



Continue

Hoplite vs swordsman

December 20, 2017, 4:53 p.m. #1 Hey, what advantages/disadvantages do swordsmen have on spear and pike units? December 20, 2017, 5:04 p.m. #2 December 20, 2017, 5:11 p.m. #3 Originally posted by KAM 2150 Swords, heating spears and pike on average. Obviously, the heavy spears will rout weak swords, but if you have for example two thorakatai units, one with swords will beat the other with a spear. Do sword units also kill faster than pike/throws? December 20, 2017, 5:16 p.m. #4 December 20, 2017, 5:19 p.m. #5 Is it with things like phalanx or Hoplite formations taken into account? December 21, 2017, 5:54 AM #6 Originally posted by Pindaking Do sword units also kill faster than pike/spear units? The Romans were not idiots. December 21, 2017, 06:02 AM #7 I think currently hoplites and pike annihilate even evasions. Even pike and medium hoplites. They suffer only losses from the initial load. December 21, 2017, 09:12 AM #8 Take a step away from the literal mechanical TW unit..... Swords (and knives for that matter) are the better the closer you get to your enemy. Spears are better when they can keep people at bay. An equal number of spears is better than an equal number of distance swords because spears can attack together (much against one) while swords can't really do that. A spear formation is great, the pike phalanx being the ultimate example. When the formation breaks and things get 1 to 1 (or when the scrum gets messy and people press too close to each other), then the edge of the spear drops a little. In the open 1 v 1, as long as the pitcher can keep some distance, he will have the advantage. But as soon as the swordsman can approach and/or use his shield, the advantage of the spear disappears. Of course, a rich spearman can just also have a sword, which has been hard to model in many TW games. KAM still did a pretty good job of implementing that, however. The shield of the Roman tower was designed to protect the soldier until he could enter the sword bonding scope. We tend to think of the Legions as sword infantry, but they were just as much heavy javelin troops or large-shield troops. Compared to, say, a hoplite, instead of a spear, they wore two large javelins instead. In terms of equipment, the difference is more a matter of use and tactics than of technology. You could say that these javelins gave the Legion a remote advantage over someone with an armoured sword spear shield, and you'd probably be right. Anyway, as KAM says, it's really more about the quality of the unit rather than the sword vs lance designation. When comparing of similar quality, the advantage of swords is probably not literally on the weapon, but rather on how the unit is best practiced with the sword. Thus, when the melee is extinguished and people are more likely to get too close to the spears, the dedicated sword unit should and would shine. Currently, the spear unit will not collapse instantly when it is loaded by a unit of equal quality as tends to occur at vanilla. As far as I can tell, this is due to KAM's work on doing melee defense and killing the work randomly properly. December 21, 2017, 9:33 a.m. #9 December 21, 2017, 10:46 p.m. #10 Originally posted by Alannon I think currently hoplites and pike even annihilate evasions. Even pike and medium hoplites. They suffer only losses from the initial load. I found current pike phalanx got huge shield defense like over X3. So it's no surprise that most pike units beat sword unit. And I don't know why, but hoplite phalanx also get a huge defense value. Last published by ragnar23; December 21, 2017 at 10:51 p.m. December 22, 2017, 9:18 a.m. #11 Versatility, flexibility, maneuverability, make your choice. Pike, and to a lesser extent hoplites, do only one thing well. Present an impenetrable wall of spears, or in the case of phalanx, in the front and invite the opponent into the meat grinder. These are poor flank units, cannot adapt to unforeseen circumstances quickly, move more slowly than the sword and need a variety of support units with them to function effectively. December 22, 2017, 10:13 a.m. #12 Thanks for the answers guys, what about spearmen are they like hoplites that don't last that long but have javelins? December 22, 2017, 11:59 a.m. #13 Sometimes they're cheaper, most of the time they're faster and more mobile. In a way, they require less babysitting since you're not trying to set up a hoplite wall of many units. In the end, they will have at least one of the following benefits on hoplites: 1) Cheaper, if lower line holding option. 2) Faster travel speed. 3) Javelins. December 23, 2017, 4:51 a.m. #14 Happens when the hoplites equip the sword and charge the enemy? Once the formations break down, I use it to do it. Are they type of weapon and damage change, are they in pairs with swordsmen? Only the visuals change. They always use the statistics they come up with (which are based around their spears). December 23, 2017, 7:34 a.m. #15 Originally posted by Bandaro123 What happens when hoplites equip the sword and charge the enemy? Once the formations break down, I use it to do it. Are they type of weapon and damage change, are they in pairs with swordsmen? Only the visuals change. They always use the statistics they come up with (which are based around their spears). December 24, 2017, 00:55 #16 I felt that this was my big complaint with the battles in DEI 1.2. Phalanges are simply better than thorakatai. In the old version 1.1, phalanx formation was rare and few spearmen had it. Now it seems that most spearman units have phalanxes. These units are basically from the front in the phalanx formation, and the phalanx units in Rome 2 have this problem where when flanked, the rear rank just flips around and the unit fights as it has two front rows. The advantage of accompanying it is lost - exactly the opposite of how the phalanxes should work. Fight any battle against a Hellenic faction and you will see that phalanx units are always the last of the road, and often only do so after the general is dead. Some will continue to fight almost to the death, even when they are surrounded and the general is dead. The phalanges are devastating compared to the cavalry, even on a flank load, while the heavy cavalry is a hard counter-fire to all swords. Then there is the argument of mobility that many will use in favor of swords. However, this ignores the phalanx units themselves. Swords have only mobility and no other choice. Heavy spears can switch between mobility and flank (extinct phalange) and invincible forward and never routes (fl phalang) at the touch of a button. This is the same reason why the Romans really weakened with the Marian reforms. The Polybian army has "tria" which beat almost any other unit, even flanked, as well as a super heavy AOR hoplite in Italy. The Romans lost access to both with Marian reforms, then their army became an ocean of swordsmen who could not pierce the phalanxes and were effortlessly carried away by the heavy cavalry. December 24, 2017, 3:38 AM #17 Originally posted by Artannis Wolfrunner I felt it was my big complaint with the battles in DEI 1.2. Phalanges are simply better than thorakatai. In the old version 1.1, phalanx formation was rare and few spearmen had it. Now it seems that most spearman units have phalanxes. These units are basically from the front in the phalanx formation, and the phalanx units in Rome 2 have this problem where when flanked, the rear rank just flips around and the unit fights as it has two front rows. The advantage of accompanying it is lost - exactly the opposite of how the phalanxes should work. Fight any battle against a Hellenic faction and you will see that phalanx units are always the last of the road, and often only do so after the general is dead. Some will continue to fight almost to the death, even when they are surrounded and the general is dead. The phalanges are devastating compared to the cavalry, even on a flank load, while the heavy cavalry is a hard counter-fire to all swords. Then there is the argument of mobility that many will use in favor of swords. However, this ignores the phalanx units themselves. Swords have only mobility and no other choice. Heavy spears can switch between mobility and flank (extinct phalange) and invincible forward and never routes (fl phalang) at the touch of a button. This is the same reason why the Romans really weakened with the Marian reforms. The Polybian army has "tria" which beat almost any other unit, even flanked, as well as a super heavy AOR hoplite in Italy. The Romans lost access to both with Marian reforms, then their army became an ocean of swordsmen who could not pierce the phalanxes and were effortlessly carried away by the heavy cavalry. The rear rank flanks and the unit fights as if it had two front rows. Well, it seems realistic, in a 5-row deep formation if the enemies would try to flank you, the last 2 rows would just turn around to protect the rest of the formation. Obviously, that makes the phalanx op as you say, but I think we should not sacrifice that for balance. Anyway, either, which bothers me is the lack of shield on the swords unit, any sword unit would simply realize that putting each shield together to comrades those next to them would protect them a lot (just like the spear units do with the phalanx), and that's actually what the Romans would do with the great scutums with things like testudo formations for example, so I don't see why almost all spearmen in DEI has phalanx but swords don't get shieldwall or anything like that. I also think that the use of spear units in the center and flanking with peltasts is the way to go against the phalanx. Just use your cav to bait their cav and then kill them with javelins (from the peltasts), when it's done, you load your cav into their skirmish and put your peltasts to release all the javelins on the pike from the rear and after that it's loaded with your cav and as soon as the charge is completed, just load your peltasts and move your cav away and the pike usually just break very quickly after that. Oh and it works with swords instead of peltasts too because some unit swords have 2 javelins. So basically you use these javelins in the cavity as before, load with your cav to their cav pinning them in place, load your swords into their cav and let your cav cycle charge 2 or 3 times break them, then your cav goes straight to the skirmishes and swords follow and then finally you repeat on the back of the pins and you win. So basically, don't use swords as a main force, use them flank while a medium spear unit with phalanx holds the center. Note: I didn't play Marian Rome in DEI so I don't know about this context. 24 December 2017, 05:01 #19 Is shieldwall in Rome 2? I've never seen it before. One of the best aspects of Attila is that all high-level swordsmen get some form of shield wall, which gives them a lot of defensive bonuses such as much higher weight and load resistance, attacking infantry and high-level cavalry, and almost total resistance to missile fire. However as far as I can see these abilities do not exist in Rome 2 thus making swordsmen weak compared to the phalanxes. If introduced, it would make swordsmen more viable on the front line. 24 December 2017, 05:47 #20 Posted by Artannis Wolfrunner Is shieldwall in Rome 2? I've never seen it before. One of the best aspects of Attila is that all high-level swordsmen get some form of shield wall, which gives them a lot of defensive bonuses such as much higher weight and load resistance, attacking infantry and high-level cavalry, and almost total resistance to missile fire. However, as far as I can see these abilities do not exist in Rome 2 thus making swordsmen weak compared to the phalanxes. If introduced, it would make swordsmen more viable on the front line. December 24, 2017, 05:47 #21 Posted by Artannis Wolfrunner I feel it was my big complaint with the battles in DEI 1.2. Phalanges are simply better than thorakatai. In the old version 1.1, phalanx formation was rare and few spearmen had it. Now it seems that most spearman units have phalanxes. These units are basically from the front in the phalanx formation, and the phalanx units in Rome 2 have this problem where when flanked, the rear rank just flips around and the unit fights as it has two front rows. The advantage of accompanying it is lost - exactly the opposite of how the phalanxes should work. Fight any battle against a Hellenic faction and you will see that phalanx units are always the last of the road, and often only do so after the general is dead. Some will continue to fight almost to the death, even when they are surrounded and the general is dead. The phalanges are devastating compared to the cavalry, even on a flank load, while the heavy cavalry is a hard counter-fire to all swords. Then there is the argument of mobility that many will use in favor of swords. However, this ignores the phalanx units themselves. Swords have only mobility and no other choice. Heavy spears can switch between mobility and flank (extinct phalange) and invincible forward and never routes (fl phalang) at the touch of a button. This is the same reason why the Romans really weakened with the Marian reforms. The Polybian army has "tria" which beat almost any other unit, even flanked, as well as a super heavy AOR hoplite in Italy. The Romans lost access to both with Marian reforms, then their army became an ocean of swordsmen who could not pierce the phalanxes and were effortlessly carried away by the heavy cavalry. The rear rank flanks and the unit fights as if it had two front rows. Well, it seems realistic, in a 5-row deep formation if the enemies would try to flank you, the last 2 rows would just turn around to protect the rest of the formation. Obviously, that makes the phalanx op as you say, but I think we should not sacrifice that for balance. Anyway, either, which bothers me is the lack of shield on the swords unit, any sword unit would simply realize that putting each shield together to comrades those next to them would protect them a lot (just like the spear units do with the phalanx), and that's actually what the Romans would do with the great scutums with things like testudo formations for example, so I don't see why almost all spearmen in DEI has phalanx but swords don't get shieldwall or anything like that. I also think that the use of spear units in the center and flanking with peltasts is the way to go against the phalanx. Just use your cav to bait their cav and then kill them with javelins (from the peltasts), when it's done, you load your cav into their skirmish and put your peltasts to release all the javelins on the pike from the rear and after that it's loaded with your cav and as soon as the charge is completed, just load your peltasts and move your cav away and the pike usually just break very quickly after that. Oh and it works with swords instead of peltasts too because some unit swords have 2 javelins. So basically you use these javelins in the cavity as before, load with your cav to their cav pinning them in place, load your swords into their cav and let your cav cycle charge 2 or 3 times break them, then your cav goes straight to the skirmishes and swords follow and then finally you repeat on the back of the pins and you win. So basically, don't use swords as a main force, use them flank while a medium spear unit with phalanx holds the center. Note: I didn't play Marian Rome in DEI so I don't know about this context. 24 December 2017, 05:01 #19 Is shieldwall in Rome 2? I've never seen it before. One of the best aspects of Attila is that all high-level swordsmen get some form of shield wall, which gives them a lot of defensive bonuses such as much higher weight and load resistance, attacking infantry and high-level cavalry, and almost total resistance to missile fire. However as far as I can see these abilities do not exist in Rome 2 thus making swordsmen weak compared to the phalanxes. If introduced, it would make swordsmen more viable on the front line. December 24, 2017, 05:47 #21 Posted by Artannis Wolfrunner I feel it was my big complaint with the battles in DEI 1.2. Phalanges are simply better than thorakatai. In the old version 1.1, phalanx formation was rare and few spearmen had it. Now it seems that most spearman units have phalanxes. These units are basically from the front in the phalanx formation, and the phalanx units in Rome 2 have this problem where when flanked, the rear rank just flips around and the unit fights as it has two front rows. The advantage of accompanying it is lost - exactly the opposite of how the phalanxes should work. Fight any battle against a Hellenic faction and you will see that phalanx units are always the last of the road, and often only do so after the general is dead. Some will continue to fight almost to the death, even when they are surrounded and the general is dead. The phalanges are devastating compared to the cavalry, even on a flank load, while the heavy cavalry is a hard counter-fire to all swords. Then there is the argument of mobility that many will use in favor of swords. However, this ignores the phalanx units themselves. Swords have only mobility and no other choice. Heavy spears can switch between mobility and flank (extinct phalange) and invincible forward and never routes (fl phalang) at the touch of a button. This is the same reason why the Romans really weakened with the Marian reforms. The Polybian army has "tria" which beat almost any other unit, even flanked, as well as a super heavy AOR hoplite in Italy. The Romans lost access to both with Marian reforms, then their army became an ocean of swordsmen who could not pierce the phalanxes and were effortlessly carried away by the heavy cavalry. The rear rank flanks and the unit fights as if it had two front rows. Well, it seems realistic, in a 5-row deep formation if the enemies would try to flank you, the last 2 rows would just turn around to protect the rest of the formation. Obviously, that makes the phalanx op as you say, but I think we should not sacrifice that for balance. Anyway, either, which bothers me is the lack of shield on the swords unit, any sword unit would simply realize that putting each shield together to comrades those next to them would protect them a lot (just like the spear units do with the phalanx), and that's actually what the Romans would do with the great scutums with things like testudo formations for example, so I don't see why almost all spearmen in DEI has phalanx but swords don't get shieldwall or anything like that. I also think that the use of spear units in the center and flanking with peltasts is the way to go against the phalanx. Just use your cav to bait their cav and then kill them with javelins (from the peltasts), when it's done, you load your cav into their skirmish and put your peltasts to release all the javelins on the pike from the rear and after that it's loaded with your cav and as soon as the charge is completed, just load your peltasts and move your cav away and the pike usually just break very quickly after that. Oh and it works with swords instead of peltasts too because some unit swords have 2 javelins. So basically you use these javelins in the cavity as before, load with your cav to their cav pinning them in place, load your swords into their cav and let your cav cycle charge 2 or 3 times break them, then your cav goes straight to the skirmishes and swords follow and then finally you repeat on the back of the pins and you win. So basically, don't use swords as a main force, use them flank while a medium spear unit with phalanx holds the center. Note: I didn't play Marian Rome in DEI so I don't know about this context. 24 December 2017, 05:01 #19 Is shieldwall in Rome 2? I've never seen it before. One of the best aspects of Attila is that all high-level swordsmen get some form of shield wall, which gives them a lot of defensive bonuses such as much higher weight and load resistance, attacking infantry and high-level cavalry, and almost total resistance to missile fire. However as far as I can see these abilities do not exist in Rome 2 thus making swordsmen weak compared to the phalanxes. If introduced, it would make swordsmen more viable on the front line. December 24, 2017, 05:47 #21 Posted by Artannis Wolfrunner I feel it was my big complaint with the battles in DEI 1.2. Phalanges are simply better than thorakatai. In the old version 1.1, phalanx formation was rare and few spearmen had it. Now it seems that most spearman units have phalanxes. These units are basically from the front in the phalanx formation, and the phalanx units in Rome 2 have this problem where when flanked, the rear rank just flips around and the unit fights as it has two front rows. The advantage of accompanying it is lost - exactly the opposite of how the phalanxes should work. Fight any battle against a Hellenic faction and you will see that phalanx units are always the last of the road, and often only do so after the general is dead. Some will continue to fight almost to the death, even when they are surrounded and the general is dead. The phalanges are devastating compared to the cavalry, even on a flank load, while the heavy cavalry is a hard counter-fire to all swords. Then there is the argument of mobility that many will use in favor of swords. However, this ignores the phalanx units themselves. Swords have only mobility and no other choice. Heavy spears can switch between mobility and flank (extinct phalange) and invincible forward and never routes (fl phalang) at the touch of a button. This is the same reason why the Romans really weakened with the Marian reforms. The Polybian army has "tria" which beat almost any other unit, even flanked, as well as a super heavy AOR hoplite in Italy. The Romans lost access to both with Marian reforms, then their army became an ocean of swordsmen who could not pierce the phalanxes and were effortlessly carried away by the heavy cavalry. The rear rank flanks and the unit fights as if it had two front rows. Well, it seems realistic, in a 5-row deep formation if the enemies would try to flank you, the last 2 rows would just turn around to protect the rest of the formation. Obviously, that makes the phalanx op as you say, but I think we should not sacrifice that for balance. Anyway, either, which bothers me is the lack of shield on the swords unit, any sword unit would simply realize that putting each shield together to comrades those next to them would protect them a lot (just like the spear units do with the phalanx), and that's actually what the Romans would do with the great scutums with things like testudo formations for example, so I don't see why almost all spearmen in DEI has phalanx but swords don't get shieldwall or anything like that. I also think that the use of spear units in the center and flanking with peltasts is the way to go against the phalanx. Just use your cav to bait their cav and then kill them with javelins (from the peltasts), when it's done, you load your cav into their skirmish and put your peltasts to release all the javelins on the pike from the rear and after that it's loaded with your cav and as soon as the charge is completed, just load your peltasts and move your cav away and the pike usually just break very quickly after that. Oh and it works with swords instead of peltasts too because some unit swords have 2 javelins. So basically you use these javelins in the cavity as before, load with your cav to their cav pinning them in place, load your swords into their cav and let your cav cycle charge 2 or 3 times break them, then your cav goes straight to the skirmishes and swords follow and then finally you repeat on the back of the pins and you win. So basically, don't use swords as a main force, use them flank while a medium spear unit with phalanx holds the center. Note: I didn't play Marian Rome in DEI so I don't know about this context. 24 December 2017, 05:01 #19 Is shieldwall in Rome 2? I've never seen it before. One of the best aspects of Attila is that all high-level swordsmen get some form of shield wall, which gives them a lot of defensive bonuses such as much higher weight and load resistance, attacking infantry and high-level cavalry, and almost total resistance to missile fire. However as far as I can see these abilities do not exist in Rome 2 thus making swordsmen weak compared to the phalanxes. If introduced, it would make swordsmen more viable on the front line. December 24, 2017, 05:47 #21 Posted by Artannis Wolfrunner I feel it was my big complaint with the battles in DEI 1.2. Phalanges are simply better than thorakatai. In the old version 1.1, phalanx formation was rare and few spearmen had it. Now it seems that most spearman units have phalanxes. These units are basically from the front in the phalanx formation, and the phalanx units in Rome 2 have this problem where when flanked, the rear rank just flips around and the unit fights as it has two front rows. The advantage of accompanying it is lost - exactly the opposite of how the phalanxes should work. Fight any battle against a Hellenic faction and you will see that phalanx units are always the last of the road, and often only do so after the general is dead. Some will continue to fight almost to the death, even when they are surrounded and the general is dead. The phalanges are devastating compared to the cavalry, even on a flank load, while the heavy cavalry is a hard counter-fire to all swords. Then there is the argument of mobility that many will use in favor of swords. However, this ignores the phalanx units themselves. Swords have only mobility and no other choice. Heavy spears can switch between mobility and flank (extinct phalange) and invincible forward and never routes (fl phalang) at the touch of a button. This is the same reason why the Romans really weakened with the Marian reforms. The Polybian army has "tria" which beat almost any other unit, even flanked, as well as a super heavy AOR hoplite in Italy. The Romans lost access to both with Marian reforms, then their army became an ocean of swordsmen who could not pierce the phalanxes and were effortlessly carried away by the heavy cavalry. The rear rank flanks and the unit fights as if it had two front rows. Well, it seems realistic, in a 5-row deep formation if the enemies would try to flank you, the last 2 rows would just turn around to protect the rest of the formation. Obviously, that makes the phalanx op as you say, but I think we should not sacrifice that for balance. Anyway, either, which bothers me is the lack of shield on the swords unit, any sword unit would simply realize that putting each shield together to comrades those next to them would protect them a lot (just like the spear units do with the phalanx), and that's actually what the Romans would do with the great scutums with things like testudo formations for example, so I don't see why almost all spearmen in DEI has phalanx but swords don't get shieldwall or anything like that. I also think that the use of spear units in the center and flanking with peltasts is the way to go against the phalanx. Just use your cav to bait their cav and then kill them with javelins (from the peltasts), when it's done, you load your cav into their skirmish and put your peltasts to release all the javelins on the pike from the rear and after that it's loaded with your cav and as soon as the charge is completed, just load your peltasts and move your cav away and the pike usually just break very quickly after that. Oh and it works with swords instead of peltasts too because some unit swords have 2 javelins. So basically you use these javelins in the cavity as before, load with your cav to their cav pinning them in place, load your swords into their cav and let your cav cycle charge 2 or 3 times break them, then your cav goes straight to the skirmishes and swords follow and then finally you repeat on the back of the pins and you win. So basically, don't use swords as a main force, use them flank while a medium spear unit with phalanx holds the center. Note: I didn't play Marian Rome in DEI so I don't know about this context. 24 December 2017, 05:01 #19 Is shieldwall in Rome 2? I've never seen it before. One of the best aspects of Attila is that all high-level swordsmen get some form of shield wall, which gives them a lot of defensive bonuses such as much higher weight and load resistance, attacking infantry and high-level cavalry, and almost total resistance to missile fire. However as far as I can see these abilities do not exist in Rome 2 thus making swordsmen weak compared to the phalanxes. If introduced, it would make swordsmen more viable on the front line. December 24, 2017, 05:47 #21 Posted by Artannis Wolfrunner I feel it was my big complaint with the battles in DEI 1.2. Phalanges are simply better than thorakatai. In the old version 1.1, phalanx formation was rare and few spearmen had it. Now it seems that most spearman units have phalanxes. These units are basically from the front in the phalanx formation, and the phalanx units in Rome 2 have this problem where when flanked, the rear rank just flips around and the unit fights as it has two front rows. The advantage of accompanying it is lost - exactly the opposite of how the phalanxes should work. Fight any battle against a Hellenic faction and you will see that phalanx units are always the last of the road, and often only do so after the general is dead. Some will continue to fight almost to the death, even when they are surrounded and the general is dead. The phalanges are devastating compared to the cavalry, even on a flank load, while the heavy cavalry is a hard counter-fire to all swords. Then there is the argument of mobility that many will use in favor of swords. However, this ignores the phalanx units themselves. Swords have only mobility and no other choice. Heavy spears can switch between mobility and flank (extinct phalange) and invincible forward and never routes (fl phalang) at the touch of a button. This is the same reason why the Romans really weakened with the Marian reforms. The Polybian army has "tria" which beat almost any other unit, even flanked, as well as a super heavy AOR hoplite in Italy. The Romans lost access to both with Marian reforms, then their army became an ocean of swordsmen who could not pierce the phalanxes and were effortlessly carried away by the heavy cavalry. The rear rank flanks and the unit fights as if it had two front rows. Well, it seems realistic, in a 5-row deep formation if the enemies would try to flank you, the last 2 rows would just turn around to protect the rest of the formation. Obviously, that makes the phalanx op as you say, but I think we should not sacrifice that for balance. Anyway, either, which bothers me is the lack of shield on the swords unit, any sword unit would simply realize that putting each shield together to comrades those next to them would protect them a lot (just like the spear units do with the phalanx), and that's actually what the Romans would do with the great scutums with things like testudo formations for example, so I don't see why almost all spearmen in DEI has phalanx but swords don't get shieldwall or anything like that. I also think that the use of spear units in the center and flanking with peltasts is the way to go against the phalanx. Just use your cav to bait their cav and then kill them with javelins (from the peltasts), when it's done, you load your cav into their skirmish and put your peltasts to release all the javelins on the pike from the rear and after that it's loaded with your cav and as soon as the charge is completed, just load your peltasts and move your cav away and the pike usually just break very quickly after that. Oh and it works with swords instead of peltasts too because some unit swords have 2 javelins. So basically you use these javel