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ABSTRACT

The triumph of Gaius Marius over the Germanic tribes in 102/101 BC is rightly ascribed to his employment of astute tactics. At Aquae Sextiae, however, that victory was based on extensive planning, not only in southern Gaul where Marius was stationed with his army, but also across the Pyrenees in northern Iberia. M. Marius is credited with a proconsulship in Hispania Ulterior, but an analysis of the ancient literature allows for his transferral to Hispania Citerior at precisely the time his brother was in command further north. Cooperation between the two, which ensured success on the battlefield, is argued below. And also suggested here is that in both regions the Marii extended their family patronage to native communities, enhancing their political prominence and prestige among the Roman élite.

Like most members of the Roman élite Marius spent many years abroad, in his case in Iberia, Asia Minor, North Africa, and southern Gaul. Marius, therefore, gained an intimate knowledge of most regions and provinces of the Roman Empire of that period. During the course of a long career, he was in Iberia for as many as eleven years, possibly one year in Asia, five years in Africa, three years in Gaul, a second visit to Asia, and after the Social War, a short spell of exile off the coast of North Africa. Marius was, therefore, well travelled, and his absence outside Rome and Italy account for more than a third of his adult life. This situation was arguably quite representative of the vast majority of Roman senators, serving in and then commanding armies, and undertaking other official duties in various roles in the provinces. Throughout his various postings Marius would also have accumulated provincial clients and, given the time he spent in Iberia, more here than elsewhere.

* The author is also an Academic Associate of the Department of Classics & European Languages, University of South Africa.
1 For Marius in Asia, see E. Badian, 'Marius and the nobles', DUF 25 (1963-64) 144; R.J. Evans, Gaius Marius: A Political Biography (Pretoria 1994) 29-30.
Marius's first attested service overseas was in the campaigns against the Numantines (Plut. Mar. 3.2), who were Celtiberians living in the region west of the Roman province of Hispania Citerior. At that stage, still in his twenties, Marius was obviously not influential, yet even then, before starting a public career but being of equestrian status, he probably attracted the attention of local figures seeking to attach themselves to any well-connected and wealthy young Roman to further their interests at Rome. And as Marius's military exploits brought fame (Sall. Ing. 63.4), his potential as a patron would certainly have increased; and it can be assumed with some confidence that in the 130s in central Iberia he initiated the formation of what would eventually become the elaborate network of clients which any successful Roman republican politician had at his disposal.

A fragment of Diodorus (34/5.38.1) stating that Marius 'was said to have become a public official' and to have barely secured the lower magistracies of the cursus honorum, has been employed to emphasise instead his connections among Roman business interests, and an occupation as a tax farmer or publicanus. While this may appear to have been in keeping with the strategy of creating a client base for a novus homo, the evidence is suspect. Firstly, this extract is from a late epitome, and so could represent a garbled version of the original. The original itself may not be authoritative since Diodorus is not particularly assertive in his claim and suggests he had some misgivings about his data. Moreover, the translation of this word 'public official' in the text of Diodorus is not found elsewhere as a collective noun for Roman equestrians who had won contracts from the censors for collecting taxes. Strabo (12.3.40), the only other example cited, employs it to describe a mining contract in Pontus. It is likely, therefore, that modern scholars have rather employed Diodorus's statement to reinforce nineteenth-century notions of Marius as a politician who rose from a lower social stratum, a sort of democrat from the commercial classes. Quite clearly, Diodorus does not mean this at all and, indeed, even if this statement is an accurate reflection of what the historian wrote, that Marius had some public position, it must refer

Note the remarkable statement of Van Nostrand/Keay, OCD3 1052, that the defeat of Numantia in 133 'marks the end of concerted resistance to Rome in Iberia', which quite ignores the situation in the 90s and afterwards down to Augustus's settlement in the 20s and even later still.

It is interesting to note that the ancient sources give anecdotal material about Scipio Aemilianus and both Marius and Jugurtha: Sall. Ing. 7.2-8.2 (Jugurtha); Plut. Mar. 3.2 (Marius). It is therefore conceivable, if not likely, that Marius and Jugurtha served alongside one another in some part of the Numantine campaign.
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to a time after his subject had been in the army in Iberia. But here again there are problems. If Marius was elected a military tribune about 130/129 as Sallust seems to indicate (Sall. Ing. 63.4), then this event shows the subject to be still intent on a political career. He could only participate in business ventures thereafter by renouncing any intent to canvass for further magistracies, again for which there is no evidence. The military tribunate, although a very junior position in the cursus honorum, was still de iure a magistracy because it entailed election by the comitia populi tributum, and Marius would subsequently have fallen foul of the lex Claudia (218 BC), obliging senators not to participate openly in any form of business. No politician would easily have avoided a law essentially enforced by the jealousy of his fellow senators. Marius was never accused of such pursuits when he was vulnerable to such accusations at crucial times in his career. Therefore, Diodorus’s mention of some unspecified public position which was related to the financial sector of the community should be discarded as part of a mostly modern construction of Marius both as a novus homo and an outsider.

Successful election to the plebeian tribunate in 120 for 119 suggests that Marius was already a well-known figure in Rome for some time before the electoral campaign. Furthermore, his narrow acquittal – a tied vote – on a charge of ambitus in 116 before a jury composed of equites would have been much more decisive had he possessed exceptional influence over them. Marius certainly appears to have been not exceptional in his connections and just like any other member of the senatorial élite. He was praetor in 115 at a time when provincial commands were not inevitable rewards for a year in high public office. However, Plutarch places Marius back in Iberia immediately after the praetorship year. The statement, although a clear reference to a propraetorian command in Hispania Ulterior, is disappointingly vague (Mar. 6.1), and has an interestingly close relationship to the more detailed

---

6 On the public offices but later equestrian status of the elder Sestius, see Cic. Sest. 3.6; R.A. Kaster, Cicero: Speech on Behalf of Publius Sestius (Oxford 2006) 15, 122.
7 R.J. Evans, Questioning Reputations: Essays on Nine Roman Republican Politicians (Pretoria 2003) 104-06.
8 The composition of the jury depends on whether or not all questiones had equestrian jurors empowered by the lex Sempronia indicaria or whether that law was applicable only to cases of repetundae. A. Lintott, The Constitution of the Roman Republic (Oxford 1999) 158-60, seems to accept that a quœstio de ambitu was in existence with equites as iudices at this time. Not all equites were publicani of course, especially those who were the sons of senators but still not senators themselves. The exact composition of the juries is impossible to retrieve.
9 Compare the statement of R. Syme, The Roman Revolution (Oxford 1939) 86, 441-42.
description of Caesar's propraetorian command in the same region in 62 (Caes. 11.1-12.2).10

After his praetorship taking by lot the province of Far Spain it is said that he cleared the place of bands of robbers the province being untamed in its savagery and in its customs ... When he returned to political life he had neither wealth nor the gift of oratory ... (Mar. 6.1)

Immediately after his praetorship taking the province of Iberia as his command ... he led his army against the Callaici and Lusitani, conquered them and marched to the outer sea making tribes there subject to Rome which had previously been independent: (Caes. 11.1-12.2)

Still, if Plutarch is accurate, it means that Marius returned to Iberia, but for a shorter spell than his previous posting and, indeed, not to the same region as twenty years before.11 Hispania Ulterior was a keenly sought-after province if the calibre of its governors is any indication.12 The answer to the question why is not hard to fathom, since the region offered an opportunity for warfare and military glory, but also possessed good mineral resources.13 The appointment could be a very useful springboard to furthering ambitions, where the governor might enhance his fame and extend his influence and hence his wealth. The existence of mountains in the Gaudalquivir valley named the Sierra Morena or Mariani montes may point to Marius or his memory having been honoured,14 while the later millionaire Sextus Marius, whose prosecution for incest and subsequent execution is related by Tacitus (Ann. 6.19; cf. Dio, 58.22.2-3), who describes him as the ‘most wealthy man

10 The order of composition may be crucial here if the Marius was written after the Caesar.

11 For a discussion of Marius’s proconsulship, see Evans (note 1) 54-57; cf. Evans (note 7) 17-21.

12 See Evans (note 1) 54 n. 4 on the number of senior figures who were proconsul in Hispania Ulterior in the last two decades of this century, and the table below.


14 Carney (note 4) 23-24 refers to the period following the praetorship in a way that implies prior connections with the publicani: ‘Marius, now a prominent member of a group of wealthy businessmen with connections in Puteoli in Southern Italy, came to be of such importance amongst the publicani ...’ There is no direct evidence to show that Marius ever possessed mines in Iberia, the Mariani montes could just as easily have been named after Sex. Marius. For recent epigraphic evidence related to a hospitium contract between Sex. Marius and possibly the emperor Tiberius, see W. Eck & F. Fernandez, ‘Sex. Marius in einem Hospitiumvertrag aus der Baetica’, ZPE 85 (1991) 217-22.
of the Spains’, may be a native Iberian whose ancestors obtained the Roman citizenship via the munificence of Marius during his time as proconsul.\textsuperscript{15} It is nonetheless worth noting that Plutarch says that Marius returned to Rome apparently not having obtained any material benefit from his command although this, like the extract from Diodorus, may have much to do with the excessive construction of Marius as a \textit{novus homo}.

Assuming that Marius’s physical presence in the peninsula must have produced some useful results in terms of clients either in the north or in Lusitania, the family’s portfolio was enlarged when another Marius took a command in Iberia (App. \textit{Ib.} 100; Obseq. 44a). On the basis that a war ‘against the Lusitani’ is taken to have involved Marcus Marius campaigning somewhere in the south west of Iberia, he has been assigned a proconsulship of \textit{Hispania Ulterior}, and the date 102/1.\textsuperscript{16} It seems that some essential part of Appian’s evidence has, however, been ignored:

There was another city near Colenda populated by a mixture of Celtiberi who had served as allies under Marcus Marius in campaigns against the Lusitani, who by decree of the senate had been settled there five years before. (App. \textit{Ib.} 100)

While these Celtiberians could have been returned north from a campaign far to the south, they could just as easily have been campaigning against Lusitanian tribes on the border of Celtiberian lands much closer to their original homes. Marcus Marius’s command may, therefore, have been in \textit{Hispania Citerior} rather than \textit{Ulterior} since he seems to have been most active in Celtiberia. His allies were not settled in or near Lusitania to keep the peace.

\textsuperscript{15} However, the evidence based on the \textit{nomen} alone is not strong seeing the frequency of the name ‘Marius’ in elite circles in the 1st century BC, and its equally possible that this Sex. Marius was a Roman \textit{eques} operating in Spain rather than a native of that region. Note L. Marius a tribune of the plebs in 62, and quaestor in 50, M. Marius a follower of Sertorius, about 76, and a Sex. Marius, legate in 43: T.R.S. Broughton, \textit{The Magistrates of the Roman Republic} (New York 1951-1952) 2.589. None of these can have been closely related to our Marius.

\textsuperscript{16} Note, however, that Broughton (note 15) 1.568 and n. 3 was a little cautious in assigning \textit{Ulterior} as the provincial command. For uncertainty over the precise date, see also Broughton 1.572 and n. 5. M. Marius’s close relationship to Gaius can be assumed with some confidence, given the prominence accorded to his adopted son M. Marius Gratidianus, praetor \textit{bis} in the 80s and murdered at the end of the civil war in 82.
there, but rather in their homeland, an already densely-inhabited region, and one which was then highly unstable (App. Ib. 99-100).17

Much of the cause of this situation was the migration of the Cimbri, which also makes Marcus Marius’s posting to, I would argue, Hispania Citerior of much greater significance. The Cimbri had crossed the Pyrenees soon after they had defeated the Romans at Arausio in the summer of 105 and did not return to Gaul until probably the spring of 102. For between two and three years the Cimbri must have devastated the province of Hispania Citerior and fought against the Celtiberians who finally forced their retreat from Iberia.18

The Romans, hard-pressed in Gaul and in Sicily, could not send any full-scale force to deal with problems in Spain, and Appian says categorically that legates but not armies were sent. This is hard to believe, considering Rome’s immense manpower reserves, if Appian’s comment was not so matter of fact. Titus Didius, consul and commander in Citerior in 98, is the main subject of the account here, and the reference to Marcus Marius’s command five years before an aside, but its inclusion in close proximity to Didius’s command suggests that it was the same province. Didius was granted a triumph for the indiscriminate slaughter of non-combatants, an event clearly regarded by Appian as unworthy of a good general. In itself this behaviour was not novel, but does give some indication of Roman attitudes towards the Iberians: exasperation from fear of Germanic invasion, relief because it had only recently been averted, and revenge for the damage to Roman interests in Iberia. The Cimbri were defeated by Gaius Marius at Vercellae and the Celtiberians were decimated by the Romans in Iberia in the next decade or so. However, first of all, this does not make much sense if the Celtiberians had been Roman allies. So could Appian be referring to this war at Iberia 100 and have transmitted Lusitani for Cimbri? This is perhaps a radical alteration to the transmitted text, but does have a certain attraction. Gaius Marius would have greatly benefited from having a family member as governor of Citerior while he was engaged in defending the Roman Empire at the Rhône frontier. If Marcus Marius was active in the north, he had no substantial Roman forces at his disposal, so would have employed Celtiberi as allies who did indeed push back the Cimbri, and they would have been rewarded with land in precisely the area mentioned in the literature. This would further support the argument of a command in Citerior since, according to the

sources, Marcus could not have obtained an army for a campaign against the Lusitani. But in the north he could have kept his brother informed of Cimbric movements, especially since the distances from modern Catalonia to southern France are easily negotiated either by the Le Perthus Pass (Via Domitia) or by sea. Two brothers holding vital commands either side of the Pyrenees at this point is undoubtedly compelling, and the evidence does not preclude the proposition. Marcus Marius almost certainly needs to be relocated as governor to *Hispania Citerior* where room exists in the chronology of proconsuls there. His appointment to a command in Citerior was crucial for Roman success and participation in the repulse of the Cimbri ensured that his elder brother knew the precise movements of the Cimbri as they began their trek back into Gaul. Victory was followed by the inevitable creation of client status for native peoples, but a bond which was taken seriously by their Roman patrons. The foundation of a town for former allies entailed the bond of client and patron between Celtiberi and Marcus Marius. He was dead soon after his commission in Iberia, but Gaius Marius would probably have acknowledged this patron-client bond.

Iberia remained unsettled. Indeed, the situation deteriorated after Roman successes at Aquae Sextiae and Vercellae. Perhaps the Romans reneged on promises to the Celtiberians or the Celtiberians having seen off the Cimbri, who had previously delivered severe blows to Roman prestige, were tempted into seeking greater freedom. Whatever the reason for the turmoil, it affected the whole of northern Iberia where the Roman response was extreme. Appian says that Didius had 20,000 Arevaci killed, ordered the relocation of Termes (Montejo de Tiermes/Soria) from its fortified hill-site into the plains, and besieged and took Colenda, selling all its inhabitants as slaves. After nearby Colenda (Cuéllar/Segovia) was destroyed by Didius about 97 in fierce fighting in the region, the client status of the unnamed foundation of Marcus Marius did not save it from receiving a similar fate. Didius promised these Celtiberians, who had been living by theft because of their poverty (very much a repetition of Plutarch's account of Marius' proconsulship of *Hispania Ulterior*) the lands of the recently defunct Colenda. He tricked them into coming into the Roman camp where the entire community was

---

19 Compare the epigraphic evidence from the native communities of Uchí Maius and Thibaris in Africa, although admittedly 2nd century AD, honouring Gaius Marius as their founder (*ILS* 1334, 6790).

20 For inherited patron-client relationships compare the Domitii Ahenobarbi and Massilia; see further below, and the Claudii Marcelli and Sicily (Cic. *Verr.* 2.4.86-90). For the particular form of Roman-Iberian *hospitium*, see Richardson (note 17, 1996) 156-58.
massacred (App. Ib. 100) adding further to the unseemly death toll. The killing of clients, even if justified on military grounds, may have been a cause of considerable strain in the relationship between Roman politicians. Didius had, after all, obtained the command in his consular year, and was the first consular governor in Iberia for many years. It is surely significant that Gaius Marius departed to Pessinus in Phrygia in Asia Minor at precisely the same time. A command in Spain may well have been on his mind after his successful conclusion of the Cimbric war.

Didius was dead by the end of the Social War (App. BC 1.40), and no connection, friendly or hostile, is attested between him and Gaius Marius. However, if Marius ordered the death of P. Licinius Crassus (cos. 97) in 87, as Appian (BC 1.70, 1.72) suggests, great hostility surely existed between them, although nothing is divulged by the sources. Crassus significantly was assigned Hispania Ulterior while consul. His son Marcus Crassus, the later triumvir, who fled into exile after his father's death in the civil unrest of 87, spent eight months in Iberia (Plut. Cras. 6.1), presumably where his father had established ties of patronage. There seems to be no doubt about the provincial posting of the elder Crassus, but the date can be challenged to some extent. Plutarch again appears imprecise (Crass. 4.1, 6.2), saying only that Crassus went where he had been before with his father, as 'praetor', and does not refer to the elder Crassus's consulship. This could well mean that Crassus had two postings in Iberia since Plutarch, even if ambiguous elsewhere, surely knew the difference between a praetorship and a consulship. This may indicate that, like Marius, the elder Crassus was in Iberia on more than one occasion. He was praetor at the latest in 100 when Hispania Ulterior was occupied by L. Cornelius Dolabella, but Crassus could have been governor of Citerior, preceding T. Didius in ca. 100, or of Ulterior in 102/1. The second solution may be favoured because it facilitates the moving of Marcus Marius from Ulterior at that same date to Citerior, the province where he seems to have played an important role.

---

21 Note the topos of Iberian robbery (Plut. Mar. 6.1), perhaps meant in part to contrast the later civility of the region.
22 Didius is mentioned by Appian in 91/90 but not afterwards. A source such as Cicero, who reported the civil unrest in 87, would probably have mentioned Didius's presence, given his seniority, had he still been alive.
23 Plutarch states that his source was Fenestella, writing relatively close, chronologically speaking, to the actual events. An Iberian client is named as Vibius Paciacus (Crass. 4.2).
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Proconsuls with knowledge of a region may have been especially desirable when there was so much upheaval and an apparent lack of manpower or financial resources to commit large armies to the field. In 97 the elder Crassus probably also received a command which Marius may have coveted, and so a possible contributing factor to his murder or suicide in 88 emerges. The source of the enmity between Crassus and Marius may well again have been an Iberian command. The elder Crassus could be assigned a command in Hispania Ulterior, between 102 and 100 as praetorius, a region to which he returned in 97 as consul. And Marcus Crassus, born in about 114, could have accompanied his father on each posting, firstly as an adolescent, and secondly as a young man serving in the army. Obtaining clients in provinces went hand-in-hand with a Roman senator’s command, but for the clients who might view such a connection as a good insurance for the future, it was not a guarantee for safety as Marcus Marius’s Celtiberians discovered. T. Didius, responsible for many deaths in this region and holding a much sought-after command, may have incurred the enmity of Gaius Marius as a result. P. Licinius Crassus (cos. 97) may have spent two periods in Iberia, his

---

**Proconsuls of Far Spain (114-93)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Proconsul</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>114-13</td>
<td>C. Marius (cos. 107)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112</td>
<td>L. Calpurnius Piso Frugi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111-10</td>
<td>Ser. Sulpicius Galba (cos. 108)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109-7</td>
<td>Q. Servilius Caepio (cos. 106)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104 (?)</td>
<td>L. Caesius</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102-1</td>
<td>P. Licinius Crassus (cos. 97)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>L. Cornelius Dolabella</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97-4</td>
<td>P. Licinius Crassus (cos. 97)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93</td>
<td>P. Cornelius Scipio Nasic</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Proconsuls in Near Spain (102-81)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Proconsul</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>104 (?)</td>
<td>Q. Fabius Labeo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103 (?)</td>
<td>M'. Sergius (Silus)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102-101</td>
<td>M. Marius</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99-98</td>
<td>C. Coelius Caldus 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98-94</td>
<td>T. Didius (cos. 98)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93-81</td>
<td>C. Valerius Flaccus (cos. 93)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

26 Since there are seldom records of a politician’s propraetorian and proconsular commands, there is not a great deal of evidence to draw on. However, there are some notable instances of political figures serving twice in the same region or province besides those mentioned in the discussion here. Thus M. Antonius (cos. 99), was quaestor and praquaestor in Asia (113-112), and praetor and proconsul in Cilicia (102-100); L. Licinius Lucullus (cos. 74), was proquaestor in Asia (85-80), and consul and proconsul in Asia (74-68); C. Cassius Longinus (pr. 44), was quaestor and praquaestor in Syria (53-51), and proconsul in Syria (43-42).
27 Marius was almost certainly back in Rome again in 97 after his visit to Phrygia and Delos.
second spell again at the expense of Marius which could have been the source of inimicitia between them. P. Crassus may even have appropriated some of Marius’s interests in this region. His son is said, by Plutarch (Crass. 2.5) to have owned many silver mines,\(^\text{28}\) and was later, of course, a prominent supporter of Sulla.

On the other side of the Pyrenees, a Roman army was redundant for several months. Marius took up his command at the beginning of 104 (Sall. Jug. 14.3) against an enemy which had disappeared into Iberia (Plut. Mar. 14.1). The Romans waited for their return. But the Cimbri had not disappeared at all: they were merely on the southern edge of a mountain range and so Marius’s reliance on intelligence gathered from his brother, based precisely where the enemy was concentrated, would have been indispensable in his preparations. However, the unexpected lull in the storm provided another opportunity for enlarging his provincial client base. The battle at Aquae Sextiae did not occur until the summer of 102, roughly eighteen months after Marius’s posting to a provincia based on the east bank of the Rhône, itself seemingly a formidable defensive line, though not, as Hannibal had shown a hundred-and-twenty years earlier, an impregnable barrier. Moreover, it is worth noting that Marius’s eventual base was probably at Valence, the crossing-point of Hannibal. The Cimbri might have been expected by the same route, but in the event they crossed the Isère not from the south-west but from the north.\(^\text{29}\)

---

\(^\text{28}\) A note of caution needs to be sounded here, since Crassus is paired with Nicias in the Plutarch Lives and Nicias, too, made a fortune from the Laurion silver mines in Attica by renting out slaves to work in this state-controlled industry (Nie. 4.2; Comp. Nie. et Crass. 1.1) – precisely, too, the sort of contractual system alluded to by Strabo 12.3.40 and Diodorus 34/5.38.1, a confusion which may have been responsible for misconceptions about Marius’s supposed occupation.

\(^\text{29}\) O.J. Schrier, ‘Hannibal, the Rhône and the “island”: some philological and metrological notes’, Mnemosyne 59 (2006) 521. Hannibal crossed the Rhône at its confluence with the Isère, not further south near Arles. The catastrophe at Avario in 105 had also followed the crossing of the Isère by the Cimbri. Caepio, campaigning in south-west Gaul, and perhaps expecting the Cimbri on the west back of the Rhône, had to cross the river to engage them. And with the river at his rear his army was forced backwards. The consul Cn. Mallius Maximus had been encamped at Avario on the east bank of the Rhône, waiting for the Cimbri and then for Caepio to arrive before engaging. As it turned out, Caepio was defeated first and Mallius was then besieged and the camp overrun.
Prior to taking up a position in the sector of his province, Marius had originally been based at Arletum where,\(^\text{30}\) according to Plutarch (\textit{Mar.} 15.3):

\textit{... his men had nothing to do and so they constructed a great canal. Into this Marius diverted the greater part of the Rhône’s volume which was brought round to a suitable spot on the coast where there was a deep bay for large shipping and where the flow emerged smoothly without turbulence into the sea. This canal is still named after him.}

The \textit{Fossae Marianae}, from Arletum to Istres, ran from Marius’s first camp to the sea west of Massilia, and was perhaps intended to form a part of the defensive line against the Cimbri, on the assumption that these might aim to cross the Rhône delta, and from there move along the coast to Liguria. The delta is notoriously treacherous, and the Cimbri knew southern Gaul well enough. Even if they were not informed about Hannibal’s preferred crossing, they would easily have observed the difficulty of crossing the lowest point of the Rhône’s course. As it was, they chose to return to the territory of the Parisi and after some time there and, probably only then uniting with the Teutones and Ambrones, moved south again on the east bank of the Rhône. In this change of tactic by the Germanic tribes lay the reason for Marius’s choice of Valence as his main camp.

The canal from Arletum to the sea was clearly also meant to overcome the logistical problem of supplying a large army away from the coast. Indeed, this remained vital when Marius was stationed at Valence, because even here river-borne supplies were able to reach him, since the river remained navigable for smaller traffic. The canal, sited west of Massilia, also expedited the arrival of information from Iberia by swift ship along the coast from any number of harbour towns such as Emporion or Rhode.\(^\text{31}\) The canal was, therefore, in all probability a multifunctional construction for the defence of the Empire, and may have been envisaged as promoting contact times between the two Marii. Strabo (4.1.8), furthermore, adds an interesting economic dimension about the canal whose usefulness to Marius was terminated with the victory at Aquae Sextiae.\(^\text{32}\)

\(^{30}\) \textit{Gallia Narbonensis} would be an incorrect title for Marius’s command since at this time Narbo had probably been at best evacuated, at worst destroyed. The command may have simply been \textit{contra Cimbros} or \textit{Gallia Transalpina}.

\(^{31}\) If these had escaped devastation by the Cimbri or had been re-established.

\(^{32}\) On Aquae Sextiae see Strabo 4.1.5. Badian (note 24) 263 n. 5 notes that this place was named after the consul of 125, C. Sextius Calvinus, and therefore another example of patronage at work.
This he gave to the people of Massilia as a reward for their aid in the war against the Ambrones and Toygeni. This canal became a source of great revenue to them as they could levy a toll from all those who used it.

The extent of the profits to be made from accelerating trade between Massilia and the interior was surely immense and must have added a great deal to the city’s prosperity. Such a gift came with the price of patronage, which was no doubt welcomed, and Massilia became linked to Marius as a result of the successful outcome of the military campaign. Plutarch (Mar. 21.3) also notes that Massilia benefited commercially in other more gruesome ways from the battle at Aquae Sextiae which was close by.

There are some writers who give a different account of the number killed. However, it is said that the Massiliotes fenced their vineyards with the bones of the dead and the soil after the bodies had wasted away in it and the rains had fallen all winter upon it, grew so rich and became so full to its depths in the putrefaction, that it produced an incredibly rich harvest in later years and confirmed Archilochus’s words that ‘fields are fattened’ by such a process.

Massilia, one of the most important cities in the western Mediterranean, fared rather better than the settlement established by Marcus Marius near Colenda, when it too became embroiled in the civil war between Caesar and Pompey. Massilia refused to take sides in the war since the city and its inhabitants had links with Pompey, who had spent time in the city and throughout the region in the 70s. The Domitii Ahenobarbi, who were allies of Pompey and enemies of Caesar, were also patrons, one of whose ancestors, the consul of 122, had campaigned in the area and been responsible for building the Via Domitia that eventually linked Iberia with Italy. En route to tackle Pompeian forces in northern Iberia, culminating in their defeat at Ilerda, Caesar began a siege of Massilia, probably in early April 49, which surrendered after a blockade lasting approximately six months, or roughly late August. When it was over, Caesar did not inflict the penalty

---

33 Evans (note 7) 50 n. 38, and 52.
34 On links with the Domitii, see Badian (note 24) 265. After L. Domitius Ahenobarbus (cos. 54) had been defeated at Corfinium by Caesar, he went on to command at Massilia in 49: Badian (note 24) 313; Broughton (note 15) 2.262. After the capitulation of Massilia, he escaped to join Pompey in Greece.
35 Caesar (B.C. 1.36) suggests that he remained outside Massilia for about a month while ships were being constructed in Arletum, before leaving Trebonius in command; so perhaps the whole of April. The defeat of Afranius and Petreius at
suffered in the past by cities such as Carthage and Corinth, or indeed that meted out to many Gallic communities in Comata. Its association with Marius, Caesar's close relative, almost certainly contributed to its salvation.

When all this was done Caesar sparing them more because of the name and antiquity of their state than for anything they had deserved, left two legions as a garrison there. (B.C. 2.22)

Cassius Dio (41.25.3) casts a more negative light on Caesar's supposed benevolent treatment of the city:

... at that time he deprived them of their arms, ships, money (control of their canal?), and later everything else except the name of freedom. To offset this misfortune Phocaea, their founding city, was given its freedom by Pompey.

The net of patronage was flung far and wide, and was probably a rather more complex phenomenon than has sometimes been appreciated. There must have been intense competition to obtain influence in regions where a provincial command was brief. Longer commands and returning to the same provinces or regions gave some lucky politicians an immediate advantage. Marius's presence in various parts of the Mediterranean world, in person or by surrogate, must certainly have contributed to his pre-eminence at Rome. The patronage of Roman senators was obviously sought after as protection for communities and to maintain their interests both in the provinces and in Rome. Multiple patrons became a common feature due to the nature of the provincial commands and their length. But this could cause problems since in unstable political conditions communities might have to choose between competing senators, not always to their advantage. Clients need not always be safe in times of crisis, but the fate of such communities could itself fuel potentially disastrous rivalry between Roman political figures. Patronage in the Empire was inevitable and a commonplace, and drew native communities into the vortex of Roman republican politics whether they liked it or not. And part of that increasingly complex _mise en scène_ in which politicians needed to survive and thrive was the family and its members securing a firm basis of support. As a result of his victories over the Cimbri and Teutones and the removal of threat of invasion of Italy, the Roman people acclaimed Marius their 'third founder' (Plut. _Mar._ 27.5). In the greater

Ilerda occurred on 2 August 49. Caesar then carried out a rapid tour of the Hispanic provinces before returning to accept the surrender of Massilia (B.C. 2.22).
part of the command in southern Gaul which culminated in his victory at Aquae Sextiae in 102, I have argued that Marius received the help of his brother Marcus, who had as his provincia not Hispania Ulterior, as is generally thought, but rather Citerior. During both these commands, on either side of the Pyrenees and at other times in the career of Gaius Marius, the formulation of the patron-client bond or hestitium contract also made its indelible mark.
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