over by Caesar¹⁵. This must have happened after

⁶ Which are mostly included in the letters from the years 50–49 and the rather numerous fragments of the Second Philippic, 2, 4; 20, 50–24, 58; 31, 78–34, 84. Cf. also: *Brut.* 1.

⁷ Hirt., *Bell. Gall.*, VIII, 50, 1–3; Caes., *Bell. Civ.*, I, 1–8; 11, 4; 18, 2; 32, 5–6; III, 1, 4.

⁸ See in order: Plut., *Ant.*, 5–7; *Pomp.*, 59; *Caes.*, 30–31; 37; Suet., *Iul.*, 29–31; 41.

⁹ Liv., *Per.*, CIX; App., *B.C.*, II, 32–33; 41; 48; III, 7; Cass. Dio, XLI, 1–3; 15; 18; 36; XLII, 24; XLIV, 47; XLV, 25; 27; XLVI, 15; XLVII, 3; Oros., VI, 15; Zonar., X, 8.

¹⁰ Niccolini 1934; Thommen 1989; as well as: Martin 1965; Vanderbroeck 1987.

¹¹ Lindsay 1936; Huzar 1978; Traina 2003; Pasquali 2009; Halfmann 2011.

¹² Seager 1979; Will 1992; Canfora 1999; Christ 2004.

¹³ Rogosz 1994; Idem 1995; Idem 1997; Idem 2001.

¹⁴ E.g.: CAH 1994 (vol. 9); Ziółkowski 2004; Jaczynowska, Pawlak 2008; Syme 2009; Bringmann 2010.

¹⁵ Plut., *Ant.*, 5, 1.

Curio's being elected to the college of plebeian tribunes in 51¹⁶. Thus, Plutarch's information on how Antonius became connected to Caesar is inaccurate, since it is a known fact that already then, and possibly even in the year 52, Antonius had already been Caesar's questor¹⁷. This may lead to a conclusion that Curio did not need to win him over to Caesar's side, as Antonius had already been allied with Caesar before.

Plutarch also wrote that while serving as the plebeian tribune in the year 50, Curio was held in high esteem of the people, which he achieved due to his two strong points: very good oratory skills and funds provided by Caesar¹⁸. Furthermore, they enabled Curio to move Antonius' election to the college of plebeian tribunes to the year 49¹⁹. The data included in one of the letters from Cicero's correspondence suggests that this probably happened during summer²⁰. Additionally, the biographer from Chaeronea clearly indicated that Curio forced Antonius through by bribing the voters. In the same year, only slightly later, by the same means, he was to make Antonius elected to the college of augurs²¹.

In the light of the above information, Antonius was chosen for the post of the plebeian tribune thanks to Curio's efforts and the funds at the latter's disposal, which came from Caesar, who was managing the Gallic provinces and with whom Curio had already been allied for many months. Therefore, it can

¹⁶ The moment of winning Curio over by Caesar is hard to determine, as he was bribed: Vell. Pat., II, 48, 4; Suet., *Jul.*, 29, 1; Plut., *Caes.*, 29, 2–3; *Pomp.*, 58, 1; App., *B.C.*, II, 26, 101; Cass. Dio, XL, 60, 2–3; Lacey 1961, 318–319; Martin 1965, 110; Rogosz 1995, 81–87; Ramsey 2009, 51; Halfmann 2011, 41–42. See also: Durand 1910, 557–574. It is understandable that neither of them revealed when it happened exactly. It is only known more or less when it came to light. This news reached Cicero, who stationed in Cilicia, in June 50: Cic., *Att.*, VI, 3, 4.

¹⁷ Cic., *Phil.*, 2, 20, 49–20, 50; Hirt., *Bell. Gall.*, VIII, 2, 1. Antonius' questor's office is dated ambiguously. For instance, Broughton 1952, 236, 531, first thought that he held this office in 52. However, later (Idem 1986, 19) he re-evaluated his view and suggested that it was in 51. Other researchers also have divergent views on this matter. Cf. e.g.: Huzar 1978, 38, 41; Schleussner 1978, 154, 238; Vanderbroeck 1987, 199; Traina 2003, 20, 21. Antonius' questor's office was discussed by: Linderski, Kamińska-Linderski 1974, 213–223.

¹⁸ Plut., *Ant.*, 5, 1. Cf. also: Vell. Pat., II, 48, 3; Cass. Dio, XL, 60, 2.

¹⁹ Plut., *Ant.*, 5, 1. See also: Cic., *Phil.*, 2, 20, 50; 21, 51; Lindsay 1936, 123–124; Huzar 1978, 43; Yakobson 1999, 177; Traina 2003, 25; Pasquali 2009, 50.

²⁰ Cic., *Ad Att.*, VI, 8, 1. Lange 1876, 400, claims that in the year 50 the election took place in July. Linderski 1966, 154, states that such a date is probable, especially bearing in mind that Cicero, staying in Ephesus on the last day of September 50 (which is known from the information included in the letter quoted in this article), learned that the officials for the following year had already been chosen. Moreover, July was a common time for organising elections and nothing indicates that the ones of the year 50 were postponed. Cf. also: Neuendorff 1913, 78.

²¹ Plut., *Ant.*, 5, 1. Cf.: Cic., *Phil.*, 2, 21, 51. Cicero also implied, *Phil.*, 2, 2, 4, that it was possible owing to the violence used by Curio's friends. See: Kowalski 1983/1984, 89. Cf. also: Cic., *Ad Fam.*, VIII, 14, 1; *Brut.* 1; Varr., *Res rust.*, III, 6, 6; Plin., *Nat. Hist.*, X, 45; Lindsay 1936, 123–124; Huzar 1978, 43; Bergemann 1992, 128; CAH 1994, 419 (Wiseman); Yakobson 1999, 177; Traina 2003, 24; Halfmann 2011, 40–41.

be implied that in fact Antonius was chosen for the function in question thanks to Caesar's support. The question is: why?

At the time, Rome was experiencing intense conflicts between the followers of Caesar and Cnaeus Pompeius with his allied *optimates*, who aimed to take away Caesar's rule over the provinces, his command over the army stationed there, and to take action against him and have him sentenced²². In 50, the before mentioned plebeian tribune, Curio, effectively protected Caesar from their hostile attempts by using his rights and cleverness, and deftly carried out political moves, thus preventing the Senate from passing a resolution which would be harmful for Caesar²³. Yet, it was obvious that his term on this position would end on the 9th of December and after this day Curio as a private person would not be able to continue his work on that objective. Therefore, Caesar needed a follower of Curio's work who would take up the work started by his predecessor and, using his achievements, carry on preventing him from his political opponents. Antonius exactly fulfilled this condition, having the same or very similar qualities to Curio²⁴. He had been connected to Caesar for some time, including his serving as his questor. A conclusion can be drawn that he fulfilled his duties well and his supervisor and patron trusted him. Antonius was also akin to Caesar, but, more importantly, he was bankrupt, so his entire future depended on Caesar²⁵. Such a situation constituted a perfect guarantee of Antonius' allegiance.

Another source informing about Caesar's (who was currently managing the Gallic provinces) supporting Antonius is Book VIII of *Bellum Gallicum* written by Aulus Hirtius. These data confirm those included in Antonius' biography

²² Caesar's opponents were not trying to conceal it. E.g. Marcus Porcius Cato Uticensis had been openly declaring it for a long time: Suet., *Iul.*, 30, 3. See also: 30, 4; Plut., *Cat. Min.*, 49, 1; 51, 1–5; Jaczynowska, Pawlak 2008, 143. About the conflicts see: Liv., *Per.*, CVIII; Vell. Pat., II, 48, 1; 49, 1–4; Suet., *Iul.*, 28, 2–30, 5; Plut., *Caes.*, 29–31; *Pomp.*, 56–59; App., *B.C.*, II, 25, 97–34, 136; Flor., II, 13, 14–17; Cass. Dio, XL, 59–XLI, 3, 3; CAH 1994, 418–422 (Wiseman); Rogosz 1995, 65–96; Idem 1994, 53–69; Idem 1997, 9–37; Idem 2001, 19–42. In 59, Caesar was granted the governorship of Gallia Narbonensis, Cisalpine Gaul and Illyria together with four legions. In the years 58–52, during the conquest of *Gallia comata*, which Caesar also managed after capturing it, his army grew to over ten legions.

²³ Liv., *Per.*, CIX; Vell. Pat., II, 48, 3–5; Suet., *Iul.*, 29, 1; Plut., *Caes.*, 30, 1–2; App., *B.C.*, II, 26, 101–27, 106; 28, 110–29, 113; 30, 118–31, 123; Cass. Dio, XL, 60, 2–62, 4; Dettenhofer 1992, 45–63; Jiménez 2000, 59–60; Christ 2004, 136–140; Dahlheim 2005, 133–134; Halfmann 2011, 41–42. Cf. also in this context the sources quoted in footnote 22.

²⁴ Plut., *Ant.*, 2, 3–4; 4, 2–4; Dettenhofer 1992, 63–66. For Curio's description see: Vell. Pat., II, 48, 3–4; Suet., *Iul.*, 29, 1; Cass. Dio, XL, 60, 2; Rogosz 1995, 86–88; Christ 2004, 136.

²⁵ Plut., *Ant.*, 2, 1; 3–4. Cf. also in this context: 4, 3–4; *Pomp.*, 58, 1, as well as: Cic., *Phil.*, 2, 2, 4; 32, 78; Hirt., *Bell. Gall.*, VIII, 50, 1; Lindsay 1936, 124; Huzar 1978, 39, 41. Antonius was also Caesar's legate: Bringmann 2010, 317. Yet, the time of his serving this function is perceived in various ways. See: Bartsch 1908, 47–48; Broughton 1952, 238, 531; Idem 1986, 20; Schleussner 1978, 154, 238; Vanderbroeck 1987, 199–200; Pasquali 2009, 50.

by Plutarch, and so do the conclusions drawn from them, even though Hirtius mentions Caesar's support for Antonius during a different election: when Antonius being recommended by Caesar strived for the vacancy in the college of augurs after Quintus Hortensius' death²⁶. This election took place in the year 50 too, but it was a little later than the already mentioned election of annually chosen officials, among them tribunes of the plebs²⁷. Thus, if Caesar supported his protégé during the second election, he must have also supported him in the first one, especially taking into consideration that introducing Antonius to the college of plebeian tribunes in 49 was, by far, more significant, particularly in the light of the situation that developed in Rome in the year 50²⁸.

Why would not Hirtius as little as mention the support that Caesar offered Antonius during the election of plebeian tribunes for 49 if it was so important to him when, as his close associate, he must have been aware of it? A possible reason is that Antonius was elected thanks to Curio's efforts and maybe even bribery²⁹. What is more, Curio had also been won over by Caesar, managing the Gallic provinces at that time, by a promise of repayment of huge debts and, by defending him, Hirtius caused a scandal. As a result, he became universally hated by the *optimates*, as he undermined their efforts to destroy Caesar³⁰. Thus, Caesar was generally held responsible for that, as it was a known fact that Curio acted to his benefit. In such circumstances mentioning any information additionally disgracing Caesar in Book VIII of *Bellum Gallicum* was not advisable.

However, maybe the reason for Hirtius remaining silent in this matter was different. Electing Antonius for the position of plebeian tribune for the year 49 did no direct harm either to Caesar's significant opponents, or the whole *opti-*

²⁶ Hirt., *Bell. Gall.* VIII, 50, 1; Linderski 1966, 154–155; Huzar 1978, 42; Dettenhofer 1992, 68–70; CAH 1994, 419 (Wiseman); Yakobson 1999, 155–156, 176; Pasquali 2009, 50; Ramsey 2009, 52.

²⁷ Hortensius died during summer, maybe in June or July: Cic., *Ad Fam.*, VIII, 13, 2; *Ad Att.*, VI, 6, 2; Linderski 1966, 155. The election to the college of augurs took place probably in September. Cf.: Cic., *Ad Fam.*, VIII, 14, 1; *Ad Att.*, X, 16, 5.

²⁸ Curio showed that by using the powers of plebeian tribunes it is possible to effectively oppose Caesar's enemies in the Senate. This is confirmed by the information included in the sources quoted in footnote 23. Therefore, introducing Antonius into the college of plebeian tribunes for the year 49 gave Caesar hope that, similarly to Curio, he would be able to protect him until assuming the consulate in 48. A similar view is presented by: Huzar 1978, 43; Vanderbroeck 1987, 199; Syme 2009, 42. An augurate, however, gave such possibilities to a lesser extent. See in this light: Cic., *Phil.*, 2, 32, 80–83; Kowalski 1995, 38–44; Traina 2003, 24–25; Halfmann 2011, 41.

²⁹ Plut., *Ant.*, 5, 1. Curio's bribing the voters, as suggested by Plutarch, had to actually take place. Moreover, his data indicates that it could not have been kept a secret.

³⁰ See sources quoted in footnote 23 and literature from footnote 22. Another result of it was that he could have easily been accused of effectively supporting Antonius by bribery during the election.

mates party. This could only be done by Antonius himself, after taking this function, which was after December 10th, 50. Introducing Antonius to the college of augurs damaged their interests immediately, as they lost the spot that had been void since Hortensius' death. What is more, Lucius Domitius Ahenobarbus, ex-consul from the year 54, one of the leading *optimates* of that time, a declared opponent of Caesar, who was appointed Caesar's successor as the governor of Gaul, also made efforts to gain the discussed spot³¹.

Consequently, from the point of view of Caesarean allies, it was a spectacular success. Hirtius being one of them could also be the reason for him mentioning this fact in his work³².

It cannot be ruled out that there is yet another possible reason for Hirtius' silence about Antonius being elected the tribune of the people for the year 49 and Caesar's supporting him in this matter. Hirtius could have omitted this matter in his work while concentrating on the election of the college of augurs, as the latter was connected to Caesar's renowned journey around Cisalpine Gaul that took place directly after the election³³. Book VIII of *Bellum Gallicum* tells us that the journey had two goals: thanking the inhabitants of the local colonies and municipalities for their huge support given to Antonius and gaining similar, or even stronger backing for Caesar in his soon-to-come efforts to become re-elected as consul³⁴. From the point of view of Hirtius – Caesar's ally – it was also crucial to emphasize in his work the support Caesar had from the residents of the mentioned colonies and municipalities of this province. The reason for this was that during the recent election of consuls for 49 his opponents schemed to take away the victory from Caesar's protégé, Sulpicius Galba, even though he received more votes than his rivals. Instead, for the posts of consuls they forced through Caesar's enemies: Lucius Cornelius Lentulus Crus and Caius

³¹ This happened after the 7th of January 49, when the Senate made the key decisions regarding the preparations for the war with Caesar. It was also decided to fill the province with new governors: Caes., *Bell. Civ.* I, 6, 5. Cf. also: Cic., *Ad Fam.*, XVI, 12, 3; Suet., *Jul.*, 34, 1; *Ner.*, 2, 2; App., *B.C.*, II, 32, 129; 38, 149; 82, 346; Broughton 1952, 261–262; as well as: Lindsay 1936, 142; Huzar 1978, 49; Jiménez 2000, 60; Ziółkowski 2004, 351. About Lucius Domitius Ahenobarbus: Carlsen 2006, 53–68.

³² It was obvious, especially in the context of the heated competition for this function that took place between Antonius with the support of Caesar and his allies and the *optimates*: Hirt., *Bell. Gall.*, VIII, 50, 1–2. Cf. also: 50, 3–4; Huzar 1978, 43; Vanderbroeck 1987, 199, 266; Ramsey 2009, 52; Syme 2009, 42.

³³ Hirt., *Bell. Gall.*, VIII, 50, 1–3. This corresponds very well with the reasons that induced Hirtius to describe the events of 50, even though there were no serious military actions going on in Gaul at that time: Hirt., *Bell. Gall.*, VIII, 48, 10–11. Cf. also in this light: Hirt., *Bell. Gall.*, VIII, praef. 8; Rogosz 1982, 9–11; Ramsey 2009, 52–53.

³⁴ Hirt., *Bell. Gall.*, VIII, 50, 3–4.

Claudius Marcellus³⁵. In this context, Caesar's journey probably needs to be perceived as an element of the current propaganda war and an opportunity to further strengthening of his influence among the Romans inhabiting Cisalpine Gaul, before the upcoming clashes with the *optimates*. Nevertheless, it cannot be ruled out that the aim of emphasizing this piece of information was simply to reflect the current events³⁶.

The lack of any mentions regarding Antonius' taking up the position of plebeian tribune indicates that it took place without any disruptions on the 10th of December 50³⁷. Next, straight away, he began his campaign for Caesar, first of all, by supporting his backers in Rome³⁸. As well as this, he found various ways to fight Caesar's opponents. First, he went against the recent move of consul Caius Claudius Marcellus, who granted Pompeius leadership over two legions once sent by Caesar for the war with the Parthian Empire, as well as the organization of further recruitments in Italia³⁹. In addition, he filed a motion to send these two legions to Syria immediately, as it had been planned not long before. Finally, he suggested taking the mentioned leadership and the organization of new legions away from Pompey⁴⁰.

Antonius' next move about which we may learn from Plutarch was connected to the letters sent to Rome by Caesar, as the Senate forbade making their content public. Using his rights as plebeian tribune, Antonius made these letters generally known among the Romans during an assembly called for this particular reason. According to Plutarch, this move changed the stand of numerous listeners, since Caesar's suggestions introduced in those letters seemed right and reasonable to the Romans present during the assembly⁴¹.

Caesar's proposals included in the letters that were read to the Romans by Antonius are described by Plutarch in *Life of Pompey*. There from it may be

³⁵ Hirt., *Bell. Gall.*, VIII, 50–51; Neuendorff 1913, 77–78; Linderski 1966, 154; Huzar 1978, 43–44; Jakobson 1999, 176; Ramsey 2009, 53.

³⁶ Cf. also in this light: Hirt., *Bell. Gall.*, VIII, 50, 1–2; 4; as well as: VIII, praef. 2; 48, 10–11.

³⁷ There is no information to confirm this, however, there is also none to contradict. We do not have any knowledge about the factors that could have caused delay in taking over the responsibilities in the college of plebeian tribunes by Antonius and his partners. See: Lindsay 1936, 132; Huzar 1978, 47; Dettenhofer 1992, 71; Jakobson 1999, 177; Jiménez 2000, 60; Ramsey 2009, 53; Halfmann 2011, 43.

³⁸ Plut., *Ant.*, 5, 2.

³⁹ Plut., *Ant.*, 5, 2. Cf. also: *Pomp.*, 58, 6–59, 1; as well as: App., *B.C.*, II, 31, 120–122; Cass. Dio, XL, 64, 4; 66, 1. Contemporary researchers place this event in time ambiguously, between the 2nd and the 4th of December 50: Kamienik 1964, 57–58; Seager 1979, 158; Thommen 1989, 171; Will 1992, 139; Rogosz 1997, 16; Jiménez 2000, 60; Christ 2004, 139–140; Dahlheim 2005, 134; Ramsey 2009, 53. See also: Bardt 1910, 337–346; Botermann 1989, 69–85.

⁴⁰ Plut., *Ant.*, 5, 2; Huzar 1978, 47–48; Seager 1979, 160; Will 1992, 139.

⁴¹ Plut., *Ant.*, 5, 3; *Pomp.*, 59, 2.

concluded that Caesar suggested both he and Pompey give up their provinces, send their armies home and report to the citizens about their activity to date⁴². This was a reference to the proposals submitted formerly in the Senate by Curio, which were very popular among the Romans⁴³, and indicates that Caesar's aim was to continue the policy carried out not so long ago by the plebeian tribune, as it was still highly appraised⁴⁴. If Caesar's letters read to the Romans by Antonius included proposals related to the demands made by Curio in the previous months of 50, it cannot be ruled out that they had been sent to Rome still before the 10th of December, which was before Antonius' taking up the function of tribune of the people⁴⁵. Therefore, it was possible to make an impression on the Romans that there was a continuity in Caesar's policy and his attitude towards the Republic's authorities, as nothing had changed in this respect. Consequently, the actions made previously on Caesar's behalf by Curio which resulted in great success of both of them in the fights with the *optimates* were to be continued. It is not a surprise that the Senate was ill-disposed towards Caesar's suggestions, which was explicitly confirmed by the decision to prohibit making the content of the letter public to the Romans⁴⁶.

These were not the last writings of Caesar delivered to the capital in December 50. In Appian's work we find information that when Curio came to him after finishing his term on this post, Caesar decided to enter upon direct nego-

⁴² Plut., *Pomp.*, 59, 2. According to Suetonius, *Iul.*, 29, 2, Caesar asked not to be deprived of the privilege that he received from the Roman people in 52, which was the possibility of attempting to be re-elected for consulate in absentia, Rogosz 1985, 1–13, or that along with him other leaders (that is Pompey – N.R.) also renounce leadership.

⁴³ They were presented best and with most insight by Appian (*B.C.*, II, 27, 104–106; 28, 110–111; 29, 113; 30, 119). Besides: Plutarch, *Caes.*, 30, 1–2 and Cassius Dio, XL, 62, 3. See also in order: Lacey 1961, 326–329; Martin 1965, 112–114; Rogosz 1995, 69–81; Idem 1994, 55–68; Idem 2001, 31–38; Idem 1997, 13–17.

⁴⁴ Cf.: Plut., *Pomp.*, 59, 2; *Ant.*, 5, 3. Also among senators. This was well confirmed by the vote on this matter that took place in the Senate on the 1st of December: Plut., *Pomp.*, 58, 4–5; App., *B.C.*, II, 30, 118–119; Lindsay 1936, 129–31; Raaflaub 1974, 301; Huzar 1978, 47; Seager 1979, 158; Bonnefond-Coudry 1989, 534–538; Canfora 1999, 156–157; Rogosz 2001, 34–38; Ramsey 2009, 53.

⁴⁵ This is implied by its content relating to Curio's actions, as it proved his willingness to continue the politics that he had been carrying out. Thus, it cannot be ruled out that they were written and sent after the success that he had achieved in the Senate on the 1st of December 50 (see sources and literature quoted in footnote 44). If this was Caesar's intention, then it was also important that Antonius familiarize the Romans with the content of these letters at the very beginning of his term. However, what we know for sure is only that they reached the capital and were read to the Romans by Antonius soon after he had taken up the post of plebeian tribune. Yet, basing on Plutarch's reports, a precise specification of the date of these events is not possible. See: Plut., *Pomp.*, 59, 2. Cf. also: *Ant.*, 5, 3.

⁴⁶ Cf. in this light: Plut., *Ant.*, 5, 3; *Pomp.*, 59, 2.

tiations with the opponents and ordered his allies in Rome to conduct them⁴⁷. He resigned from the current proposals assuming giving away the province and sending the army away both by him and by Pompey, even though, as mentioned before, they were very popular among the Romans, letting them hope that avoiding civil war was possible. However, he proposed that he would give up most of his armies and provinces, except two legions plus Cisalpine Gaul and Illyria, which he intended to keep until assuming the second consul⁴⁸.

These Caesar's suggestions reached Rome in December 50 too, and in this case we are also not able to specify the exact day or days of delivery to the capital. Bearing in mind the subject discussed in this article, it is important to state whether Antonius had something to do with them. In ancient texts, whose authors do mention the letters, there is no reference to Antonius, whatsoever. Despite this fact, it needs to be indicated that being a continuator of Curio's work, Antonius has to be perceived similarly to his predecessor, which is as Caesar's main defender, not only in college of plebeian tribunes, but also on the Roman political scene⁴⁹. In such a situation it is hard to imagine that these proposals would not go through his hands either: Antonius must have been informed about them and he probably played a part in handing them over to the antagonists of his patron.

In one of his letters, Cicero wrote about Antonius' performance in the public gathering. This probably took place in *Formianum* on the 27th December 50 after coming back from Cilicia⁵⁰, because the great orator only arrived in Rome on the 4th January 49⁵¹. In the letter, Cicero informed Atticus that he had had the script of Antonius' speech from the public gathering (assembly – N.R.) at the beginning of the third decade of December 50. He also mentioned having

⁴⁷ App., *B.C.*, II, 32, 125; Dahlheim 2005, 135. Thus, he had to inform them about his intentions, which could only be done by a letter. Probably this initiative of Caesar was his reaction to the events that took place in Rome on the 4th of December, and namely handing over the leadership over two legions that had been initially intended for the war with the Parthian Empire to Pompey by consul Marcellus and instructing him to carry out recruitments in Italia. See in this context sources and studies quoted in footnote 39.

⁴⁸ App., *B.C.*, II, 126. Suetonius, *Iul.*, 29, 2, described Caesar's suggestions in a similar way; Dahlheim 2005, 135.

⁴⁹ This results from the fact that in source texts concerning the discussed events after the 10th of December 50 no ally of Caesar except Antonius and Curio is mentioned by name. They are only referred to anonymously. Specific supporters of Caesar are only listed in the source texts in fragments concerning the Roman events from the first days of January 49 (Caes., *Bell. Civ.*, I, 1–6; Liv., *Per.*, CIX; Suet., *Iul.*, 29, 2; 31; Plut., *Ant.*, 5; *Caes.*, 30–31; *Pomp.*, 59, 2–3; App., *B.C.*, II, 32–33; Cass. Dio, XLI, 1–3). Cf. also: Lindsay 1936, 124; Huzar 1978, 47.

⁵⁰ Cic., *Ad Att.*, VII, 8, 4.

⁵¹ Cic., *Ad Fam.*, XVI, 11, 2; Rawson 1983, 188; Kumaniecki 1989, 385; Mitchell 1991, 247; Pasquali 2009, 51.

spoken with Pompey about this speech. He underlined the fact that Antonius' speech, attacking the great leader, was related to his whole career. The tribune supposedly criticized all of Pompey's achievements, even the ones from his younger years⁵².

This is the only aspect of Antonius' meeting with the Romans that we know of, so it is possible that this assembly was entirely dedicated to the criticism of Pompey and this was the reason for organizing it in the first place. The military leader was namely the most important person and, at the same time, the key element of the coalition that he formed together with the *optimates*⁵³. Therefore, undermining his position and thereby weakening the opponents was very much desired. However, it might have not been the only problem debated on at that time. During the assembly, for example, at the very beginning, other matters could have been discussed, such as Caesar's politics, or his suggestions to solve the current conflict. Antonius could have first relate to these subjects, as this allowed him to inform those present about various news and only afterwards, in their context, concentrate on attacking Pompey⁵⁴. Of course, Cicero in his letter only emphasized the aspect of the meeting that he himself found most interesting, which was the mentioned Antonius' attacks on Pompey⁵⁵. Also, we do not know if this was the only attack on Pompey after the 10th of December 50, the date of taking up the function of the plebeian tribune by Antonius, or whether there were other similar ones.

The information in ancient source texts proves that directly after becoming the tribune of the people, Antonius was very active. Organizing assemblies

⁵² Cic., *Ad Att.*, VII, 8, 5; Lindsay 1936, 132; Seager 1979, 160; Rawson 1983, 188; Kumaniecki 1989, 384; Mitchell 1991, 247; Christ 2004, 140; Dahlheim 2005, 136; Ramsey 2009, 53; Halfmann 2011, 43.

⁵³ Several factors were decisive in this matter. Firstly, there were the results of his third consulate (year 52), during which he significantly extended his influence on the political arena of the capital and kept it in the years 51–50. He had had similar influence and numerous clientele for many years in some key regions of the Empire, including Italia, the East, Spain and Africa. Also, not to be omitted was the mentioned leadership over the legions stationed in Italia as well as carrying out new recruitments. These were the only military forces at the disposal of the Senate. As a result, without Pompey, the Senate could not do anything do threaten Caesar. See in this light the view of Ziółkowski, 2004, 352, referring the relation between Pompey and his supporters.

⁵⁴ Such a scenario of this session was highly probable, especially in the current situation, in the light of events that took place in Rome on the 4th of December 50. However, there are no data to confirm it.

⁵⁵ This could have been the result of meeting with Pompey and discussing with him the most important current affairs: Cic., *Ad Att.*, VII, 8, 5. What is more, it could have been influenced by the esteem that Cicero had for him until a certain time. He regarded him as the support of the Republic: Cic., *Ad Att.*, VII, 1, 3; 3, 5; 4, 2; 5, 4; 6, 2; *Ad Fam.* XVI, 11, 3; Kumaniecki 1989, 385, see also: 379–384.

during which he presented and explained the politics of Caesar and attacked his enemies is one of examples proving his activeness. It is not known, how many of such meetings he held: possibly at least two in December 50, but it cannot be ruled out that there were more, maybe three. Still, it needs to be kept in mind that due to the short time (since there were only about twenty days until the end of the month), there could not have been too many, because organizing them would not have been possible⁵⁶. Besides, Antonius definitely participated in the mentioned negotiations with Caesar's opponents as well as in sharing his suggestions to solve the current conflict with them, although his role in them cannot be determined due to lack of proper information.

The authors informing about further moves of Antonius on the post of plebeian tribune relate them to the beginning of January 49. This stage of his public activity included the first seven days of the month⁵⁷.

The first event to be related with Antonius' activity during that time was Caesar's sending to Rome further suggestions to resolve the conflict between him and Pompey with the allied *optimates*. Appian reported that at the end of December 50 Caesar included those in a letter brought to the capital by Curio after travelling 2,300 stadia within three days⁵⁸. In this letter the conqueror of Gaul returned to his former opinion on this matter and once again proposed to resign from all his provinces and army, under the condition that Pompey would do the same thing. What was a new element of these peace proposals was a suggestion that should Pompey fail to do so, Caesar would lead his soldiers to Rome to avenge the harms that the Republic and himself suffered⁵⁹.

It is known from *Bellum Civile* that Curio handed the letter to the consuls Lucius Cornelius Lentulus Crus and Caius Claudius Marcellus on the 1st of January 49. Appian mentions that it happened while they were entering the Senate's session, while Cassius Dio specifies that it took place already during

⁵⁶ Organisation of such meetings had to take place according to a certain procedure. They could also only take place on certain days. Cf. in this context: Caes., *Bell. Civ.*, I, 5, 4.

⁵⁷ To 7th January inclusive: Caes., *Bell. Civ.*, I, 5, 1; 5. See also: Liv., *Per.*, CIX; Plut., *Ant.*, 5, 4; Caes., 31, 2; App., *B.C.*, II, 33, 131–132; Cass. Dio, XLI, 3, 2. In Senate, however, where the decisions regarding the conflict with Caesar were made officially, only five days (1st, 2nd, 5th, 6th and 7th of January; Bonnefond-Coudry 1989, 232), because two days (3rd and 4th of January) were comitial, which means they were devoted to the session of plebeian assembly: Caes., *Bell. Civ.*, I, 5, 4.

⁵⁸ App., *B.C.*, II, 32, 127. Lindsay 1936, 132.

⁵⁹ App., *B.C.*, II, 32, 128. Cassius Dio, XLI, 1, 3–4, presented the content of this letter, and particularly the opinion of Caesar, more mildly. Cf. also: Liv., *Per.*, CIX; Suet., *Iul.*, 29, 2; Plut., *Caes.*, 30, 1; *Pomp.*, 58, 3–5; 59, 2; App., *B.C.*, II, 27, 104–106; 28, 110–111; 29, 113; 30 118–119; Cass. Dio, XI, 62, 3; Halfmann 2011, 43.

the session⁶⁰. The tribunes of the plebs who cooperated with Caesar, Antonius and Quintus Cassius Longinus probably participated, or at least witnessed this event, however, the authors of ancient texts do not confirm this. It would be strange, though, if it had been different, as in the capital they were both the main associates and, moreover, defenders of Caesar. At the same time, they were both members of the Senate, so they could have participated in the session inaugurating the new year *ex officio*⁶¹.

It appears from Caesar's information that the consuls did not plan to make the content of the letter delivered by Curio public. The mentioned tribunes of the plebs did, however, manage to convince them to agree on reading the letter. Still, they did not manage to persuade the consuls to consent to a debate over Caesar's suggestions⁶². According to Cassius Dio, Marcus Antonius aided his patron enormously, thereby suggesting that the public reading of the letter was mainly the effect of Antonius' efforts and endeavours, while Quintus Cassius probably played the part of Antonius' helper⁶³.

After reading the letter, the Senate started discussing the situation in the Republic, as indicated in Caesar's reports on the civil war. This discussion lasted the whole day and finally, at the request of Scipio, who was then Pompey's father-in-law, the senators passed a resolution that until a set date Caesar was to send his armies go. Should he fail to do so, he would be recognised as the Republic's enemy⁶⁴. Both plebeian tribunes, Antonius and Cassius, who cooperated with Gaul's governor, vetoed this decision. As a result, in accordance with the law and Roman customs, the decision lost its legislative power and only became the Senate's opinion. Antonius is said to have played a major part in causing this situation⁶⁵. On the initiative of the tribune's main antagonists,

⁶⁰ App., *B.C.*, II, 32, 127; Cass. Dio, XLI, 1, 1. Cf.: Caes., *Bell. Civ.*, I, 1, 1; Stein 1930, 62; Bonnefond-Coudry 1989, 43, 212. See also: Niccolini 1934, 331; as well as: Lindsay 1936, 132; Huzar 1978, 48; Will 1992, 139, 140; Jiménez 2000, 60; Dahlheim 2005, 136; Halfmann 2011, 43.

⁶¹ The information given by Cassius Dio indirectly implies that Antonius and Quintus Cassius were present when Curio handed Caesar's letter to the consuls, XLI, 1, 1–2. This assumption is indicated by the fact that both Antonius and Curio needed to know the consuls' reaction to the letter of the governor of Gaul. Both tribunes were namely supposed to carry on representing him in the Senate and participating in this act would enable them to do better.

⁶² Caes., *Bell. Civ.*, I, 1, 1. See also: App., *B.C.*, II, 32, 129; Cass. Dio, XLI, 1, 2; Stein 1930, 62; Niccolini 1934, 331; Lindsay 1936, 133; Raaflaub 1974, 306; Huzar 1978, 48; Bonnefond-Coudry 1989, 485; Thommen 1989, 205; Libero 1992, 83; Halfmann 2011, 43.

⁶³ *Ibidem*. Cf.: Cic., *Phil.*, 2, 21, 51.

⁶⁴ Caes., *Bell. Civ.*, I, 1, 2–2, 7. See also: Plut., *Caes.*, 30, 2; App., *B.C.*, II, 32, 129; Cass. Dio, XLI, 2, 1–2; Bonnefond-Coudry 1989, 587–588, 628; Thommen 1989, 205; Canfora 1999, 157–158.

⁶⁵ Caes., *Bell. Civ.*, I, 2, 7; Cass. Dio, XLI, 2, 2. Cf.: Plut., *Caes.*, 30, 3; Stein 1930, 62; Niccolini 1934, 331; Lindsay 1936, 132–133; Bonnefond-Coudry 1989, 564; Thommen 1989, 215; Libero 1992, 36; Canfora 1999, 158; Jiménez 2000, 60; Halfmann 2011, 43.

the senators summoned in the room responded to this manoeuvre by putting under debate their intercession. During this discussion, various accusations against them were put forward and their activity was criticised⁶⁶. Cassius Dio mentioned also that after the veto of the tribunes, the members of the Senate changed their robes as an act of protest to demonstrate their disapproval of the tribunes' move⁶⁷.

The Senate was dealing with the situation in the Republic over the next few days: it was debated on the 2nd, 5th, 6th and 7th of January⁶⁸. The tribunes of the plebs, and particularly Antonius, continued their activity protecting Caesar from the designs of his opponents. On the last day, there was a deciding clash between them and their antagonists. In response to their actions, most probably pressured by the consuls and their main associates, the senators resorted to – as expressed by Caesar – the final decree of the Senate (*senatus consultum ultimum*) appointing the consuls, other officials and proconsuls stationing in Rome to look out for the Republic not to be damaged in any way⁶⁹. Antonius and Cassius voiced their reservation about this manoeuvre of the Senate. Fearing their further actions, the members of Senate deprived them of the right to put tribune veto on this Senate's decision⁷⁰. Simultaneously, consul Lentulus, either on his own or cooperating with his fellow consul, dismissed Antonius from the Senate's session and Quintus Cassius left with him⁷¹. At night, both of them escaped from Rome in disguise and went to Caesar⁷². According to Cicero,

⁶⁶ Caes., *Bell. Civ.*, I, 2, 7–8; Libero 1992, 44.

⁶⁷ It is emphasized by Plutarch (*Caes.*, 30, 3) and Cassius Dio, XLI, 3, 1; Stein 1930, 62.

⁶⁸ This results unambiguously from the information included by Caesar in *Bellum Civile*, I, 5, 4. See also: Stein 1930, 63; Bonnefond-Coudry 1989, 232; Will 1992, 140.

⁶⁹ Caesar presented the course of the Senate's session in the most detailed way (*Bell. Civ.*, I, 3, 1–5, 3). See also: Cic., *Phil.*, 2, 21, 51–53; Liv., *Per.*, CIX; Vell. Pat., II, 49, 4; Suet., *Iul.*, 29, 2–30, 1; Plut., *Ant.*, 5, 4; *Caes.*, 31, 1–2; *Pomp.*, 59, 3; App., *B.C.*, II, 33, 130; Cass. Dio, XLI, 3, 1–3; Stein 1930, 63; Niccolini 1934, 331–332; Raaflaub 1974, 321; Huzar 1978, 48–49; Seager 1979, 162; Libero 1992, 36; Canfora 1999, 158; Jiménez 2000, 60; Traina 2003, 25; Dahlheim 2005, 136; Halfmann 2011, 43. A detailed discussion on the matters related to enacting *scu* against Caesar, see: Appel 2013, 242–271.

⁷⁰ Caes., *Bell. Civ.*, I, 5, 1. Cf.: Cass. Dio, XLI, 3, 1–2; Niccolini 1934, 331–332; Lindsay 1936, 133; Traina 2003, 25.

⁷¹ These facts were noted and clearly emphasized in the way that he needed mostly by Caesar, *Bell. Civ.*, I, 5, 1–5. However, authors of other texts also mentioned these facts, presenting them in various ways: Liv., *Per.*, CIX; Suet., *Iul.*, 30, 1; 31, 1; Plut., *Ant.*, 5, 4; *Caes.*, 31, 2; App., *B.C.*, II, 33, 131; Cass. Dio, XLI, 3, 2. Stein 1930, 63; Niccolini 1934, 332; Huzar 1978, 49.

⁷² The escape of the tribunes disguised as slaves or servants was described by Plutarch (*Ant.*, 5, 4; *Caes.*, 31, 2) and Appian (*B.C.*, II, 33, 133). Caesar only noted it, *Bell. Civ.*, I, 5, 5. Cicero, *Phil.*, 2, 21, 53, and Suetonius, *Iul.*, 31, 1, referred to it as one of the causes of the outbreak of the civil war. Caesar recognised as such violating their rights (*Bell. Civ.*, I, 7, 2–4; 7; 32, 6); Niccolini 1934, 332; Lindsay 1936, 133; Huzar 1978, 49; Canfora 1999, 161; Jiménez 2000, 60; Traina 2003, 25; Ramsey 2009, 53; Halfmann 2011, 43–44.

nobody forced them to leave neither the session, nor the city and doing so was of their own will⁷³.

Having received the news about Antonius and Cassius being deprived of their right to veto, the events of the Senate's session and the decisions made by the Senate on the 7th of January, Caesar immediately spread the information to his soldiers. The tribunes handed him a great propaganda asset against his opponents, which justified not only the steps that he had already taken, but also the intended ones, therefore, he did not hesitate to use it during the soldiers' assembly. He stated that he felt obliged to protect the rights of the plebeian tribunes from his opponents' designs, thereby strengthening the arguments that he used to boost the morale of his legionaries⁷⁴. Having made sure that the soldiers are well-disposed towards his arguments, at night from the 10th to the 11th January 49 he led his troops to cross the Rubicon and occupied Ariminum, on the Rubicon, on the Italian territory. It was there where he met Antonius and Quintus Cassius who had escaped from Rome⁷⁵.

As Antonius left Rome, his service in the college of tribunes of the plebs stopped, because plebeian officials had no power outside of the sacred town borders, *pomerium*. It was then when Antonius was given military command by Caesar and since then he functioned as *tribunus plebis pro praetore*. It was necessary to change his status, since as plebeian tribune he could not lead an army, thus he received the rights of *pro praetor*, which was connected with granting him the Empire⁷⁶. In the first stage of military operations, Caesar entrusted him with two cohorts and sent to Arretium, and afterwards to Sulmona, as the leader of five cohorts⁷⁷. After having occupied whole Italia, before Caesar left for Spain, Antonius had received the task to manage Italia and the command of the troops stationing there⁷⁸.

Antonius only returned to serve as the tribune of the plebs at the end of 49, while Caesar held his first dictatorship⁷⁹. Then, in the last stage of his office,

⁷³ The great orator stated this in his letter to Tiron: Cic., *Ad Fam.*, XVI, 11, 2.

⁷⁴ Caes., *Bell. Civ.*, I, 7, 1–6. See also: Cic., *Phil.* 2, 22, 53; Jaczynowska, Pawlak 2008, 144; Bringmann 2010, 318.

⁷⁵ Caes., *Bell. Civ.*, I, 7, 7–8, 1; Cass. Dio, XLI, 4, 1. Cf.: Liv., *Per.*, CIX; Vell. Pat., II, 49, 4; Suet., *Iul.*, 31, 1; Plut., *Caes.*, 32, 1–3, 1; *Pomp.*, 60, 1; *Ant.*, 6, 1; App., *B.C.*, II, 35, 137–141; Flor., II, 13, 18; Huzar 1978, 49; Canfora 1999, 162; Jiménez 2000, 68; Halfmann 2011, 44.

⁷⁶ It is unambiguously confirmed by the heading of Antonius' letter to Cicero: Cic., *Ad Att.*, X, 8 A. See also: Lindsay 1936, 144; Huzar 1978, 54; Pasquali 2009, 52; Halfmann 2011, 44.

⁷⁷ Caes., *Bell. Civ.*, I, 11, 4; 18, 2; Kamienik 1963, 18; Huzar 1978, 50; CAH 1994, 424 (Rawson); Jiménez 2000, 68; Traina 2003, 25; Halfmann 2011, 44.

⁷⁸ Plut., *Ant.*, 6, 4. Cf. also Cic., *Phil.*, 2, 23, 57; App., *B.C.*, II, 41, 165; Cass. Dio, XLI, 18, 3; Lindsay 1936, 153; Kamienik 1963, 18; Huzar 1978, 54; Traina 2003, 26; Halfmann 2011, 45.

⁷⁹ Plut., *Caes.*, 37, 1; App., *B.C.*, II, 48, 196; Cass. Dio, XLI, 36, 1; Utczenko 1973, 333–334, 341; CAH 1994, 431–432 (Rawson); Canfora 1999, 197–198; Traina 2003, 29; Gardner 2009, 58; Halfmann 2011, 46–47.

with Caesar's permission or maybe even on his initiative, Antonius enacted two new laws. The first one enabled the descendants of the proscribed to hold honourable functions. By its power amnesty was declared for the supporters of Sertorius and Marcus Aemilius Lepidus⁸⁰. The second act let those banished from Rome in accordance with acts passed during Pompey's third consulate in 52 to come back, with the exception of Titus Annius Milo.⁸¹

When assessing Marcus Antonius as tribune of the plebs, it is important to keep in mind its specificity. After less than a month, his serving the office was terminated, influenced by the conflict between Pompey with the supporting him *optimates* and Caesar, which turned into the civil war. During the battles in Italia, Antonius led some of Caesar's troops and after capturing it, Caesar designated him to manage this region. It is impossible to determine whether he handled any matters falling within the scope of plebeian tribune's duties, even occasionally. As mentioned before, it is only known from information included in ancient source texts that he returned to matters related to holding the office of plebeian tribune at the end of 49.

Nevertheless, there are two reasons why Antonius' activity as tribune of the plebs needs to be recognised as significant. Firstly, Antonius provided Caesar with very good propaganda arguments which justified his entering Italia and starting the civil war. The second argument should be looked at differently, rather in personal dimension, even though Antonius did not manage to equal Curio and delay the moment of Caesar's opponents taking action against him as long as Curio did. By aiding Caesar enormously while serving this function, Antonius accelerated his own huge career, as in the next years he took up more and more important positions at Caesar's side. In the year 44, he already held the consulate together with him and shortly after Caesar's tragic death on 15th of March that year, Antonius became one of the most important and powerful persons in the country.

⁸⁰ Suet., *Iul.*, 41, 1; Plut., *Caes.*, 37, 1; Cass. Dio, XLI, 18, 2; XLIV, 47, 4; Zonar., X, 8; Niccolini 1934, 330; Utczenko 1973, 340–341; Thommen 1989, 126; Halfmann 2011, 47. For basic information on this act see: Broughton 1952, 258; Rotondi 1962, 416.

⁸¹ Cic., *Phil.*, 2, 23, 56; Caes., *Bell. Civ.*, III, 1, 4; Suet., *Iul.*, 41, 1; Plut., *Caes.*, 37, 1; App., *B.C.*, II, 48, 198; Cass. Dio, XII, 36, 2; XLII, 24, 2; Zonar., X, 8; Niccolini 1934, 330; Broughton 1952, 258; Utczenko 1973, 341. Milo then joined the movement organised by Marcus Caelius Rufus, whose pride was hurt and who was in conflict with Caesar: Łoposzko 1982, 138–141; Idem 1987, 310–315; Idem 1994, 268.

Streszczenie

Trybunat ludowy Marka Antoniusza (49 rok przed Chrystusem)

Omawianie kwestii łączących się ze sprawowaniem przez Marka Antoniusza urzędu trybuna ludowego w 49 roku przed Chrystusem autor rozpoczął od wskazania specyficznych cech jego trybunatu. Ową plebejską godność Antoniuszowi przyszło bowiem piastować w czasie, gdy w Republice Rzymskiej rozgrywały się wydarzenia decydujące o jej przyszłych losach, w których Antoniusz, ze względu na swe polityczne powiązania, wziął aktywny udział i odegrał znaczącą rolę. Następstwem zaangażowania w nie była wielomiesięczna przerwa w jego działalności na tym stanowisku oraz czynny udział w wojnie domowej. Powrót Antoniusza do wypełniania obowiązków trybuna ludowego nastąpił dopiero pod koniec jego kadencji, czyli krótko przed 9 grudnia wspomnianego roku.

Następnie autor przedstawił zagadnienia związane z wyborem Marka Antoniusza do kolegium trybunów ludowych na 49 rok, szczególnie eksponując poparcie udzielone mu wtedy przez G. Skryboniusza Kuriona, zaprzyjaźnionego z nim trybuna ludowego z poprzedniego roku oraz przez protektora, a zarazem mocodawcę obydwu, G. Juliusza Cezara. Bardzo wiele uwagi poświęcił w związku z tym analizie informacji źródłowych związanych z tymi sprawami, zwłaszcza zamieszczonych w ósmej księdze *Bellum Gallicum* autorstwa Aulusa Hircejusza.

Omawianie działań podjętych przez Antoniusza po objęciu przez niego urzędu w dniu 10 grudnia 50 roku autor rozpoczął od przedstawienia jego wystąpień w obronie Cezara oraz posunięć wymierzonych przeciw Pompejuszowi zrealizowanych do końca tego miesiąca. Następnie skoncentrował się na prezentacji najważniejszych i najlepiej znanych manewrów Antoniusza, realizowanych przez niego na forum senatu w dniach 1–7 stycznia 49 roku, w trakcie obrad poświęconych konfliktowi Pompejusza z Cezarem. Należną uwagę autor artykułu zwrócił zwłaszcza na wydarzenia, które rozegrały się na sali obrad senatu w pierwszym oraz ostatnim z tych dni. Działalność Antoniusza poza Rzymem w czasie kampanii italskiej, jako nie związana z problemem ujętym w tytule artykułu została tylko zasygnalizowana. Wywody autora zamyka omówienie powrotu Antoniusza do wykonywania obowiązków trybuna ludowego w końcowym okresie jego urzędowania oraz ocena jego trybunatu.