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ABSTRACT

There can be no doubt that both Philip II of Macedon and Gaius Marius of the Roman Republic were significant military reformers, and, in broad terms, significant historical persons in general. However, both Philip and Marius both tend be overshadowed by those who succeeded them, whether it be Alexander in Philip’s case, or Sulla and Caesar among others after Marius. This paper aims first to demonstrate the similarities between Philip and Marius, and then to highlight the importance of both of these historical figures by emphasizing the significance of their military reforms, and particularly by highlighting their fairly distinct skill of seizing upon opportunities as they arise, and furthering their own power by whatever means they are able to use. This is particularly important for Marius, who is generally relegated to the role of a purely military figure. His political skills and methods are significant, and worthy of acknowledgement.
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CURRICULUM VITAE
A Modern Parallel Lives: Military Reform and Political Opportunism in the Lives of Gaius Marius and Philip of Macedon

1: Introduction

Gaius Marius and Philip II of Macedon were both exceptional generals who rose to essentially unprecedented levels of power during their respective careers. The aim of this project is to compare the two of them in terms of both their military and political careers. It will be shown that the two were similar in terms of their military reform programs, which focused on discipline, logistics, and armament. Likewise, the two were similar in that they had to perform in periods of political tumult. Philip’s Macedon faced enemies on all fronts, and Rome was under threat of foreign invasion, having suffered a number of devastating defeats in the period leading to Marius’ ascent. They differ in that Philip was more multifaceted. Marius’ power came almost entirely from his military successes; he does not appear to have been interested overly in being an excellent domestic politician. Philip meanwhile navigated political landscapes as well as military ones.

This comparison accomplishes a number of goals, which will be outlined here. For one, it will attempt to give Marius the credit he deserves for all he accomplished and brought about in his career. Marius is not overlooked, per se, but is often overshadowed by the massive figures who followed him in the late republic, including Sulla and Caesar. It would be difficult to dispute that Philip’s military career was exemplary, and so in having Marius placed in that same vein, it will show that what he accomplished was also exceptional.

An important characteristic of both Philip and Marius is that their successes and careers are overshadowed by those of their successors. Despite Philip’s importance to Macedonian history, his achievements lie in the shadow of those of his son, who would
become Alexander the Great. Similarly, Marius, though he enjoyed numerous important military victories and reached an unprecedented level of personal prestige in Rome, was eclipsed by those who came after him, including Caesar and possibly others including Sulla. The fact that both these figures became more obscure than those who came after them is not because they did not merit prestige, but because of a number of external factors. Philip always dealt with the reality of being a Macedonian rather than a Greek, which made him a semi-barbarian in the eyes of many, and so the Greeks were not always eager to give to Philip the recognition he had earned. Though this was true also for Alexander, the son waged a war of conquest against the Persians, the historic enemy of the Greek peoples. It is important to note that Philip also likely would have invaded Persia had he not been assassinated before he had the chance. There are a number of reasons why Marius receives a smaller amount of renown than men like Caesar. Notably, Caesar wrote accounts of his wars, preserving them in detail for future readers. But further, Caesar’s career is directly associated with the transition at Rome from Republic to Empire, whereas Marius’ career is only a step on the path in that direction, and just how large a step is debatable, at that. Marius was also a novus homo, a man whose family had no consular history.

Both Philip and Marius also endured many hostile accounts of their actions. Philip was consistently attacked by Demosthenes, and the historian Theopompus is also critical of him, at the very least in a moral sense. Marius meanwhile, was maligned by the fact that his later career ended with political turmoil and violence. He also had many prominent enemies at Rome, including Sulla, who would go on to become dictator and publish his memoirs, which were probably fairly widely read. Plutarch’s life of Marius also has some
unflattering portrayals of Marius, particularly as he ages, and this depiction was probably influenced by the tradition of hostility around him.

It will also be shown that the military reform programs follow similar tracks. The goal of this comparison is to demonstrate that there are certain principles of military organization that foster success regardless of the political or strategic situation. These include, first of all, logistical reforms. Both Philip and Marius reduced the baggage train of their armies so as to increase their speed and manoeuvrability on the march. Both generals also transformed their armies into more professional forces, even if the degree to which each accomplished this may be debated due to the scant nature of the primary source evidence. In any case, these transformations led to soldiers being equipped more uniformly, as well as more unit cohesion on the battlefield. Marius and Philip each also made changes to the armaments of their soldiers. For Marius, this included changes to the pilum, as well as the standardization of different classes of soldiers within the legion. Philip also made many changes, perhaps most notably making use of pikemen using the large sarissa, rather than the traditional Greek hoplite. It will be shown that, since the reform programs bear so many similarities, the overall goals of these programs was the same, and they were successful for many of the same reasons.

Marius and Philip are also both noteworthy in that their careers took place over periods that were politically turbulent. Philip’s Macedon was under significant threat when he ascended the throne, and he was forced to subdue enemies both foreign and domestic. Even more than that, however, Greece as a whole was strained to its limit. Decades of constant warfare had pushed the poleis of the Greek world beyond what they could bear, and by the time of Philip, even the most powerful states, like Athens and Thebes, were unable to exert much control outside their own borders. This would be a
significant theme throughout the career of Philip. Marius, two centuries later, faced both foreign and domestic political problems. Issues of land redistribution and urban unrest were rising to a head, and foreign invaders threatened the Italian peninsula. Marius and Philip both showed the ability to capitalize on this instability, in order to further their own careers and maximize their own power. Different trends will be drawn out to show that the political exigencies of both Macedon before Philip and late Republican Rome are similar. These similarities include the combination of civilian and military leadership, the weakening of the traditional form of government, and the ambition of individual military leaders who disregarded the political well-being of the state. All of these are significant because both Marius and Philip played important parts in the transition of their respective states from more representative forms of government into military dictatorships. By comparing two significant cases of this occurrence, common themes which lead to more autocratic governments can be identified.

This comparison will begin with a biographical discussion of both figures, starting with their early lives and careers. It will be shown by which means both Philip and Marius became the preeminent politicians of their respective eras. There will be a significant focus on the military aspects of the careers of each man, with special attention paid to their reform programs. There will also be a focus on the political goings-on surrounding both Philip and Marius, so that it can be seen how each of them responded to and took advantage of what was happening around them.

Comparative studies, especially those of Plutarch, are an important part of the classical tradition. Plutarch used his Parallel Lives to draw out moral lessons for his readers. An interesting example of this occurs in his life of Marius, where he infers that Marius’ boorish personality is related to the fact that he was not educated in Greek
language and culture. While this study will not attempt to draw moral conclusions based on the comparison between Philip and Marius, such a comparison remains an important means of approaching a topic. The study of military history seeks in part to determine which aspects of military command, strategy, and leadership are universally applicable so that they can be properly applied by modern commanders. A comparative study is a direct way of examining successful commands from separate periods which differ in many aspects but are also similar in many important respects. Thus the similarity of this study to the endeavours of Plutarch is noteworthy, but this comparison will draw academic conclusions rather than moral ones. Whereas Plutarch wished to elucidate the moral characteristics of his subjects, this project wishes to judge the abilities, achievements, and significance of the careers of Philip and Marius without passing moral judgement on their characters.
Any survey of the careers of Marius and Philip must begin with the ancient sources. As both men were politicians and generals who led prominent careers, there were a number of writers who covered their careers in varying degrees of detail. Each of these comes with its own set of problems, whether they be the transmission of the text, inherent bias, or otherwise. Modern authors have also been fascinated by both Philip and Marius. Neither wants for study as an individual; however, there are conclusions which can be drawn by comparing the two directly, somewhat in the style of Plutarch, which this project aims to do.

Athenian speechwriters provide a large percentage of the information available to scholars about Philip’s career. Prominent among these are Aeschines and especially Demosthenes. Aeschines was more favourable in his treatment toward Philip, which is understandable given his frequent role as Demosthenes’ rival. Demosthenes was arguably the greatest orator of the Athenians, and spent much of his career criticizing the actions of Philip as well as the steps the Athenians took – or often did not take – to oppose him. Demosthenes was a strong proponent of direct intervention against Philip’s imperialism.\(^1\)

Of course, by the time the Athenians and the other Greeks met Philip at Chaeronea, Philip was already too strong for them to stop and they were defeated. Although throughout the corpus of his works Demosthenes has much to say about Philip and what he was accomplishing, his work is characterized by its passion, and the fact that he was giving political speeches means that his goal was to invoke the passions of the listeners to gain

\(^1\) Demosthenes, *First Philippic* 22-23. Throughout the *First Philippic*, Demosthenes argues that the Athenians should maintain a small standing force in order to perpetually have the means to check Philip’s movements.
support, rather than to tell an objective truth as one might expect from a historian. The fact that Demosthenes gave his speeches to a democratic assembly checked his ability to lie somewhat, as he would lose support if he was found to be flagrantly dishonest, yet he is still more than capable of bending matters to suit his purpose. For all of Demosthenes’ posturing, Philip never revealed any desire to act cruelly toward the Athenians, although the Athenians and Macedonians were regularly in conflict over Amphipolis.

It is unfortunate for those interested in the Macedonians that the works of Theopompus do not survive. Theopompus of Chios wrote a history of the life of Philip called the Philippica. This book would have been incredibly useful, as no contemporary writer left a history of the late fourth century or of the actions of Philip. Theopompus’ history expanded 58 books, although only 16 of them were directly related to the life of Philip. The works of Theopompus do not survive in a coherent form, however, and exist only in a fragmented form. It is known that Theopompus was a harsh judge of Philip’s moral character, no doubt in part because of the cultural differences between the Macedonians and the Greeks. This arguably was a natural part of the historiography of the time, as neutral history as a concept was not yet so entrenched. Philip for his part certainly was fond of drink and other excesses. Regardless, the work does not survive other than in fragments, and so its use is dependent on its treatment by other writers.

Although a Life of Philip does not survive from Plutarch as it does for Marius, there is still information to be gained from parts of both the Life of Pelopidas and the Life of Alexander. Plutarch’s pitfalls as a historian are well-known; he is more interested in

---

2 Kennedy (2011) 74; Mader (2006) 372
3 Flower (1994) 27; Shrimpton (1991) 60-63
moral lessons than in historical facts; but all the same it is unfortunate that there is no Life of Philip. Other biographical information can be gleaned from Satyrus the Peripatetic, whose writing comes down through Athenaeus. This information largely relates to Philip’s seven marriages.\(^5\)

Trogus wrote another history, called the Historiae Philippicae, but the original does not survive. The contents of this work come to the modern period through the Epitome of Justin. Contrary to its name, the original work by Trogus was a universal history. Details of Justin’s personal life are scarce, and thus provide little context into his works as a historian.\(^6\) Books eight and nine deal with Philip directly, while Book seven provides an early history of Macedon. Trogus is not fond of Philip as a historical figure, ascribing to him the end of Greek freedom, although he recognizes that Philip was in possession of a multifaceted skillset.\(^7\) Although the Epitome of Justin is a relatively complete account, as it is a reduction of a universal history, Justin necessarily removed details, and so the account is not as full as it may have been before. Diodorus Siculus also produced a universal history, the Bibliotheca Historica, Book sixteen of which deals with the reign of Philip II. In general Diodorus’ histories are maligned as jumbled and sometimes even incorrect, and so he must be used with caution.\(^8\) Nonetheless, Diodorus’ account is more detailed than most of what remains to modern readers.

Some of Philip’s more daring military manoeuvres are known through the tactical handbooks of Polyaenus and Frontinus. Authors like these two sought to educate their audience on the tenets of good generalship, rather than on the social and political

\(^5\) Tronson (1984) 116
\(^6\) Alonso-Núñez (1987) 56-58
\(^7\) Justin 9.8.11-12
\(^8\) Drews (1962) 383-389; Diodorus Siculus 16
consequences of the wars being fought in these stories. For this reason the writing takes the form of short snapshots of significant events or characteristics of a commander. Polyaenus’ *Stratagems* include the feigned retreat at Chaeronea and several other significant actions. Polyaenus’ depictions are short and lacking detail, however, and do not provide satisfactory information to allow scholars to recreate the scenes of battles. Frontinus also relates some details of Philip’s career, including his use of false letters, but these also take the form of short depictions of particular events, and so are often lacking detail. Nevertheless, these collections of *Strategems* augment scholars’ ability to understand the workings of the Macedonian military.

There are many sources depicting elements of the life of Marius as well. These include Sallust’s *Jugurthine War* as well as Plutarch’s *Life of Marius*, but also a number of others. Appian is also relied upon to some degree, and there are a variety of minor sources which are useful especially for information regarding the Roman military context, if not for the life of Marius directly.

Sallust’s *Jugurthine War* provides an account of Marius’ actions in North Africa both under Metellus and afterward. Before writing, Sallust was a politician who served under Caesar, a relative of Marius. This partly explains his bias toward Marius, but Sallust is also particularly hostile toward the senate. He describes the Roman aristocracy as overly greedy for wealth and luxury, as well as overtly corrupt, in both the *Jugurthine War* and the *Conspiracy of Catiline*. At the time of Marius’ first election, at least, Sallust viewed Marius as a potential champion against the decadent nobility who are destroying the state,

---

9 Campbell (2004) 13
10 Sallust, *Conspiracy of Catiline 3; Jugurthine War* 4
and for this reason he is keen to avoid discussing the negative elements of his career and personality.¹¹

Appian wrote a *Roman History* in the period of Trajan, and his work contains a section pertaining to the time of Marius. Appian does not interest himself with political history, however, often leaving out important background information when dealing with specific problems.¹² His rendering of Latin words into Greek can also sometimes be problematic.¹³ As Appian was not a contemporary of the late Republic, there are difficulties in determining what he used for sources for this period as well.¹⁴

Plutarch’s *Life of Marius* is the most relevant source, naturally. It is a full account of Marius’ career. The difficulty with Plutarch, once again, is that he is not interested in concrete history. He is more interested in personality and in moral lessons. Plutarch is very interested in revealing that Marius is morally deficient and that this is the result of his refusal to be educated according to the Greek custom.¹⁵ As well, Plutarch like Appian wrote much later than Marius’ lifetime and was therefore reliant on other sources to craft his works. This is of particular relevance for Marius, because Plutarch would have been required to use pieces which were particularly hostile toward Marius. Marius did not leave anything resembling a memoir himself, but contemporaries like Sulla, Marius’ great rival, seem to have, and although these accounts do not survive now, Plutarch probably made use of them, and his works are therefore coloured by the opinions of others. This fact, combined with Plutarch’s own aim of instructing his readers in the virtues of a Greek

---

¹¹ Parker (2004) 422
¹³ Luce (1961) 21-22
¹⁴ Gargola (1997) 575
¹⁵ Duff (1999) 118; Swain (1990) 138
education, suggest that some of the particularly hostile episodes in Plutarch’s *Life of Marius* may be exaggerated.¹⁶

Diodorus wrote about the period concerning Marius’ career, but there are large sections of that portion of the work which are missing, and the same criticisms of him as a historian as noted above still apply. When discussing Marius’ military reforms, details can be gleaned from many sources which do not discuss military matters in detail. It is Pliny the Elder, for example, who ascribes the adoption of the eagle as the universal standard for the legion.¹⁷

Both Philip and Marius were very prominent figures in their respective times, and so in addition to the ancient literature, much has been written about both men in contemporary times. Each has been the subject of numerous issues and debates, which need discussing.

Philip for a long time existed in the shadow of his son Alexander, but many modern authors have begun to appreciate his role in the development of the Macedonian empire. Authors like Cawkwell, Hammond, and Worthington have provided numerous books dedicated to Philip’s life as a whole. Many of the problems that arise regarding Philip’s career deal with specific issues regarding matters that are simply difficult to know without a source from the Macedonian point of view. In particular this is the case regarding Philip’s motivations at various stages in his career, and especially during his resolution of the Third Sacred War.

Comparatively there is less literature about Marius specifically. Many scholars writing about the late Republic include sections about Marius but do not cover his career

¹⁶ Carney (1970) 3; Matthew (2010) xvi
¹⁷ Pliny the Elder, *Natural History* 10.5
or actions in full detail; however, their treatment is still important. There are a small number of biographies written about the Roman general by writers like Carney and Evans, and more recently by Santangelo, although these tend to focus on Marius the politician rather than Marius the military reformer. Generally small sections of these books focus on Marius’ reforms, but do not attempt to contextualize them or give them any great emphasis. The exception is Matthew’s book specifically about the Marian reforms.\(^{18}\) Some authors are guilty of presenting Marius as an opponent of the Roman Senate, a people’s champion, but this is an overly simplistic view. Santangelo’s recent treatment, among others, is more balanced and attempts to place Marius in the greater context of the Late Republic.\(^{19}\)

Marius’ characterization as a politician is a subject of much discourse. It is tempting to see him as a populist who opposes the nobility outright, and as a man whose sheer ambition outweighs his political cunning. These viewpoints are simplistic, however, and do not offer a full picture of Marius’ achievements. Others like Evans do attempt to offer a more nuanced view of Marius’ career, but in the literature which attempts to cover the late Republic as a whole, Marius can be overshadowed by those that came before and after him, as the Gracchi were more significant social reformers, and Marius’ military greatness was replicated by men like Sulla and Caesar.\(^{20}\)

Many of the debates about both Marius and Philip deal with their military reform programs. This is because no source gives a comprehensive overview of the changes, and

\(^{18}\) Matthew (2010) describes in great detail the evidence available for each of the reforms that are attributed to Marius.

\(^{19}\) Carney (1970) 71-71; Santangelo (2016) 1-4

\(^{20}\) Hildinger (2003) 59, for example, says that Marius wanted only, “to fight and to hold high office,” and Smith (1951) 124-5 describes Marius as a man who came to power with the support of the *populares*. 
so historians must gather information based on context. The description of Philip’s formation of the Macedonian phalanx is vague in the sources and scholars like Markle and Hammond have differing opinions on how to resolve the issue.\textsuperscript{21} The same is true of Marius. It is known that he enlisted the \textit{capite censi} and that his training program emphasized fitness, but many changes including the adoption of the cohort as the standard tactical unit of the legion are more difficult to date precisely. Once again scholars must rely on contextual clues in order to attempt to date these reforms.\textsuperscript{22}

Ultimately a good deal of the scholarly debate around Marius and Philip comes from the fact that the sources from the period provide less than a complete picture. The aim of this project is not to stand on one side or the other of the key issues. It is worth pointing out, however, that the work will assume that Marius and Philip were both instrumental military reformers in their respective periods. This is the view most generally accepted, and there is no satisfactory alternative view, even if the sources may be scant enough to offer some uncertainty.

\textsuperscript{21} Markle (1978) and Hammond (1980) discuss the different positions regarding the origins of the sarissa. \textsuperscript{22} Bell (1965) and Matthew (2010) discuss the possibility of Marius being responsible for the permanent adoption of the cohort as the base tactical unit for the Roman army.
3: The Life and Career of Philip

Philip’s military and political career was highly successful. He instituted a number of military reforms that allowed the Macedonian army to become the most successful armed force of its day, and his multifaceted skillset allowed him to reach unparalleled heights in Greek politics. This chapter will have three purposes. First, it will place the reforms of the Macedonian army into their historical context. Then, the reforms themselves will be examined in some detail. Finally, a brief summary of the successes brought about by Philip through both military and political means will follow. This will highlight the wide array of abilities of which Philip made use.

Philip was born in 382 to the royal Macedonian house, the Argead dynasty. This family traced their ancestry back to Heracles through Temenos, the legendary founder of the city of Argos. This dynasty began around 700 BCE. His father was king Amyntas III. It is certain that as a member of the Macedonian royal family, Philip would have received a good and varied education, but one important feature of Philip’s youth was that he spent time at Thebes as a hostage. At this time, Thebes was the premier power in Greece, especially in military matters. He spent three years there, and this would have been ample time to learn from great figures such as the general Epaminondas, who led the Thebans to victory against the Spartans in 371 BCE. In particular Philip would have seen the effectiveness of the Theban Sacred Band, a group of 300 soldiers who trained professionally, and were at the time arguably the best group of soldiers in Greece.

---

23 Herodotus 8.137; Borza (1982) 8; Hammond (1994) 1; Rossos (2008) 12
24 Diodorus 16.2.2-3; Justin 7.5.2-3; Thucydides 2.100.2; Cawkwell (1978) 27; Tsouras (2004); Worthington (2014) 27-28
Before ascending to the throne, Philip did have some experience as a governor. His brother Perdiccas, who was his predecessor, made him ruler of a part of the Macedonian kingdom, perhaps at Amphaxitis. Here Philip may have had a chance to experiment with some of his later reforms, but it is difficult to say for certain.25

The state of Macedon at the time of Philip’s ascension must be considered in order to fully appreciate the change of fortunes that Philip brought to this outsider state after he became king. Although he was a logical choice for next in line to rule after the fall of his brother, his kingdom was for a long time faced with difficulties, and at the time of his ascension in 359, Macedon was politically and militarily weak. This meant that Philip himself was not in a strong position either.

First the location and geography of Macedonia itself must be examined. Before Philip, the Macedonian kingdom included the lands around the Haliacmon and Axius Rivers, which flow into the Thermaic Gulf. The Kingdom of Macedonia was divided into Upper and Lower Macedon. Upper Macedon, the western portion of the kingdom, was much more unruly and decentralized. Here the tribal chieftains were largely independent; they could act without much interference from the Macedonian king. These peoples lived hard, nomadic, pastoral lives. Lower Macedon comprised more coastal plains compared to the more rugged Upper Macedon. The land was much more fertile and the climate was less harsh, so that even the tribes from Upper Macedon would migrate into these lands in harsh winters.26

Macedonian resources extended beyond farmland, however. Macedon had access to resources including various types of trees which made good timber, gold, silver, and

---

25 Worthington (2014) 28
other metals including iron and lead. Thus Macedonia possessed great potential to be exploited. However, the lack of a central government and strong power meant that these resources were not exploited to their full potential.\(^\text{27}\)

Although the land was not used to its full potential, the Macedonian kings were not impoverished. They possessed large plots of public land from which they drew income, they possessed mines, and further they were able to draw taxes from the population.\(^\text{28}\) Despite this, it remained difficult for the kings of Macedonia to consolidate their power, and ultimately, the lack of a centralized government and economy was more detrimental than the abundance of natural resources was beneficial. Thus, the development of the Macedonian state and economy before Philip had been slow.\(^\text{29}\)

Next, the political climate of Macedonia before Philip must be examined. This brief consideration will go back almost a century and a half before Philip’s ascension. The fifth century was a relatively stable period for Macedonian rulers. There were three prominent rulers during the 400s BCE. These were Alexander I, who ruled around 485-440; Perdiccas II, having ruled around 440-413; and Archelaus, ruling from 413 to 399. These kings were constantly at odds with tribal rulers who constantly had to have their independence checked.\(^\text{30}\) The Macedonians, especially under the aforementioned Alexander, who was known as the Philhellene, were constantly vying for the acceptance of the Greeks, who viewed the Macedonians as barbaric.\(^\text{31}\) Archelaus, too, did a great deal

\(27\) Worthington (2008) 7
\(28\) Worthington (2008) 12
\(30\) Cawkwell (1978) 20
\(31\) Cawkwell (1978) 22
for the perception of Macedon, turning the city of Pella into a center for Hellenic culture. The perception yet remained, and even Archelaus was called a barbarian.\textsuperscript{32}

During the fifth century Macedonia was consistently under threat from outside pressures. These included the Illyrians; the Athenians, founded colonies including Amphipolis in territory that might otherwise have been considered Macedonian.\textsuperscript{33} After the decline of Athens and the events of the Peloponnesian War, Macedonia was threatened by Sparta for not allying with them against Athens, and so Macedonia was constantly wary of whichever power was preeminent in the Aegean region.\textsuperscript{34} Macedonian kings always had to be wary of their own courts as well, as pretenders frequently emerged to try and wrest power for themselves. The danger of this was augmented by the Macedonian practice of polygamy, as it increased the number of potential heirs and claimants to the throne.\textsuperscript{35}

Despite all the potential dangers, Archelaus had created a relatively powerful and advanced kingdom by 399. The period immediately after his rule was not smooth, however. There were four brief reigns which spanned a total of seven years, before the father of Philip, Amyntas, came to power. Macedonia was once again reduced in power, and Amyntas nearly saw his kingdom ruined by invading Illyrians. He had to leave Pella to deal with the situation, and entrusted the governance of some territory to allies in the Chalcidice. Amyntas dealt with the Illyrians but now found the Chalcidians unwilling to relinquish his territory. By 382 the Chalcidians had taken even Pella, and it was not until

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{32} Cawkwell (1978) 22-23
\item \textsuperscript{33} Cawkwell (1978) 23
\item \textsuperscript{34} Cawkwell (1978) 23-24
\item \textsuperscript{35} E. Carney (1992) 173
\end{itemize}
the Spartans, wary of the growing power of the Chalcidians, intervened and Amyntas regained control of Macedonia.36

Amyntas died in 370, and the throne was passed to his son, Alexander II. It was during the rule of this Alexander that Philip was made a hostage at Thebes, for the Thebans were called to arbitrate a dispute between Alexander and a ruler called Ptolemy of Alorus, a city at the mouth of the Haliacmon River.37 This Ptolemy, a few months later, murdered Alexander, and Alexander’s brother Perdiccas succeeded him in 369. Perdiccas was a teenager, and Ptolemy asserted that he himself would be regent. The Thebans under Pelopidas intervened again and placed the rule in the hands of Perdiccas, taking Ptolemy’s son and fifty other Macedonian nobles as hostages. Perdiccas’ rule was not strong. The Athenians captured the cities of Pydna and Methone during his reign, and he died during an invasion of Illyria, losing 4,000 Macedonian soldiers in the process. This was the situation Philip inherited when he took the throne. Macedonia had suffered due to the fractured nature of its internal politics, and it was beset by external threats on all sides.38

Before going into detail concerning Philip’s governance of Macedonia and his expansion of its territory and power, it is necessary to examine his rebuilding of the Macedonian military machine. He inherited a weak country with a crippled military, and transformed it into the premier army of the world at its time. Though this must not have happened immediately at his ascension to the throne, his military supremacy was obvious early on in his career. Therefore, the extent of Philip’s reforms will be examined here.

36 Cawkwell (1978) 25
37 Diodorus 16.2.2-3; Justin 7.5.2-3; Cawkwell (1978) 26
38 Diodorus 16.2.4-5; Worthington (2014) 28-29
There are two contexts into which the military reforms of Philip II fit. The first is the traditional Greek way of war. The Greeks fought in their own style. Unlike the massive conscript armies of the Persians, the Greeks relied on lines of heavy infantrymen which fought in a formation known as the phalanx. It is an important observation that the Greek hoplite was a citizen-soldier who probably had a personal interest in defending his homeland, rather than a poor conscript, as was the case in many other armies. The heavy armament of the Greek soldier and their ordered way of fighting made them a preeminent fighting force for a long period of time.

The individual Greek soldier was known as a hoplite, named for his shield, which was called a *hoplon*, but elsewhere an *aspis*. The shield was the most important part of the panoply, or armament, of the hoplite. It was a round shield made of wood and either rimmed or faced with bronze. Occasionally it was decorated, in order to inspire fear into the enemy. Perhaps the most important characteristic of the hoplite shield was that it was double-gripped.\(^{39}\) The shield was large, around three feet in diameter, meaning it covered a sizeable portion of the hoplite’s body, and extended outward to his left. This means that, in a tight formation, a hoplite can offer protection to the man next to him. This is what formed the basis of the phalanx formation.

In addition to the shield, the hoplite was equipped with a great deal of protective gear. The hoplite wore a heavy breastplate made of bronze, as well as a helmet, also bronze, which covered most of the face. This would have impaired the senses of the soldier to a great degree. Wealthy hoplites might also protect their shins with bronze greaves. There are a number of conflicting estimates regarding the weight of a typical hoplite

\(^{39}\) Hanson (1993) 65
panoply, the highest of these coming in around seventy pounds.\textsuperscript{40} Accordingly the panoply tended to become lighter over time. As the Greeks progressed toward and into the Classical period, the weight of the hoplite panoply was steadily reduced, as the corselet was made compact, greaves became less frequently worn, and helmets became less enclosed.\textsuperscript{41}

The primary weapon of the hoplite was a thrusting spear. It was around eight feet long, making it much larger than spears used by other types of soldiers, like the Persians. This contributed to the success of the hoplite. Some hoplites may have carried a second spear with them to battle, either as a thrown weapon or as a backup in case the first broke. The spear could have been wielded either underhand or overhand.\textsuperscript{42} The Greek hoplite also carried a short sword, for use in close quarters if his spears should break.\textsuperscript{43}

Hoplite warfare between the Greeks was essentially a contest between two armies of heavy infantry. Lined up in formations between eight and sixteen ranks deep, hoplite armies would meet one another and battle it out. Thucydides explains that the most dangerous position in a hoplite phalanx was the right wing, since the rightmost file did not have shields beyond them. For this reason, the most courageous troops were typically placed on the right of a hoplite formation.\textsuperscript{44} The Greeks disdained light-armed missile troops, and usually opted not to use them, even though their effectiveness was proven throughout the Peloponnesian War and the fourth century. The Greeks were slow to learn important lessons about the integration of light troops into their armies, even when
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preeminent commanders made it all too evident that mobility and ranged attacks could be used to achieve a great degree of success.\textsuperscript{45} With a few exceptions, until Philip II, the Greek way of war remained a clash of heavy infantry.

There is a great debate about how this style of warfare was actually fought. For a long time, it was generally thought that hoplite warfare took on the style of a massive scrum, in which soldiers literally pushed into the backs of those in front of them in order to drive the enemy from the battlefield. This is derived from the Greek verb \textit{otheo}, to shove, which appears in descriptions of hoplite battle. Greek armies are said to push the enemy off the battlefield, which many scholars choose to interpret literally. To support this argument, scholars point out the heavy weight of hoplite equipment, the cumbersome nature of the shield, the apparent importance of the depth of the formation of hoplites, and the limited perceptive abilities the Greek hoplite would have had on the battlefield, as well as specific references to the word \textit{othismos} and its verb cognate in the ancient texts, including notably Xenophon’s description of the battle of Coroneia.\textsuperscript{46} Other scholars, rejecting this interpretation, argue in favour of a more open sort of combat. They argue that the shield was more maneuverable than is thought, and that the armour was lighter.\textsuperscript{47} They further point out the difficulty in fighting in such a clash as would take place in a literal collision of two walls of men. It remains difficult to truly and accurately reconstruct hoplite warfare, as visual representations are artistic and textual descriptions are vague.

\textsuperscript{45} The Athenians used missile troops to great effect at Sphacteria during the Peloponnesian War, for example, and the Athenian general Iphicrates took steps to lighten the armament of Athenian hoplites and even lengthened their spears, in a precursor to the reforms of Philip. Despite this, the trend of progressive military tactics did not continue in Athens much after Iphicrates himself. Diodorus 15.44 discusses the reforms of Iphicrates.
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Thus the final reconstruction of the Greek way of war continues to elude modern scholarship.

Philip himself, however, did not come from a Greek *polis*. He hailed from the kingdom of Macedon, which had its own military tradition, very different from that of the Greeks, although they did speak a dialect of Greek. Philip’s Macedon was much more culturally similar to the world of Homer than to the more culturally developed Greek *poleis*. It was a land ruled by chieftains and kings, and those chieftains and kings were difficult to control and possessed a high degree of autonomy.\(^{48}\) Unlike the Greek *poleis*, who drew on citizen soldiers equipped as hoplites, as well as mercenaries and in some cases elite professional bodies of soldiers, the Macedonians relied primarily on a levy of farmers, who were poorly trained and equipped. Their infantry did not have a strong nor illustrious reputation.\(^{49}\) While the *hetairoi*, the mounted Companions of the King, were in place before the reign of Philip, they were but a small part of the army. These made up the core of the Macedonian forces, staffed by Macedonian noblemen who lived a militaristic and masculine lifestyle. But there were not enough of these noble cavalrymen to establish a powerful fighting force, and further, since these nobles and lords were not always loyal to the king, the Macedonian army was not near as strong as it might have been. It is possible that Alexander II had created the *pezhetairoi* before Philip’s reign, but even if this is the case, Philip increased the strength of this unit to a large degree, as before his reign the Macedonian infantry was not a point of strength.\(^{50}\)

\(^{50}\) Green (2013) 19
With all this in mind, the Macedonian army changed dramatically during Philip’s rule. First, Philip reformed the core of the infantry. Although the institution of the *pezhetairoi* probably predates him, it was Philip who transformed it into an elite unit. Philip’s *pezhetairoi* trained professionally, doing drills and marches in full equipment.\(^{51}\) These *pezhetairoi* provided a standing corps of soldiers similar to the Theban Sacred Band, which was capable of anchoring Philip’s battle lines, and also served as the king’s bodyguard. It is possible the *pezhetairoi* are analogous to the hypaspists, the king’s bodyguard, but they could also be a distinct unit of elite troops.\(^{52}\) What was unique about Philip’s reforms, however, is that he adopted a new style of infantryman as the backbone of his forces. In part this was the result of a difference of tradition; Greek hoplites provided their own equipment, whereas the Macedonian peasantry was not wealthy enough to support this system.\(^{53}\) While the Greek hoplite used a thrusting spear, typically eight feet long, Philip’s infantry wielded a two-handed pike called the *sarissa*, which could be fourteen to eighteen feet long.\(^{54}\) This was a two-handed weapon, meaning Philip’s infantrymen could not use the Greek *hoplon*. Instead they used a much smaller shield called the *pelte*, which they strapped to their shoulders. They still wore helmets and greaves, but their cuirasses were lighter than the bronze favoured by hoplites. Thus the sum of their gear was probably lighter than the Greek hoplite.\(^{55}\) Owing to the length of the *sarissa*, the Macedonian infantry became highly effective on the battlefield. A greater number of spears would extend beyond the front line of soldiers than in a traditional
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phalanx, meaning more men were involved in the fight. Further, due to the extra length, the enemy came under attack well before they were able to reach Philip’s men.\textsuperscript{56}

Although the \textit{hetairoi}, the Companion Cavalry, existed before Philip, it was he who gave it the principle offensive role in a combined arms context. Traditionally in Greek armies the infantry was most important, and the Greeks were not accustomed to use different types of arms in a cohesive manner. Further, Philip adopted the wedge formation for his cavalry assaults, which made them more able to penetrate enemy lines and force gaps. This he borrowed from the Scythians and the Thracians.\textsuperscript{57} Through this, Philip turned the cavalry into the offensive arm of the most deadly army in Greece at the time.

Philip also deployed his cavalry in varying capacities. The typical cavalryman in Philip’s army wielded a lance called a \textit{xyston}, as well as a short sword.\textsuperscript{58} However, he also had a unit called the \textit{sarissophoroi}, which, if anything can be learned from their name, must have wielded a longer lance, although it is not likely to have been as long as the infantry lance.\textsuperscript{59} In addition, Philip may have created the \textit{prodromoi}, a group of scouts who could move and deploy quickly, as the need arose, and which Alexander used to great effect early in his campaigns. These two units may be the same, bearing two different names. It is difficult to discern their exact roles, but a longer spear would be useful for a fast-moving scouting unit to be able to keep any enemy they might contact at bay.\textsuperscript{60}

Philip also showed a willingness to incorporate foreign troops into his army, in addition to the ability to recognize their usefulness. This led to his use of light-armed
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troops, like the Agrianian javelin-throwers. This is also noteworthy because of the Greeks’ traditional disdain for missile troops. This use of foreign troops did not come without risk. Many felt that their service was forced, and thus were not happy to be campaigning with the king in far-off lands. However, for others, it was a way for Philip to ensure their loyalty, by offering them pay and a way of life.

As another way to ensure the loyalty of his men, Philip established the Royal Pages, or basilikoi paides in Greek. These were teenagers, between fourteen and eighteen years old, who underwent a sort of officer training program. They spent their time attending the king, hunting with him, keeping watch over him, and the like. It was a coveted position among the nobility. This served as a way not only to train future officers, but also to ensure the loyalty of the Macedonian lords; they were less likely to misbehave if their sons were working at the court of the king. It allowed Philip to essentially keep political hostages while maintaining a friendly appearance. It is worth noting that while it is the generally accepted view that Philip established the Royal Pages, Hammond puts forth the possibility that the institution predated Philip, owing to the vagueness of the passages used to credit Philip. This does not, however, diminish the importance of the Pages as a means to supply future officers and leaders, and Philip’s use of such a program is significant even if he himself is not the originator.

Another important addition to the Macedonian army was Philip’s corps of mechanical engineers. This was implemented sometime after 350 BCE, probably after
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Philip had come into contact with the engineer Polyeides in Thessaly, who later moved to Pella. It is difficult to say positively how far siege warfare advanced under Philip, or what machines he used and when he used them. It is known, though, that Philip used rams and other machines during the siege of Amphipolis in 357, and that he used siege machinery which fired bolts at Olynthus in 348, as bolt heads were found there bearing Philip’s name. Further, Philip is known to have used torsion catapults at Byzantium in 340, which were much stronger than other forms of artillery. These developments are not necessarily unique to Philip, but his army is one of the first Greek forces to successfully use these machines, which no doubt aided him in taking the many cities which he captured. Further, these siege engines were integral to the many sieges carried out by his son Alexander.66

Although not really a reform, it is important to note that Philip greatly expanded the size of the Macedonian army as well. He took over a ramshackle army when he became king in 359, but by 358, he had already mustered 10,000 infantry and 600 cavalry. These numbers would continue to grow. By 352, he had 20,000 infantry and 3,000 horse.67 It would continue to grow. The growing size of the army meant that Philip was more able to deal with powerful Greek poleis and their allied armies, since they were often drawn together in their various leagues and treaties.

Philip was also instrumental in reorganizing the army in terms of its structure. For one, as part of their drill and training, the Macedonian army was made to carry its own supplies, reducing the need for a cumbersome baggage train. This allowed the Macedonian to move more swiftly than other armies of the day, and further, they were able to move through more difficult terrain. In addition, the animals were not taken away from the

67 Worthington (2008) 26
By organizing the various units, particularly the cavalry, of his army by region, Philip ensured that the soldiers would fight more fiercely, as their valour would become synonymous with their homeland. As a result, Philip turned his army into a professional force. Many scholars believe that the Macedonian soldiers received regular pay, which allowed Philip to maintain his large standing army and campaign so consistently. Furthermore, he incentivised the men through a system of promotions. A soldier who performed well might be promoted. This could come with a higher grade of pay, or perhaps an appointment to one of the elite units of Philip’s army. Soldiers could also be granted land, as after the siege of Methone. By doing this, Philip created a culture of competition and drive for success in his army, through which the army was always striving for success on the field. High-ranking Macedonians who performed well for the king might achieve high commands in his army, and this reduced the desire, which the lords under him might have held, to mutiny against the king. Philip thus made sure that the men of his army and his kingdom were loyal to him.

It is through these means that Philip was able to reform his army into the most effective fighting force in Greece, and one of the most powerful in the world at the time. Philip accomplished much with his army. To explore all of his achievements in any depth...
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would be a project on its own, but a brief summary is important to understand the degree of success Philip’s reforms allowed him to achieve.

This reformed military was not available to Philip upon his ascension, however. Instead, he inherited a crisis situation that required his immediate attention. Having defeated Perdiccas and destroying much of Macedon’s military power, the Illyrians were preparing to attack. Recognizing the situation, the Paeonians a tribe on the Vardar River, began to plunder Macedonian territory. Various pretenders sought Philip’s throne. One, Pausanias, had secured support from a Thracian king. Another, Argaeus, got support from Athens, which sent 3,000 infantrymen and a naval presence to assist him. Philip had to act quickly.

He did just that. He gathered as many troops as he could, withdrawing a garrison from Amphipolis, which was left there by his brother. He defeated the Paeonians and paid off the Thracians supporting Pausanias. Meanwhile, Argaeus, who had landed in Athenian-controlled Methone, attempted and failed to have the city of Aegae declare him king, and on his return march to Methone Philip intercepted and defeated his army, and captured Argaeus himself. Next, Philip turned his attention to the Illyrian threat. He had to this point, in only a few months’ time, gathered an army of 10,000 infantry and 600 cavalry. With this force he invaded and defeated Illyria in 358 BCE, using a flanking manoeuvre with his cavalry to outstrip the square formation of the Illyrian army, killing around 7,000 of his enemy. The Illyrian king, Bardylis, escaped and made peace. The
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Illyrians were forced to withdraw from all Macedonian cities, and the peace was sealed by Philip’s marriage to Audata, the daughter or granddaughter of Bardylis.\(^78\)

With the Illyrians defeated, Philip was able to assert his authority in Upper Macedon. From this point onward, the Upper Macedonians for the most part remained subordinate to the Macedonian king.\(^79\) For Philip, this meant that he now had access to the population and material wealth of Upper Macedonia.\(^80\) In 358 BCE, Philip was called to aid the Thessalian League as the city of Pherae was attempting to assert dominance over the region.\(^81\) Philip intervened, taking another wife, Philinna, an aristocratic Thessalian, in the process.\(^82\) By intervening on behalf of the League and marrying one of theirs, Philip earned the support of the Thessalians, notably granting him access to the renowned horses of Thessaly.\(^83\)

In 357, Philip took the city of Amphipolis by siege, having breached the city walls and thus gaining control of a territory the Athenians repeatedly tried and failed to take. During the process of taking the city, in order to prevent Athenian intervention, Philip claimed that he would hand the city over to the Athenians after taking it, in exchange for the city of Pydna. Philip reneged on the deal and kept Amphipolis for himself, successfully deceiving the Athenians.\(^84\) Taking Amphipolis consolidated Philip’s holdings in the east, and provided for him an important port.\(^85\) Further, the taking of Amphipolis provided for Philip access to the mines on Mount Pangaeus, providing significant wealth to the
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Macedonians. He subsequently took Pydna from the Athenians, and kept both cities for himself. This he accomplished in 357. It was in this year as well that he married Olympias, who would become the mother of Alexander the Great. This was part of an alliance with the Molossians.

The taking of Pydna led to Athens openly declaring war on Philip. The two sides now entered competition for the allegiance of Olynthus, an important city in the southern Chalcidice. Philip secured the friendship of the Chalcidian League by offering them the city of Potidaea and granting them use of Anthemus. This was fortunate timing for Philip, as at this time an alliance formed against him. The Illyrians, Paeonians, and some Thracians made common cause against Philip. Philip reacted swiftly, however, and prevented them from combining forces and launching a concerted invasion. He defeated the Thracians in summer 356, and Macedonians under the general Parmenio defeated the Illyrians. The Paeonians soon too were bested. Athens had allied with the three forces, but was too slow to deliver aid.

In the same year, Philip took control of a colony of Thasians called Crenides. Normally allied with Athens, instead this colony appealed to Philip for help when it was besieged by Thracians. Philip renamed the city Philippi. That the city went over to Philip's side was important because it possessed a significant amount of mineral wealth. Philip then made good on his promise to take Potidaea for the Chalcidians, taking it from the Athenians. He sold the Potidaeans into slavery and sent the Athenian garrison home.
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He did in fact turn the city over to the Chalcidians. Athens to this point was bested by the wily Philip at each turn.\textsuperscript{93}

Soon thereafter, Philip took from the Athenians the city of Methone, where Argaeus had landed. The siege began in 355, and the city was taken in 354, before Athenian aid was able to arrive.\textsuperscript{94} Various siege techniques, including rams, sappers, and scaling ladders were used in the taking of the city.\textsuperscript{95} During the siege, Philip was struck by an arrow and lost the use of one eye.\textsuperscript{96} Although he allowed its citizens to depart, Philip destroyed the city of Methone so that it could not rise up against the Macedonians, and distributed its territory among Macedonians. In doing all this, Philip consolidated his kingdom and reduced the possibility that a threat might arise from near to him.\textsuperscript{97}

Philip now began to exploit the wealth of resources that were available to him in Macedonia. In addition to the aforementioned mines, Philip harvested timber from Macedonia’s vast forests and drained swamps to create fertile fields for cultivation, which he did for example in the plains near Philippi. His exploitation of mines was greater than the kings who preceded him.\textsuperscript{98} Philip’s expansion of Macedon’s power also gave him great reserves of manpower, which no individual Greek city-state could be expected to match.\textsuperscript{99} Philip spent lavishly, especially on his army, but was able to afford it due to the economic development of his kingdom.

Meanwhile, the Greek world was becoming embroiled in yet another major conflict between the city-states. The war centered on the shrine at Delphi. At this time in
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Greece, the treasury of the Delphic shrine was governed by a group known as the Amphictyonic Council. Various tribes of Greeks had representation on this council, although at this time the most powerful faction was led by the Thebans. The war erupted when Thebes, through the Amphictyonic Council, imposed a heavy fine on one of the tribes, the Phocians. Rather than pay the fine, the Phocians, under the leadership of one Philomelus, seized control of the treasury at Delphi and used the money to increase his forces with mercenaries.\(^{100}\) In response, the Amphictyonic Council declared a sacred war against Philomelus and Phocis. Notably, the Athenians allied themselves with the Phocians.\(^{101}\)

Philip became involved through the Thessalians. Thessaly had voted, along with Thebes, in favour of war against Phocis. They sent an army of some 6,000 troops to help with the effort, but Philomelus defeated this force in spring 354. The result was that the Thessalian League was divided with regards to the war, and Pherae changed sides, allying itself with Phocis and Athens. Thessaly now appealed to Philip for help, and he obliged. He laid siege to Pherae in 354.\(^{102}\) Meanwhile, the Boeotians raised an army of 13,000 men and defeated Philomelus at Neon. The latter committed suicide.\(^{103}\)

In the estimation of Thebes, the war was now over. In order to recover some of the expense they had spent on the war, they sent an army of 5,000 men to Asia Minor, in order that they might assist the Persian rebel Artabazus in exchange for money; Philip allowed the army to pass through his territory freely.\(^{104}\) Meanwhile, Philip engaged in his own war.
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in Thrace, despoiling Abdera and Maronea, who were allies of Athens. Athens attempted to disable Philip’s fleet which was stationed at Neapolis, but the Macedonian navy was able to escape destruction.105

However, Phocis was not to disappear so easily, and soon a new leader emerged, by the name of Onomarchus.106 He hired more mercenaries and spent freely on retaining allies. He drove the Locrians, another Greek tribe, out of the war in early 353, and became a threat to those Boeotian troops which remained in Greece, and further, he captured Boeotian cities and ravaging their lands.107 He was also effective in bribing some Thessalian states into leaving the war. Once again, the Thessalian states that still supported the war against Phocis turned to Philip for help, and once again, Philip obliged.108

Philip was able to defeat the tyrant of Pherae, a man named Lycophron, who enjoyed the support of the brother of Onomarchus, named Phayllus. Philip forced Phayllus and his army of 7,000 mercenaries out of Thessaly. However, soon, Onomarchus arrived in support, and leveled upon Philip two defeats, one of which was major. Onomarchus hid stone-throwing catapults behind the crest of a hill, and using a feigned withdrawal, he drew Philip’s phalanx into range. The densely-packed soldiers were savaged by the hidden catapults. Philip was forced to return to Thessaly to regroup and to rebuild the morale of his army.109 It is said that Philip withdrew, “like a ram, to butt the harder.”110

Onomarchus remained active, capturing Coronea and Orchomenus, moving against Philip in Thessaly. Philip would not remain on the receiving end for long,
however. Having received news of the movements of the Phocians, Philip intercepted the army of Onomarchus before he could link up with his Thessalian allies at Pherae. The two forces met on the coast, south of Pherae, at a place called the Crocus Field. Likely as a public-relations stunt, Philip had his men wear laurel crowns, representing themselves as avengers of Apollo in this battle.¹¹¹ The Athenians were also present at this battle with their navy, which acted in support of the army of Onomarchus. However, it was not able to land soldiers in support before the battle was over. Philip defeated Onomarchus decisively in battle, killing 6,000 troops, including the leader Onomarchus, and taking 3,000 prisoners. The prisoners were executed by means of drowning, which was a traditional punishment for sacrilegious crimes.¹¹² The Battle of the Crocus Field went on to remain one of Philip’s most significant military victories, especially in terms of the prestige it won him among the Greek states. This was unequivocally significant for a man whom the Greeks still considered semi-barbarous.

Next, Philip returned to Pherae and completed his siege of the city. He also married another wife, Nicesiplois, a niece of Jason of Pherae, in order to ingratiate himself to the city.¹¹³ He took further action to unify the Thessalians, removing statesmen and populations who had caused trouble and disunity.¹¹⁴ For his assistance, the Thessalians essentially made Philip the leader of the Thessalian League, whether as archon as is suggested by modern scholarship, or otherwise. This greatly increased the resources and
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Philip’s disposal. He also kept in his own name the territories of Perrhaebia and Magnesia, extending his own lands as far as Pasagae.\(^{115}\)

The Third Sacred War still did not come to an end. Phayllus, the brother of Onomarchus, did not disappear. He still had the assistance of Athens and Sparta in addition, and with their help he mustered an army to oppose Philip, although he was required to double the pay of his mercenaries after the defeat of Onomarchus.\(^{116}\) These men he took to occupy the pass at Thermopylae in 352. Rather than risk an assault which surely would have been costly in terms of casualties, Philip chose not to engage the Phocians.\(^{117}\) He instead left to focus on his own interests in other regions, and would not reappear in the Third Sacred War until it was time to settle the wreckage.

Philip now took up a position in Thrace, opposite the Chalcidice, which had become allied with Athens. The Chalcidian League was probably at this time the most dangerous political body to the interests of the Macedonians. It was also close to the heart of Philip’s kingdom. Formerly the Chalcidians had allied themselves with Macedonia. But at that time, Athens had appeared much more threatening than they now did, and the shadow of Macedonian imperialism loomed menacingly. In 349, Philip attacked the city of Olynthus, a dominant power in the Chalcidice. About this aggression the famous Athenian orator Demosthenes wrote a series of famous speeches known as the *Olynthiacs*. Olynthus was a target for Philip both because of its alliance with Athens and because it was harbouring some rival claimants to the Macedonian throne. The Athenians did send help to the Olynthians under the generals Chares and Charidemus, but they arrived too
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late to be able to help, as seasonal winds delayed the sailing of the fleet. Ultimately Philip captured Olynthus through bribery, apparently bribing two of its leading citizens. The city was destroyed, its population was made into slaves, and the Chalcidian League was disbanded.\textsuperscript{118}

Before intervening in the Sacred War once again, Philip waged a campaign against the Thracians. Although the Thracians were allies of Athens, Thrace was not a member of the Second Athenian Confederacy, and thus Athens said nothing even though they knew their ally was under threat.\textsuperscript{119} The Thracians actually invited Philip to arbitrate regarding a dispute between two brothers, who were the kings. These were Cersobleptes and Amadocus. Instead of arbitration, however, Philip brought in his army and reduced the influence on both, rendering them dependent on him. The campaign was over within a few months.\textsuperscript{120}

Around this same time Philip re-entered the arena of the Third Sacred War. In 347/6, Philip, under the pretense of intervening in a dispute between Pharsalos and Halos, manoeuvred his army and siege train near the pass at Thermopylae, causing anxiety for those who opposed him in the war.\textsuperscript{121} Before this, however, the war had continued to rage. Phayllus had attempted to take territory from Thebes, but was unsuccessful in this aim. He did cause much destruction, however.\textsuperscript{122} After failing in his goals in Boeotia, Phayllus turned to the Locrians, from whom he took several cities. These conquests were strategically important because their strong, fortified positions gave to Phayllus control

\textsuperscript{118} Demosthenes, \textit{On the False Embassy} 265-66; Diodorus 16.53.2-3; Justin 8.3.10-11; Hammond (1994) 52
\textsuperscript{119} Aeschines, \textit{On the Embassy} 84-85; Buckler (1989) 128
\textsuperscript{120} Justin 8.3.14-15; Hammond (1994) 83
\textsuperscript{121} Buckler (1989) 119
\textsuperscript{122} Diodorus 16.37.5-6
over the entire pass of Thermopylae. Through constant campaigning, it seemed as though none of the Greek states were strong enough on their own to bring the war to an end.

Thus the Greeks all turned to Philip. He received a number of embassies, including those from Thebes and Athens. But it was not clear to anyone exactly what he would do. It is somewhat difficult to ascertain what the true aims of Philip and the Macedonians were at this time. They were nominally allied with the Thebans, but they also seem to have had a desire to entreat Athens. This has been the subject of much debate. Potentially Philip no longer considered Thebes a significant threat, and so no longer needed their favour. Athens had also supported Phocis during the war, against Philip. It is difficult to know for sure what Philip was planning for the future. In any case, Philip’s actions would clearly grant to him the most powerful position of all the belligerents in the Sacred War. Philip, wishing to treat the Athenians leniently, forced them to abandon Phocis, which had been their ally during the war. This left Phocis essentially without allies. Philip was thus able to force the Phocians, now under Phalaecus and thoroughly demoralized, to surrender the pass at Thermopylae exclusively to him in exchange for their lives. They thus marched away, leaving the pass in the hands of the Macedonians and causing great terror for the Athenians. They had surrendered to Philip alone, and the Amphictyonic Council later made its own peace with the Phocians. That they surrendered to Philip alone was probably frustrating to the Boeotians, who had done much to carry on the war themselves. The terms of the ensuing peace were such that the Phocians were forced to destroy the walls

---
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of their own cities and live separately in small villages. The citizens were not killed nor made slaves, however.\textsuperscript{126}

The result of the Third Sacred War was very significant to what would occur shortly thereafter. The historical great powers of Greece, namely Athens, Thebes, and Sparta, continued to see their power eroded by constant warfare. Boeotia in particular was left in a much weaker position than it had been earlier in the fourth century, and Athens as well was left unable to muster an army that was able to oppose Philip in a significant way, and its navy imposed significant costs on the city-state. Meanwhile, with control of the pass at Thermopylae, Philip was left in a very strong position militarily – he could enter southern Greece as he wished. His interventions over the course of the Sacred War also left him on excellent terms with the Thessalians, of whom, as archon of the Thessalian League, he was essentially the leader. He also received as thanks for his services the votes on the Amphictyonic Council that had belonged to the Phocians.\textsuperscript{127} It is clear that of all the belligerents, Philip is the one who gained the most from the Third Sacred War.

Many in Greece were certainly uneasy about the results of the Third Sacred War. Athens was at peace with Macedonia, but this would not last long. Thebes was now distrustful of Macedonia as well. Philip had left them on their own earlier on in the war, in 352, and now Philip did not reward the Thebans as well as they thought they were due for their help in the war. Sparta too was on edge, as Philip now began interfering in politics in the Peloponnese, and sought to strengthen the ring of cities that continued to surround the Lacedaemonians. Sparta was quite isolated, as only Corinth and Achaea remained friendly to them. Thus the traditional Greek powers were not necessarily friendly toward

\textsuperscript{126} Diodorus 16.59.1-16.60.5; Buckler (1989) 142
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Philip at this time, but there was little they could do, as not even together did they possess the might to oppose him, ground down as they were by the war.128

Philip did not enjoy peace for long. By 345 or 344 he was once again at war with the Illyrians. He defeated an Illyrian tribe known as the Ardiaioi and captured loot from the war. Philip seems to have been injured during this campaign, and Isocrates criticized him for taking unnecessary risks in battle. However, as he came from a Macedonian culture, it was important for Philip to maintain his appearance as a fierce warrior, and thus he was not dissuaded from participating actively in combat.129

Around this same time, Philip took measures to secure his borders. These took the form of forced migrations of subjugated peoples. He moved various tribes onto the borders of his territory in order to create military outposts. In addition, the consolidation of the population resulted in the increased urbanization of Philip’s territory, which stimulated the economy. On the other hand, the displaced populations were naturally unhappy with the arrangement, having to abandon their ancestral territories.130

Philip was also forced to deal with unrest in Thessaly. He quickly moved in and made the political situation to his advantage. By expelling tyrants from cities, he gained the support of the Thessalian people, and a number of neighboring Greek peoples as well. Thessaly remained under Philip’s control, and continued to be a valued asset.131

In 344 or 343, Philip sent an embassy to Athens in order to attempt to amend the terms of the Peace of Philocrates in order to maintain peace the Athenians, who were constantly wary of Philip’s actions. Philip endeavoured to transform the peace into a
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common peace, allowing other Greek states entrance into the alliance. However, the Athenian assembly was persuaded by Demosthenes and another speaker, Hegesippus, to require the return of lost territory, including Amphipolis. Naturally, Philip found this unacceptable. Feelings against the Macedonians continued to grow, stirred up as they were by pro-war politicians like Demosthenes, and it was becoming clearer that the Peace of Philocrates was not meant to last.132

In 343 Philip continued his own movements, invading Epirus and installing Alexander, the brother of his wife Olympias, as king of that place. The move secured Philip’s southwestern border and provided him with land and timber. Philip continued to campaign actively, and in 342 launched his effort to conquer Thrace. Thrace was a difficult area to invade. The terrain was rugged, and the people were famously warlike, making use of a specialist troop known as a peltast, which was lightly armoured and carried a longer-than-average spear. The details of the campaign are not clear in the sources, but it was over in 340, and the end result was that Cersobleptes, the king of Thrace and a former Athenian ally, was expelled, and Philip added the vast resources and manpower of Thrace to his own. Philip made war against another tribe of Thracians in the north. These were called the Getae. Philip defeated them, and married the daughter of Cothelas their king, named Meda.133 Also in 342, Philip sent a smaller force to assist the Euboeans in establishing their independence from Athens.134

By 341, the situation with Athens was deteriorating critically. Athenian settlers on the Chersonese encroached on the territory of the Cardians, who were allies of Philip.

132 Demosthenes, Second Philippic; Worthington (2008) 113
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Philip, naturally, intervened on their behalf. Philip sent a small force, and accused the Athenian commander in the region, a man named Diopeithes, of acting dishonourably. The Athenians, far from being discouraged by Philip’s complaint, sent reinforcements led by Chares, at the behest of Demosthenes. Further, Athens appealed to Persia for help at this time. Although Persia did not offer an official alliance, they did agree to provide monetary support. More to Philip’s disadvantage, the Euboeans had a change of heart at this time. They appealed to Athens for alliance in exchange for their continued independence. The Athenians agreed, as they were aware that Euboea would be a necessary friend if they were to oppose Macedonia in a significant way. The Peace had been strained to its breaking point, and by 340 Athens and Macedon were at war.\textsuperscript{135}

Athens at this time received support from various states. These were Byzantium, Chios, Cos, and Rhodes. Significantly, these were the states that had opposed Athens in its Social War of 356. All these realized that the threat posed by Philip’s growing power was more significant than either the threat of further Athenian domination or the historical enmity that the states had for the Athenians.\textsuperscript{136}

Philip now laid siege to the city of Perinthus. The city was built into a hill, and was thus difficult to assault. Philip’s troops were not insignificant. He had around 30,000 troops in his army and was supported by his navy, although it was small. Philip successfully breached the walls with catapults, probably torsion catapults developed by the famous engineer Polyeidōs, but was unable to capitalize on this as the Perinthians were able to hastily recover their defenses and deny the Macedonians access to the city despite the holes in the wall. The city was also able to be supported by sea, and Philip’s navy was
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not powerful enough to prevent this. Philip now divided his army in two and laid siege to Byzantium as well. It is known that Polyeidos accompanied Philip to Byzantium.\(^{137}\) The decision is interesting, as Philip could not take one city with his entire army. It is difficult to see how he believed he might take two by splitting his army. He failed to take either city, as both were well-defended, and were well-supported by their allies. The action was not a complete failure, however. During the course of these affairs, Philip managed to use his forces to seize an Athenian grain fleet. The ships numbered 230 in total, of which Philip kept 180 and released 50. These actions are significant because the use of torsion catapults in siegecraft was new in Greece at this time, even if Philip did not here use them successfully. Further, Philip gained significant wealth by capturing these ships, put the Athenians into a food shortage, although not a famine, and, significantly, ensured that Athenian resistance to Macedonia would be absolute.\(^{138}\)

After lifting his siege of Byzantium, Philip marched his army north against the Scythians. He defeated them decisively, and seized a large amount a loot. Perhaps he did this for the sake of his army’s morale, or perhaps for the monetary value. On his return to Pella, however, Philip was barred by a group of Thracians known as the Triballi, who clearly were not totally subjugated by Philip’s previous campaign. The Triballi demanded that Philip hand over a portion of the loot from the Scythians. The Macedonians refused, and the situation escalated into a battle which ended disastrously for the Macedonians. Philip was struck by a spear in his thigh which also killed his horse from under him. His men carried him from the field, and in the confusion the Triballi captured the loot from
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the Scythians. Philip’s recovery was lengthy and the defeat was serious. However, aside from the physical danger, Philip remained firmly in a position of control with regard to the other Greeks.\textsuperscript{139}

A Fourth Sacred War began to erupt among the Greeks. The city of Amphissa, having attempted to have the Amphictyonic Council declare a Sacred War on Athens, were themselves found to have built on sacred land, and thus had a Sacred War declared against themselves. The Council elected Philip as the leader of the war effort. Thus, this new Sacred War provided Philip with an entry into mainstream Greek politics once again, which he would use to settle Greece to his liking, this time using military force overtly against the Greek powers.\textsuperscript{140}

Philip marched toward Amphissa, so as to appear as though he meant to attack there. However, he suddenly changed direction and seized the territory of Elatea. This gave Philip access to Amphissa, but also to Nicaea, which was the barrier between Philip and Thebes, and Athens after that. The Athenians were alarmed, and, despite Philip’s best efforts to the contrary, convinced the Thebans to ally themselves with Athens, to form a coalition against Philip and the Macedonians.\textsuperscript{141} A force was assembled to oppose Philip. Mercenaries, led by the Athenians Chares and Proxenus, were stationed in the pass at Gravia, and more were placed at Parapotamii. These troops were to bar Philip’s entry into Boeotia. The coalition made attempts to gain more allies, but only found a few. Among the notables were Megara, Corinth, Achaea, Euboea, and Acarnania.\textsuperscript{142}
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Philip forced the pass at Gravia with a ruse. He sent a fake letter that was meant to be intercepted, which said that he planned on abandoning his position near Gravia. The coalition army fell for the ruse and relaxed their guard. This allowed the Macedonians, led by the general Parmenion, to storm the pass and seize Amphissa. After this, the coalition abandoned its position at Parapotamii, and in 338 BCE decided that it would fight a decisive engagement on the plain of Chaeronea. This would be the battle to decide the fate of the Greeks.\textsuperscript{143}

The plain of Chaeronea is about three kilometers wide. There are hills to the north and south, and the city of Chaeronea was below the southern hills. The Cephisus River was the largest river on the plain, and it flowed from the northwest to the southeast. Other rivers, including the Haemon, flowed through the plain, creating anchors for flanks. The rivers also made the ground marshy, preventing the optimal deployment of cavalry.\textsuperscript{144}

Philip’s army was made up of some 30,000 infantry, of which 24,000 were Macedonians. He had with him as well 2,000 cavalry. Justin says the Athenian side had the numerical advantage, but Diodorus says the opposite. Hammond provides a reconstruction of the allied army, giving an estimated total of 35,000 infantry, and Worthington numbers the allied cavalry at 3,800. Boeotia contributed the most troops, and also made use of the Sacred Band, an elite group of 300 homosexual lovers who were up to this time thought to be the most elite hoplite troops in Greece. The Athenians contributed a large number of troops as well, and troops from those states that joined in the coalition against Philip made up the rest.\textsuperscript{145}
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There have been numerous attempts to reconstruct the Battle of Chaeronea. Philip was probably situated on the Macedonian right, accompanied by his bodyguard. The Companion Cavalry were on the left, under Alexander’s command. Philip’s wing engaged the Athenian infantry, where it appears the Macedonians attempted to draw the fighting out in order to generate an advantage owing to their constant drill and campaigning; the longer the day went, the more tired the Athenians would be. Philip seems to have won the day by means of a feigned retreat, luring the Athenian army, which was under mediocre generalship, into an impetuous charge. Philip stopped his retreat and counterattacked, routing the Athenians. Meanwhile, Alexander defeated the Sacred Band of Thebes with his cavalry, and the Macedonians achieved victory on the left of the field as well.¹⁴⁶

Philip won the battle of Chaeronea decisively, and wasted no time setting about settling affairs in Greece. Thebes he treated with severity. He ransomed their dead and sold their prisoners as slaves. He removed them as leader of the Boeotian League, and garrisoned their city with soldiers. In addition, he created a pro-Macedonian oligarchy to govern the city. Despite Athens’ panic at the situation, Philip treated them lightly by comparison. He did not invade Attica and returned their dead without ransom, and they were accompanied by an embassy led by his general Antipater and his son Alexander. Philip did not garrison Athens, nor did he dismantle their democracy. He also allowed them to maintain their position on the Amphictyonic Council and to keep their navy. However, they lost their settlers in the Chersonese. Philip and Alexander were made Athenian citizens, but this was not indicative of any new pro-Macedonian feeling in the city. In the Peloponnese, Philip installed a favorable government in Corinth and ensured

¹⁴⁶ Frontinus 2.1.9; Plutarch, Life of Alexander 9.2; Polyaeus 4.2.2, 4.2.7; Worthington (2008) 149-151
that Sparta’s power was reduced enough so that they could not oppose him significantly. He had thus in effect neutralized the historical Greek powers so that none could oppose him further, even should they attempt to ally together.\footnote{Worthington (2008) 154-5; Worthington (2014) 97}

Next, Philip sought to create a mechanism by which the peace he was imposing would remain permanent. He did this by creating the so-called League of Corinth. This was a Common Peace which was governed by a \textit{synedrion}, or council, with representatives from each member state. The League was led by a \textit{hegemon}, leader, a position to which Philip was to be elected. The League was to vote on matters pertaining to the military, to finance, and to politics. It would also arbitrate in case of dispute between member states. Although Philip would become \textit{hegemon}, Macedon was not a member-state of the league. In his handling of the League of Corinth, Philip displays his excellence in diplomacy. Although Philip was certainly backed by Macedonian military might, the League created the appearance that the Greek states maintained their autonomy. Although the Greeks had become dominated by the Macedonians, Philip’s terms were such that they could not act as though they were subjugated by a foreign leader, as had been the perception of the King’s Peace of 386. Further, any state that acted against the League risked isolation, as other members were bound to oppose them. Thus, Philip’s League of Corinth served to join the Greeks together in such a way as to end their infighting as well as provide security for Philip’s kingdom. Philip was now essentially established as the leader of all Greece, except Sparta, who did not participate in the League.\footnote{Demosthenes, \textit{On the Treaty with Alexander}; Worthington (2008) 158-9; Perlman (1985) discusses the details of the League of Corinth in much greater detail.}
Philip was elected *hegemon* of the League in 337, and at this time he also announced his plan to cross into Asia. The motivations for the invasion are not altogether clear. Perhaps Philip wished to foster unity among the Greeks by fighting the barbarians; perhaps he wanted personal glory; perhaps it was to seek revenge for the historic hostility between Greece and Persia; perhaps it was because Philip, who was constantly campaigning, had little left in the treasury and was enticed by the famous Persian wealth. Whatever the case may be, he sent an advance force into Asia to rally support from those Greeks living in Asia Minor. However, Philip would not live to see his invasion come to fruition, as he was assassinated in 336 by a former lover of his, Pausanias of Orestis.¹⁴⁹

Philip’s assassination is intriguing. The nominal motive was the personal animosity of Pausanias. He had been a former lover of the king who was sexually assaulted by Attalus, one of the Macedonian generals. Philip did nothing to reprimand Attalus, and although Pausanias was offered a prestigious position as recompense, his anger was not assuaged. However, the historian Justin puts forward the idea that one of Philip’s wives and the mother of Alexander, Olympias, was responsible for the plot, and that Alexander was not unknowing. Philip had just taken another wife, Cleopatra, the niece of Attalus. At the wedding, Attalus made a jest at Alexander’s expense, and Philip did not defend him. The result was that Alexander and his mother left court, and tensions between those two and Philip were certainly high.¹⁵⁰ However, it is impossible to know for certain what happened. This does illustrate the potential dynastic trouble that accompanies the polygamy that the Macedonians practiced.

¹⁴⁹ Worthington (2014) 112-113
Philip was assassinated, but his legacy endured. His son Alexander would go on to forge the greatest empire the world had seen to that point using the tools left to him by his father. In many ways today Philip’s history is overshadowed by that of his son. Philip’s own contributions should not be ignored, however. Philip was a master strategist. He transformed Macedonia from a feudalistic, backwater state into the premier power of Greece. He totally reformed the Macedonian military and turned it into the most powerful force in the world at its time. His military prowess was only outdone by his intelligence. Philip frequently outwitted the great politicians of Athens and other states. He used marriage wisely for political purposes. Philip was always taking steps to ensure his gains were secured, and truly he deserves to be ranked among the great leaders of history.
4: The Life and Career of Gaius Marius

Gaius Marius was a prominent general in his own right. The discussion of his own military career will follow a similar progression to that of Philip. Marius’ rise to prominence will be examined, followed by his actions in the Numidian campaign against Jugurtha. Next, as Marius changed theaters and had to face a threat in the north, the events of the Cimbric War prior to Marius’ arrival will be considered, followed by a discussion of the actions Marius took to end this war. Throughout these accounts of Marius’ military achievements, various reforms to the Roman army attributed to Marius will be discussed. Finally, there will be a brief look at Marius’ career after its zenith.

While Philip inherited a Macedonia that was unable truly to exert its will through its military, Marius’ Rome was perhaps not so badly off. Rome had Italy under its control (although not without some serious political difficulties which erupted in conflict later in Marius’ career), it had defeated the remnants of the Macedonian empire, securing Greece and parts of Asia Minor. Before that, it had defeated the Carthaginians and added their African territories to its own, as well as land in Iberia. Rome at this time was governed by the republic; its system of government was much more stable at this time than that of the Macedonians in the time of Philip. This is advantageous for someone like Marius because there is not the need to build the state from the ground up, but disadvantageous because there are processes that are expected to be followed as well as stiff competition from many powerful political figures. However, by the time of Marius, the Roman Republican government had already shown cracks in its armor, with the events involving the Gracchi brothers, for example. Santangelo (2016) 10-12 Domestically Rome was not at its strongest, but this political change...

151 Santangelo (2016) 10-12
uncertainty creates openings for opportunist politicians, the sort Marius would show himself to be.

Marius’ early political career was somewhat unremarkable. Born in the town of Arpinum, Marius likely came from the local nobility, and not from a poor background as is often attested.\(^\text{152}\) Although often Marius is portrayed as somewhat boorish, he clearly had some sort of education. Plutarch says that this is a traditional education, but what exactly is meant by this is hard to ascertain.\(^\text{153}\) Marius first served in the army at twenty-one years of age, under Scipio Aemilianus in Numantia.\(^\text{154}\) Marius’ military career was necessary if he was to have political ambitions, as the Roman system required ten years of service in the army before one could hold office, and this was least of all avoidable for a *novus homo* like Marius.\(^\text{155}\) Marius adapted quickly to military life and thrived under the discipline of Aemilianus. While in Numantia, Aemilianus is said to have signaled Marius out for potential future greatness. Although the details of Marius’ ten years of service are not recorded, Marius was distinguished for his bravery.\(^\text{156}\) At this time, Marius probably exploited the successes of Rome in Numantia, securing for himself mineral rights in Spain and creating mines. No doubt Marius was successful in this, as a mountain range in the area bore the name *Mons Mariana* in Roman times.\(^\text{157}\)

Next, Marius was elected to the office of military tribune.\(^\text{158}\) This position saw Marius sent to the Balearic Islands along with Quintus Caecilius Metellus, who would
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earn the name Balearicus. Once again Marius’ service was successful. Next, Marius sought and obtained the quaestorship. He was elected to this position at the age of thirty-five, although the minimum age to seek the position was only twenty-six.\footnote{Evans (1994) 31; Kildahl (1968) 35} Marius owed his early success to the support of the Metelli, who were at this time a very influential family.\footnote{Badian (1962) 216; Gruen (1964) 99} As quaestor, Marius served under Quintus Fabius Maximus in Transalpine Gaul. Next, in 120 BCE, Marius served as tribune of the people. Marius’ actions while in this office are confusing. He supported a bill designed to reduce the control held by the senatorial elite over elections, and also supported a bill limiting grain distribution to the poor. Thus Marius reduced his prestige among both factions in Rome at the time.\footnote{Plutarch, \textit{Life of Marius} 4.2-4; Hildinger (2003) 62; Kildahl (1968) 39} This is one of the reasons why many see Marius as an inept politician without much vision.\footnote{Shotter 39}

Subsequently Marius became an unpopular political candidate. He tried to secure the curule aedileship, an office sought by many, and lost. He, foreseeing his loss, transferred his candidacy to the plebeian aedileship, but lost here as well. The double loss was unprecedented in Roman politics.\footnote{Plutarch, \textit{Life of Marius} 5.1-2; Kildahl (1968) 40; Plutarch, \textit{Life of Marius} 5.2. 6.1-2; Kildahl (1968) 41} Marius retired from politics for two years, but returned to run for the praetorship, for which he was narrowly elected. Marius was subsequently accused of bribery, probably having used his accumulated wealth to garner support. He was narrowly acquitted in a tie vote, and was most likely guilty in reality.\footnote{Plutarch, \textit{Life of Marius} 6.1-2; Hildinger 62-63; Kildahl (1968) 40-41} His praetorship, however, seems not to have been remarkable. Little is recorded of his actions. He was subsequently sent to Further Spain as propraetor, where he probably dealt with banditry to some degree.\footnote{Plutarch, \textit{Life of Marius} 6.1-2; Hildinger 62-63; Kildahl (1968) 40-41} Around this time, Marius married a member of the Julian
family, and although they were not dominant in politics at the time, they were an ancient and distinguished family. Accordingly, the marriage would have enhanced Marius’ own political prestige.\footnote{Plutarch, \textit{Life of Marius} 6.2; Kildahl (1968) 42}

It was not long after this that Marius accepted a commission to work under Quintus Caecilius Metellus in Numidia, against the rogue king Jugurtha. Having become propraetor and having received a position on Metellus’ staff, it appears that Marius successfully overcame his prior alienation of the nobility. The war in Numidia would provide the means for Marius to achieve the highest office in the Roman republic.

The war in Numidia had raged for some time before Metellus was sent to subdue Jugurtha, however. Jugurtha was the illegitimate nephew of the Numidian king Micipsa, who himself had two sons, Adherbal and Hiempsal. After a successful service in Numantia assisting the Romans, Micipsa, having long ago recognized the talents of his nephew, adopted Jugurtha and made him joint heir to the Numidian kingdom. After Micipsa’s death, Jugurtha quickly set about having Micipsa’s two sons murdered, securing power for himself. While this unfolded, Jugurtha at various times sent envoys to Rome, and it is alleged that members of the senate, more concerned with money than with the proper course of action, were bribed by Jugurtha in order to allow his machinations to continue.\footnote{Sallust’s \textit{Jugurthine War} repeatedly accuses leading Romans of taking bribes from Jugurtha, at 25.1-4 for example.}\footnote{Kildahl (1968) 46-47} However, Adherbal and Hiempsal had been under Roman protection, and there were Italian merchants who had been killed in the violence.\footnote{Kildahl (1968) 46-47} Accordingly the Senate was forced to declare war, and Lucius Calpurnius Bestia, consul in 111, was sent to Africa, with Aemilius Scaurus as his lieutenant, the leading man in the senate at this time. Scaurus
was among those accused by Sallust of accepting the money of Jugurtha.\textsuperscript{169} This initial campaign resulted in Jugurtha’s surrender, but he was offered highly favourable terms. Jugurtha, now having been summoned to Rome, through more bribery ensured that he was acquitted and was therefore able to secure his throne. However, a botched assassination attempt of a potential usurper who was also in Rome led to Jugurtha’s expulsion from Rome and the continuation of the war.\textsuperscript{170}

Another consul, Spurius Albinus, commanded an army against Jugurtha in Africa, but was unable to force a decisive engagement. Nearing the end of his term as consul, Albinus was required to return to Rome and left his brother Aulus in charge of the army. Supposedly through bribery, Jugurtha managed to defeat the Roman army under Aulus and forced those who surrendered to march under the yoke, a sign of great shame. The army was forced to leave Numidia, and fell into a state of disarray.\textsuperscript{171}

This was the situation inherited by Metellus, who was elected consul for 109 BCE and was sent to Numidia with Marius. Though Marius had fallen out with the Metelli, the relationship must have been rehabilitated to some degree in order for Marius to have been selected for this position.\textsuperscript{172} To Metellus’ credit, he commanded the army well, unlike those who preceded him. He reintroduced discipline into the army and began strategically reducing the resources of Jugurtha, seizing towns, like Vaga, and, perhaps somewhat ironically, bribing away Jugurtha’s own envoys whom Jugurtha sent to negotiate with the Romans.\textsuperscript{173} A battle took place near the Muthul River, where the Romans anticipated a
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Numidian surprise attack and successfully drove them off, although most were able to escape under cover of darkness.\textsuperscript{174} Jugurtha continued to recruit into his army, and Metellus decided that he would not join battle directly, but continue to wage war by attrition.\textsuperscript{175} The strategy was a successful one, but it was time-consuming, and the war dragged on and on.

With winter approaching, Marius was sent to forage for food at the town of Sicca. He was ambushed, however, and narrowly escaped a trap by not remaining in the town. Quickly after leaving, however, he turned around and attacked the enemy behind him, who had assumed that he would continue his withdrawal. Instead this enemy was put to flight. Subsequently Marius was recalled to the aid of the main army, which had come under attack by the Numidians. The Numidians had overwhelmed the Roman camp, but Marius was able to clear them out when he arrived to help. However, they escaped under cover of darkness once again.\textsuperscript{176}

The armies now rejoined, Metellus sought to capture the stronghold at Zama. The city was well-protected by strong walls, however, and the siege looked to be a difficult one. The Romans proved unable to capture the city before winter, and they camped in Tunisia, close to the eastern border of Numidia. Thus the war dragged on yet longer. Metellus managed to turn Jugurtha’s ally Bomilcar, the same man who had implicated Jugurtha in the attempted assassination of the Numidian usurper mentioned above. Metellus attempted to use this man to broker a peace, but was unable to do so. It seemed no matter what he tried, Metellus could not end the war.\textsuperscript{177}
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Shortly thereafter, Marius sought permission to return to Rome and stand for the consulship. Metellus objected, suggesting that Marius wait until Metellus’ son was old enough to stand as his colleague.\(^{178}\) However, Marius in the end received permission to head for Rome, and was elected consul for 107 BCE. This position he won largely by publicly discrediting his commander Metellus, inciting the passion of the people against the nobility.\(^{179}\) Despite Marius’ election, the senate renewed Metellus’ command in Numidia. However, by means of a plebiscite, Marius was able to have this decision vetoed and assume command.\(^{180}\) Before returning to Africa, however, Marius began his reforms of the Roman legions, for which he is highly renowned.

Marius’ reforms to the Roman legions were many. First, he eliminated the need for a potential recruit to possess a certain amount of property, and allowed the *capite censi*, those men who were counted in the census by their heads as they did not have any property worth considering, to join the legions. Marius also is said to have restructured the legion, changing the basic tactical unit from the maniple to the cohort. Marius also took steps to greatly reduce the baggage train of the army. He took the *Aquila* as the universal standard for the legion.\(^{181}\) Finally, he made amendments to the heavy javelin carried by the legionaries. Other reforms are variously attributed to Marius, but the evidence is not strong enough to make any definitive statements concerning these. The dating of these reforms is not altogether clear, and they must have taken some time. It is unlikely that they were all completed immediately after Marius was first elected consul. Nevertheless, they will
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all be discussed here, and attention to issues regarding dating will be brought up where necessary.

Marius’ most famous reform is perhaps his recruitment of the *capite censi* into the army. Before Marius took control of the legion, recruitment was done through a process known as the *dilectus*, which was essentially a levy of citizens. These men were required to own a certain amount of property to serve in the legions.\(^{182}\) The poorest soldiers fought as *velites*, who were light-armed troops. Next were the *hastati* and *principes*, who were more heavily armed and fought with swords. Finally, the *triarii* fought in the back. These were the oldest soldiers and fought with spears, serving as a last line of defense. The *velites*, stationed in the front, opened the fighting by launching their missile weapons, and then retreated through gaps in the line. Then the *hastati* and *principes* joined battle, and were able to fall back to the rear, to the support of the *triarii*, if under pressure. This was the basis of the *triplex acies* formation.\(^{183}\) This style of fighting was effective against dense formations of men, but was liable to be swarmed by more open formations.\(^{184}\) The legion was subdivided into maniples, its basic tactical unit, which was typically made up of two centuries, or around 120 fighting men.\(^{185}\) In very brief terms this is the basic tactical organization of the pre-Marian legion.

Marius changed this by allowing the *capite censi*, the poorest Roman citizens, to serve in the legion. The term *capite censi* comes from the fact that they were counted in the census by their head and not by their property.\(^{186}\) This had far-reaching consequences
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both militarily and politically, although Marius seems not to have foreseen the political effects. Instead, Marius saw the reform as an immediate answer to a problem. Namely, he needed more troops and could not get them through traditional means, and so he created a way to obtain them.\textsuperscript{187}

It has been argued that this was not a drastic reform, but rather the culmination and permanent adoption of a trend in lowering the property requirements for the army which had already been occurring for a long period of time, or that the difficulty of the evidence pertaining to property requirements is poor and difficult to interpret.\textsuperscript{188} However, the velites, the class of soldier that was the poorest, was eliminated around this same time and the legion became equipped in a more standardized manner. This means that, even if poorer and poorer soldiers were being allowed into the legions in the period leading up to Marius’ career, the elimination of the velites and the standardization of equipment make the reform significant all the same.\textsuperscript{189}

These volunteer soldiers had numerous benefits. For one, it increased the pool of men from which an army might be drawn. In addition, since the soldiers were volunteers and tended to be poor, they had no livelihood outside of the army. This meant that they were more willing to campaign for longer periods of time, even if the campaign did not promise to be particularly profitable in terms of booty.\textsuperscript{190} These men were reliant on the military for their income. On the other hand, soldiers who were farmers on their own time could not endure long campaigns away from home, as their farms would go untended and would become unprofitable. Since the pool of potential recruits was larger, Marius was
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able to rely on soldiers who were happier to be on campaign, eliminating the need to bring
those who might bring with them a poor attitude.\textsuperscript{191} Along with this came changes in
training. Notably, Marius made use of gladiatorial training in order to improve the hand-
to-hand combat skills of his men. This, however, was not a unique idea, and Marius
probably borrowed it from Publius Rutilius Rufus, a contemporary of his. Thus the
military became a more professionalized institution rather than a levy of citizens who
served out of duty to the state and to protect their own interests.\textsuperscript{192}

There were downsides to this reform. Simply put, the soldiers were poor. They had
no life to return to after their service was complete. Because of this, they became reliant
on the support of their commander. At this time, land grants for veterans of the army were
not common, because typically the soldiers already possessed land. Therefore, in order to
secure property for their retirement, soldiers became reliant on their commanders for land
grants.\textsuperscript{193} This only aggravated the problems experienced by the poor in the Late Republic.
Nevertheless, the opening of the legions to the \textit{capite censi} was a far-reaching reform that
had long-term implications to the structure and culture of the Roman army.

Another very significant reform to the Roman legion brought about around this
time was the adoption of the cohort as the basic tactical unit instead of the maniple. It is
important to note that this change cannot be firmly dated and no ancient source
deliberately attributes this reform to Marius.\textsuperscript{194} However, there is evidence that the camps
in the Numantine campaign in the 130s BCE used maniples as the standard tactical unit.\textsuperscript{195}
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By the time of Caesar, the cohort as the base unit is standard.\textsuperscript{196} Thus the window for the change is established. It is logical that Marius was the man to bring about the change. He was a preeminent military leader; he held the consulship, as will be discussed, for five consecutive years; he took command of an army that was experiencing a decline in efficiency; and he is known to have made other changes to the army. The adoption of the cohort over the manipular system and the \textit{triplex acies} logically would follow the standardization of equipment necessitated by the admittance of the \textit{capite censi} into the army.\textsuperscript{197} Sallust makes use of the term cohort in his commentary on the Jugurthine War,\textsuperscript{198} but this is not a necessarily a guarantee that it was used as the primary tactical unit at this time. Despite a lack of firm certainty around its dating, the reform definitely took place it is logical to assume that Marius is responsible for this reform.

The use of the cohort over the maniple provided a number of advantages. First, it reduced the number of potential gaps in the line, as it resulted in larger individual units. Matthew argues that this may explain its adoption in the context of the German invaders later in Marius’ career, as their free-flowing style of warfare would have been able to successfully exploit gaps in the line.\textsuperscript{199} This argument would place the reform after the Jugurthine War. A further advantage is that the cohort is more able to turn about and project force in various directions, rather than only forward as a line.\textsuperscript{200} In addition, the adoption of the cohort over the maniple meant that the commander of a legion had fewer different pieces to move around. This might mean a reduction in the number of individual
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moving parts, but it meant that planning a battle and laying out dispositions was much simpler and easier, and therefore resulted in an increase and not a decrease in tactical flexibility. Therefore the adoption of the cohort was important to the re-emergence of the Roman army as the premier force of the ancient world.

Marius is also famous for his logistical reforms to the Roman army. Plutarch dates these to 104 BCE. Prior to Marius, the Roman army was encumbered by a large baggage train with many pack animals, which inhibited the army’s ability to travel quickly, especially over rough terrain. Marius greatly reduced this train by introducing the *furca*, a forked pole which allowed the Roman soldier to carry a greater amount of weight by distributing the weight across the body. Marius may have been influenced by his time under Scipio Aemilianus in this regard. This led to the soldiers being referred to as “Marius’ Mules.” The Roman soldier was now expected to carry his kit for fighting, as well as cooking gear, rations, and trenching equipment. It is estimated that a Roman soldier had to carry 20kg in addition to his arms. The reduction in the baggage train improved the speed of the army, and the increased burden of the soldier made them more physically fit when it came time actually to fight.

Marius is credited with the adoption of the *Aquila*, the eagle, as the universal standard of the legions. The universal standard must have improved esprit-de-corps among the troops, helping develop a sense of unity in the legions. The eagle became a powerful symbol for the army. It was disastrous if it was lost, and it was a significant event
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if a general or politician secured the return of a standard that had previously been lost. Its adoption demonstrates Marius’ appreciation for the importance of morale and unity in an army.

The final major reform with which Marius is credited is a change to the *pilum*, the javelin thrown by Roman soldiers before a general engagement. Marius made one of the bolts fixing the head of the javelin in place breakable, so that the head would become bent after making contact with the enemy. In this way, the *pilum* could not be removed and thrown back at the enemy. Further, if it became lodged in the shield or other equipment of the enemy, it was troublesome to remove. This could lead to increased disorder in the enemy ranks. Though somewhat more minor in scope than some of Marius’ other reforms, it is still a significant change.

These changes did not occur immediately, and they were not all ideas that were unique to Marius, but for the most part they became standardized during and after Marius’ time in power. This is probably both because the reforms themselves were sound, and also because Marius was a proven commander, and so it seemed natural to leave his reforms in place.

It was with these reforms that Marius was able to establish himself as the premier military commander in Rome, and it was in Numidia in 107 BCE, having recently earned the consulship for the first time, that Marius would first have the chance to do so. It was at the time of Marius’ election as consul that another important figure arrived on the scene. This was Lucius Cornelius Sulla, a talented young noble Roman who later came a dictator.

---

For now, though Sulla had been elected quaestor, and was tasked with recruiting and training cavalry for Marius’ army.  

The strategy Marius employed in Numidia was similar to that of Metellus, though more effective. At the outset, Marius avoided major engagements, instead fighting small skirmishes and taking lightly defended areas. In doing so, he whittled away at Jugurtha’s resources while at the same time giving his new recruits a taste of battle, hardening them. Eventually though, Marius did strike at a major fortified city. This was the city of Capsa. It laid across the desert, which would take three days to cross. Marius had cattle butchered and used the hides to make water containers, allowing the troops to take with them more food and water. His logistical planning and swift movement allowed him to advance on the city unexpectedly, and he took it with only minimal losses.

Shortly thereafter, Marius learned of the location of Jugurtha’s treasury, at some remote and desolate fortress. Though remote and well-defended, Marius knew he had to deprive the Numidians of resources in order to beat them, and so resolved to take the treasury. He once again quickly marched his army to the site, but here Marius faced a problem. The treasury was not able to be taken by storm. It was through good fortune, this time, that a Ligurian soldier in Marius’ army found an obscure path which might lead a body of men behind the fortifications of the enemy. Marius selected a small force to climb the steep trail, instructing them to attack the enemy’s rear when the signal was given. When the battle was joined, this small detachment did as instructed, and the Numidians, believing they were to be surrounded, surrendered to Marius.
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While Marius had seized Jugurtha’s treasury, the Numidian king still had an ally in Bocchus, the king of Mauretania. Bocchus was sheltering and aiding Jugurtha, making it once again incredibly difficult for the Romans to bring the war to an end. For the time being, Bocchus remained allied with Jugurtha and so made war on the Romans. The Mauretanians ambushed the Romans while they sought an area to camp for the winter, but Marius was able to rally his men and withdraw to a hilltop in order to reorganize. The Mauretanians thought they had won a victory, and celebrated through the night. However, at dawn, the Romans counterattacked and routed the force, seizing most of their weapons and standards.²¹²

Marius knew he had to decisively defeat the Numidians, or else capture Jugurtha. Accordingly he made plans to lure them into a major encounter. It was while marching to winter quarters that Jugurtha and Bocchus made a large attack on the Roman army, and Marius was ready for them. Bocchus opened the assault, attacking the rear of the force, but the Romans, here under Sulla’s command, routed their foe after the Romans were momentarily tricked into believing that Marius had been slain; the notion was dispelled after Marius appeared in sight of the troops, having defeated Jugurtha’s attack on the Roman vanguard. The attacks on the flank were also unsuccessful, and the enemy was forced to flee. The Romans here inflicted great casualties on the enemy, but did not capture their leaders.²¹³

Shortly after this battle, Bocchus sent envoys to Marius in order to negotiate. He requested that the Romans send officers to such an end. The negotiations did not provide immediate fruits, as Bocchus continued to change his mind. Negotiations between the
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Romans and envoys of Bocchus once again took place, this time at Cirta, and the Mauretanian was convinced to hand over Jugurtha.\textsuperscript{214} Sulla was sent to Bocchus to continue to negotiate. This mission was dangerous, as there was no guarantee that the Numidians would not attack Sulla’s small detachment on its way. Apparently evading a force of Jugurtha on his way, Sulla arrived to negotiate with Bocchus. Sulla convinced Bocchus to hand over Jugurtha. When the Numidians arrived, Jugurtha’s guard was eliminated and the king was captured. Sulla returned him to Marius, thus essentially ending the war. Sulla could perhaps claim responsibility for the deed that ended the war, but as supreme commander, the credit was owed to Marius and he was accordingly granted a triumph.\textsuperscript{215}

Although the exact dates of events in the war are suspect, it is known that Marius did not return to Rome until after the elections of 105 BCE. Marius was once again elected consul, this time \textit{in absentia}, for 104 BCE. Rome had another threat to face, this time in the form of invaders from Germany. While Marius’ political career had been advancing and while he had been campaigning in Africa, the Roman army elsewhere was experiencing a decline in its combat efficiencies in the face of these invaders. The Romans suffered many defeats in the final decades of the second century BCE, some of them catastrophic. The Roman governor of Macedonia, Sextus Pompeius, was defeated by the Scordisci in 119 BCE; A consular army under the command of Papirius Carbo was defeated by advancing barbarians in 113 BCE; the same tribesmen who defeated Carbo also defeated Junius Silanus in 109; Lucius Cassius Longinus was defeated in 107 by the Tigurini; and the Romans suffered a massive defeat at the hands of the Cimbri at Arausio.
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in 105 BCE. These defeats were perhaps a symptom of the fact that Romans did not, in general, seem to elect their leaders based on military command potential even if they recognized those leaders that possessed it, and further, before the successive commands of Marius, the Roman army had no uniformity in its commanders, which also may have negatively affected the army.

The Battle of Arausio perhaps best demonstrates the dire military straits the Romans were facing in the time of Marius’ early career. While there were other defeats, Arausio was massive, and caused dissatisfaction toward the senatorial class. Two Roman armies were present for the battle. On the east bank of the Rhone River, Cn. Mallius Maximus, consul in 105, had an army of around 40,000 men, and on the west bank, Q. Servilius Caepio had an army of similar size. For whatever reason – perhaps because Mallius was not from an aristocratic background – Caepio refused to join his army with that of Mallius on the other side of the river even though Mallius was technically the senior commander as consul. Eventually, Caepio did cross the river, although the armies remained separated. Caepio’s army was nearer to the enemy. Thus the armies were engaged separately, and both were defeated. It was a disaster for the Romans. The defeat of such a large force signaled that the advance of the Cimbri was indeed an emergency, and also that Rome needed a commander with the ability to meet the present threat.

Fortunately for Rome, Marius, newly returned from Africa, was the man to face the threat. From the outset, Marius experienced good fortune in this campaign. Having defeated the Romans several times in the field, the barbarians unexpectedly did not
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advance on Italy, but instead travelled west, giving the Romans, and Marius, time to breathe.\textsuperscript{219} Marius, wanting to bring with him as capable a staff as possible, consented to have Sulla join his army as a legate, despite the personal enmity that existed between the two.\textsuperscript{220}

In early 104 BCE Marius marched into Gaul. By this time Marius’ reforms led to the rise in authority of the centurion, who became more responsible for tactical movement on the battlefield. Meanwhile more senior officers were less responsible for field manoeuvres and more for planning.\textsuperscript{221} By this time the eagle standard, the \textit{aquilifer}, had been adopted, and the legions had been given names, increasing the sense of belonging and \textit{esprit-de-corps} of the men.\textsuperscript{222} These reforms, in conjunction with Marius’ strict training regimen and enforcement of discipline, as well as his abilities as a commander in the field, meant that the army was now ready for war.

Marius, in no real hurry, looked for an area suitable for his legions to wage war. Knowing he had time, to prevent his men from becoming idle and restless, Marius directed his men to construct a famous canal, the \textit{Fossa Mariana}, at Massila on the Rhone River.\textsuperscript{223} A feat of engineering in itself, this construction project served to occupy the troops as well as maintain their physical fitness and readiness. This is consistent with Marius’ overall treatment of his armies.

Marius at this time needed to be mindful of political in addition to military affairs. He enlisted the help of Lucius Appuleius Saturninus, who in 103 BCE secured land grants
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for Marius’ veterans. This was necessary to maintain the favour of his army as well as to maintain the attractive appearance of the army to volunteers, since there was no standard in place for grants to army veterans.\footnote{Cagniart (2007) 82} As the Germans did not attack right away, fear of the threat dwindled, and with it Marius’ political support. Marius, in the face of the German threat, was all the same elected consul for 103 BCE as well as 102. In 102 he had for his colleague as consul Quintus Lutatius Catulus. Marius remained in overall command in Gaul, however.

In 102, Marius learned that the invaders were finally advancing toward Italy. The invasion was undertaken by a coalition of tribes. The Teutones, Ambrones, Cimbri, and Tigurini all invaded from different areas.\footnote{Kildahl (1968) 108} Marius took command against the Teutones and Ambrones, invading Liguria; Catulus took command against the Cimbri, and the Tigurini were to be dealt with later.\footnote{Kildahl (1968) 108}

Marius delayed in making battle, so much so that his troops grew restless and accused Marius of being afraid. Marius, conversely was happy, because this meant his men were not afraid.\footnote{Plutarch, \textit{Life of Marius} 16.1-2} Marius would not fight until the opportune moment, at the opportune place. He outmanoeuvered the enemy army and marched to a place called Aquae Sextiae. Here an engagement developed out of a skirmish for water near a stream, in which Marius lured the barbarians into an attack on the stream. The army of the Ambrones was divided by the water and was subsequently defeated. Plutarch asserts that the engagement was an accident, developing out of a brawl, but those like Kildahl who are supportive of Marius argue that Marius meant to lure out the Ambrones in such a way,
and that the battle is ascribed to luck only out of hostility toward Marius.\textsuperscript{228} The Ambrones were nonetheless defeated, but the Teutones still remained.

The Romans did not rest that night, but completed their camp instead. The barbarians did not attack the next day either. Marius used this time to hide a contingent of troops, some 3,000 men under the command of Claudius Marcellus, in a nearby wooded area, so as to ambush the enemy unexpectedly. Marius used his cavalry to lure the Teutones into attacking uphill toward the camp, in front of which he had marshalled his army. Marius successfully forced the attacking Teutones back, and Marcellus did as instructed and attacked the enemy’s rear. The barbarians were thrown into confusion and routed.\textsuperscript{229} The Teutones and Ambrones were completely defeated, their threat to Rome eliminated.

Unfortunately, Marius’ colleague, Catulus, was not met with the same success. The Cimbri had forced passage through the Alps, and Catulus, unable to hold the Adige Valley, retreated to the south bank of the Po River. The sources are not disparaging of Catulus. Plutarch states that Catulus personally took the standard and led the retreat, to spare his soldiers the dishonour.\textsuperscript{230} Sulla was present with the army of Catulus at this time, and was responsible in large part for avoiding a full rout.\textsuperscript{231} Marius did not immediately come to the aid of Catulus after his victory, instead returning to Rome. Having been elected as consul once again for 101, he did return to help in that year, after Catulus’ own command had been extended.\textsuperscript{232}
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Marius had the army cross the Po, so as to limit their territory and keep them further from Rome. Worried that the enemy would attempt to outflank him, Marius sought a location for the battle that would impede such efforts. The location was at a place called Campi Raudii, and the battle is known as the Battle of Vercellae. Marius chose the time of the battle as well, arranging it so that the sun shone directly into the eyes of his enemies. During the battle itself, however, misfortune fell upon Marius. Plutarch relates that, according to Sulla, Marius, having been blinded by a large dust cloud, missed his charge entirely at first, and that then the majority of the fighting fell upon Catulus and Sulla, who were stationed in the center of the army. This was a curious incident for such a prominent commander, and naturally there were disagreements over who was chiefly responsible for the victory, but overall, Marius, as supreme commander and also due to his prior success, was awarded the bulk of the credit, and hailed as the third founder of Rome after the victory, so great was the perceived threat of the barbarians.

This would be the zenith of Marius’ career. Though he was elected consul again for 100 BCE, the reality of his political situation became more apparent. Throughout his string of consulships, as previously mentioned, Marius relied on the support of Lucius Appuleius Saturninus, as well as another man, Servilius Glauca. He may also have resorted to buying the needed votes. These men helped Marius retain his political relevance, and also helped secure the exile of Metellus, now an enemy of Marius. These men, however, would prove to be his political undoing. In 100, Glauca served as praetor.
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and Saturninus as tribune. Saturninus attempted to revive the ambitions of the Gracchi to distribute grain. His bill received the complete opposition of the senate.\textsuperscript{239} Marius also, through his actions in support of Saturninus, incited the wrath of the senate. Further, Saturninus wanted to grant land to war veterans once again, this time in the Po Valley, as well as in Sicily, Macedonia, and Greece.\textsuperscript{240} This attempt, as well as that of 103 BCE, was supported by violence in the Forum.\textsuperscript{241} Saturninus and Glaucia became progressively more radical in their actions, and eventually hostilities erupted took refuge on the Capitoline. Marius, forced to intervene by the political pressure of the Senate, and probably by his own desire to maintain stability, had them captured.\textsuperscript{242} Though Marius tried to save them, Saturninus and Glaucia were killed. Thus, at the end of his sixth consulship, Marius’ political support has largely eroded. He was unpopular with the senate because of his association with such demagogues as well as his frequent campaigning against them, and now unpopular with the people because of his failure to protect his former allies.\textsuperscript{243}

Marius, having failed as a peacetime politician, saw that his time as chief man in Rome was over. He did not run for a term as censor, which would have been a great capstone to a glorious career.\textsuperscript{244} Instead, Marius departed to the east, where he perhaps attempted to provoke a war with Mithridates of Pontus.\textsuperscript{245} It is also possible that he could not bear the return of Metellus, his enemy, to Rome, and left for this reason. Marius had protested this recall, but was unsuccessful.\textsuperscript{246} Upon returning to Rome, Marius did
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compete with Sulla for a command against Mithridates, although he did not earn it.\textsuperscript{247} Marius was, for the most part, now a minor figure in Rome. Marius did eventually hold another command, this time in the Social War. He was a minor commander under the consul Publius Rutilius Lupus. Lupus was killed in action and Marius assumed command of the troops and defeated the Marsi, a warlike tribe, and drove them toward Sulla’s army, where they were cut down.\textsuperscript{248} Shortly thereafter, Marius resigned his position.

By 88 BCE, Marius was weakened by age and by the life of luxury afforded to him by the wealth he had accrued throughout his career.\textsuperscript{249} The events of this period are more complicated than will be relayed here, but this shall serve to summarize Marius’ role in things. The political situation descended into violence. Sulpicius, an ally of Marius and tribune of the plebs, used armed thugs to seize power in Rome, forcing the consuls, Sulla and Pompeius Rufus, to flee. Sulpicius attempted to force Sulla to release command of the army that was now being led against Mithridates to Marius. Sulla refused the order, and successfully kept his soldiers under his command. Sulla ordered his legions to march on Rome. His officers found this abhorrent, but the soldiers obeyed. He was joined by his fellow consul, Pompeius Rufus.\textsuperscript{250}

Sulla’s soldiers entered Rome, though pillaging was strictly limited. Now Sulla began the practice of proscription, declaring his political enemies outlaws. These enemies could be killed with impunity. Marius and Sulpicius were, predictably, among those proscribed.\textsuperscript{251} Marius escaped death, however, and lived for a while as an outlaw.\textsuperscript{252} Sulla,
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now in power at Rome, attempted to return stability to the Roman government, but, in 87 BCE left to carry out his command against Mithridates. In this year, one of the elected consuls was Lucius Cinna, a friend of Marius. The other, Gnaeus Octavius, was more an ally of Sulla. The two clashed, violence erupted, and Cinna was driven from Rome.\textsuperscript{253} Cinna in response attempted to regain his position by force. Marius sent to join him. When Marius and Cinna returned to the city, they, and especially Marius, were apparently filled with bloodlust, and set about slaughtering very many Roman citizens.\textsuperscript{254} Having returned to Rome in bloody fashion, Marius was made consul for a seventh time, but died only seventeen days into his term.\textsuperscript{255}

Although Marius’ fall from grace is dramatic, and the end of his life as it is related in the ancient sources is less than dignified, it must not be allowed to detract from the amount that Marius was able to achieve. He was made consul more times than any man had been before him, including five consecutive terms. He took command of two major theatres of war and won significant victories for the Romans where many commanders before him had failed to do so, and he made significant improvements to the Roman legions while he did so. Marius was a man who was very much able to seize on an opportunity to further himself, and became the most prestigious Roman of his time in doing so.
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5: Direct Comparison and Conclusions

There are several parallels between the lives of Marius and Philip. The most obvious line of comparison between the two is through their military careers. Both Philip and Marius achieved greatness in large part due to military successes, and both men introduced critical reforms to their armies that allowed them to achieve their objectives. Both sets of reforms, when examined, were designed with many of the same philosophies in mind. Namely, both Marius and Philip created armies that relied on seasoned troops who were exposed to constant training and campaigning, forming professional or semi-professional systems that proved superior to the civilian militias that were more common in the ancient world. Further, both generals introduced logistical reforms with the aim of reducing the size of the baggage train of their armies to allow faster movements, as both Philip and Marius recognized the importance in war of maintaining the initiative, and a swifter army allowed them to do this.

Beyond their reforms, Philip and Marius both displayed similar characteristics as commanders. Both, for example, experienced their shares of military setbacks, but did not allow these obstacles to prevent them from achieving their overall military objectives, as both were men of strong spirit, and were able to convey this force of character upon their armies. Both Marius and Philip also fought multiple wars in diverse areas, and demonstrated the ability to adapt their strategies and tactics to the necessities of various situations. Marius and Philip were both also aware of the importance of religious reverence in a military context. By exploiting this, both men were able to use religion to help maintain the morale of their respective armies. This is not a characteristic unique to these two commanders in the ancient world, but it still demonstrates their understanding of the importance of morale. Both Marius and Philip were also known for their personal
toughness and excellence. A commander demonstrating personal aptitude makes them an easy figure for an army to rally behind. All of these similarities, as well as the similarities in their reform programs, will be explored in order to demonstrate principles which allowed for military excellence both in the Macedonian and the Roman contexts; the comparison will show that both men understood elements that were universally important in the success of ancient armies, and not just relevant to their own times.

Philip, having spent time in his youth as a hostage in Thebes, was afforded the opportunity to learn from their military successes. At the time, Thebes was a dominant power in Greece, and Philip was able to understand what precisely made this the case. In particular, Philip was exposed to the Theban Sacred Band, the famous group of 300 soldiers made up of pairs of homosexual lovers who constantly trained and in theory, fought harder because their lovers were among them. From this group, Philip was able to learn the value of constant training, as well as the importance of unit cohesion. It is a simple enough assumption that an army that trains constantly will fight more effectively than one that does not, but Philip was one of the first in the Greek world to create a professional class of soldiers that fought for the state and the king. This can perhaps be seen as a natural progression after the rise of mercenary soldiers in Greece, who were professional soldiers that were not particularly loyal to any state or leader. Philip drilled his troops constantly and campaigned often, but also took steps to ensure his men were loyal to Macedonia and to him as its king. This was, for some poorer troops, as simple as offering consistent pay and a way of living, but for the more ambitious, Philip offered paths for promotions and rewards based on the quality of service. By thus fostering an environment of competition, Philip created a desire for success among his soldiers, improving the quality of the army in the field, and since the rewards came from the king,
it also generated loyalty to Philip.\textsuperscript{256} This system of rewarding exceptional service was similar to that instituted by Jason of Pherae, the Thessalian leader known for his exceptional use of professional mercenary armies.\textsuperscript{257} Philip also was careful to organize his troops by the regions from which they came. In a similar vein to the Sacred Band, Philip thus created an environment in which troops, who now could foster a common identity and would be motivated to protect their countrymen and friends, would fight harder because of their organization.

Marius, a career Roman military officer, also understood the importance of seasoned troops as well as that of unit cohesion, and his military reforms reflect this understanding. Despite the varying opinions of scholars on Marius’ abandonment of the property requirements for entry into the Roman army, Marius’ acceptance of the \textit{capite censi} allowed him to make use of soldiers who were more willing to campaign constantly, since those who owned land would have needed to return home to tend to their properties and affairs. By making use of poorer soldiers who enjoyed the prospects offered through campaigning, Marius was able to heighten morale in his army. Further, the lengths of the campaigns Marius used his troops for made them more efficient combatants. The war in North Africa against Jugurtha was famous for drawing on, and Marius notably made use of his standing army to dig the \textit{Fossa Mariana}, a canal in northern Europe. This is a testament to the discipline and physical fitness of his army. Marius also made use of professionalized training of his soldiers, modeled after the gladiatorial schools of the day. Prior to Marius, the Roman army was essentially a citizen militia, like many armies of the
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classical period.\textsuperscript{258} This, coupled with the standardization of Roman troops as legionaries instead of dividing them into different classes, allowed Roman soldiers to fight effectively as units. Another reform credited to Marius is his adoption of the \textit{Aquila} as the universal standard for the Roman legions. This served to help create a sense of identity among the soldiers. Marius’ desire to create a feeling of unity for his army demonstrates that he, like Philip, had an appreciation for the importance of unit cohesion in an army, especially when it was fighting lengthy campaigns away from home.

Both Philip and Marius prioritized logistical reforms in their armies as well. In part, this goes hand in hand with the transition to a professional army, as a professional soldier is better prepared to carry his own supplies that a citizen soldier due to both discipline and physical fitness. However, both Marius and Philip introduced specific reforms with the aim of increasing logistical efficiency. In both cases, this generally took the form of soldiers carrying their own supplies instead of relying on pack animals and servants. For Marius, this took the form of the introduction of the \textit{furca}, the forked pole to which the Roman soldiers affixed packs filled with fighting gear, cooking tools, and other necessary supplies including food. This, in combination with physical fitness drills, greatly increased the ability of the Roman army to move with speed. Of this advantage Marius made great use. A prominent example is his capture of the fortified city of Capsa from the Numidians, whereby a rapid march across the desert allowed the Romans to attack the city by surprise. Further, in his campaigns against the northern barbarians, Marius is frequently seen to be choosing the locations where they would do battle. The ability of his army to move efficiently afforded him such options. Thus Marius’ logistical
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reforms allowed him to swiftly advance on his enemy and not be caught in inopportune positions. He was instead able to maintain the initiative in his wars, granting him advantage.

Philip, likewise, understood the importance of logistics to the successful waging of war, especially in longer campaigns. Like Marius, Philip reduced the size of his army’s baggage train by having his troops carry their own supplies. Although not necessarily aided by a specific device like the *furca*, Philip’s army was able to move more swiftly and through rougher terrain. This was a military asset especially important in Greece and its surrounding areas, as these locations are known for their mountainous character. Even the Athenians, and especially Demosthenes, Philip’s most ardent opponent, knew that the Macedonian army was much swifter than the Athenians and their allies. In part Demosthenes ascribes this to the slowness of the democratic process, but Philip’s army reforms were also a large contributing factor. Philip’s swift arrival at and seizure of the pass at Thermopylae prior to the Battle of Chaeronea is just one example of his ability to exploit rapid movements of the army. Demosthenes and the Athenians constantly discuss the speed and decisiveness of the Macedonians. Philip, like Marius, understood the necessity of an army that was both fast and well-supplied, and through his reforms ensured that he had this at his disposal. For both Philip and Marius, the reduction of the baggage train and the number of camp followers was critical in allowing the army to move quickly, and this granted a significant tactical advantage to both the Macedonians under Philip and the Romans under Marius.
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Although it did not necessarily take similar forms, Philip and Marius both greatly changed the organizational structure of their armies. Under Philip, the Macedonians became a much more regimented and structured military machine. By transforming his military into a well-organized professional entity, Philip was able to make use of different formations and tactics depending on the situation at hand. This includes the wedge formation for cavalry charges, which allowed heavy cavalry to penetrate lines of infantry; as well as various infantry formations, including lines of various depths and infantry squares. The organization of the infantry was made all the more powerful by the adoption of the *sarissa*, a pike which provided Philip’s army with a greater offensive reach than the traditional Greek armies of the day due to its substantial length. By ensuring his army was well-organized, Philip was able to exploit his superior tactical abilities on the battlefield.

Marius, too, made organizational reforms to the Roman army in adopting the cohort rather than the maniple as the basic tactical unit of the army. A larger basic individual unit allowed for fewer gaps in the battle line, but the division of the army into smaller units allowed for field commanders to separate and act independently as the need arose. Matthew speculates that Marius adopted to cohort as a means of presenting a more unified line against the invading Germans since they relied on a mass charge tactic in battle, which would have been able to exploit the natural gaps in the front created by the structure of the *quincunx* formation. Marius’ and Philip’s organizational reforms were significant for similar tactical reasons.

Aside from their reforms, Philip and Marius both displayed similar characteristics in terms of their personalities and in how they commanded their armies. Marius in
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particular was seen as a sort of ideal Roman soldier. His men recognized within him an exceptional toughness, and he was famous for continuing his physical training even after he had passed the prime of his career.\textsuperscript{261} They knew that he was brave and strong, and these are attributes which coincide greatly with reliability in the mind of a soldier. Marius is known for having partaken in the toils of the common soldiers, which endeared him to the rank and file.\textsuperscript{262} Further, Marius’ continued success on the battlefield no doubt contributed to his perception as an excellent general. Marius appeared in an era of regression for the Roman army. They had suffered a number of large and humiliating defeats before Marius took control of the military. Although the turnaround arguably began with Metellus, it was Marius who capitalized on the changes and ended the Jugurthine War, and it was Marius who commanded the Romans when they decisively defeated the barbarians invading from the north. Marius’ ability to not only win these battles but to successfully capitalize on the popular opinion that came from his victories contributed to the loyalty of his army, which in turn made the army more effective in battle.

Philip, likewise, displayed many personal characteristics of an ideal military leader to the Macedonians. Notably, he led his armies from the front, and was constantly exposed to danger. And for his trouble, Philip suffered a number of serious wounds as a result of this habit. While this perhaps seems a little foolhardy to modern sensibilities, and even to the ancient Greeks, as Isocrates criticized Philip for endangering himself despite his own importance, to the ancient Macedonians it proved that Philip was strong and courageous,
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which was as important to him as it was to Marius. Philip was famously charismatic as well, which no doubt contributed to his popularity among his staff, who would have had to work closely with him. This was a trait in which Philip certainly exceeded Marius, who was known for his gruffness and in some cases his unpopularity with the officers serving directly under him. It is possible, however, that these accounts are hostile toward Marius for personal and political reasons. He was popular with his senior officers in his early career, like Scipio Aemilianus, and so could not have been absolutely without social grace. This personal charisma must have been very important for Philip, especially early on in his career, as he would have had to have convinced the other Macedonian aristocrats that he was the right man to follow. Like Marius, Philip also benefitted from his initial successes in the field. His men had no reason to doubt him in the field; they knew they were in the hands of the most competent commander possible. Thus under Philip, just like under Marius, the troops had the best chance to earn rewards. This encouraged them to fight better. They knew they could trust their commander to make good decisions, and they knew that the commander would ensure they were properly rewarded.

In many ways the military careers of Philip and Marius were very different, but there are enough similarities to draw a parallel. Marius started off more slowly. As he was born into a house with only minor social standing, Marius began his career by moving through the ranks as a Roman officer. He served adequately and if the anecdotes in his biographies are to be believed, he was marked for distinction by his superiors before he reached his peak. By the time Marius was in overall command of the Roman army, he
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was already a proven officer. He inherited a difficult situation with the war against Jugurtha. It was, to the consternation of the Roman politicians, a protracted conflict in which it was difficult to force a decision. Still, Marius through quick movements and ultimately through craftiness and deception was able to effect an end to the conflict. This did not come without difficulties, however. As mentioned, the war against Jugurtha was a long and difficult one, and ultimately Marius did not in fact force a decision on the field of battle. It was one of his lieutenants, Lucius Cornelius Sulla, who was ultimately credited with the deed that ended the war. Further, during the course of the war in Numidia there were a number of situations from which Marius and the Romans only barely escaped. Though it was a springboard for his career, it was hardly a clean and easy victory.

Nevertheless, Marius was awarded a triumph for the success against Jugurtha and was perceived by the Romans as the preeminent commander of his day. His success led to his election as consul for five consecutive terms. He was chosen because he was seen as the man most capable of defeating the Germanic tribes who threatened Rome from the north. As commander of the army he defeated the invaders in a series of battles, even if some of the sources say he suffered some personal embarrassments which probably originated from writers who were particularly hostile to Marius. These must not have been too severe, for Marius was still awarded great honours by the Romans, and was named the third founder of the city. This marked the height of his career. He saw some success as an officer during the Social War before falling into political obscurity in his later years.

By contrast, Philip’s rise was meteoric. As a member of the royal family, he was naturally among those in the best position to succeed the late king Amyntas. Philip quickly eliminated his rivals and restored the Macedonians to a position of military strength, quickly offering a demonstration of his prowess. Philip fought bitterly in the early years
of his reign and rapidly increased the power of his kingdom, whereas the power of Rome was already well-established by the time of Marius. Philip’s Macedon had not yet earned the respect of the Greek world, by contrast.

Philip’s kingdom saw a massive increase in power and prosperity directly as a result of his military successes. Philip was constantly gaining new territory. This differs with Marius, whose wars were mostly defensive; he had to fight to maintain the power Rome had already accumulated. It is possible to argue that Philip was the more impressive general on these grounds. It historically is always seen as a positive to bring new territories under one’s control, and Marius’ time as commander did not result in Rome gaining new and prosperous lands. However, to make the comparison on this basis is unfair to Marius since Rome already controlled such a large area. The strategic needs of the Romans in his time did not permit him to be a conquering general, as Rome’s military concerns were mostly defensive on the heels of the defeats they had suffered leading up to Marius’ time, and in addition the political situation at home had deteriorated significantly.

The Macedonians before Philip, however, controlled relatively little territory, and in order to become a great power relative to the rest of the Greeks, and later to the Mediterranean world, Philip needed to add to his holdings. While Philip was also no stranger to defensive wars, as his holdings were faced with enemies on all sides when he first ascended the throne, for the most part Philip’s campaigns, especially the most famous ones, were either offensive or at least interventionist wars. Philip was constantly taking control of valuable territory, perhaps most notably the port of Amphipolis, which was a bone of contention for the Athenians throughout Philip’s career. Further, through the Third Sacred War, Philip became directly involved in the Greek political sphere, allowing him to intervene militarily in Greece proper without being seen as a foreign invader. This
dangerous precedent was in part what allowed him to move his armies south and force a confrontation between himself and the other Greek states.

The Jugurthine War, over which Marius did hold a command, was a foreign war, but it was not a war of conquest. Rome was a reluctant participant against an opponent that did not threaten Italy’s soil directly, but who did perpetrate violence against Roman citizens who were stationed abroad in Africa. The war against Jugurtha did not directly add to Rome’s holdings, but it did neutralize a difficult political situation. Still though, the differences between this outcome and the result of Philip’s campaigning throughout his career are stark.

This does lead in to one of the most significant aspects of both Philip’s and Marius’ career. Both of them were career generals who fought in and led in diverse environments and against a variety of enemies. Philip fought against a large variety of different tribes and peoples. The types of troops he faced were diverse, and the territories in which he engaged in battle were often rough and difficult. While Philip’s military career is perhaps highlighted by his domination of the Greeks in battle, he showed the ability to take cities by siege, to defeat tribal enemies like those found in Thrace, to make use of emerging technologies like catapults on the field of battle, and to adopt new tactics including innovative use of cavalrymen. Philip’s adaptability in battle is one of the most important aspects of what made him such an outstanding field commander.

Marius, likewise, was able to adopt his style of battle to face different threats. He successfully continued the war of attrition against Jugurtha which had been begun by Metellus, continuing to capture territory and weakening the Numidians’ position until, with Sulla’s aid, he forced a decision. When the tactical and strategic necessities of the war were different against the invading Germans during Marius’ string of consulships,
Marius changed his tactics to defeat a massed army of enemies in a pitched battle, using both tactical innovations as well as ambush and flanking tactics at the Battle of Aquae Sextiae. Thus Marius too was able to adopt different measures as the situation demanded them, a talent which cannot be understated in the military world.

There are many different comparisons that emerge between the military careers of Marius and Philip. Both were highly innovative commanders who brought about significant structural and tactical reforms to the armies of which they gained command. It is clear that their reforms focused on similar areas, notably including logistical reforms. These reforms in particular are significant because they granted their armies the ability to march quickly which provided significant tactical advantage to the commander. The impact of this was bolstered by standardized training in both cases, which contributed to marching speeds through increased physical fitness but also allowed the armies to execute more complicated manoeuvres through regular drills. Though this seems evident in our modern world where national armies of professional soldiers are the norm, in the ancient world this idea was still not ubiquitous. Both commanders also demonstrated flexibility in their strategies and tactics. The ability to adapt their methods to the challenge at hand combined with their military aptitude allowed Philip and Marius to both achieve successes which they may not have been able to had they constantly employed the same tactics at every place. By contrast, the Greeks continued to use standard hoplite armies against Philip even later in his career when the Macedonian method was already showing its superiority, and the ideological inflexibility of Roman commanders before Marius led to several defeats in the field. These aspects of military command and organization are not unique to Philip and Marius in history, but were exceptional in their day. Logistics, speed,
training, discipline, and adaptability are always critical for a successful army, regardless of the time period.

Outside the realm of the military, there are several political comparisons that can be drawn between Philip and Marius as well. Notably, both the Roman Republic and the Greek system of independent *poleis* were both already showing their weaknesses by the times of Marius and Philip respectively. Taking advantage of these issues allowed both men to reach unprecedented levels of power. Nonetheless, the Roman Republic was evidently a massively different political system than the more primitive Macedonian military monarchy, and this meant that the political obstacles faced by Marius were different than those faced by Philip. In spite of these differences, Marius and Philip in some ways displayed the same sort of political opportunism that allowed them to acquire and maintain their power through means outside the military. Both were willing to engage in underhanded political tactics to achieve their goals, as well. These similarities and differences are worth exploring because the political difficulties that allow military means to gain supremacy over governing institutions are common across eras. It is also important to highlight the skills that both leaders used throughout their career. This is especially true in the case of Marius, as he is often unfairly criticized as lacking in political ability. The fact that he overcame his modest origins, the fact that he used many untraditional methods to grow his influence, and the sheer height of success that he reached all suggest that Marius was best characterized by the cunning and decisiveness he used to bring about his ambitions; he was more than just a general.

Although this is not the time and place to delve into the full intricacies of the political machinery of the Roman Republic, the fact that such complex institutions existed created a vastly different political climate for Marius than the one with which Philip had
to deal. However, that is not to say that Philip did not himself have to navigate his share of political obstacles. Although Philip was a member of the Argead dynasty, his succession was not based on a constitutional mechanism. This is why there were many rival claimants to the throne when Philip first ascended. Philip had to prove himself a worthy king to the Macedonian nobles, and also deal with the rival claimants directly through military action or other means. His kingship was not official until it was recognized by the military assembly. Macedonia was a militaristic society, and so much of Philip’s power was linked to his martial aptitude. After Philip secured the support of the military and eliminated the threat from pretenders, his position was more or less permanent. While he always had to be wary of political rivals and other dangers, and had to maintain his support from the army, Philip’s reign was not bound by a fixed term like that of a Roman consul; he did not have to stand for re-election.

Marius, meanwhile, did not deal with rival claimants to a throne, but with rival candidates in political elections. As a politician in the Roman republic, Marius was expected to follow the *cursus honorum*, the path of offices that would eventually lead a political figure to the consulship. Marius’ political career began with his service in the army, which was expected of young men who wished to enter public life. After this, Marius was to stand for various posts within the government, which eventually culminated in his election as consul during the Jugurthine War, a feat all the more impressive because of Marius’ status as a *novus homo*. The Romans, not fond of kings, designed their political system in order to specifically prevent individuals from achieving the level of political power which Philip gained. Thus consuls always served as pairs rather than as individuals, and they usually did not serve consecutive terms; normally a ten-year period was supposed
Marius would go on to break this political norm during his wars against the Germanic tribes to the north. Leveraging the threat posed by the horde of barbarians, Marius reached a height of political success that was up to that point unprecedented in Roman history.

Both Philip and Marius were political opportunists who were able to identify advantageous situations and seize upon them. Marius demonstrated this clearly when he sought his first consulship. Acting against the advice of his commander Metellus, Marius ran a campaign that spoke poorly of that patron, capitalizing on the fact that the Jugurthine conflict had drawn on too long, and that the people were tired of the lengthy foreign war. In fact Marius’ strategies were not much different than those of Metellus, but he was able to convince the people that he could act more swiftly, and this was all he needed to secure his election. In addition, Marius was successfully able to identify the opportunities to enrich himself throughout his career. Through his astuteness he was able to acquire the wealth needed to gain influence in Rome. Marius is said to have become one of the wealthiest men in Rome by the end of his career, despite the fact that he came from a relatively meagre background. He also was capable of seizing on a time when popular support for the noble ruling class was dwindling. His first campaign for consulship, in addition to being against the wishes of Metellus, also came at a time of public dissatisfaction with Rome’s aristocrats, a factor which no doubt benefitted the *novus homo*. Marius was also able to leverage another military emergency into a five-year series of successive consulships. Like Philip, the Romans valued military expertise, and this was doubly true in a time when their commanders had failed several times in the field, often
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spectacularly. Thus in many ways Marius was excellent at identifying and capitalizing on advantages when they came up.

In Philip’s case, his vision stretched externally rather than internally. Philip was able to recognize that after a century of infighting, the Greek city-states were no longer strong enough to offer resistance to a quick, professional army. Even the power and influence of the Thebans, who for much of the fourth century seemed to be on the rise, was ground down by decades of incessant conflict and warfare. Philip saw first-hand the weakness of the Greek militaries while he systematically removed any claim Athens might have had to its territories in the north, and further when he intervened in the Third Sacred War. While he did not seem seek out open warfare with the Greeks, when it came down to it Philip knew his armies would defeat the ramshackle Greek coalition. Philip was also able to make use of a wide array of political skills and tools. He frequently identified the best way to deal with problems, whether the solution was bribery, marriage, deceit, alliance, or battle. It is worthwhile to note, however, that since Philip was an autocratic ruler he was freer to choose his methods than Marius, who had to answer to the Roman Senate and other political bodies. He was constantly able to buy time when needed, and to act decisively when the opportunity arose. Philip was also able to identify territories that generated strategic resources and capture them or otherwise bring them under his control, notably Amphipolis but also Thessaly and others. He further placed emphasis on economic development within his holdings, and in doing so vastly increased the wealth available to the Macedonian state. Thus Marius and Philip were both similar in their ability to identify crucial opportunities for advancement, and were decisive in seizing upon them.

In many ways, Philip and Marius maintained their power in similar ways, despite the differences in their political environments. Both certainly were popular in large part
because of their military successes. This was especially true for Marius, whose career outside of the military was rather pedestrian. Marius’ first election was won based on claims of military efficiency, and his string of five consulships came in the wake of a frightening defeat by a foreign invader. Naturally Rome chose its most prominent military leader to govern during this period. Equally important was his use of the military at home, however. By supporting his army and his veterans in his policies in Rome, notably through land grants and other benefits, Marius ensured that he would keep their support. Unfortunately for Marius, it is true, he used Saturninus to achieve this, and that particular political alliance had disastrous consequences for Marius once Saturninus turned rogue.

Philip, meanwhile, was the ruler of a society which was, essentially, wholly militaristic, especially before his reign. Therefore, had he not been successful as a military leader, he would have been deposed rather quickly, whether because a pretender would have bested him in the field or because the Macedonian nobles would have refused to follow him. Like Marius, Philip ensured that his army stayed loyal to him through good rates of pay and awards of booty when campaigns were successful. This was important for military morale but also for Philip to maintain the support of the Macedonian noblemen, who were not only the backbone of his military but also the key to his political security, and a group which historically was hard to control fully. As a king, Philip was not subject to term limits or political hierarchies like Marius, but nevertheless he had to leverage his military capabilities in order to stabilize his rule. For both Philip and Marius, therefore, control of the military was key to their political power and they both recognized this.

---
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Both Philip and Marius had similar political obstacles to overcome as well. Both began their careers outside the primary political arena of their geographic areas. Philip may have been a member of the royal Macedonian bloodline, but that meant little in the grand scheme of things at the time, since Macedon would scarcely have qualified even as a minor regional power at the time of Philip’s ascension. Philip inherited a kingdom besieged on all sides by enemies which had just been dealt a crushing defeat. Even once Philip had stabilized his own position, he was not immediately accepted into the larger sphere of Greek politics. The Greeks viewed the Macedonians as semi-barbarous tribesmen. In their own eyes, the Greeks were more culturally and politically developed. The Macedonian kings saw themselves as Greeks, and even before Philip had made attempts to earn the favour of their southern neighbors.²⁶⁹ Because of this perceived barbarism, when it came time to deal with the Greeks politically, Philip had to be careful with regards to how he presented himself and his terms.

This he handled excellently. The best example is perhaps the establishment of the League of Corinth. Although Philip had decisively bested the Greeks in combat at Chaeronea, he had to ensure that they would remain docile under his control. Effectively the treaty was backed by Macedonian military might, but Philip framed the terms in a way that was palatable to the Greeks. By framing the agreement as a league, it maintained the appearance that the Greeks were making the decision of their own free will, important because of how highly the Greeks valued their political independence. Leagues were also a common form of joining city-states together, and so in this way Philip was not imposing

²⁶⁹ Borza (1982) 7-13
a new reality on the Greeks, but continuing a tradition that had existed for years before him.

Marius was a political outsider because he was a novus homo, a man whose family had no prior consular history and was not prominent among the Roman nobility. 270 Though it is sometimes popular, largely thanks to Plutarch, to think of Marius as having come from a poor background, this is probably not the case. Marius came from a rural background, but still probably one that was wealthy enough. It must have provided at least some wealth for him, as he was fortunate enough to be able to enter politics at Rome at all. Nonetheless, Marius was not from a blue-blooded noble family, and thus was reliant on the patronage of his social betters early on in his career. For Marius this came from the Metelli, a prominent family at Rome. As already mentioned, Marius served as an officer under Metellus in Numidia before he was consul, and the Metelli also assisted Marius in seeking lesser political offices early on in his career. 271 But the Metelli were only willing to support Marius in going so far. It is possible that Metellus never saw Marius as a man to contend for the consulship. He was, after all, dismissive of the idea that Marius should run. 272 Once Metellus would aid him no further, Marius had to forge his own path. He did so, as has been discussed above, by garnering popular support as well as the support of the army; however, he had to remain tolerable to the Senate and the nobles as well; populist politicians had met with unfortunate fates before Marius. 273 Marius in fact did not always support the goals of the commoners. He notably opposed a bill that would have
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271 Plutarch, Life of Marius 4
272 Plutarch, Life of Marius 8.3
273 The Gracchi, for example, were famously killed after fighting for Agrarian reform in the period before Marius.
extended the grain allotment to the *plebs*, and when called upon to restore order in the crisis caused by Saturninus, Marius turned against that man even though Saturninus had been useful to him in the past. It is suggested sometimes that Marius’ seeming inability to fully support either the people or the nobility is the result of ineptitude in domestic politics, and the portrayal of Marius as purely a military figure in the sources encourages this belief.\textsuperscript{274} However, Plutarch in particular is in many ways hostile to Marius, and probably relied on even more hostile sources when writing his account.\textsuperscript{275} That, combined with the fact that Marius gained an unprecedented level of political prestige in Rome suggests that, while Marius was no great social or economic reformer for the Romans, he was a man who understood how to leverage his position and station to make himself a viable leader to both the common people and to the senate. Had Marius been wholly inept, the Romans could have found another commander, especially during the interlude of the barbarian invasion when the barbarians wandered away from Italy. In these ways, Marius, as a political outsider, overcame obstacles of a similar nature to those with which Philip was presented in terms of their political station.

Despite the disadvantages of inheriting a beleaguered kingdom Philip’s position as a monarch did afford him a number of advantages over Marius. Notably this is relevant in their treatment of the army and its veterans. If Philip wanted to be generous to his soldiers, he was able to make an autonomous decision. But Marius had to contend with Roman politics in order to bring his goals to bear. This was relevant during his attempts to acquire land with which to settle former soldiers. He had to make use of his political

\textsuperscript{274} Santangelo (2016) 2 points out that this idea originally comes from Mommsen, a prominent German 19th century historian.

\textsuperscript{275} Plutarch, *Life of Marius* 26 and 35 both cite Sulla directly, who was certainly not of favourable disposition toward Marius.
allies to push these bills through the assembly, and this meant working with the dangerous Saturninus, who ended up being a major part of Marius’ political undoing. Macedonian culture also afforded Philip advantages that were not available to Marius. Notably this included polygamy. Philip’s seven marriages afforded him a number of important political alliances. While this practice did cause some issues, especially with regard to succession, overall it provided Philip an important tool for creating and maintaining relationships. Marius did enter a political marriage with a member of the gens Julius, at that time an impoverished but still noble family, yet he could not marry again and again to his benefit. Philip’s political autonomy granted him the ability to do whatever he needed to do to succeed, but this was also partly the result of the fact that Philip’s rise in political relevance came through his defeat of external players, rather than internal ones. Marius most likely bribed his way to the praetorship, and was known to disregard political customs, as when he went around the senate to acquire the command in Numidia over Metellus, as traditionally it was the senate’s role to assign commands. Marius’ tendency to put his own ambition above Roman tradition is in part what allowed him to reach the heights he did, but it also contributed to his rapid decline, as no one who was part of the Roman establishment was particularly keen to offer him strong support once he was no longer needed.

There is also perhaps a notable connection between Marius and Philip in that they are both necessarily linked to time periods which saw violence become a much more important means of carrying out political activities. Philip, for example, saw and understood the deficiencies of the free Greek city-states. Ground down by years of in-fighting, the Greek poleis were no longer strong enough to accomplish meaningful foreign policy goals by military means, and they could not get along with one another long enough
to bring about these goals as a collective. Although Philip’s entry into the theatre did not represent a sudden shift toward war as a means of settling disputes (as just mentioned, the Greeks were constantly fighting one another), the fact that the Greeks needed Philip to solve the Third Sacred War shows the failure of the polis system; constant conflict had ground their power away, and they needed a new means to solve their dispute. This new means took the form of a great military power, which, once invited into the picture, was able to compel the other Greeks to remain loyal by force, even if the compulsion itself took the form of a traditional Greek alliance.

Marius also represents a step toward the failure of the political infrastructure of which he was a part. Tiberius and Gaius Gracchus had been beaten to death in bouts of political violence not long before Marius’ career got underway, and Marius’ own career represented a significant departure from the traditions of the Roman Republic. Despite not being as much a populist as is often claimed, Marius won his first election to the consulship through invective and demagoguery, denouncing Metellus, his own patron. He proved he was willing to act outside Roman political tradition by denying the Senate the ability to extend Metellus’ command in Africa, highlighting the problem with having a political system based on tradition rather than on codified laws. Marius’ successive run of consulships represented a huge break from tradition, as a man had essentially used military prowess as a means to gain an unprecedented level of power. Marius, when called to act in the benefit of the Republic and oppose the radical Saturninus, did so, although, despite the fanciful depiction by Plutarch, Marius’ later career was marred by controversy and
violence. Still, Marius’ actions and successes set a dangerous precedent for later generals and statesmen including Sulla and Caesar.276

Thus by examining the careers of both Marius and Caesar, a dangerous tradition can be identified. Both men led military forces in periods of political tumult. Philip observed the failing of the Greek political tradition, and Marius was party to the Roman. Marius and Philip represent the notion that, once regular politics fail, it is entirely possible to default to physical force in order to accomplish one’s goals. The Greek city-states ground themselves down too significantly to offer true resistance to Philip, especially after Chaeronea, and the Roman Republic proved itself unable to adequately contain a man who valued his own ambitions more than the sanctity of the republic itself. It is not a perfect comparison as Greece was not a unified political body and the Macedonians always relied on the military for politics Nonetheless, in both Greece and Rome the end result was that the military became the primary means of maintaining political power rather than a tool to be used by those who gained power through civil politics.

Despite the vast differences between the circumstances surrounding the careers of both Marius and Philip, many parallels can be drawn between the way each man operated, and the problems they had to overcome. The common perception that Marius was an ineffective political figure successful only because of his military ability does not resonate with the magnitude of his success. Many of the same personal attributes and political attitudes can be found in the actions of both Marius and Philip. It would be difficult indeed to deny that Philip was successful only because of his martial acumen, although it was certainly a factor. To ascribe that one-dimensionality to Marius is equally unfair. Marius
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was ambitious and shrewd, and just because he did not have it in mind to reform the nature of Roman politics as those who came after intended does not mean that his abilities were limited.
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