The main purpose of T.’s dissertation is to provide a sequel to J. Bleicken’s *Das Volkstribunat der klassischen Republik* (München 1955). The author has attempted a broad investigation of the functioning of the tribunate of the plebs during the years 133-43 B.C. He has researched the 242 tribunes of the plebs from this period which are known to us. T. presents these magistrates in a list and indicates whether they were non-senatorial, *popularis*, and whether they became praetor or consul¹. The book is, moreover, very much Bleicken inspired in the sense that most attention goes to legislation and jurisdiction.

The book starts with a sound survey of the *status quaestionis* (9-14) The first chapter deals with the social and political conditions for tribunician action. Many new men are found among the tribunes (22-24), as among other lower magistrates.

T. holds that about a fifth (48 individuals) of the 242 known tribunes of the plebs between 133-43 were *populares*, and that the remaining large majority should be counted among the *optimates* (24-25 and 249). This statement is based on the list of *populares* in C. Meier’s article *Populares (RE Suppl. 10 (1965), 573-583)*. Meier, however, explicitly states that he does not pretend to be exhaustive (573) and at some points only gives some examples (574). Indeed, if we just stick to Meier’s criteria for *popularis*, i.e. being called *popularis* explicitly in the sources or having acted *populariter* in some ways, including acts in support of a *popularis* or his laws (e.g. Manlius, 576), and if we only look at the period 78-49 B.C., we can add quite a few tribunes of the plebs to T.’s list of *populares*. Strangely enough, T. knows most of these persons and their actions, for he mentions them elsewhere in his book. The tribunes are listed below and, when found, with reference between brackets to T.’s discussion of the person²:

Q. Opimius in 75 supported Cotta’s proposal to reopen the *cursus* for former tribunes;
C. Herennius in 60 introduced a bill to transfer Clodius to the plebs (203);
Aelius Ligus in 58 vetoed Cicero’s recall from exile in the senate (214);
Sex. Atilii Serranus Gavianus (214) and Q. Numerius Rufus in 57 opposed and tried to prevent Cicero’s recall;

A. Allienus, C. Fabius, Mamilius, Sex. Peducaeus, and L. Roscius Fabatus in 55 introduced a law to supplement Caesar's agrarian law (55);
C. Caelius Rufus, P. Cornelius, C. Vibius Pansa, and L. Vinicius in 51 opposed anti-Caesarian resolutions in the senate (214);
M. Antonius and Q. Cassius Longinus in 49 strongly supported Caesar shortly before the outbreak of the civil war (215).
This shows that T. moves on very shaky ground indeed when he tries to draw some numerical conclusions.

T. goes on to demonstrate that the occupation of the tribunate had neither a negative nor a positive influence on one's later career in comparison to other lower magistracies (25-30). The tribunate held an ordinary position among the other magistracies and was subject to the same written and unwritten rules of the senatorial oligarchy (30-39). Next, T. analyses what the tribunes actually did during the late Republic, which forms the central part of his study. T. divides his analysis up in three parts, according to the rights of action attached to the magistracy of the tribunate. At the end of each subdivision, T. chronologically lists the examples from the late Republic of the subject previously discussed, which, in combination with the index of laws at the end of the book, is most useful.

With the ius agendi cum plebe the tribunes could introduce bills in the assembly on any subject that touched Roman state and society (41-129). It has been a very good idea of the author to make his treatise on tribunician legislation follow by an analysis of its initiators and beneficiaries: the senate, the equites, and individual politicians (130-147). This shows that anyone could benefit from tribunician legislation, not just one specific interest group. It is rather odd that T. apparently does not include the people among the beneficiaries. After all, his study deals with a magistracy which was called tribunate of the plebs. Tribunician legislation, indeed, was never solely initiated for the benefit of the rural or urban plebs, yet it is obvious that at some points the lower strata received important benefits from such legislation and that certain tribunes thus acquired popular support. It is an omission that this study does not ask how and to what extent did the Roman plebs benefit from tribunician laws.

The ius agendi cum plebe also included the right to initiate lawsuits against persons (147-168), to issue edicts (e.g. to close the tabernae; 168-170), and to hold contiones (171-179). T. concludes this part by a discussion of popular support for tribunes and acts of violence (179-191). The ius agendi cum senatu enabled the tribunes to