

AMELA BAJRIĆ

Blagovac I/46, Vogošća
BIH – 71000 Sarajevo
amela1907@yahoo.com

ILIRSKA VLADARICA TEUTA I ILIRI U POLIBIJEVOM ODLOMKU O RIMSKOM POSLANSTVU U ILIRIJI

UDK: 94(398:37)

Izvorni znanstveni rad

Polibije, grčki povjesničar i državnik dao je najdetaljniji prikaz rimske diplomatske misije u Iliriji. To je ujedno i prvi zabilježeni diplomatski kontakt između Rimljana i Ilira uoči 1. ilirskog rata. Za razliku od drugih starih pisaca, Polibije je jedini koji je iznio sadržaj razgovora. Odlomak se izdvaja višestrukim značenjem. Posebno je zanimljiv jer je upravo u njemu Polibije iznio stanovit broj istraživački atraktivnih bilježaka karakterizacije Ilira i ilirske vladarice Teute. Momenti iz odlomka koji dopuštaju da se analizira Polibijeva slika Ilira su: kritika institucije kraljevstva, razlike između rimskih i ilirskih običaja i izravne karakterizacije ilirske vladarice Teute. Polarizacija Rimljani – Iliri na političkom polju analogna je konceptualnoj shemi Grci – barbari, prema kojoj je grčko društvo demokratsko i ravnopravno, dok je barbarsko tiransko i hijerarhijsko. Poput Grka, Rimljani su predstavljani kao ljubitelji slobode, zaštitnici prava i zakona, a Iliri kao kontrast svim načelima ljudskosti i rimskim vrlinama. Razlike između Ilira i Rimljana, Polibije

ILLYRIAN QUEEN TEUTA AND THE ILLYRIANS IN POLYBIUS'S PASSAGE ON THE ROMAN MISSION IN ILLYRIA

UDC: 94(398:37)

Original scientific paper

Polybius, a Greek historian and statesman, gave the most detailed view of the Roman diplomatic mission in Illyria before the First Illyrian War. This is also the first recorded diplomatic contact between the Romans and Illyrians. Unlike other ancient authors, Polybius was the only one who presented the content of the conversation. The passage stands out with its multiple meanings, but particularly interesting as a place where Polybius presents a certain number of the characterization notes of the Illyrians and their ruler Teuta. The moments in the passage that allow an analysis of Polybius's image of the Illyrians are: the critique of the institution of the kingdom, the differences between Roman and Illyrian customs, and the explicit characterization of the Illyrian ruler, Teuta. Polarization between Romans and Illyrians is analogous with the conceptual scheme of the polarization of Greeks and barbarians, by which Greek society is democratic and equal, while barbaric society is tyrannical and hierarchical. Like the Greeks, the Romans are presented as lovers of liberty and protectors of law, and the Illyrians as a contrast to all principles of humanity and Roman virtues. Polybius underlines the

je podcrtao suprotnošću između njihovih običaja i zakona. Ilirske radnje definirao je kao nepravedne i nezakonite, u velikoj mjeri kao sramotne u kontekstu načina stjecanja dobitka. Suprotno tome, rimski postupci koji su potjecali iz njihovih običaja i zakona, bili su pravedni i zakoniti, u skladu s općepriznatim civiliziranim normama. Kako bi objasnio vojne i političke poteze ilirske vladarice, Polibije je Teuti izravno pripisao prosuđivanje na ženski način, ukazujući da je bila politički kratkovidna i loša vladarica. Dion Kasije i Flor prihvatili su rimsku verziju događaja, pronalazeći razlog 1. ilirskog rata u postupcima ilirske vladarice. Shodno tomu, Teuta je kod njih negativan lik, a Apijanova Teuta pozitivan je lik.

Ključne riječi: Polibije, rimska diplomatska misija, Teuta, Iliri, barbari, Rimljani

differences between the Illyrians and Romans through the contradictions between their customs and laws. He defines Illyrian actions as unjust and illegal, largely as shameful in the context of ways of earning income. In contrast, the actions of Romans that originate from their customs and laws are fair and lawful, in accordance with universally recognized civilized norms. Polybius directly attributes to Teuta a woman's natural shortness of view, in order to explain her military and political moves, saying that she was politically shortsighted and a bad ruler. Dio Cassius and Florus embrace the Roman version of events, finding the cause of the First Illyrian War in the procedures of the Illyrian ruler; therefore representing Teuta in a negative light. Appian's Teuta is a positive figure.

Key words: Polybius, Roman diplomatic mission, Teuta, Illyrians, barbarians, Romans.

Polibije, povjesničar i državnik iz Megalopolisa u Arkadiji, najdetaljniji je sačuvani pisani izvor o rimskoj diplomatskoj misiji u Iliriji uoči 1. ilirskog rata (*Polyb.* II, 8, 1-13).¹ To je ujedno i prvi zabilježeni diplomatski kontakt između Rimljana i Ilira.² Sadržaj razgovora isključivo nam je poznat zahvaljujući njemu i nema po-

¹ Polibije se osvrnuo na događaje u Iliriji kako bi iznio razloge prvog rimskog prelaska s vojskom na istočnu obalu Jadranskoga mora, što je, prema njegovom mišljenju, bilo neophodno da bi se pravilno shvatila: a) tema njegova djela - kako i zaslugom kojeg uređenja je skoro čitav svijet bio nadvladan i za manje od pedeset tri godine potpao pod jedinstvenu vlast Rimljana (*Polyb.* I, 1), b) stvaranje i jačanje rimske vlasti (*Polyb.* II, 2).

² Valja istaknuti da termine »Iliri« i »ilirski« koristimo u kontekstu Ilirskog kraljevstva.

Polybius, a historian and statesman of Megalopolis in Arcadia, is the most detailed surviving written source on the Roman diplomatic mission in Illyria before the First Illyrian War (*Polyb.* II, 8, 1-13).¹ This is also the first recorded diplomatic contact between the Romans and Illyrians.² Thanks to him, the content of the conversations is known to

¹ Polybius refers to the events in Illyria to bring out the reasons for the first crossing of the Roman army to the eastern coast of the Adriatic Sea, which was, in his opinion, necessary to properly understand: a) the subject of his work – the merits of the unique Roman political institutions that conquered almost the whole world in less than fifty-three years (*Polyb.* I, 1), b) the creation and strengthening of the Roman government (*Polyb.* II, 2).

² It should be noted that the term "Illyrians" and "Illyrian" are used in the context of the Illyrian kingdom.

tvrdi u drugim pisanim izvorima.³ Polibi- je ga je iznio u osmom poglavlju 2. knjige *Historije* kao posljedicu ilirskog napada na italske trgovce (*Polyb.* II, 8, 1-13).⁴

Prikaz rimske diplomatske misije u Iliriji izdvaja se svojim višestrukim značenjem. Pozornost modernih povjesničara privla-

³ Diplomatsku misiju spominju i drugi stari pisci koji ne iznose detalje, usp. *App. Illyr.* 7., *Dio. Cass.* 12, fragm. 49. i *Flor* 1, 21. Polibije je najopširniji izvor za rekonstrukciju događaja iz ilirske povijesti posljednja dva desetljeća 3. st. pr. Kr. U odnosu na druge antičke pisce, on je vremenski bio najbliži događajima koje je opisao. Holleaux ga je smatrao najpouzdanijim pisanim izvorom (Holleaux 1954, 822). Derow je ocijenio da je Apijan Aleksandrijski vjerodostojniji izvor od Polibija (Derow 1973, 118-134). V. i usp. Badian 1952, 72-93; Walser 1954, 311; Gabričević 1974, 5-26; Gruen 1984, 259-361; Šašel Kos 1986, 67-83; Šašel Kos 2005, 249-252; Džino 2010, 47-48. Za ovaj rad bitno je reći da su se proturječnosti u pisanim izvorima odrazile na sliku ilirske vladarice Teute i da ćemo u radu po potrebi ukazati na te momente.

⁴ 8. poglavlje započeo je opisom ilirskog napada na italske trgovce, naglašavajući da su ih Iliri i ranije stalno pljačkali (*Polyb.* II, 8, 1-2). U nastavku je napravio usporedbu između ranijih i tadašnje reakcije Senata prema ovim ilirskim pothvatima. Ono što je u posljednjem slučaju navodno bilo presudno je da se tada više ljudi pojavilo pred Senatom u vezi s ilirskim napadom na italske trgovce, tako su Gaja i Lucija Korunkanija odredili da kao poslanici odu u Iliriju i ispituju stvar (*Polyb.* II, 8, 3). Nakon ove kratke digresije, Polibije se vraća događajima u Iliriji koji su prethodili dolasku rimskih poslanika: završetak ilirskog pohoda u Epiru Teutinim oduševljenjem stečenim plijenom (*Polyb.* II, 8, 4), spominje unutarnje nemire koji su je navodno privremeno zaustavili u daljnjem pljačkanju Helena, u istom paragrafu kaže da je dovela u red pobunjene Ilire i započela opsadu Ise, jedinog grada koji joj se odbio pokoriti (*Polyb.* II, 8, 5). Slijedi dolazak rimskih poslanika (*Polyb.* II, 8, 6), razgovor s Teutom (*Polyb.* II, 8, 7-11), Teutina ljutnja zbog Korunkanijeve otvorenosti i ubojstvo mladog poslanika (*Polyb.* II, 8, 12). Poglavlje je završio rimskom reakcijom na zločin i naznakom rata protiv Teute (*Polyb.* II, 8, 13).

us, and there are no other written sources to confirm it.³ Polybius mentions the aforementioned conversations in the eighth chapter of the second book of his *Histories* as a result of the Illyrian attack on the Italic merchants (*Polyb.* II, 8, 1-13).⁴

³ This diplomatic mission is also mentioned by other ancient authors without giving more details, cf. *App. Illyr.* 7, *Dio. Cass.* 12, fragm. 49 and *Flor* 1, 21. Polybius is the most comprehensive source for the reconstruction of events from Illyrian history in the last two decades of the 3rd century B.C. Compared to other ancient authors, he was the closest to the time of the events he described. Holleaux considers him the most reliable written source (Holleaux 1954, 822). Derow esteems Appian of Alexandria as a more credible source than Polybius (Derow, 1973, 118-134). See and cf. Badian 1952, 72-93; Walser 1954, 311; Gabričević 1974, 5-26; Gruen 1984, 259-361; Šašel Kos 1986, 67-83; Šašel Kos 2005, 249-252; Džino 2010, 47-48. As for this paper, it is important to say that these contradictions in written sources affected the image of the Illyrian queen, Teuta, and these instances shall be pointed out as needed.

⁴ He begins the eighth chapter with the description of the Illyrian attack on the Italic merchants, stressing that the Illyrians had been constantly performing raids on them much earlier (*Polyb.* II, 8, 1-2). In his following narrative, he makes a comparison between the earlier reaction and the current reaction of the Senate to the predatory Illyrian ventures. What was allegedly crucial in the latter case is that a few people, at that time, appeared before the Senate regarding the Illyrian attack on the Italic merchants. So the Senate elected Gaius and Lucius Coruncanus legates to go to Illyria and investigate the matter (*Polyb.* II, 8, 3). After this brief digression, Polybius goes back to the events in Illyria that preceded the arrival of the Roman legates: the end of the Illyrian campaign in Epirus after Teuta's enthusiasm for the booty (*Polyb.* II, 8, 4); he mentions the inner turmoil that supposedly stopped her further plunder of Hellas; in the same paragraph, he states that she settled the matter with the rebellious Illyrians and began the siege of Issa, which was the only city that refused to obey her (*Polyb.* II, 8, 5). This was followed by the arrival of the Roman legates (*Polyb.* II, 8, 6); talks with Teuta (*Polyb.* II, 8, 7-11); Teuta's anger at Coruncanus's openness, and the murder of the young legate (*Polyb.* II, 8, 12). The chapter ends with the Roman reaction to the crime and an indication of war against Teuta (*Polyb.* II, 8, 13).

čio je njegov politički karakter,⁵ budući da se njime objašnjavao razlog povrede svetosti poslanstva, što je prouzročilo 1. ilirski rat, ali i kao početak rimskog osvajanja Grčke i Makedonije.⁶ Odlomak je ključan za proučavanje fenomena ilirskog gusarenja⁷ i rimskog »imperijalizma«.⁸ Nesumnjivo je ilustrativan primjer rimske vojne i političke propagande.⁹ Govor koji je Polibije pripisao mladom rimskom poslaniku Korunkaniju najčešće se ocjenjuje kao nevjerodostojan, izmišljen ili prenesen iz Polibijevog izvora Fabija Piktora.¹⁰ Moderni znanstvenici uglavnom odbacuju govore iz antičke historiografije kao retorička mjesta, gdje autori naglašavaju određene ideje.¹¹ Njihova povijesna vjerodostojnost vrlo je upitna. Oni najčešće odstupaju od povijesne zbiljnosti jer sadrže ono što nije stvarno rečeno, nego korisno i primjereno u određenoj situaciji. Čini se da je i sam Polibije bio toga svjestan te je tražio da mu bude oprosteno ako se otkrije da je negdje namjerno ili zbog koristi iznosio lažne podatke (*Polyb. XXIX, 12, 10-11*). Polibije je svoj

The representation of the Roman diplomatic mission in Illyria stands out with its multiple meanings. The attention of modern historians has been drawn by his political character,⁵ since it has explained the cause of the violation of the sanctity of messengers, and thus caused the First Illyrian War, as well as the beginning of the Roman conquest of Greece and Macedonia.⁶ The fragment is crucial for studying the phenomenon of Illyrian piracy⁷ and Roman 'imperialism'.⁸ Undoubtedly, it is an illustrative example of Roman military and political propaganda.⁹ The speech which Polybius attributes to the young Roman legate Coruncanus is commonly assessed as unsound, invented or transferred from Polybius's source, Fabius Pictor.¹⁰ Modern scholars generally dismiss speeches from ancient historiography as rhetorical places where authors emphasize certain ideas.¹¹ Their historical authenticity is highly questionable. They tend to depart from historical reality because they contain what was not really being said, except for something useful and appropriate in a given situation. It seems that Polybius himself was aware of it, and asked to be for-

⁵ S obzirom na njegovu političku važnost, moderni povjesničari su ga opravdano naglašavali iz ove točke gledišta. Neki su, svakako nekritički, preuzeli Polibijevu verziju događaja i odgovornost ilirske vladarice Teute za rat (Holleaux 1920, 97-129). V. suprotna mišljenja: Walbank 1970, 158-159; Harris 1979, 65, 137, 171, 195-197; Wilkes 1995, 159-162; Cabanes 2002, 144-149.

⁶ Derow 2003, 51-71.; Gruen 1984, 359-437.

⁷ Dell 1967, 344-358; Ormerod 1997, 169-189; De Souza 1999, 76-80; Šašel Kos 2002, 137-155.

⁸ Harris 1979, 195-197.

⁹ Šašel Kos 1986, 73, 81; 2005, 271; Bajrić 2009, 43-45.

¹⁰ Pédech 1964, 291; Walbank 1970, 159; Harris 1979, 171; Sacks 1981, 79-96; Šašel Kos 1986, 73ss.; Riel 1988a, bilj. 23, 598; Marincola 2001, 128-133; Šašel Kos 2002, 140. Prema Walbanku, govor je najvjerojatnije izmišljen naknadno da bi se uvećala nedužna žrtva (Walbank 1970, 159; Riel 1988a, bilj. 23, 598).

¹¹ Marincola 2001, 128-133; Marincola 2007a, 118-132; Adler 2011, 61-63, 79-81.

⁵ Given his political importance, modern historians have justifiably emphasized him from this point of view. Some of them have uncritically taken Polybius's version of events and the responsibility of the Illyrian queen, Teuta, for the war (Holleaux 1920, 97-129). See oppos. opinion: Walbank 1970, 158-159; Harris, 1979, 65, 137, 171, 195-197; Wilkes 1995, 159-162; Cabanes, 2002, 144-149.

⁶ Derow 2003, 51-71; Gruen 1984, 359-437.

⁷ Dell 1967, 344-358; Ormerod 1997, 169-189; De Souza 1999, 76-80; Šašel Kos 2002, 137-155.

⁸ Harris 1979, 195-197.

⁹ Šašel Kos 1986, 73, 81; 2005, 271; Bajrić 2009, 43-45.

¹⁰ Pédech 1964, 291; Walbank 1970, 159; Harris 1979, 171; Sacks 1981, 79-96; Šašel Kos 1986, 73ff; Riel 1988a, n. 23, 598; Marincola 2001, 128-133; Šašel Kos 2002, 140. According to Walbank, the speech was probably invented later in order to emphasize the innocence of victimhood (Walbank 1970, 159; Riel 1988a, n. 23, 598).

¹¹ Marincola 2001, 128-133; Marincola 2007a, 118-132; Adler 2011, 61-63, 79-81.

stav o iznošenju govora iznio kritizirajući metode i način sastavljanja govora drugih povjesničara, osobito Filarha i Timeja (II, 56, 10; III, 20, 1-5; XII, 25a; 25b, 1, 25i, 4-9; XXIX, 12, 10-11; XXXVI, 1, 1-7).¹² Neki od njegovih principa su da povjesničar slušateljima treba pružiti dokaz o onome što im je nepoznato i u što ne vjeruju (*Polyb.* XII, 25i, 4-9), te da u govorima treba iznositi ono što odgovara situaciji i to samo najvažnije i odlučujuće momente (*Polyb.* XXXVI, 1, 1-7). Njegov prikaz razgovora između Teute i rimskog poslanika pokazuje da je u znatnoj mjeri ostao dosljedan nekim svojim principima. Ovdje je, prije svega, iznio one presudne momente koji su prouzročili napad na rimsko poslanstvo, što je dovelo do prvog rata između Rima i Ilira. Međutim, umetnutim »dijalogom« je kroz riječi mlađeg poslanika iznio i svoj sud o kraljevskoj vlasti i zakonskom pravu ilirskih kraljeva i o Teuti kao ženi-vladarici.

Odlomak o rimskom poslanstvu u Iliriji posebno je zanimljiv jer je upravo u njemu Polibije iznio određen broj istraživački atraktivnih bilježaka karakterizacije Ilira i ilirske vladarice Teute. Potrebno je ispitati sadrže li te bilješke specifične stvarne podatke ili ih treba smatrati izdankom općeg grčkog viđenja »drugog«. Momenti iz Polibijevoga odlomka koji nam dopuštaju takvu vrstu analize su:

- kritika institucije kraljevstva;
- razlike između rimskih i ilirskih običaja i zakona;
- karakterizacije ilirske vladarice Teute.

Polibije je 6. knjigu *Historije* posvetio državnim uređenjima, da bi objasnio kako i zahvaljujući kojoj vrsti uređenja je skoro čitav svijet za manje od pedeset i tri go-

given if it came out that he, on purpose or for his own self-interest, gave out false information (*Polyb.* XXIX, 12, 10-11). Polybius presented his own attitude to making a speech by criticizing the methods and manner of other historians in preparing their speeches, especially Phylarchus and Timaeus (II, 56, 10; III, 20, 1-5; XII, 25a, 25b, 1, 25i, 4-9; XXIX, 12, 10-11; XXXVI, 1, 1-7).¹² Some of his principles suggest that a historian should provide the evidence for listeners on what is unknown to them and what they do not believe in (*Polyb.* XII, 25i, 4-9), and that the speech should be on what suits the situation best, citing the most important and decisive moments (*Polyb.* XXXVI, 1, 1-7). His representation of the conversations between Teuta and the Roman legate indicates that he largely remained consistent to certain of his principles. Here, he primarily cites those crucial moments that caused the attack on the Roman envoy, which led to the first war between Rome and the Illyrians. However, in the inserted "dialogue" through the words of the younger delegate, he expressed his opinion on the royal government and legal rights of the Illyrian kings, and Teuta as a female ruler.

The fragment of the Roman envoy in Illyria is particularly interesting because it precisely presents the excerpt where Polybius presents a certain number of attractive research notes on the characterization of the Illyrians and the Illyrian queen, Teuta. It is necessary to examine whether the notes contain specific items of actual information or are to be regarded as a scion of the general Greek notion of "otherness". Sequences from Polybius's paragraph that allow us this kind of analysis are:

- critique of the institution of the kingdom;
- differences between Roman and Illyrian customs and laws;
- characterization of the Illyrian ruler Teuta.

¹² Marincola smatra da je Polibije ipak priznavao retorički pristup u svojoj zamisli da povjesničar mora izabrati »primjerene« i »prihvatljive« argumente (Marincola 2007a, 125), usp. Pédech 1964, 255-302; Sacks 1981, 79-96; Adler 2011.

¹² Marincola believes that Polybius nevertheless acknowledged a rhetorical approach in his conception that the historian must choose "appropriate" and "acceptable" arguments (Marincola 2007a, 125), cf. Pédech 1964, 255-302; Sacks 1981, 79-96; Adler 2011.

dine potpao pod vlast Rima.¹³ Iznio je pomno razrađen model smjenjivanja ustava (ἀνακύκλωσις), čiji je važan izvor biološka teorija prema kojoj su sva živa bića podložna promjenama i prolaze kroz stadije rođenja, vrhunca i opadanja. Proces je započeo s primitivnom monarhijom, a potom slijede kraljevina, tiranija, aristokracija, oligarhija, demokracija i ohlokracija, da bi krug zatvorio vraćanjem na monarhiju gdje je proces i započeo.¹⁴ Rimski mješoviti ustav držao je boljim od drugih, jer je bio ravnoteža između monarhije, aristokracije i demokracije, i u vezi s tim, onih pozitivnih značajki kojima su se odlikovale.¹⁵

Govoreći o Polibijevoj političkoj teoriji, Walbank pokazuje da je Polibije vjerovao da državna uređenja propadaju uslijed djelovanja vanjskih i unutarnjih faktora, napose da je društveno opadanje posljedica pomanjkanja moralnih.¹⁶ Također, ukazuje na ulogu *Tyche*, koja je u ovim momentima primjetna, ali ne i presudna. Tako npr. Polibije joj je pripisao ključni značaj kada je opisivao pad Makedonije pod rimsku vlast. Međutim, kada je govorio o Rimljanima, primarno mjesto dao je obliku ustava smatrajući ga najvećim uzrokom uspjeha i neuspjeha u svakom državnom poslu.¹⁷ Prema Walbanku, Polibijev stav o kraljevini i tiraniji, pokazuje da je prihvatio tradicionalne kriterije o razlici između vladavine kralja i tiranina.¹⁸ Sukladno tome, za tiranina je karakteristično da čini zlo i strahom vla-

Polybius devoted Book VI of his *Histories* to the order of the state, so as to explain how, and through what kind of planning, almost an entire world came under the authority of Rome in less than fifty-three years.¹³ He presented an elaborate model for changing the constitution (ἀνακύκλωσις), whose important source lies in the biological theory that all living beings are subject to change and go through the stages of birth, peak and decline. The process started with primitive monarchy, followed by kingship, tyranny, aristocracy, oligarchy, democracy and ochlocracy, to close the circle by returning to monarchy, where the process itself had begun.¹⁴ He thought that the Roman mixed constitution was better than any other, because it was a balance between monarchy, aristocracy and democracy, as well as all the positive features that were within its framework.¹⁵

Speaking of Polybius's political theory, Walbank shows that Polybius believed that government regulation tended to fail due to external and internal factors, and particularly that social decline is a consequence of moral deficiency.¹⁶ He also points to the role of *Tyche*, which is noticeable in these moments, yet not decisive. For example, Polybius attributes a key role to it when describing the decline of Macedonia under Roman rule. However, when speaking of the Romans, Polybius gives the primary place to the form of constitution, considering it the greatest cause of success and failure in any government job.¹⁷ According to Walbank, Polybius's stand on kingship and tyranny shows that he accepted the traditional criteria of the difference between

¹³ *Polyb.* VI, 2, (1); Walbank 2002, 221.

¹⁴ Više o ovome v. Walbank 1970, 635-663; Walbank 2002, 193-211.

¹⁵ Walbank 1970, 659-746; Eckstein 1995, 166-168; 172-173; Champion 2004, 67-142.

¹⁶ Walbank 2002, 193-211.

¹⁷ *Polyb.* I, 63, 6-I, 64, 2; III, 2, 6; 118, VI, 10, 13-14; 50; Walbank 1970, 16-26; Walbank 2002, 194-197; 209-216; Walbank 2007, 349-355, usp. Pédech 1964, 331-354; Gruen 1984, 343-351.

¹⁸ Walbank 2002, 217-218.

¹³ *Polyb.* VI, 2, (1); Walbank 2002, 221.

¹⁴ For more on this topic, see Walbank 1970, 635-663; Walbank 2002, 193-211.

¹⁵ Walbank 1970, 659-746; Eckstein 1995, 166-168; 172-173; Champion 2004, 67-142.

¹⁶ Walbank 2002, 193-211.

¹⁷ *Polyb.* I, 63, 6-I, 64, 2; III, 2, 6; 118, VI, 10, 13-14; 50; Walbank 1970, 16-26; Walbank 2002, 194-197; 209-216; Walbank 2007, 349-355, cf. Pédech 1964, 331-354; Gruen 1984, 343-351.

da protiv volje građana, da mrzi i da je sam omrznut od potčinjenih; kralj, pak, čini svima dobro, voljen je zbog svojih dobročinstava i čovječnosti te vodi i štiti ljude koji ga rado slijede (*Polyb.* V, 11). Polibijevog idealnog kralja krasio je plemenit duh (μεγαλοψυχία) spojen s blagošću i umjerenošću (εὐγνωμοσύνη; μετριότης).¹⁹ Kod Polibija, prelazak iz monarhije u kraljevinu usko je povezan sa samom ličnošću monarha, koji, kada razum (λογισμός) preuzme vodstvo od sile i snage, neprimjetno postaje kralj.²⁰ Kraljevina se, dakle, rađa i nastaje s predstavama o dobrom i pravednom, a u svoj izobličeni oblik tiraniju prelazi uslijed poroka i moralnog opadanja koje se pojavljuje kod nasljednika.²¹

Šestu knjigu *Historije*, Eckstein procjenjuje ne samo ključnom za analizu političke i državne postojanosti, nego i karaktera. On objašnjava da je Polibije veličao odlike rimskog mješovitog ustava i stabilnosti osigurane ravnotežom ravnopravne raspodjele vlasti na tri organa - senat, konzul i narod. Zahvaljujući tome, Rimljani su se održali u ratu protiv Hanibala. Opis rimskog pogreba smatra mjestom gdje je Polibije nastojao predočiti kako su rimski običaji inspirirali ljude da traže καλόν. Polibijev opis rimskog načina života i rimskih političkih institucija imao je za primarni cilj pokazati sposobnost da se u potpunim promjenama sreće sve podnosi uzvišeno i hrabro (μεγαλοψύχως καὶ γενναίως), i da je upravo ta sposobnost države proizlazila iz njenih političkih institucija.²² Poput Walbanka, ukazuje da se Polibijev prikaz kraljevine oslanjao na teoriju o dobrom kralju.²³ Polibije je, između ostalog, pisanje o časnim i pravičnim djelima (τὰ καλὰ καὶ δίκαια) smatrao

the rule of a king and the rule of a tyrant.¹⁸ Accordingly, the characteristic of a tyrant is that he does evil and he uses fear to rule the government against the will of the citizens, to hate and to be hated by his subordinates; the king, in turn, does good to everybody, is loved because of his charity and humanity, and leads and protects his people, who are happy to follow him (*Polyb.* V, 11). Polybius's ideal king is adorned by a generous spirit (μεγαλοψυχία) along with gentleness and moderation (εὐγνωμοσύνη; μετριότης).¹⁹ According to Polybius, the transition from monarchy to kingship is closely linked to the very personality of the monarch himself, who, once reason (λογισμός) has taken over leadership from force and power, seamlessly becomes a king.²⁰ A kingship is thus born and emerges with the notions of good and right, but it becomes distorted into the form of tyranny due to the vices and moral decline that is to befall its successors.²¹

For Eckstein, Book VI of the *Histories* is crucial for the analysis not only of political and civil stability, but also of character. He explains that Polybius praises the qualities of the Roman mixed constitution and stability that had ensured the balance of equal distribution of power in three bodies: the Senate, the Consul and the people. Thanks to this, the Romans endured the war against Hannibal. The description of a Roman funeral, he thinks, is a place where Polybius tries to point out how Roman traditions inspired people to seek the καλόν. Polybius's description of the Roman way of life and the Roman political institutions had the primary objective of demonstrating the ability to endure and remain noble and brave (μεγαλοψύχως καὶ γενναίως) in a complete twist of luck, and it is precisely this ability of the state that resulted from its political institutions.²² Like Wal-

¹⁹ Walbank 1984, 81-84; Walbank 2002, 218-219.

²⁰ *Polyb.* VI, 6, 12; 7, 1-3; Walbank 2002, 220-225.

²¹ Walbank 1970, 655; Walbank 2002, 222.

²² Eckstein 1995, 65-67.

²³ Eckstein 1995, 36, 227, 273-274.

¹⁸ Walbank 2002, 217-218.

¹⁹ Walbank 1984, 81-84; Walbank 2002, 218-219.

²⁰ *Polyb.* VI, 6, 12; 7, 1-3; Walbank 2002, 220-225.

²¹ Walbank 1970, 655; Walbank 2002, 222.

²² Eckstein 1995, 65-67.

obvezom povjesničara.²⁴ Njegovi nazori bili su obrazovani tradicionalnim, aristokratskim idealima o moralno lijepom i dobrom (καλόν).²⁵ Eckstein je mišljenja da je Polibijeva percepcija barbara izdank opće grčke predodžbe o »drugom«, shodno tome, barbari, najamnici, mase, mladež i žene bili su destruktivne snage koje su konstantno ugrožavale i prijetile civiliziranom, uređenom društvu.²⁶ Držao ih je opasnim zbog njihovih navodnih urođenih sklonosti nasilju, bijesu i nedostatku samokontrole. Gledano u ovom kontekstu, Polibije je vjerovao da je grčka i rimska elita (oni kojima je i posvetio svoje djelo) imala dužnost (τὸ καθήκον) zaštititi društvo od sila nereda i kaosa koje su mu prijetile. Zreli aristokratski muškarac mogao je biti dorastao ovom izazovu samo hrabrošću i razumnim postupcima, dakle, ispravno i časno ponašanje elite trebalo je biti glavna zaštita protiv prijetećeg kaosa.²⁷

U *Cultural Politics in Polybius's Histories*, Champion pokazuje da je Polibijev stav prema Rimljanima bio dvosmislen, on ih je prikazivao civiliziranim, pripisujući im helenske vrline, što autor naziva »politics of cultural assimilation of the Romans to Hellenism«, ali i neciviliziranim, kada pokazuje njihovu brutalnost prema Grcima »politics of cultural alienation of the Romans to Hellenism«. ²⁸ Položaj Rimljana unutar dva pola, helenizma i barbarizma analizirao je preko Polibijevih narativnih prikaza Rimljana, Ahejaca i drugih. Smatra da je okosnica unutar koje je Polibije radio bila helensko–barbarski bipolaritet i da je koristio tri tradicionalna objašnjenja razlika među narodima: 1) distinktivne značajke urođene jednom naro-

bank, he indicates that Polybius's representation of kingship relies on the theory of a good king.²³ Polybius, among other things, felt that writing about right and honourable deeds (τὰ καλὰ καὶ δίκαια) was an obligation of historians.²⁴ Traditional and aristocratic ideals of moral good and aesthetic properties (καλόν) educated and influenced his worldview.²⁵ Eckstein believes that Polybius's perception of barbarians presents an offshoot of the general Greek notion of 'otherness'. Therefore, barbarians, mercenaries, the masses, youth and women were destructive forces that were constantly jeopardizing and threatening the civilized, organized society.²⁶ He believed they were dangerous because of their alleged innate propensity to violence, anger and lack of self-control. Seen in this context, Polybius believed that the Greek and Roman elites (to whom he dedicated his works) had a duty (τὸ καθήκον) to protect society from the threatening forces of disorder and chaos. A mature aristocratic man could be able to cope with this challenge only if he had courage and reasonable actions; therefore, a proper and honourable behaviour of the elite was to be the main protection against the threatening chaos.²⁷

In his *Cultural Politics in Polybius's Histories*, Champion shows that Polybius's attitude toward the Romans was ambiguous; he pictured them as civilized, attributing to them Hellenic virtues, which the author calls the "politics of cultural assimilation of the Romans to Hellenism", but also uncivilized, showing their brutality toward the Greeks ("politics of cultural alienation of the Romans to Hellenism").²⁸ Using Polybius's narrative representation of Romans, Achaeans and others, he analyses the Roman position within

²⁴ Eckstein 1995, 22.

²⁵ Eckstein 1995, 28-55.

²⁶ Eckstein 1995, 118-160, usp. Cartledge 1993; Walbank 2002, 212-213; Champion 2004, 70-71.

²⁷ Eckstein 1995, 119, 158-160.

²⁸ Champion 2004, 4.

²³ Eckstein 1995, 36, 227, 273-274.

²⁴ Eckstein 1995, 22.

²⁵ Eckstein 1995, 28-55.

²⁶ Eckstein 1995, 118-160, cf. Cartledge 1993; Walbank 2002, 212-213; Champion 2004, 70-71.

²⁷ Eckstein 1995, 119, 158-160.

²⁸ Champion 2004, 4.

du (*phusis*), 2) klimatski i geografski faktori determiniraju grupne karakteristike i 3) državno uređenje.²⁹ Međutim, autor pokazuje da je Polibije vješto izmanipulirao političko-kulturni jezik helenizma kako bi odgovorio na političke i ideološke izazove svoga vremena. Koristeći političke i društvene institucije kao presudne u povijesnom uzrokovanju općih kolektivnih karakteristika, Polibije nije Rimljanima odredio čvrst položaj unutar helenско-barbarskog bipolariteta, nego se oni kreću između ta dva pola. U Polibijevoj političkoj teoriji, zajednice prolaze kroz ciklične stadije razvoja, uživajući period »helenskih« vrlina, kada su bile direktno vođene razumom (λογισμός) i prelazeći u stanje iracionalnog i razuzdanog nagona (θυμός), što je u osnovi, polje Polibijevih barbara. Svaki narod može se pogoršati od helenskih vrlina do barbarskih poroka kroz institucionalno propadanje. Svojstva helenizma – razum, red i umjerenost – rezultat su dobrih državnih struktura. Protivno tomu, barbarizam kod Polibija posljedica je institucionalnog propadanja i društvenog kvarenja. Helenizam i barbarizam nisu urođeni i nepromjenjivi u jednom narodu.³⁰ Champion primjećuje da je Polibije odbacio zamisao da je *Tyche* bila isključivo odgovorna za rimski uspjeh i da je razloge uspona Rima vidio u njihovom dobro organiziranom političkom sustavu.³¹ Autor također konstatira da je termin *barbaros* kod Polibija u biti negativan termin koji je imao značenje samo kada je stajao u opreci s helenizmom, i kao takav, da je u Polibijevo vrijeme zazivao sliku stalne prijetnje civilizaciji. Prihvaćajući tradicionalni koncept o bipolarnosti Grci – barbari, za Polibija barbari su bili sve što je bilo suprotno poželjnim značajkama uređenog i skladnog društva.³² Champion smatra da je za Polibija λογισμός bio

the two poles – Hellenism and Barbarism. He believes that the framework within which Polybius acted was a Hellenic–barbarian bipolarity and that he used three traditional explanations of the differences among peoples: 1) distinctive characteristics inherent to any people (*phusis*), 2) climatic and geographical factors determining the characteristics of the group, and 3) system of government.²⁹ However, the author shows that Polybius skilfully manipulated the political-cultural language of Hellenism in order to respond to the political and ideological challenges of his time. Using political and social institutions as crucial in historical causation of general collective characteristics, Polybius did not fix the position of the Romans within the Hellenic–barbarian bipolarity, since they move between these two poles. According to Polybius’s political theory, communities go through cyclical stages of development, enjoying a period of “Hellenic” virtue, when they were directly guided by reason (λογισμός), and then passing into a state of irrational and wild instincts (θυμός), which is basically the field of Polybius’s barbarians. Each nation can worsen from Hellenic virtues to barbaric vices through institutional decay. The properties of Hellenism – reason, order and moderation – are the result of good government structures. In contrast to this, Polybius’s barbarism is the result of institutional decline and social decay. Hellenism and barbarism are not innate and unchangeable in one nation.³⁰ Champion notes that Polybius rejected the idea that *Tyche* itself was solely responsible for the Roman success, and he saw the reasons for the rise of Rome in their well-organized political system.³¹ The author also notes that the term *barbaros* used by Polybius is essentially a negative one that had meaning only when it stood in contrast to Hellenism. Therefore, in Polybius’s time, it invoked the image of the constant threat to their civilization. Accepting the traditional concept of the

²⁹ Champion 2004, 75-84

³⁰ Champion 2004, 68-75.

³¹ Champion 2004, 84.

³² Champion 2004, 70-71.

²⁹ Champion 2004, 75-84.

³⁰ Champion 2004, 68-75.

³¹ Champion 2004, 84.

produkt državne strukture i da je Polibije često suprostavljao grčki λογισμός i barbarski θυμός. Polibije je najniže i najiskvarenije državno uređenje ohlokraciju opisao istim značajkama kojima je opisao i barbare.³³ Osobinama pojedinaca često je podcrtavao karakteristike etničko-kulturne grupe kojoj su pripadali, kao što je slučaj s Hanibalom, Agronom, Teutom, Demetrijem Farskim, Etolcem Dorimachom i ahejskim državnikom Aratom.³⁴ U drugoj i trećoj knjizi gdje su opisani ratovi Rimljana protiv Ilira i Gala, Champion vidi mjesto gdje je θυμός kod Ilira, Gala i Etolaca nadvladao λογισμός.³⁵

Kritika institucije kraljevstva

Prema Polibiju, rimsko poslanstvo upućeno je ilirskoj kraljici Teuti kao posljedica gusarskog napada na italske trgovce, prilikom čega su neki od njih ubijeni, a neki odvedeni u ropstvo (*Polyb.* II, 8, 1-13). Pored želje da se zaštite trgovci, bili su upleteni i drugi faktori, ali pritužbe italskih trgovaca protiv Ilira bile su ono što je privuklo pažnju rimskog Senata, koji je odlučio poslati poslanike Teuti da ispituju stvar. Ilirska vladarica primila ih je u isejskim vodama, dok je ilirska vojska opsjedala Isu.³⁶

Dion Kasije i Apijan Aleksandrijski iznijeli su drugačiji slijed događaja. Prema Apijanu, ilirski kralj Agron osvojio je dio Epira i Kerkiru, a kasnije i Epidamno i Far (*App. Illyr.* 7), ali kada je napao i druge, Isa je uputila poziv u pomoć Rimu (*App. Illyr.* 7). Rimljani su poslali poslanike Agronu. Ilirski laki brodovi napali su ih na putu za Iliriju i ubili Kleempora, isejskog poslanika i rimskog Korunkanija (*App. Illyr.* 7). Dion Kasije je poput Apijana istaknuo važnost Ise koja je, iz

³³ Champion 2004, 73, 84-95.

³⁴ Champion 2004, 104.

³⁵ Champion 2004, 111-117.

³⁶ *Polyb.* II, 8, 5-6; Gabričević 1974, 9; Šašel Kos 1986, 69.

Greeks-barbarians bipolarity, they were, for Polybius, all that was contrary to the desirable features of an ordered and harmonious society.³² Champion believes that, according to Polybius, λογισμός was a product of the governmental structure and that Polybius often contrasted Greek λογισμός with barbaric θυμός. Polybius described the lowest and most corrupted state of polity – ochlocracy – using the same features he used when describing barbarians.³³ Using characteristics of individuals, he frequently underlined the characteristics of the ethnic-cultural group to which they belonged, as was the case with Hannibal, Agron, Teuta, Demetrius of Pharos, Dorimachus Aetolian and the Achaean statesman Aratus.³⁴ In the second and third books, which describe the Roman wars against the Illyrians and Gauls, Champion, as for the Illyrians, Gauls and Aetolians, sees a place where θυμός overwhelmed λογισμός.³⁵

Critique of the institution of the kingdom

According to Polybius, a Roman envoy was sent to the Illyrian Queen Teuta as a result of pirate attacks on Italic merchants, during which some of them were killed and some were taken captive (*Polyb.* II, 8, 1-13). Alongside the desire to protect the merchants, some other factors were involved, but it was the complaints of Italic merchants against the Illyrians that drew the attention of the Roman Senate, which decided to send their envoys to Teuta in order to investigate the matter. The Illyrian ruler received them in Issa's waters, while the Illyrian army was in the process of besieging Issa.³⁶

Dio Cassius and Appian of Alexandria present a different sequence of events. According to Appian, the Illyrian king Agron captured part of Epirus and also Corcyra, and

³² Champion 2004, 70-71.

³³ Champion 2004, 73, 84-95.

³⁴ Champion 2004, 104.

³⁵ Champion 2004, 111-117.

³⁶ *Polyb.* II, 8, 5-6; Gabričević 1974, 9; Šašel Kos 1986, 69.

straha od Ilira, sklopila savez s Rimljanima, a potom je više uzgredno dodao da su Rimljani namjeravali kazniti Ardijejce jer su ometali plovidbu lađa iz Brundizija (*Dio. Cass.* 12. fragm. 49, 1-7). Na isejski zahtjev Rim je poslao poslanstvo Agronu, kako bi mu predložili da Isejcima čini nepravde, ali u međuvremenu on je umro i poslanike je primila Teuta (*Dio. Cass.* 12, fragm. 49, 1-2).

Posljedica gusarskog akta na autoritet ilirske vladarice, i uopće na zakonsku snagu ilirskih vladara, vrlo je dobro ilustrirana u dijalogu između Teute i rimskog poslanika (*Polyb.* 2, 8, 6-11). Nakon što je izložio razloge dolaska rimskog poslanstva u Iliriju, Polibije je opisao držanje i ponašanje ilirske vladarice tijekom diplomatskog razgovora. Naime, ona je rimske poslanike slušala vrlo oholo (*Polyb.* II, 8, 7). Kada su završili s iznošenjem zločina počinjenih protiv njih, Teuta im je odgovorila sljedeće:

a) da će se pobrinuti da Rimljane ne zadesi nikakva nepravda od Ilira,

b) da ilirski kraljevi nemaju zakonsko pravo ometati privatne osobe u pljačkanju na moru (*Polyb.* II, 8, 8).³⁷

Početak Teutina odgovora odnosi se na autoritet javne vlasti u Iliriji, tj. na zakonska prava ilirskih vladara.³⁸ Drugi dio pokazuje da je nadležnost javne vlasti bila ograničena na određene društvene strukture. To je, po svemu sudeći, bio odraz društveno-ekonomskih prilika u Teutinoj

³⁷ καταπαυσάντων δὲ τὸν λόγον, κοινῇ μὲν ἔφη πειρᾶσθαι φροντίζειν ἵνα μηδὲν ἀδίκημα γίνηται Ῥωμαίοις ἐξ Ἰλλυριῶν· ἰδίᾳ γε μὴν οὐ νόμιμον εἶναι τοῖς βασιλεῦσι κωλύειν Ἰλλυριοῖς τὰς κατὰ θάλατταν ὠφελείας (*Polyb.* II, 8, 8).

³⁸ O ustrojstvu Ilirskog kraljevstva v. Holleaux 1954, 826-827; Hammond 1966, 239-253; Papazoglu 1967, 123-144; Wilkes 1969, 163, 189; Domić-Kunić 1993, 210-212. O društveno-gospodarskim prilikama u Iliriji v. Cabanes 2002, 105-131.

Epidamnus and Pharos in succession (*App. Illyr.* 7), but when he threatened others, Issa asked Rome for help (*App. Illyr.* 7). The Romans sent their ambassadors to Agron. Illyrian light vessels attacked them on the way to Illyria and killed Cleemporus, the envoy of Issa and the Roman Coruncanus (*App. Illyr.* 7). Dio Cassius, like Appian, stresses the importance of Issa, which, out of fear of the Illyrians, surrendered itself voluntarily to the Romans. More incidentally, he added that the Romans intended to punish the Ardiaeans, who were annoying those who sailed from Brundisium (*Dio. Cass.* 12. fragm. 49, 1-7). At the request of Issa, Rome sent a mission to Agron in order to point out he was doing injustice to the Issaeans. He died, however, and Teuta received the ambassadors (*Dio. Cass.* 12, fragm. 49, 1-2).

The consequence of pirate acts on the authority of the Illyrian queen and the legal force of Illyrian kings in general is well illustrated in the dialogue between Teuta and the Roman legate (*Polyb.* 2, 8, 6-11). Having laid out the reasons for the arrival of the Roman envoys in Illyria, Polybius describes the attitude and behaviour of the Illyrian queen during diplomatic talks. She listened arrogantly to the Roman legates (*Polyb.* II, 8, 7). When they had finished presenting the crimes committed against them, Teuta responded as follows:

a) That care would be taken that the Illyrians did not commit any injustice against the Romans,

b) That Illyrian kings have no legal right to interfere with privateers in winning booty from the sea (*Polyb.* II, 8, 8).³⁷

The beginning of Teuta's response refers to the authority of the public government in Illyria, i.e. the legitimate rights of the Illyrian

³⁷ καταπαυσάντων δὲ τὸν λόγον, κοινῇ μὲν ἔφη πειρᾶσθαι φροντίζειν ἵνα μηδὲν ἀδίκημα γίνηται Ῥωμαίοις ἐξ Ἰλλυριῶν· ἰδίᾳ γε μὴν οὐ νόμιμον εἶναι τοῖς βασιλεῦσι κωλύειν Ἰλλυριοῖς τὰς κατὰ θάλατταν ὠφελείας (*Polyb.* II, 8, 8).

Iliriji.³⁹ Teuta je, dakle, ponudila Rimljanima jednu vrstu garancije da im njene trupe neće činiti nikakve nepravde,⁴⁰ i jasno im dala do znanja da nije odgovorna za gusarski napad na italske trgovce jer nema zakonskih prava nad privatnim osobama.⁴¹ Na osnovi toga može se reći da je povijesni lik Teuta postupila korektno, ali ne i u skladu s rimskim očekivanjima.⁴² Izvješće Diona Kasija podudara se s Polibijevim po pitanju držanja ilirske vladarice (*Dio. Cass.* 12. fragm. 49, 1-7). On je naveo da Teuta nije dala primjeren odgovor rimskim poslanicima i da je pokazala tipičnu žensku prenapljenost i slabost pojačanu osjećajem moći zbog vlasti koju je imala (*Dio. Cass.* 12, fragm. 49).

Poslanikov govor dijametralno je suprotan Teutinom odgovoru.⁴³ Njime je poslanik naglasio da su rimski običaji pravedniji od ilirskih. Naime, Rimljani imaju odličan običaj (κάλλιστον ἔθος) kojim država kažnjava privatna zlodjela i pomaže oštećenima, čime se sprječava nepravda i zločin. Nasuprot tome postavio je zakonska prava kraljeva (βασιλικὰ νόμιμα) prema Ilirima, koja su loša jer nekažnjavanjem zlodjela podržavaju i ohrabruju nepravedne radnje.⁴⁴ Riječima mlađeg poslanika Polibije je potvrdio svoje izne-

rulers.³⁸ The second part shows that the jurisdiction of public authorities was limited to certain social structures. It most likely presents a reflection of the socio-economic conditions in Teuta's Illyria.³⁹ Teuta, therefore, offered the Romans a sort of guarantee that her troops would not do them any injustice⁴⁰, and she clearly indicated that she had not been responsible for the pirate attack on the Italic merchants, because she had no legal rights over privateers.⁴¹ On this basis, we can say that the historical figure of Teuta acted correctly, but not in accordance with Roman expectations.⁴² Dio Cassius's report coincides with Polybius's in terms of the Illyrian queen's manner (*Dio. Cass.* 12. fragm. 49, 1-7).

He states that Teuta did not give a respectful reply to the Roman legates and showed a typical female temerity and weakness intensified because of the power she possessed (*Dio. Cass.* 12, fragm. 49). The envoy's speech is diametrically opposed to Teuta's response.⁴³ In his speech, he stresses that Roman customs are fairer than Illyrian ones. In fact, the Romans have an admirable custom (κάλλιστον ἔθος) by which the government punishes private crimes and helps the victims, thus pre-

³⁹ Za gusarenje kao priznat način stjecanja sredstava za život kod Ilira v. Badian 1952, 75; Walbank 1970, 159; Ormerod 1997, 67, 169-173; de Souza 1999, 76-78; Šašel Kos 2002, 140-141.

⁴⁰ Walbank 1970, 159; Badian 1952, 75.

⁴¹ U privatnim osobama valja prepoznati lokalne moćnike: Ormerod 1997, 169-176; Domić-Kunić 1993, 212; Bajrić 2009, 39-41.

⁴² Stipčević 1989, 41, bilj. 91; Bajrić 2009, 44.

⁴³ εἶπεν γὰρ ὅτι Ῥωμαίοις μὲν, ὃ Τεῦτα, κάλλιστον ἔθος ἐστὶ τὰ κατ' ἰδίαν ἀδικήματα κοινῇ μεταπορεύεσθαι καὶ βοηθεῖν τοῖς ἀδικουμένοις πειρασόμεθα δὴ θεοῦ βουλομένου σφόδρα καὶ ταχέως ἀναγκάσαι σε τὰ βασιλικὰ νόμιμα διορθώσασθαι πρὸς Ἰλλυριοῦς (*Polyb.* II, 8, 10-11).

⁴⁴ Champion sugerira da je Polibije nastojao pokazati da su Iliri podredili zajedničko dobro privatnim zahtjevima, dok je kod Rimljana opće dobro bilo iznad svega (Champion 2004, 112).

³⁸ On the organization of the Illyrian Kingdom, see Holleaux 1954, 826-827; Hammond 1966, 239-253; Papazoglu 1967, 123-144; Wilkes 1969, 163, 189; Domić-Kunić 1993, 210-212. On the socio-economic conditions in Illyria, see Cabanes 2002, 105-131.

³⁹ For piracy as a recognized way of earning a livelihood for the Illyrians, see Badian 1952, 75; Walbank 1970, 159; Ormerod 1997, 67, 169-173; de Souza 1999, 76-78; Šašel Kos 2002, 140-141.

⁴⁰ Walbank 1970, 159; Badian 1952, 75.

⁴¹ Privateers should be recognized as local power holders: Ormerod 1997, 169-176; Domić-Kunić 1993, 212; Bajrić 2009, 39-41.

⁴² Stipčević 1989, 41, n. 91; Bajrić 2009, 44.

⁴³ εἶπεν γὰρ ὅτι Ῥωμαίοις μὲν, ὃ Τεῦτα, κάλλιστον ἔθος ἐστὶ τὰ κατ' ἰδίαν ἀδικήματα κοινῇ μεταπορεύεσθαι καὶ βοηθεῖν τοῖς ἀδικουμένοις πειρασόμεθα δὴ θεοῦ βουλομένου σφόδρα καὶ ταχέως ἀναγκάσαι σε τὰ βασιλικὰ νόμιμα διορθώσασθαι πρὸς Ἰλλυριοῦς (*Polyb.* II, 8, 10-11).

sene navode o pljačkaškom karakteru ilirskih aktivnosti na kopnu i moru i Teutinu odgovornost za iste.

Arogantno držanje i »sloboda« neprimjerena diplomatu mogli su biti prouzročeni i pretpostavkom da se je odnosio prema nekome manje vrijednim. Takvo ponašanje rimskog poslanika može se opisati grčkom riječju ἡ ὑπερηφάνια, u smislu kako je istaknuo J. P. V. D. Balsdon »the higher a Roman's rank, the worse he suffered from the disease which the Greeks called *hyperêphania*, bossiness, arrogance, the sense of innate superiority«. ⁴⁵ Radi usporedbe, pokazivanje rimske superiornosti preko predstavnika u stranim zemljama, uglavnom prema nosiocima kraljevske vlasti, očigledno je u odnosu rimskih poslanika prema makedonskom kralju Filipu V. i sirijskom kralju Antiohu Epifanu. ⁴⁶

Sam sadržaj poslanikova govora bio je poučavanje o običajima i zakonima civiliziranog društva u kojem do izražaja dolazi poimanje »drugog« i odražava Polibijevu percepciju Ilira kao barbara.

U nastavku pripovijedanja, Polibije je iznio Teutinu reakciju na poslanikove riječi. Naime, ona je Korunkanijevu otvorenost primila ljutito i nerazumno kao žena, i toliko se razbjesnila da je zanemarila utvrđene ljudske zakone poslavši ljude da ubiju poslanika koji joj se otvoreno obratio (*Polyb.* II, 8, 12). A ovaj Teutin *hybris* prouzročio je rimsku vojnu intervenciju. Time je Polibije, prije svega, istaknuo odgovornost ilirske vladarice za rat s Rimljanima, ali i potvrdio svoj stav da je u vođenju političkih poslova prosuđivala na ženski način (*Polyb.* II, 4, 8).

Polibije je ovdje vrlo jasno prikazao da je rimski poslanik primjer rimskog slobodoumlja, a ilirska vladarica njegova suprotnost. Jednakost (ἰσηγορία) i sloboda

venting injustice and crime. Conversely, he set forth the legal rights of kings (βασιλικά νόμια) upon the Illyrians, which are poor, given that their impunity supports atrocities and encourages unfair actions. ⁴⁴ Through the words of the younger messenger, Polybius confirms his statements on the aggressive and predatory nature of Illyrian activities on land and sea and Teuta's responsibility for the same. An arrogant posture and "freedom" that is inappropriate to any diplomat may have been caused by the assumption that one treated someone as inferior. Such behaviour of the Roman legate can be described by the Greek word ἡ ὑπερηφάνια, in terms of how J.P.V.D. Balsdon pointed out "the higher a Roman's rank, the worse he suffered from the disease which the Greeks called *hyperêphania*, bossiness, arrogance, the sense of innate superiority." ⁴⁵ For comparison, the manifestation of Roman superiority over representatives in foreign countries, mainly to the holders of royal power, is apparently in relation to the Roman legates sent to the Macedonian King Philip V and the Syrian king Antiochus Epiphanes. ⁴⁶

The content of the envoy's speech was to teach about the customs and laws of a civilized society in which the understanding of "otherness" has come to the fore, and reflects Polybius's perception of the Illyrians as barbarians.

In the narrative that follows, Polybius presents Teuta's reaction to the words of the envoy. In fact, she receives Coruncanian's openness with anger and caprice as a woman, and is so infuriated that she ignores the established human laws by sending her people to kill the legate who had openly addressed her (*Polyb.* II, 8, 12). This *hybris* of Teuta's

⁴⁴ Champion suggests that Polybius sought to present the Illyrians as subjugating the common good to the benefit of private claims, while the common good was in first place for the Romans (Champion 2004, 112).

⁴⁵ Balsdon 1979, 25-26, 170-171.

⁴⁶ Balsdon 1979, 25-26; Bajrić 2009, 39.

⁴⁵ Balsdon 1979, 25-26, 170-171.

⁴⁶ Balsdon 1979, 25-26; Bajrić 2009, 39.

govora (παρρησία) bili su obilježja prave demokracije.⁴⁷ U ovom je kontekstu polarizacija Rimljani – Iliri na političkom polju analogna konceptualnoj shemi Grci – barbari, prema kojoj je grčko društvo demokratsko i ravnopravno, dok je barbarsko tiransko i hijerarhijsko.⁴⁸ Poput Grka, Rimljani su predstavljeni kao ljubitelji slobode, zaštitnici prava i zakona, a Iliri kao kontrast svim načelima ljudskosti i rimskim vrlinama.

Polibijeva konstrukcija događaja iz ilirske prošlosti prožeta je ocrnjivanjem rimskog protivnika i stereotipiziranjem Ilira. To je bio dio rimske političke i vojne propagande, usko povezan s konceptom pravednog rata.⁴⁹ Odluka za rat protiv Teute bila je donesena nakon ubojstva poslanika, čime je rat dobio moralno opravdanje i imao je karakter legitimnog odgovora na ilirsko nasilje i zločin (*Polyb.* II, 4, 8; *Flor.* 1, 21; *Dio. Cass.* 12. fragm. 49, 2-7).

⁴⁷ *Polyb.* VI, 9, 4; Walbank 1970, 656-659; Walbank 2002, 212-216.

⁴⁸ Salmon 1986, 203-204; Hall 1989; Cartledge 1993; Nippel 2002, 278-310.

⁴⁹ Rich 1976; Harris 1979, 165-175.

caused the Roman military intervention. Thereby, Polybius primarily emphasized the responsibility of the Illyrian queen for the war with the Romans, but also reaffirmed his view that her conduct of political affairs was assessed in a woman's way (*Polyb.* II, 4, 8).

Polybius clearly illustrates here that the Roman ambassador was an example of Roman broadmindedness, and the Illyrian queen its opposite. Equality (ἰσηγορία) and freedom of speech (παρρησία) were the characteristics of true democracy.⁴⁷ In this context, the polarization between the Romans and Illyrians in the field of politics was analogous to the conceptual scheme of Greeks–barbarians, according to which Greek society was democratic and equal, while barbarian society was tyrannical and hierarchical.⁴⁸ Like the Greeks, the Romans were presented as freedom lovers, protectors of law, while the Illyrians were presented as a contrast to all the principles of humanity and Roman virtues.

Polybius's construction of events from the Illyrian past was imbued with denigrating Roman opponents and stereotyping the Illyrians. It was part of the Roman military and political propaganda, closely linked to the concept of the just war.⁴⁹ The decision to wage the war against Teuta was made after the murder of the messenger. The war thereby won moral justification and had the character of a legitimate response to the Illyrian violence and crime (*Polyb.* II, 4, 8; *Flor.* 1, 21; *Dio. Cass.* 12. fragm. 49, 2-7).

⁴⁷ *Polyb.* VI, 9, 4; Walbank 1970, 656-659; Walbank 2002, 212-216.

⁴⁸ Salmon 1986, 203-204; Hall 1989; Cartledge 1993; Nippel 2002, 278-310.

⁴⁹ Rich 1976; Harris 1979, 165-175.

Razlike između rimskih i ilirskih običaja i zakona

U poglavlju gdje je prikazao rimsku diplomatsku misiju u Iliriji,⁵⁰ Polibije je Ilire istaknuo sa dva elementa, to su *ἀδικία*⁵¹ i *παρανομία*,⁵² čime je sugerirao da su ilirski običaji i zakoni bili suprotni općepriznatim normama. Riječ *ἀδικία* koristio je u kontekstu ilirskog pohoda u Epiru (*Polyb.* II, 8, 4) i napada na italске trgovce.⁵³ U oba primjera nastojao je pokazati karakter ilirskih aktivnosti. Centralno mjesto u ovim prikazima zauzima sklonost pljački, osobina koju je Polibije često koristio kao barbarsku značajku usko povezanu s pohlepom (*πλεονεξία*).⁵⁴

Prema Polibiju, pohodi u Elidi, Meseniji i Epiru bili su pljačkaški pothvati koje je organizirala ilirska vladarica Teuta, poslavši flotu i trupe na more, i uputivši ih da svaku zemlju smatraju neprijateljskom (*Polyb.* II, 4, 9).⁵⁵ Upućene trupe su kao prvi cilj odabrale Elidu i Meseniju

⁵⁰ v. bilj. 4.

⁵¹ Osnovno značenje riječi je nepravda, krivnja, uvreda, oštećivanje. Njoj srodna riječ τὸ ἀδικημα označava: a) učinjena nepravda, zločin, krivnja, uvreda; b) nepravdom stečeno dobro. Champion naglašava da se kod Polibija pojavljuje vrlo često u raznim kontekstima, između ostalog, ἀδικία je značajka izrođenih Polibijevih državnih uređenja, redovno se pojavljuje i u prikazima barbara (Champion 2004, 241-242).

⁵² Παρανομία je kod Polibija općenito bezakonje, nezakonito postupanje, preziranje (zakona i običaja), zločin, nepravda i opisuje ohlokraciju i barbarsko ponašanje Gala, Ilira, Mamertina, kartaginskih najamnika, Etolaca (Champion 2004, 243-244, usp. Eckstein 1995, 121-122). Također, παρά-νομος označava nezakonit, nedopustiv i nepravedan čin, ali i bezbožan i kazneni kada se odnosi na osobu.

⁵³ U vezi s ovim događajem, pojavljuje se tri puta u diplomatskom razgovoru (*Polyb.* II, 8, 6, 8 i 10).

⁵⁴ Champion 2004, 242-243.

⁵⁵ Prema Marjeti Šašel Kos pljačke na moru, kao što je slučaj s ilirskim gusarenjem, bile su uvijek organizirane na razini »države« i dio njene politike, te način stjecanja sredstava za život, sasvim priznat od vladajuće elite (Šašel Kos 2002, 139).

Differences between Roman and Illyrian customs and laws

In the chapter where he presents the Roman diplomatic mission in Illyria⁵⁰, Polybius points out two elements regarding the Illyrians: *ἀδικία*⁵¹ and *παρανομία*⁵², suggesting that the Illyrian customs and laws were contrary to generally accepted standards. The *ἀδικία* word was used in the context of the Illyrian military campaign in Epirus (*Polyb.* II, 8, 4), and the attack on the Italic merchants.⁵³ In both cases, he tried to present the character of the Illyrian activities. Central to these representations was a propensity to plunder, which was a characteristic Polybius often used as a barbaric feature closely associated with greed (*πλεονεξία*).⁵⁴

According to Polybius, the military campaigns to Elis, Messenia and Epirus were predatory ventures organized by the Illyrian queen, Teuta, who sent her fleet and troops to sea, instructing them to consider each country hostile (*Polyb.* II, 4, 9).⁵⁵ The first target chosen by the instructed

⁵⁰ see n. 4.

⁵¹ The basic meaning of the word is injustice, culpability, insult, damage. The similar word τὸ ἀδικημα means: a) committed injustice, crime, injustice, insult, b) unjustly gained goods. Champion points out that Polybius, very often and in various contexts, uses *ἀδικία*, which presents a feature of Polybius's invented government regulation, and it regularly appears in depictions of barbarians (Champion 2004, 241-242).

⁵² For Polybius, *παρανομία* presents general lawlessness, illegal actions, contempt (of laws and customs), crime and injustice, and it describes ochlocracy and the barbaric conduct of the Gauls, Illyrians, Mamertines, Carthaginian mercenaries and Aetolians (Champion, 2004, 243-244, cf. Eckstein 1995, 121-122). Also, *παρά-νομος* means *an illegal, unacceptable and unfair act*. It also means *godless and punishable* when referring to a person.

⁵³ In connection with this event, it appears three times in the diplomatic talks (*Polyb.* II, 8, 6, 8 and 10).

⁵⁴ Champion 2004, 242-243.

⁵⁵ In Marjeta Šašel Kos's opinion, depredations at sea, as is the case with the Illyrian pirates, were always organized at the state level and were part of its policy, and the methods of acquisition of livelihood were fully recognized by the ruling elite (Šašel Kos 2002, 139).

(*Polyb.* II, 5, 1).⁵⁶ Ovo područje opisao je kao zemlje koje su Iliri i inače stalno (ἀεὶ) pljačkali.⁵⁷ Kako bi predočio opseg i jačinu pothvata usporedio ga je s ranijim ilirskim aktivnostima: dotada Iliri su uvijek neometano pljačkali obalno područje koje je bilo prirodno nezaštićeno, no tada su došli do Fenike (*Polyb.* II, 3); osvajanje Fenike, najjačeg i najmoćnijeg grada, izazvalo je među Helenima užas i strah, i nisu se više plašili za prinose sa zemlje, kao u ranijim vremenima, već za sebe same i svoje gradove (*Polyb.* II, 6, 8).⁵⁸

Polibije je i Teutinom reakcijom na stečeni plijen iz Fenike sugerirao da pothvat nije imao vojno-strateške ciljeve,⁵⁹ nego da je bio potaknut isključivo stjecanjem plijena, čija ju je veličina i ljepota iznenadila i dvostruko ohrabrila za daljnje pljačkanje Helena (*Polyb.* II, 8, 4). Ovom kratkom digresijom oslikao je Teutu kao pohlepnu vladaricu čiji su vojni potezi bili motivirani isključivo željom za plijenom.⁶⁰

Pljačka trgovaca koji su plovili iz Italije drugo je mjesto u Polibijevoj naraciji gdje

troops was Elis and Messenia (*Polyb.* II, 5, 1).⁵⁶ He described this area as countries that were continually (ἀεὶ) looted by the Illyrians.⁵⁷ To demonstrate the scope and intensity of this venture, he compared it with earlier Illyrian activities: until then, the Illyrians had always freely plundered the coastal area that was naturally unsafe, and then they came to Phoenice (*Polyb.* II, 3); conquering Phoenice, the strongest and most powerful city, caused horror and fear among the Hellenes, and they no longer feared for yields from the land, as in earlier times, but for their own safety and their cities (*Polyb.* II, 6, 8).⁵⁸

Polybius, according to Teuta's reaction to the spoils taken from Phoenice, suggested that the venture had no military-strategic goals⁵⁹, but was driven specifically to gain loot, whose size and beauty surprised Teuta and encouraged her to further plunder the Hellenes (*Polyb.* II, 8, 4). With this brief digression, he depicts Teuta as a greedy ruler whose military actions were motivated solely by the desire for plunder.⁶⁰

The pillage and rapine against the merchants who sailed from Italy takes second place in Po-

⁵⁶ *Polyb.* II, 5, 1-2; Dell 1967, 352-353; Salmon 1986, 205-206; Šašel Kos 2002, 140.

⁵⁷ Prema Dell-u (1967, 352, bilj. 34), «ἀεὶ with the imperfect form of the verb seems to connote persistent action.»

⁵⁸ Dell smatra da ovaj odlomak pokazuje da su Iliri do 230. god. pr. Kr. bili zainteresirani za pljačkanje polja radi hrane i svega onoga što su njihove *lembi* mogle prevoziti, gusarenje je bilo samo jedan od načina stjecanja prihoda za život i nije imalo šire razmjere. U vezi s time, gledanja na ilirsko gusarenje kao endemsko zlo smatra konstrukcijom literarnih izvora. Gusarenje je eskaliralo s porastom trgovine i posebno s usponom Ardijejaca (Dell 1967, 356-358). Vidi i: Ormerod 1997, 67, 169-173; de Souza 1999, 76-78; Cabanes 2002, 140-142; Šašel Kos 2002, 139-140.

⁵⁹ O ilirskom ratovanju u Epiru v. Badian 1952, 73-75; Hammond 1968, 4-9; Gruen 1984, 359-368; Šašel Kos 1986, 54-83; Wilkes 1995, 158-159; Cabanes 2002, 142-144; Šašel Kos 2005, 252-267; Bajrić 2009, 41-43; Džino 2010, 45-47.

⁶⁰ Eckstein 1995, 72; Champion 2004, 242-243.

⁵⁶ *Polyb.* II, 5, 1-2; Dell 1967, 352-353; Salmon 1986, 205-206; Šašel Kos 2002, 140.

⁵⁷ According to Dell (1967, 352, n. 34), «ἀεὶ with the imperfect form of the verb seems to connote persistent action.»

⁵⁸ Dell believes that this passage shows that the Illyrians, until 230 B.C., were interested in looting the fields for food and everything else they could carry on their *lembi*. Piracy was just one way of earning an income for life and did not have a wider scope. In connection with this, he believes that regarding the Illyrian piracy as an endemic evil is a construction of literary sources. Piracy had escalated with the increase in trade; especially with the rise of the Ardiaeans (Dell 1967, 356-358). See also: Ormerod 1997, 67, 169-173; de Souza 1999, 76-78; Cabanes 2002, 140-142; Šašel Kos 2002, 139-140.

⁵⁹ On Illyrian warfare in Epirus see Badian 1952, 73-75; Hammond 1968, 4-9; Gruen 1984, 359-368; Šašel Kos 1986, 54-83; Wilkes 1995, 158-159; Cabanes 2002, 142-144; Šašel Kos 2005, 252-267; Bajrić 2009, 41-43; Džino 2010, 45-47.

⁶⁰ Eckstein 1995, 72; Champion 2004, 242-243.

se ἀδικία pojavljuje kao značajka Ilira.⁶¹ Kao i u opisu pohoda na Elidu i Meseniju, Polibije je i ovdje naglasio da su Iliri i ranije stalno pljačkali trgovce koji su plovili iz Italije.⁶² Time je sugerirao da su ovi prijestupi bili kontinuirani, što je kontradiktorno njegovom navodu da je Teuta bila ta koja je dopustila privatnim osobama da pljačkaju brodove (*Polyb.* II, 4, 8).

Prema Polibiju, načini stjecanja dobitka bili su u uskoj vezi s društvenim običajima i zakonima. To se jasno vidi iz 6. knjige *Historije*, gdje je iznio da su običaji i zakoni (ἔθη καὶ νόμοι) bili temelji svake države, da su o njima ovisile njene osobenosti i uređenje, kao i sam karakter ljudi (*Polyb.* VI, 47, 1-2). Primjenjujući ih na privatni i javni život, Polibije je prihvatljivim smatrao samo one koji su ljude činili poštenim i skromnim, a državu miroljubivom i pravednom (*Polyb.* VI, 47, 3-4).⁶³ Kao primjer utjecaja loših običaja i zakona naveo je Krećane, koje je smatrao najlažljivijim, a njihove državne postupke najnepravednijim (*Polyb.* VI, 47, 5). Za njih je karakteristična prljava žudnja za dobitkom i pohlepa, jer nijedan način stjecanja dobitka kod njih nije sramotan (*Polyb.* VI, 46, 3). Walbank ukazuje da su njihovi postupci bili proverbijalno loši još od Homerova vremena, kada su bili gusari.⁶⁴ Gotovo prema istom obrascu istaknuo je i Kartazane (*Polyb.* VI, 56, 1-2) i Etolce (*Polyb.* IX, 38, 6).⁶⁵

⁶¹ οἱ δ' Ἰλλυριοὶ καὶ κατὰ τοὺς ἀνωτέρω μὲν χρόνους συνεχῶς ἠδίκουν τοὺς πλοῖζομένους ἀπ' Ἰταλίας (*Polyb.* II, 8, 1).

⁶² V. i usp. Holleaux 1954, 822-827; Dell 1967, 353-354; Gruen 1984, 363-364; Wilkes 1995, 158; Ormerod 1997, 67, 169ss; de Souza 1999, 78-80; Cabanes 2002, 140-141; Walser 1954, 310-311; Šašel Kos 2002, 137-155; Šašel Kos 2005, 252ss.; Džino 2010, 44-45, 49.

⁶³ Više o ovome v. Eckstein 1995; Champion 2004.

⁶⁴ Walbank 1970, 733.

⁶⁵ Kartazanima je to pripisao kako bi pokazao da su rimski običaji i zakoni o bogaćenju bolji od njihovih, a Etolcima, kada je govorio o njihovim pljačkama na moru.

lybius's narration where ἀδικία appears as a feature of the Illyrians.⁶¹ As in the description of the invasion of Elis and Messenia, Polybius emphasizes here that the Illyrians, much earlier, tended to raid merchants who sailed from Italy.⁶² He thereby suggests that these offenses were frequent and continuous, which is contradictory to his allegation that Teuta was the one who allowed privateers to loot the ships (*Polyb.* II, 4, 8).

According to Polybius, ways of earning income were closely related to social customs and laws. This is evident from Book VI of the *Histories*, where he states that customs and laws (ἔθη καὶ νόμοι) were the foundations of every state, and that the characteristics of a state and its regulation were dependent on them, as well as the character of its people (*Polyb.* VI, 47, 1-2). Applying them to private and public life, Polybius considered acceptable only those customs that made people honest and humble, and the country peaceful and just (*Polyb.* VI, 47, 3-4).⁶³ As an example of the impact of bad customs and laws he cites the Cretans, whom he considered treacherous, and their government actions most unjust (*Polyb.* VI, 47, 5). They are characterized as having dirty lust for profit and greed, since no method of earning income was shameful for them (*Polyb.* VI, 46, 3). Walbank suggests that their actions had been initially bad since Homer's time, when they were pirates.⁶⁴ Polybius mentions Carthaginians (*Polyb.* VI, 56, 1-2) and Aetolians (*Polyb.* IX, 38, 6)⁶⁵ using almost the same pattern.

⁶¹ οἱ δ' Ἰλλυριοὶ καὶ κατὰ τοὺς ἀνωτέρω μὲν χρόνους συνεχῶς ἠδίκουν τοὺς πλοῖζομένους ἀπ' Ἰταλίας (*Polyb.* II, 8, 1).

⁶² See and cf. Holleaux 1954, 822-827; Dell 1967, 353-354; Gruen 1984, 363-364; Wilkes 1995, 158; Ormerod 1997, 67, 169ff; de Souza 1999, 78-80; Cabanes 2002, 140-141; Walser 1954, 310-311; Šašel Kos 2002, 137-155; Šašel Kos 2005, 252ff; Džino 2010, 44-45, 49.

⁶³ For more on this, see Eckstein 1995; Champion 2004.

⁶⁴ Walbank 1970, 733.

⁶⁵ He attributed this to the Carthaginians in order to demonstrate that Roman customs and laws on enrichment were better. He did the same with the Aetolians when he spoke of their pirate sea looting adventures.

Pljačkanje na moru i kopnu, kod Tukidida prizivalo je stari helenski način života koji je bio sličan barbarskom.⁶⁶ Smatrao zgodnim usporediti Tukididovo i Polibijevo viđenje istih pojava u različitom vremenu. Iz Tukididova opisa nazire se da je ove aktivnosti smatrao kao sasvim normalne pojave u svoje vrijeme. Prema Tukididu, gusarenje su vodili najmoćniji ljudi zbog svoje koristi i prehrane slabih; napadali su i plijenili neutvrđene i poput sela nastanjene gradove i od toga živjeli najveći dio života. Taj im posao nije donosio sramote nego, štoviše, i neku čast. To se očituje još i sada kod nekih kopnenih stanovnika, kojima je dika, da to vješto rade. I na kopnu su plijenili jedni druge. I dosad se veliki dio Helade ravna po starom običaju, kao kod ozolskih Lokrana, Etolaca, Akarnanaca i onih na tom dijelu kopna (*Thuc.* I, 5). Za razliku od njega, Polibije ih je percipirao kao nedostojne, sramotne i nepravedne radnje, što se jasno nazire iz njegovih opisa Ilira i Etolaca.⁶⁷

Drugi element kojim je Polibije konstruirao ilirski identitet je *παρανομία*. Time je Ilirima imputirao sklonost nasilju. Ilirsku vladaricu Teutu optužio je za ubojstvo rimskog poslanika (*Polyb.* II, 8, 13). Dok ga je u prikazu 1. ilirskog rata neposred-

⁶⁶ *Thuc.* I, 5; Cabanes 2002, 142.

⁶⁷ Etolce i Ilire u mnogo čemu je prikazao prema identičnom modelu:

- Etolci stalno vode razbojnički život u kome nemaju prijatelja, već svakog drže za neprijatelja (*Polyb.* IV, 3, 1) usp. s Teutom koja je poslala trupe uputivši ih da svaku zemlju smatraju neprijateljskom (*Polyb.* II, 4, 9);

- stari običaj ih je vodio u pljačkanje Peloponeza (*Polyb.* IV, 3, 3). Dok su bili slobodni da otimaju i pljačkaju Helene, živjeli su na njihov račun i svaku zemlju smatrali neprijateljskom (*Polyb.* XXX, 11, 2) usp. s opisom Ilira koji stalno pljačkaju Elidu i Meseniju (*Polyb.* II, 5, 1);

- Etolci su stekli naviku da žive od gusarenja i sličnih nezakonitih radnji (*Polyb.* XXX, 11, 1) usp. s opisom ilirskih napada na trgovce (*Polyb.* II, 8, 1).

For Thucydides, looting at sea and on land evoked the old Hellenic way of life that was similar to barbarians.⁶⁶ It is opportune to compare Thucydides's and Polybius's views of the same phenomenon at different times. From Thucydides's description of the looting, he regarded these activities as quite normal at the time. According to Thucydides, piracy was led by the most powerful people for their own gain and to feed the poor; they attacked and plundered unfortified and village-like inhabited cities, and lived that way most of their lives. These activities did not bring them shame, but honour. Even today, this is made evident by some inland residents that are proud to perform these activities skilfully. They also attacked and plundered each other on the mainland. A large part of Hellas had been, until then, in compliance with the old customs of the Ozolian Locrians, Aetolians, Acarnanians, and other inhabitants in that part of the land (*Thuc.* I, 5). Unlike him, Polybius perceived those customs as dishonest, shameful and unfair actions, which can be clearly discerned from his description of the Illyrians and Aetolians.⁶⁷

Another element which Polybius used to construct Illyrian identity was *παρανομία*. He thereby imputed to the Illyrians a propensity for violence. He accused Teuta, the Illyrian

⁶⁶ *Thuc.* I, 5; Cabanes 2002, 142.

⁶⁷ In many ways, he presented the Aetolians and Illyrians in accordance with an identical model:

- The Aetolians permanently lead a predatory way of life where there are no friends, but each is held as an enemy (*Polyb.* IV, 3, 1), cf. with Teuta, who sent her troops instructing them to consider each country hostile (*Polyb.* II, 4, 9);

- Old customs led them to plunder the Peloponnese (*Polyb.* IV, 3, 3). While they were free to rob and plunder the Hellenes, they lived at their expense and considered each country hostile (*Polyb.* XXX, 11, 2), cf. the description of the Illyrians who repeatedly sacked Elis and Messene (*Polyb.* II, 5, 1);

- The Aetolians acquired the habit of living off piracy and related illegal activities (*Polyb.* XXX, 11, 1), cf. the description of the Illyrian attack on the merchants (*Polyb.* II, 8, 1).

no pripisao Ilirima, naglašavajući da su se Kerkirani stavili pod rimsku zaštitu jer su smatrali da će im u budućnosti to biti jedina garancija protiv ilirskog nasilja (*Polyb.* II, 11, 5). Sklonost nasilju i zločinu kod Polibija može se tumačiti na dva načina, kao osobina koja je bila svojstvena barbarima i kao tipičan element koji je potjecao iz barbarskih običaja i zakona. U oba primjera riječ je o kulturnim stereotipima kojima su podliježali uglavnom svi narodi koji su prema rimskom konceptu spadali u kategoriju barbarskog »drugog«.⁶⁸

Sa stajališta međunarodnog prava (*ius gentium*), napad na trgovce i ubojstvo poslanika smatralo se kršenjem općepriзнatih normi. Norme općenarodnog prava izgrađuju se, u skladu sa zahtjevima vremena, na temelju općih običaja međunarodnog trgovačkog prometa, iz pravnih institucija drugih naroda i samog rimskog građanskog prava. Zakon o pravu i svetosti poslanika (*ius et sacra legationis*) također je bio dio međunarodnog prava. Tim je zakonom i običajem poslanikova osoba bila zaštićena, a bilo kakva povreda poslanikove ličnosti vrijedila je kao zločin i neprijateljski akt protiv države i bogova koje je zastupao.⁶⁹

Polibijevi Iliri i njihova vladarica kao uzurpatori općenarodnog prava bili su stalna prijetnja civiliziranom društvu. Takvu sliku o Ilirima Polibije je pojačao opisom reakcije Grka na dolazak Rimljana. Kerkirani su im se obradovali, vidjevši u njima zaštitnika od ilirskog nasilja (*Polyb.* II, 11, 5). U istom kontekstu valja promatrati i postupke Apolonije, Epidamna i Ise koji su se također stavili pod rimsku zaštitu (*Polyb.* II, 11, 8-12). Pri-

queen, of killing a Roman legate (*Polyb.* II, 8, 13). Having ascribed the first Illyrian war to the Illyrians, he pointed out that the Corcyreans were put under Roman protection because they thought the Romans would in future be the only guarantee against Illyrian violence (*Polyb.* II, 11, 5). This propensity for violence and crime in Polybius's descriptions can be interpreted in two ways: as a feature that was inherent to barbarians, and as a typical element that came from barbaric customs and laws. In both cases, we are dealing with cultural stereotypes that were mostly associated with all the peoples who belonged to the Roman concept of the category of barbaric "otherness".⁶⁸

From the standpoint of international law (*ius gentium*), the attack on the merchants and murder of the legate was considered a violation of universally recognized norms. The norms of international law were developed, in accordance with the requirements of the time, on the basis of the general practices of international commercial transportation, legal institutions of other nations, and Roman civil law itself. The Law on the Rights and Sanctity of Legates (*ius et sacra legationis*) was also part of international law. This law and custom protected the personality of a messenger, and any violation of the messenger's personality was a crime and hostile act against the state and the gods he represented.⁶⁹ Polybius's Illyrians and their queen as the usurpers of nation-wide rights were a constant threat to civilized society. Polybius heightened such a picture of the Illyrians, describing Greek reactions to the arrival of the Romans. The Corcyreans were glad that the Romans had arrived and saw them as protectors against Illyrian violence (*Polyb.* II, 11, 5). In this context, we should also observe the

⁶⁸ V. Dauge 1981. gdje je autor dao iscrpnu analizu o različitim narodima koje je antička historiografija percipirala kao barbare; Eckstein 1995, 118-160; Champion 2004, 243-244.

⁶⁹ O statusu poslanika u međunarodnom pravu starog vijeka v. Bederman 2001.

⁶⁸ See Dauge 1981, where the author gives a detailed analysis of the various nations that ancient historiography perceived as barbarians; Eckstein 1995, 118-160; Champion 2004, 243-244.

⁶⁹ On the status of delegates in the international law of the ancient world, see Bederman 2001.

kaz prvog rimskog vojevanja protiv Ilira završio je konstatacijom da su Rimljani oslobodili Helene velikog straha, jer Iliri tada nisu bili neprijatelji samo nekima, već svima zajedno (*Polyb.* II, 12, 5-6).

Polibije je razliku između Ilira i Rimljana podcrtao suprotnošću između njihovih običaja i zakona, definirajući ilirske radnje kao nepravedne i nezakonite,⁷⁰ u velikoj mjeri kao sramotne u kontekstu načina stjecanja dobitka. Suprotno tome, rimski postupci koji su potjecali iz njihovih običaja i zakona, bili su pravedni i u skladu s općepriznatim civiliziranim normama. Na taj je način kreirao sliku o Rimljanima kao dostojnim zaštitnicima Grka. Rimljani su provodili zakon i pravo, dok su Iliri činili nezakonite radnje i nasilje.

Karakterizacije ilirske vladarice Teute

Polibijev prikaz 1. ilirskog rata ispunjen je izravnim karakterizacijama ilirske vladarice Teute koje se uglavnom iznose u kratkim digresijama. Takve digresije Polibije je napravio na nekoliko mjesta kako bi objasnio razloge njenih vojnih i političkih poteza. U njima je iznio osim karaktera i neka Teutina emocionalna stanja i način razmišljanja. Poput iznošenja govora, i ovaj dio Polibijeve naracije može se smatrati subjektivnim, pristranim i tendencioznim. Na početku opisa njene vladavine, prikazujući smjenu na ilirskom prijestolju, u kratkoj digresiji istaknuo je da je Teuta prosuđujući na ženski način, to jest imajući na umu samo Agronovu pobjedu kod Mediona, dopustila onima koji plove za svoj račun da pljačkaju brodove na koje naiđu i uputila trupe u

⁷⁰ *Polyb.* II, 5, 1-2; II, 8, 1-4; Ormerod 1997, 67, 169-189; Bederman 2001, 125; Šašel Kos 2002, 137-155.

actions of Apollonia, Epidamnus and Issa, which also put themselves under Roman protection (*Polyb.* II, 11, 8-12). The presentation of the first Roman warfare against the Illyrians ends with the statement that the Romans had liberated the people of Hellas from great fear, because the Illyrians, at the time, were enemies not to some people, but to all of them (*Polyb.* II, 12, 5-6).

Polybius underlined the difference between the Illyrians and Romans using a contradiction between their customs and laws, thus defining Illyrian actions as unjust and illegal⁷⁰, largely as shameful in the context of their methods to acquire gains. By contrast, the Roman actions originating from their customs and laws were fair and in accordance with universally civilized and recognized norms. In this way, he created an image of the Romans as worthy guardians of the Greeks. The Romans practised the law, while the Illyrians did unlawful acts and violence.

Characterization of the Illyrian queen Teuta

Polybius's representation of the First Illyrian War is filled with random characterizations of the Illyrian queen, Teuta, mostly reduced to brief digressions. Polybius makes such digressions in several places in order to explain the reasons for her military and political moves. Besides her character, he also presents some of Teuta's emotional states and her way of thinking. Like the presentation speech, this part of Polybius's narration can also be considered subjective, partial and tendentious. At the beginning of the description of her reign, showing the shift in the Illyrian throne, in a brief digression, he notes that Teuta, judging in a woman's way, that is, keeping in mind only Agron's victory at Medion, had permitted those who sailed as private persons to loot ships they encountered,

⁷⁰ *Polyb.* II, 5, 1-2; II, 8, 1-4; Ormerod 1997, 67, 169-189; Bederman 2001, 125; Šašel Kos 2002, 137-155.

grčke oblasti (*Polyb.* II, 4, 8-9).⁷¹ Kako bi objasnio njen odnos prema podanicima i prema Helenima, Polibije je ilirskoj vladarici pripisao kratkovidnost tipičnu za ženski spol, riječima *χρωμένη δὲ λογισμοῖς γυναικεῖοις* (*Polyb.* II, 4, 8). Za shodno opravdanje ovakvog stava uzeo je primjerenim usporediti njene vojno-političke poteze s onim kralja Agrona. Prvim navodom nesumnjivo joj je imputirao krivicu za nasilje nad trgovcima (*Polyb.* II, 8, 1). Dok je drugim nastojao pokazati da je ilirska vladarica poslala trupe na more, uputivši ih da svaku zemlju smatraju neprijateljskom (*Polyb.* II, 4, 9).

Polibijeva ocjena Teutinih političkih poteza kao nepromišljenih i kratkovidnih kontradiktorna je njegovom prikazu ilirskog rata u Epiru, čiji su rezultati bili osvajanje Fenike, tada najjačeg i najmoćnijeg grada u Epiru, sklapanje saveza između Ilira s jedne i Epiraca i Akarnanaca s druge strane, u čemu se može vidjeti širenje ilirskog utjecaja i moći na ova područja (*Polyb.* 5, 1-8; 6, 1-11).⁷² Može se pretpostaviti da se povijesni lik Teuta u vođenju pojedinačnih poslova oslanjala na pomoć povjerljivih prijatelja. Polibije je to spomenuo na početku prikaza njene vladavine (*Polyb.* II, 4, 7). Međutim, on se u nastavku nije više osvrnuo na ovu instituciju i njen mogući utjecaj na ilirsku

and sent her troops into Greek areas (*Polyb.* II, 4, 8-9).⁷¹ In order to explain her relationship towards her subjects and the Hellenes, Polybius attributes short-sightedness, typical of the female sex, to the Illyrian queen using the following words: *χρωμένη δὲ λογισμοῖς γυναικεῖοις* (*Polyb.* II, 4, 8). In order to properly justify this attitude, he found it appropriate to compare her military-political moves with those of King Agron. The first allegation was undoubtedly an insinuating blaming of her for the violence against the merchants (*Polyb.* II, 8, 1). The second allegation he makes is to present the Illyrian queen as having sent her troops to sea, instructing them to consider each country hostile (*Polyb.* II, 4, 9).

Polybius's assessment of Teuta's political moves as hasty and short-sighted is contradictory to his description of the Illyrian war in Epirus, which led to the conquest of Phoenice, the strongest and most powerful city in Epirus, and the forming of an alliance between the Illyrians, on one hand, and the Epirots and Acarnanians on the other. This can be seen as spreading Illyrian influence and power in these areas (*Polyb.* 5, 1-8; 6, 1-11).⁷² It can be assumed that the historical figure of Teuta, in the conduct of some individual affairs, relied on the help of trusted friends. Polybius mentions it at the beginning of his description of her rule (*Polyb.* II, 4, 7). However, in his following narrative he

⁷¹ Polibijev prikaz početka Teutine vladavine omogućava viđenje Teute u odnosu prema Agronu (*Polyb.* II, 4, 7-8). Uspoređujući njihovu politiku on je istaknuo da je Teuta dopustila privatnim osobama gusarenje, što bi u danom kontekstu moglo implicirati da je kralj Agron to bio zabranio (više v. Bajrić 2009, 39-43).

⁷² Prema ugovoru o savezu, Iliri su od Akarnanaca primili sedam ratnih brodova i izvojevali pobjedu nad Ahejcima u pomorskoj bici kod Paksa (*Polyb.* II, 10, 1-9). V. Badian 1952, 73-75; Hammond 1968, 4-9; Gruen 1984, 359-368; Šašel Kos 1986, 54-83; Wilkes 1995, 158-159; Cabanes 2002, 142-144; Šašel Kos 2005, 252-267; Bajrić 2009, 41-43; Džino 2010, 45-47.

⁷¹ Polybius's representation of the beginning of Teuta's rule allows us to see Teuta in relation to Agron (*Polyb.* II, 4, 7-8). In comparing their politics, he notes that Teuta permitted private individuals to perform piracy, which, in the given context, may imply that King Agron had banned it. (For more, see Bajrić 2009, 39-43).

⁷² According to the contract of alliance, the Illyrians accepted seven warships from the Acarnanians, and thereby scored a victory over the Achaeans in the battle of Paxi (*Polyb.* II, 10, 1-9). See Badian 1952, 73-75; Hammond 1968, 4-9; Gruen 1984, 359-368; Šašel Kos 1986, 54-83; Wilkes 1995, 158-159; Cabanes 2002, 142-144; Šašel Kos 2005, 252-267; Bajrić 2009, 41-43; Džino 2010, 45-47.

vladaricu.⁷³ Institucija prijatelja, φίλοι, postojala je na dvoru helenskih vladara i imala je veliki značaj u kreiranju vladarske politike.

Također, kratkom digresijom opisao je Teutino oduševljenje veličinom i ljepotom plijena iz Fenike (*Polyb.* II, 8, 4), kako bi objasnio razloge njenih pohoda na Isu, Kerkiru i Epidamno (*Polyb.* II, 8, 5; 9, 1-2).

Polibije je iznio izravne bilješke karakterizacije Teute koje su bile determinirane ženskim osobinama i u odlomku o rimskom poslanstvu. Istaknuo ju je snažnim emocijama. Opisujući njenu reakciju na govor mladog poslanika Korunkanija, iznio je da je Teuta njegove riječi primila »ljutito i nerazumno kao žena«. ⁷⁴ Vođena ovim osobinama počinila je *hybris*, naredivši da se ubije poslanik koji joj se otvoreno obratio (*Polyb.* II, 8, 12). Pouzdano je, da ovakva slika ilirske vladarice djelomično odražava stavove helenističke povijesne tradicije, koja je stvorila jedan stanovit model antičke žene koju karakteriziraju slabost, nedostatak razuma, strastvenost i taština.⁷⁵

Polibije je Teutinu pripadnost ženskom spolu naglasio i kada je prikazivao kako su Rimljani prihvatili vijest o ubojstvu poslanika, ističući da je Rimljane razbjesnio zločin koji je ta žena počinila (*Polyb.* II, 8, 13).

Dion Kasije (12. fragm. 49, 2-7) i Flor (1, 21) prihvatili su rimsku verziju događaja, pronalazeći razlog rata u postupcima ilirske vladarice. Kod Flora postoje gotovo istovjetne konstrukcije, što je očito u

⁷³ Radi usporedbe, instituciju »kraljevi prijatelji« spomenuo je i Tit Livije u prikazu Gencijeve vladavine. Prema Liviju, ilirski kralj Gencije ubio je brata Platora i svoja dva prijatelja, Etrita i Epikada, da bi što sigurnije vladao (*Liv.* 44. 30, 2-4).

⁷⁴ *Polyb.* II; 8, 12; Eckstein 1995, 154-155; Champion 2004, 112-113.

⁷⁵ Walbank 1970, 156; Šašel Kos 1986, 81.

no longer refers to this institution and its possible influence on the Illyrian queen.⁷³ The institution of friends, φίλοι, is found in the courts of Hellenic rulers and played a big role in creating royal policy.

Also, in his short digression he describes Teuta's enthusiasm at the sight of the size and beauty of the booty from Phoenice (*Polyb.* II, 8, 4) in order to explain the reasons for her military campaigns to Issa, Corcyra and Epidamnus (*Polyb.* II, 8, 5, 9, 1-2).

Polybius presents direct notes on the characterization of Teuta, which were determined by female characteristics, even in the section on the Roman mission. He emphasizes her strong emotions. Describing her reaction to the speech of the young legate Coruncanus, he states that Teuta had received his words "with anger and caprice, as a woman."⁷⁴ Guided by these properties, she committed *hybris* and ordered the killing of the messenger who had openly addressed her (*Polyb.* II, 8, 12). What is for sure is that this image of the Illyrian queen partly reflects the views of Hellenistic historical tradition, which has created a certain model of an ancient woman, characterized by weakness and lack of reason, full of passion and vanity.⁷⁵

Polybius emphasizes Teuta's affiliation to femininity when describing how the Romans accepted the news of the murder of the messenger, and points out that the Romans were infuriated by the crime this woman had committed (*Polyb.* II, 8, 13).

Dio Cassius (12. fragm. 49, 2-7) and Florus (1, 21) accept the Roman version of events, finding the reason for the war in the actions of the Illyrian queen. Florus comprises almost

⁷³ For comparison, the institution of "the king's friends" was mentioned by Livy in his description of Gentius's rule. According to Livy, the Illyrian king Gentius killed his brother Plator and two friends of his, Etritus and Epicadus, for the greater security of his reign (*Liv.* 44. 30, 2-4).

⁷⁴ *Polyb.* II; 8, 12; Eckstein 1995, 154-155; Champion 2004, 112-113.

⁷⁵ Walbank 1970, 156; Šašel Kos 1986, 81.

njegovom stavu da je ubojstvo poslanika bio zločin koji su Iliri počinili, a počinjeni zločin je tim veći i stravičniji jer ga je naredila žena (*Flor.* 1, 21). Dion Kasije iznio je izravne karakterizacije u kojima je naglasio njenu pripadnost ženskom spolu (*Dio. Cass.* 12, fragm. 49, 2-7). Poput Polibija, Dion je dotične osobine istaknuo u vezi s njenim vojno-političkim postupcima, najprije u opisu smjene na ilirskom prijestolju (Τεύτα δὲ ἡ γυνὴ αὐτοῦ, μητρικὰ δὲ τοῦ Πίννου, ἐκράτει τῶν Ἀρδιαίων) i dva puta u epizodi s rimskim poslanicima (gdje je dodana i opaska koja se tiče generalno ženskog roda). Posredne karakterizacije (kod Zonare neposredne) mogu se izlučiti iz prikaza rimske vojne i odnosa prema Demetriju Farskom. Prema Dionu Kasiju ona je pokazala žensku slabost i prenagljenost (*Dio. Cass.* 12. fragm. 49, 2-7). Kao uzrok kršenja svetosti poslanstva Dion Kasije je naveo Teutinu tipičnu žensku naglost, što se u ovom kontekstu, prije svega, treba shvatiti kao nerazuman i nagonski potez. Pripisao joj je slabost tipičnu za ženski spol, žensku prenagljenost i taštinu koja ometa rasuđivanje zbog osjećaja nadmoći zaradi vlasti koju je posjedovala (*Dio. Cass.* 12. fragm. 49, 2-7). Dionov navod o Teutinoj politici podsjeća na onaj Polibijev da je ilirska vladarica imala isključivo na umu Agronovu pobjedu nad Etolcima (*Polyb.* II, 4, 8-9). U nastavku, Dion je bio još oštriji kada je karakterizirao Teutu riječima da je u kratkom vremenu pokazala slabost ženskog spola, koji brzo plane zbog pomanjkanja prosuđivanja i brzo je se prestrašila zbog kukavičluka (*Dio. Cass.* 12. fragm. 49, 2-7). Takav stav iznio je kada je prikazivao njen odnos prema Rimu, nakon napada na poslanstvo i vijesti da su Rimljani glasali za rat protiv nje. Apijan Aleksandrijski, čiji se prikaz 1. ilirskog rata razlikuje od gore navedenih, Teutu je prikazao u sasvim drugom svjetlu. Ilirska vladarica, poslala je izaslanike u Rim

identical structure, which is evident in his attitude that the murder of the ambassador was a crime committed by the Illyrians, which was far greater and terrifying, for it was ordered by a woman (*Flor.* 1, 21). Dio Cassius presents direct characterization which emphasizes her affiliation with femininity (*Dio. Cass.* 12, fragm. 49, 2-7). Like Polybius, Dio points out these specific characteristics in connection with her military-political actions, once when describing the shift in the Illyrian throne (Τεύτα δὲ ἡ γυνὴ αὐτοῦ, μητρικὰ δὲ τοῦ Πίννου, ἐκράτει τῶν Ἀρδιαίων), and twice in the episode with the Roman legates (where a remark on womanhood was added). Indirect characterization (for Zonaras it is direct) can be extracted from the description of the Roman military and the relationship towards Demetrius of Pharos. According to Dio Cassius, she showed feminine weakness and temerity (*Dio. Cass.* 12. fragm. 49, 2-7). As the cause of violating the holiness of the mission, Dio Cassius cites Teuta's typical feminine impetuosity, which, in this context, should be seen as an irrational and instinctive move. He attributes her with weakness that was typically female, feminine temerity and vanity that interferes with sound judgment because of the sense of superiority due to the power she possessed (*Dio. Cass.* 12. fragm. 49, 2-7). Dio's allegation on Teuta's policy resembles that of Polybius, that is, the Illyrian queen had in mind only Agron's victory over the Aetolians (*Polyb.* II, 4, 8-9). In addition, Dio is even sharper when he characterizes Teuta by saying that, in a short period of time, she manifested the weakness of a woman, who quickly became furious due to a lack of judgment and quickly became frightened out of cowardice (*Dio. Cass.* 12. fragm. 49, 2-7). He expresses this attitude when describing her relationship towards Rome, after the attack on the envoys and the news that the Romans had voted for the war against her. Appian of Alexandria, whose representation of the First Illyrian War differs from those aforementioned, presents Teuta in a com-

kako bi im predala zarobljenike i dezertere. Molila je i oprost za ono što je učinjeno ne za njene, nego Agronove vladavine (*App. Illyr. 7*). Apijanova Teuta bila je savjesna i oštromna vladarica, svjesna posljedica i mogućeg rata s Rimljanima, te je diplomatskim putem pokušala urediti odnose s Rimom.

Usklađena izvješća Polibija, Flora i Dion Kasija istovjetna su po pitanju karakterizacije Teute, i ona je predstavljena kao loša i nesposobna vladarica, jer je bila žena. Ključno je reći da oni nisu bili zainteresirani za dublju analizu prilika u Iliriji za vrijeme Teutine vladavine i da su njihovi prikazi bili jedna vrsta opravdanja prve rimske vojne intervencije na istočnoj obali Jadranskog mora, ali i prilika da se Rimljani istaknu i prikažu kao dostojni zaštitnici Grka.

Osobine ilirske kraljice u potpunom su kontrastu s osobinama dobrog državnika, Aratom, kojeg je Polibije u četvrtoj knjizi istaknuo kao savršenog državnika i uzora svakome tko se bavi politikom (*Polyb. IV, 8, 1-12*). To su bile i osobine vladara koji nije upravljao razumom, nego strahom i nasiljem. Po principima koje je Polibije postavio u šestoj knjizi *Historije* (*Polyb. VI, 4*), Teutina bi se vladavina mogla okarakterizirati kao tiranska. U vezi s tim, stari su pisci iznijeli poteze Demetrija Farskog, čime su željeli pokazati njezin odnos prema podanicima (*Polyb. II, 11, 2-5; Dio. Cass. 12, fragm. 49, 1-7; 12, Zon. 8, 19, 3-7*). Prema Polibiju, Demetrije Farski bojao se Teute pa je Rimljanima predao Kerkiru i prešao na njihovu stranu (*Polyb. II, 11, 2-5*). U diskursu kojim je Zonara prenio Dionovo kazivanje, također se osuđuje Teutino loše i nerazumno vladanje, proizročeno ženskom nestabilnošću, što je dovelo do dezerterstva njenih podanika na čelu s Demetrijem Farskim i potpu-

pletely different light. The Illyrian queen sent her envoy to Rome in order to return the prisoners and deserters. She also prayed for forgiveness for what had been done only during Agron's reign, but not hers (*App. Illyr. 7*). Apian's Teuta was a conscientious and shrewd ruler, aware of the consequences and possible war with the Romans, who tried to settle the relationship with Rome through diplomacy.

The adjusted reports of Polybius, Florus and Dio Cassius are identical in terms of their characterization of Teuta, who is presented as a poor and incompetent ruler, because she was a woman. It is important to say that they were not interested in any deeper analysis of the situation in Illyria during Teuta's reign. Their views were a kind of justification of the first Roman military intervention on the eastern coast of the Adriatic Sea, and also an opportunity to highlight and present the Romans as worthy protectors of the Greeks.

The characteristics of the Illyrian queen are in complete contrast to the characteristics of the good statesman Aratus of Sicyon, whom Polybius mentioned in his Book IV as a perfect statesman and role model for anyone who was involved in politics (*Polyb. IV, 8, 1-12*). These are the characteristics of a ruler who is not driven by reason, but by fear and violence. According to the principles that Polybius sets forth in Book VI of his *Histories* (*Polyb. VI, 4*), Teuta's reign could be characterized as tyrannical. In this regard, the ancient writers showcased the moves of Demetrius of Pharos in order to present her relationship towards her subjects (*Polyb. II, 11, 2-5; Dio. Cass. 12, fragm. 49, 1-7; 12, Zon. 8, 19, 3-7*). According to Polybius, Demetrius of Pharos was afraid of Teuta, so he handed Coreyra to the Romans and crossed over to their side (*Polyb. II, 11, 2-5*). The discourse by which Zonaras presents Dio's narratives also condemns Teuta's bad and unreasonable behaviour, caused by woman's instability, which led to the desertion of her subjects, led

nog poraza u ratu protiv Rimljana (*Dio. Cass.* 12, fragm. 49, 1-7; 12, *Zon.* 8, 19, 3-7).

Polibije se često u danim situacijama pozivao na *Tyche*, ali su njegove izjave o njenoj ulozi u povijesnim procesima vrlo proturječne.⁷⁶ Međutim, sudeći prema 17. poglavlju 36. knjige, gdje je kritizirao one koji odgovornost za svjetske događaje i privatne nevolje pripisuju *Tyche* i Usudu, može se reći da je Polibije vjerovao da su povijesni događaji rezultat ljudskih djela. Gledano u ovom kontekstu, prikaz i sudbinu ilirske vladarice Teute ne možemo vidjeti kroz prizmu *Tyche*. Polibije je kroz cijeli opis njene vladavine prikazuje kao nepromišljenu i naglu ženu, koja je svojim potezima prouzročila rat s Rimljanima što je dovelo do kraja njene vladavine.

Polibijev odlomak o rimskoj diplomatskoj misiji u Iliriji nesumnjivo govori u prilog da se slika rimskog neprijatelja kreirala pod utjecajem općih rimskih predodžbi o kraljevskoj vlasti i barbarima. Polibije je Ilire i Teutu istaknuo negativnim osobinama. U njegovom prikazu najizraženije su ilirske navodne mentalne karakteristike čiji su izvor ilirski običaji i način života. Polibijeva slika ilirske vladarice podliježe dvostrukom odrugovljenju, budući da je determinirana barbarskim i ženskim osobinama. Ilustrativni je primjer prijenosa općih kulturnih i društvenih stereotipa.

⁷⁶ Walbank 1970, 16-26; Walbank 2002, 194-197, 212-216.

by Demetrius of Pharos, and complete defeat in the war against the Romans (*Dio. Cass.* 12, fragm. 49, 1-7; 12, *Zon.* 8, 19, 3-7).

In a given situation, Polybius often calls for *Tyche*, but his statements about its role in the historical process are very contradictory.⁷⁶ However, according to Chapter XVII, Book XXXVI, where he criticizes those who cast responsibility for world events and private troubles on *Tyche* and Fate, we can say that Polybius believed that historical events were the result of human actions. Seen in this context, the representation and fate of the Illyrian queen, Teuta, cannot be seen through the prism of *Tyche*. In the full description of her rule, Polybius portrays Teuta as a reckless and abrupt woman whose actions caused the war with the Romans, which eventually led to the end of her reign.

Polibius's section on the Roman diplomatic mission in Illyria undoubtedly speaks to the fact that the image of the Roman enemy was created under the influence of the general Roman idea of the royal government and the barbarians. Polybius uses negative characteristics to describe the Illyrians and Teuta. His description abounds with allegedly Illyrian mental characteristics whose source was to be found in Illyrian customs and their way of living. Polybius's image of the Illyrian queen is subject to a double perspective, since he uses both barbaric and female traits to define her personality. She is an illustrative example of a transfer of general cultural and social stereotypes.

⁷⁶ Walbank 1970, 16-26; Walbank 2002, 194-197, 212-216.

Izvori / Sources

Appian 1982 – *Appian's Roman history I*, with an English translation by Horace White, Loeb classical library 2, 1982.

Appian 2005 – M. Šašel Kos, *Appian and Illyricum*, Situla: razprave Narodnega muzeja Slovenije 43, Ljubljana, Narodni muzej Slovenije, 2005, 52-81.

Dio 1986 – M. Šašel Kos, *Zgodovinska podoba prostora med Akvilejo, Jadranom in Sirmijem pri Kasiju Dionu in Herodijanau*, Ljubljana, Slovenska akademija znanosti in umetnosti Ljubljana, 1986, 50-273.

Dio 1989 – *Dio's Roman history II: books XII-XXXV (fragments)*, with an English translation by Earnest Cary, Loeb classical library 37, 1989.

Florus 1995 – *Epitome of Roman history*, with an English translation by Edward Seymour Foster, Loeb classical library 231, 1995.

Flor 2005 – *Dvije knjige izvadaka iz Tita Livija o svim ratovima u sedam stotina godina/Epitome de Tito Livio bellorum omnium annorum DCC libri duo*, preveo i priredio Josip Miklič, Biblioteka Latina et Graeca knj. 53, Zagreb, Izdanja Antibarbarus, 2005.

Livy 1989 – *Livy, History of Rome XIII, books XLIII-XLV*, with an English translation by Alfred C. Schlesinger, Loeb classical library 396, 1989.

Polybii 1859 – *Polybii, Historiarum reliquiae*, Graece et Latine cum indicibus, Parisiis, A. F. Didot, 1859.

Polibije 1988 – *Polibije, Istorije I*, knj. I-VIII, predgovor, prevod i komentar Marijana Riel, Novi Sad, Matica srpska, 1988.

Polibije 1988a – *Polibije, Istorije II*, knj. IX-XXXIX, prevod i komentar Marijana Riel, Novi Sad, Matica srpska, 1988.

Polybius 2000 – *Polybius, The Histories I*, with an English translation by W. R. Paton, Loeb classical library 128, 2000.

Tukidid 1991 – *Tukidid, Povijest peloponeskog rata*, preveo Stjepan Telar, Beograd, Dereta, 1991.

Bibliografija / Bibliography

Adler 2011 – E. Adler, *Valorizing the Barbarians: enemy speeches in Roman historiography*, Ashley and Peter Larkin series in Greek and Roman culture, Austin, University of Texas Press, 2011.

Badian 1952 – E. Badian, »Notes on roman policy in Illyria (230-201 B.C.)«, *Papers of the British School at Rome*, London, Rome, 20, 1952, 72-93.

Badian 1997 – E. Badian, *Foreign Clientelae (264-70 B.C.)*, Amsterdam, Hakkert, 1997.

Bajrić 2009 – A. Bajrić, *Lik protivničkog vođe u rimskoj povijesnoj predaji: (primjeri iz Ilirika)*, magistarski rad, Zagreb, Sveučilište u Zagrebu, Filozofski fakultet, 2009.

Balsdon 1979 – J. P. V. D. Balsdon, *Romans and Aliens*, London, Duckworth, 1979.

Bederman 2001 – D. J. Bederman, *International Law in Antiquity*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2001.

Cabanes 1988 – P. Cabanes, *Les Illyriens de Bardylis à Genthios (IVe - IIe siècles avant J.-C.)*, Regards sur l'histoire: histoire ancienne 65, Pariz, Sedes, 1988.

Cabanes 2002 – P. Cabanes, *Iliri od Bardileja do Gencija (IV. – II. stoljeće prije Krista)*, Zagreb, Svitava, 2002.

Cartledge 1993 – P. Cartledge, *The Greeks: a portrait of self and others*, OPUS, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 1993.

Champion 2004 – B. C. Champion, *Cultural Politics in Polybius's Histories*, Hellenistic culture and society 41, Berkeley, London, University of California Press, 2004.

Champion 2007 – B. C. Champion, »Polybius and Aetolia: A Historiographical Approach«, in Marincola, J. (ed.), *A companion to Greek and Roman historiography*, vol. 1, Blackwell companions to the ancient world, Malden, Oxford, Blackwell Publishing, 2007, 356-362.

De Souza 1999 – P. de Souza, *Piracy in the Graeco-Roman world*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1999.

Dauge 1981 – Y. A. Dauge, *Le Barbare: recherches sur la conception romaine de la barbarie et de la civilisation*, Collection Latomus 176, Bruxelles, Latomus, 1981.

- Dell 1967 – H. J. Dell, »The Origin and Nature of Illyrian Piracy«, *Historia: Zeitschrift für Alte Geschichte*, Wiesbaden, 16, 1967, 344-358.
- Derow 1973 – P. S. Derow, »Kleemporos«, *Phoenix: the journal of the Classical Association of Canada*, Toronto, 27, 1973, 118-134.
- Derow 2003 – P. Derow, »The arrival of Rome: from the Illyrian wars to the fall of Macedon«, in Erskine, A. (ed.), *A companion to the Hellenistic world*, Blackwell companions to the ancient world. Ancient history, Malden, Oxford, Blackwell Publishing, 2003, 51-70.
- Domić-Kunić 1993 – A. Domić-Kunić, »Gentije – međunarodni odnosi između Ilirije, Rima i Makedonije uoči i za vrijeme trećeg makedonskog i trećeg ilirskog rata«, *Opuscula archaeologica*, Zagreb, 17, 1993, 205-251.
- Džino 2010 – D. Džino, *Illyricum in Roman politics: 229 BC-AD 68*, Cambridge, New York, Cambridge University Press, 2010.
- Eckstein 1995 – A. M. Eckstein, *Moral vision in the Histories of Polybius*, Berkeley, University of California Press, 1995.
- Erskine 2003 – A. Erskine (ed.), *A companion to the Hellenistic world*, Blackwell companions to the ancient world. Ancient history, Malden, Oxford, Blackwell Publishing, 2003,
- Gabričević 1974 – B. Gabričević, »Bilješke uz prvi ilirski rat: (s posebnim obzirom na našu historiografiju)«, *Radovi. Filozofski fakultet u Zadru*, Zadar, 12, 1974, 5-26.
- Grant 1995 – M. Grant, *Greek and Roman historians: information and misinformation*, London, Routledge, 1995.
- Gruen 1984 – E. S. Gruen, *The Hellenistic world and the coming of Rome*, Berkeley, London, University of California Press, 1984.
- Hall 1989 – E. Hall, *Inventing the barbarian: Greek self-definition through tragedy*, Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1989.
- Hammond 1948 – M. Hammond, »Ancient imperialism: contemporary justifications«, *Harvard studies in classical philology*, Boston, 58-59, 1948, 105-161.
- Hammond 1966 – N. G. L. Hammond, »The Kingdoms in Illyria circa 400-167 B.C.«, *Annual of the British School at Athens*, London, 61, 1966, 239-254.
- Hammond 1968 – N. G. L. Hammond, »Illyris, Rome and Macedon in 229-205 B.C.«, *Journal of Roman studies*, London, 58, 1968, 1-21.
- Hammond, Walbank 1988 – N. G. L. Hammond and F. W. Walbank, *A history of Macedonia*, vol. III: 336-167 B.C., Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1988.
- Harris 1979 – W. V. Harris, *War and imperialism in Republican Rome 327-70 B.C.*, Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1979.
- Harrison 2002 – T. Harrison (ed.), *Greeks and Barbarians*, Edinburgh readings on the ancient world, Edinburgh, Edinburgh University Press, 2002.
- Holleaux 1920 – M. Holleaux, *Rome, la Grèce et les monarchies hellénistiques au IIIe siècle avant J. C. (273-205)*, Paris, E. de Boccard, 1920.
- Holleaux 1954 – M. Holleaux, »The Romans in Illyria«, u Cook, S. A., Adcock, F. E., Charlesworth, M. P. (eds.), *The Cambridge Ancient History*, vol. VII: The Hellenistic monarchies and the rise of Rome, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1954, 822-857.
- Marincola 2001 – J. Marincola, *Greek Historians*, Greece & Rome. New surveys in the classics 31, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2001.
- Marincola 2007 – J. Marincola (ed.), *A companion to Greek and Roman historiography*, vol. 1, Blackwell companions to the ancient world, Malden, Oxford, Blackwell Publishing, 2007.
- Marincola 2007a – J. Marincola, »Speeches in Classical Historiography«, in Marincola, J. (ed.), *A companion to Greek and Roman historiography*, vol. 1, Blackwell companions to the ancient world, Malden, Oxford, Blackwell Publishing, 2007, 118-133.
- Nippel 2002 – W. Nippel, »The Construction of the »Other«, in T. Harrison (ed.), *Greeks and Barbarians*, Edinburgh readings on the ancient world, Edinburgh, Edinburgh University Press, 2002, 278-310.
- Ormerod 1997 – H. A. Ormerod, *Piracy in the ancient world: an essay in Mediterranean history*, Baltimore, The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1997.

- Papazoglu 1967 – F. Papazoglu, »Poreklo i razvoj ilirske države«, *Godišnjak. Centar za balkanološka ispitivanja*, Sarajevo, V/3, 1967, 123-144.
- Pédech 1964 – P. Pédech, *La méthode historique de Polybe*, Collection d'études anciennes, Paris, Les Belles lettres, 1964.
- Petzold 1971 – K.-E. Petzold, »Rom und Illyrien: Ein Beitrag zur römischen Außenpolitik im 3. Jahrhundert«, *Historia: Zeitschrift für Alte Geschichte*, Wiesbaden, 20, 1971, 199-223.
- Rich 1976 – J. W. Rich, *Declaring war in the Roman Republic in the period of transmarine expansion*, Collection Latomus 149, Bruxelles, Latomus, 1976.
- Ricl 1988 – M. Ricl, »Polibije – vrhunac helenističke istoriografije«, u Polibije, *Istorije I*, Novi Sad, Matica srpska, 1988, 7-34.
- Ricl 1988a – M. Ricl, »Komentar«, u Polibije, *Istorije I*, Novi Sad, Matica srpska, 1988, 583-648.
- Sacks 1981 – K. S. Sacks, *Polybius on the writing of history*, University of California publications in classical studies 24, Berkeley, University of California Press, 1981.
- Salmon 1986 – P. Salmon, »L'image des Illyriens à Rome: étude de mentalité«, *Iliria*, Tirane, 16, 1, 203-214.
- Stipčević 1989 – A. Stipčević, *Iliri: povijest, život, kultura*, Zagreb, Školska knjiga, 1989.
- Šašel Kos 1986 – M. Šašel Kos, *Zgodovinska podoba prostora med Akvilejo, Jadranom in Sirmijem pri Kasiju Dionu in Herodijanu*, Ljubljana, Slovenska akademija znanosti in umetnosti Ljubljana, 1986
- Šašel Kos 2002 – M. Šašel Kos, »From Agron to Genthius: large scale piracy in the Adriatic«, in Braccesi, L., Luni, M. (eds.), *I Greci in Adriatico*, Hesperia 15, Roma, »L'Erma« di Bretschneider, 2002, 137-155.
- Šašel Kos 2005 – M. Šašel Kos, *Appian and Illyricum*, Situla: razprave Narodnega muzeja Slovenije 43, Ljubljana, Narodni muzej Slovenije, 2005.
- Walbank 1984 – F. W. Walbank, »Monarchies and monarchic ideas«, in Walbank, F. W. et al. (eds.), *The Cambridge Ancient History*, vol. VII/1: The Hellenistic world, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1984, 62-100.
- Walbank 1970 – F. W. Walbank, *A historical commentary on Polybius*, vol. I: Commentary on books I-VI, Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1970.
- Walbank 2002 – F. W. Walbank, *Polybius, Rome and the Hellenistic world: essays and reflections*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2002.
- Walbank 2007 – F. W. Walbank, »Fortune (tychē) in Polybius«, in Marincola, J. (ed.), *A companion to Greek and Roman historiography*, vol. 1, Blackwell companions to the ancient world, Malden, Oxford, Blackwell Publishing, 2007, 349-355.
- Walser 1953/1954 – G. Walser, »Die Ursachen des ersten romisch-illyrischen Krieges«, *Historia: Zeitschrift für Alte Geschichte*, Wiesbaden, 2, 1953/4, 308-318.
- Wilkes 1969 – J. Wilkes, *Dalmatia*, History of the provinces of the Roman empire 2, London, Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1969.
- Wilkes 1995 – J. Wilkes, *The Illyrians*, The Peoples of Europe, Oxford, Blackwell, 1995.
- Zippel 1877 – G. Zippel, *Die Römische Herrschaft in Illyrien bis auf Augustus*, Leipzig, Teubner, 1877.