

studied the characters of living Venice. It was not till four years afterwards that he satisfied himself as to the motive, and the discovery of an old document afterwards proved that his reading of history was correct. In other cases he showed the same studious care for accuracy, the very opposite of rash and dashing identification of characters with himself. In most of his tales and dramas there is an historical basis, and the basis is scrupulously ascertained. He particularly prided himself upon the truth of his local colouring.

The most interesting and complete portrait of Byron is perhaps that drawn by Lady Blessington, who saw him at Genoa a few months before his departure for Greece. It is not so favourable as some, but it is peculiarly valuable because taken from a definite point of view, that of a clever woman of the world and practised critic of appearance and manner. "I had fancied him," she says, "taller, with a more dignified and commanding air, and I looked in vain for the hero-looking sort of person with whom I had so long identified him in imagination. His appearance is, however, highly prepossessing, his head is finely shaped, and the forehead open, high, and noble, his eyes are grey and full of expression, but one is visibly larger than the other, his mouth is the most remarkable feature in his face, the upper lip of Grecian shortness, and the corners descending, the lips full and finely-cut. In speaking he shows his teeth very much, and they are white and even, but I observed that even in his smile—and he smiles frequently—there is something of a scornful expression in his mouth that is evidently natural, and not, as many suppose, affected. . . . His countenance is full of expression, and changes with the subject of conversation; it gains on the beholder the more it is seen, and leaves an agreeable impression. . . . He is very slightly lame, and the deformity of his foot is so little remarkable that I am not now aware which foot it is. His voice and accent are peculiarly agreeable, but effeminate—clear, harmonious, and so distinct that, though his general tone in speaking is rather low than high, not a word is lost. . . . I had expected to find him a dignified, cold, reserved, and haughty person, resembling those mysterious personages he so loves to paint in his works, and with whom he has been so often identified by the good-natured world, but nothing can be more different; for were I to point out the prominent defect of Lord Byron, I should say it was flippancy, and a total want of that natural self-possession and dignity which ought to characterize a man of birth and education." Such, judged by the social standard of his own country, was the look and personal manner of the greatest literary power of this century.

The best edition of Byron's works is that published by Murray, with illustrative extracts from his letters and diaries, and from the criticisms of his contemporaries. A selection from his works, edited and prefaced by Mr A. C. Swinburne, is published by Moxon. The facts of his life may be studied in Moore's *Life, Letters, and Journal of Lord Byron*, supplemented by Leigh Hunt's *Lord Byron and his Contemporaries*, Lady Blessington's *Conversations with Lord Byron*, Trelawney's *Recollections of Shelley and Byron*, and the Countess Guiccioli's *Lord Byron jugé par les témoins de sa vie* (translated under the title of *Recollections of Lord Byron*). Numerous allusions to Byron occur in the published memoirs of his contemporaries, such as the *Shelley Memorials* and Crabb Robinson's *Diary*. Karl Elze's biography (translated), although often mistaken in its conception of his character, is valuable as a collection of facts. (W. M.)

BYRON, HON. JOHN (1723–1786), admiral and circumnavigator, second son of the fourth Lord Byron, and grandfather of the poet, was born November 8, 1723. While still very young accompanied Anson in his voyage of discovery round the world. During many successive years he saw a great deal of hard service, and so constantly had he to contend, on his various expeditions, with adverse gales and dangerous storms, that he was aptly nicknamed by the sailors, "Foul-weather Jack." It is

to this that Lord Byron alludes in his famous *Epistle to Augusta*:—

"A strange doom is thy father's son's, and past
Recalling as it lies beyond redress,
Reversed for him our grandsire's fate of yore,
He had no rest at sea, nor I on shore.

In 1769 he was appointed governor of Newfoundland. In 1775 he attained his flag rank, and in the following year became a vice-admiral. In 1778 he was despatched with a fleet to watch the movements of the Count d'Estaing, and in July 1779 fought an indecisive engagement with him off Grenada. He soon after returned to England, retiring into private life, and died April 10, 1786.

BYSTRÖM, JOHANN NICOLAUS (1783–1848), Swedish sculptor, was born December 18, 1783, at Philipstad. At the age of twenty he proceeded to Stockholm and studied for three years under Sergell. In 1809 he gained the academy prize, and in the following year visited Rome. He sent home a beautiful work, *The Reclining Bacchante*, in half life size, which raised him at once to the first rank among Swedish sculptors. On his return to Stockholm in 1816 he presented the crown prince with a colossal statue of himself, and was entrusted with several important works. Although he was appointed professor of sculpture at the academy, he soon returned to Italy, and with the exception of the years from 1838 to 1844 continued to reside there. He died at Rome in 1848. Among Byström's numerous productions the best are his representations of the female form, such as *Hebe*, *Pandora*, *Juno suckling Hercules*, and *the Girl entering the Bath*. His colossal statues of the Swedish kings are also much admired.

BYZANTINE EMPIRE. See GREEK EMPIRE.

BYZANTINE HISTORIANS. The historians who have related the transactions under the Eastern, Greek, or Byzantine empire, for the millennium intervening between the death of Theodosius and the Turkish conquest of Constantinople, are collectively classed together under the above designation. Until, however, the middle of the 6th century, they are, with one conspicuous exception, too merely fragmentary to deserve special notice. This exception is Procopius, the Polybius of his age, whose histories are of such importance as to demand a separate article. We shall arrange his successors in chronological order, distinguishing between the historians properly so called and the chronologers.

HISTORIANS.—I. AGATHIAS of Myrina in Ætolia, was born under Justinian, about 536 A.D., and is believed to have died under Tiberius the Second, about 580. His character as an epigrammatist and an editor of poetry has been already considered under the head ANTHOLOGY. We are indebted to him in his historical capacity for an extremely valuable narrative of six of the most eventful years of the Greek empire, 553–558. The first book details the conquest of Italy from the Goths by Justinian's general Narses; the remainder describe, along with other incidents, the Persian war of 554–556, the two great earthquakes of 554 and 557, the great plague, the rebuilding of St Sophia, and Belisarius's last exploits against the Bulgarians. The history terminates abruptly, and was probably left unfinished. As a narrator, Agathias is sensible and impartial, but deficient in general knowledge, and far below the standard of a philosophic historian. His style is rhetorical, but not unpleasing. II. MENANDER PROTECTOR, the far inferior imitator of Agathias, lived under Maurice, whose reign began in 581, and continued the history of Agathias to the date of the accession of that emperor. His work was comprised in eight books, which are entirely lost, with the exception of numerous extracts relating to embassies preserved in the collection *Περὶ πρεσβευῶν*—the 27th and only existing book of the extensive compilation of historical excerpts made by the Emperor Constantine Porphyrogenitus.

III. THEOPHYLACTUS of Simocatta, a sophist and civilian of Egyptian extraction, wrote the history of the Emperor Maurice (582–602) in eight books, all of which are preserved. The work seems to have been completed under Heraclius. Theophylactus lived until 628 or 629. He is an accurate and not inelegant writer, but frequently trivial and frigid. IV. JOANNES of Epiphaneia, a contemporary of Theophylactus, wrote the history of the wars of the Greeks and Persians from the latter part of Justinian's reign until the restoration of Chosroes II. by Maurice (591). His history has never been printed, but is said to exist in MS. at Heidelberg. V. THE EMPEROR CONSTANTINE PORPHYROGENITUS (reigned 911–959). Among the many services rendered to literature by this learned sovereign is to be enumerated his history of his grandfather Basil the Macedonian, emperor from 867 to 886. VI. GENESIUS, who lived in the time of Constantine Porphyrogenitus, wrote by his order the history of Basil II. and of his four immediate predecessors (813–886). The work is brief and meagre, but is almost the only authority we possess for a portion of the period described. VII. JOANNES CAMENIATA, a native of Thessalonica, and cross-bearer to the archbishop, wrote an account, which has been preserved, of the sack of that wealthy city by the Saracens in 904. Cameniata himself was one of the captives, and his narrative is very lively and valuable. VIII. LEO DIACONUS, an ecclesiastic in the latter half of the 10th century, is the author of an indifferently written, but honest and instructive, narrative of the remarkable period of national recovery under the emperors Romanus II., Nicephorus Phocas, and John Zimisces, when Crete was reconquered, Syria invaded, and the Russians driven out of Bulgaria (959–975). Leo wrote at least as late as 993. IX. NICEPHORUS BRYENNIUS, the son-in-law of the Emperor Alexius Comnenus, and one of the first statesmen and generals of his time, wrote in four books the history of the empire under the Comneni from 1057 to 1081. X. His still more celebrated wife, ANNA COMNENA, daughter of the Emperor Alexius, and the marvel of her sex at that extremely low period of female education, wrote (1148) the history of her father in fifteen books. The period of Alexius is peculiarly interesting as that in which the barrier of Byzantine isolation was broken down, and the East and West brought into contact by the encroachments of the Normans on the Eastern empire and by the Crusades. We cannot be too grateful to the Princess Anna for her vivid sketch of the arrival of the Crusaders at Constantinople, and the relations between them and the Byzantine court. Her work, however, must be used with great caution. Gibbon's employment of it is an example of his usual discernment. XI. Her history was continued by JOANNES CINNAMUS, one of the most eminent of all the Byzantine historians. He was one of the imperial notaries under the reign of Manuel Comnenus (1143–1180), an office nearly corresponding to that of a modern secretary of state. He had, consequently, great administrative experience, and a thorough knowledge of the relations of the empire with foreign states, and of the internal affairs of the latter. He is thus in an excellent position for writing history, besides which his own judgment and sagacity are of a very superior order, and his style is commonly terse and clear. Like most writers who have themselves participated in the transactions they describe, he is not altogether exempt from partiality. His history comprehends the period from the death of Alexius Comnenus in 1118 to the siege of Iconium by Manuel Comnenus in 1176, four years before the death of that emperor. There is little doubt that Cinnamus brought his work down to the close of Manuel's reign, and that the conclusion is lost. XII. NICETAS ACOMINATUS, or CHONIATES, a patrician and holder of

many important public offices under the emperor Isaac Angelus at the beginning of the 13th century, described the same period as Cinnamus, but continued his narrative to 1206. The latter books of Nicetas's history possess especial importance, inasmuch as they contain the Byzantine account of the taking of Constantinople by the Latins in the fourth crusade (1204). Nicetas's own palace was burned and plundered, and he escaped with difficulty to Nicæa, where he composed his history under the protection of the emperor Theodore Lascaris. His narrative, though too rhetorical, is striking and pathetic; it necessarily requires careful comparison with the Latin accounts. The remainder of his history is also valuable. He is also said to be the author of an account of the statues destroyed by the Latins, which, however, is thought to have been interpolated by a later writer. It has been published by Wilken (Leipsic, 1830). XIII. GEORGIUS ACROPOLITA, an eminent scholar and diplomatist, who lived from 1220–1282, wrote the history of the Eastern empire during its subjugation by the Latins (1204–1261). The work is so brief that it has been regarded as merely an epitome of Acropolita's original history. XIV. GEORGIUS PACHYMERES, a priest and ecclesiastical jurist under Michael and Andronicus Palæologus, wrote the history of these emperors (1258–1308) in thirteen books. Pachymeres is one of the best of the Byzantine historians; his style is singularly good for his age, and his tone dignified and impartial. XV. NICEPHORUS GREGORAS, a man of great learning, but passionate and untrustworthy as an historian, wrote the history of his country from 1204–1358, in thirty-eight books, the last fourteen of which remained unpublished until 1855, when they were edited at Bonn by Immanuel Bekker. After the recovery of Constantinople by the Greeks in 1261, Byzantine politics entered into a new phase; the feeble and distracted empire, unable to make head against the Turks, was compelled to lean for support upon the European powers, which it sought to obtain by patching up the long-standing religious schism. Greeks and Latins, however, were equally resolved to concede nothing save in appearance, and the history of the time is to a great extent that of hollow negotiations, meant only to deceive. In these Gregoras had a considerable share; he also took an active part in the internal religious controversies of his church, and his personal knowledge of affairs imparts considerable value to his history. He was at one time a favourite of the Emperor Cantacuzenus, but was subsequently persecuted by him. He possessed extensive attainments, and is especially celebrated for having anticipated the astronomers of Pope Gregory XIII. in the correction of the Julian Calendar. XVI. The Emperor JOHN CANTACUZENUS, after his abdication, wrote the history of his times from 1320–1357, including the fifteen years of his own eventful reign. This "is written," as Dr Plate observes, "with elegance and dignity, and shows that the author was a man of superior intelligence, fully able to understand and judge of the great events of history;" but Gibbon's remark is no less just that Cantacuzenus "presents, not a confession, but an apology of the life of an ambitious statesman. Instead of unfolding the true counsels and characters of men, he displays the smooth and specious surface of events, highly varnished with his own praises and those of his friends." The truth is arrived at by a comparison of Cantacuzenus with the rival and inimical narrative of Nicephorus Gregoras, so far as they cover the same ground. XVII. JOANNES CANANUS wrote an account of the siege of Constantinople by Amurath II. in 1422; and XVIII. JOANNES ANAGNOSTES described the capture of Thessalonica by the same Sultan in 1430. XIX. MICHAEL DUCAS, the chief historian of the fall of the Greek empire, escaped from the sack of Constantinople

to Lesbos, where he entered into the service of the prince of that island, and wrote his history after the reduction of Lesbos by the Turks in 1462. It commences in 1342, and goes down to the conquest of Lesbos. Ducas is the most difficult and barbarous of all the Byzantine historians, and the only one who appears entirely unacquainted with classical models. At the same time he is among the most intelligent, impartial, and sagacious. The ruin of the Greek empire has also been recorded by XX. GEORGIUS PHRANTZES and XXI. LAONICUS CHALCOCONDYLES. Both of these were eminent among the statesmen of their disastrous period, and Phrantzes in particular played a very important part in diplomacy. Broken hearted at the capture of his native city and the death of his son and daughter in slavery, he retired to a monastery in Corfu, where he wrote his *Chronicon* about 1477, to which year it extends. It commences at the year 1259, but by far the most valuable portion is that which records the transactions of the author's lifetime, and the value of this is very great. Chalcocondyles, beginning at 1298, brings his history down to the invasion of the Morea by the Turks in 1463. He also is an accomplished man, of much experience in public business; and although his digressions respecting the affairs and manners of other nations are irrelevant, and betray ignorance, they are interesting as an index to the knowledge possessed by his countrymen at his time.

II. CHRONICLERS AND CHRONOLOGERS.—The chronologers usually published in the Byzantine collection are frequently very valuable, but neither their lives nor their writings need detain us long. They are I. GEORGIUS SYNCHELLUS, the attendant (*syncellus*) upon the patriarch Tarasius, about the beginning of the 9th century. His unfinished chronicle extends from Adam to Diocletian, and was continued to 813 A.D. by II. THEOPHANES ISAUROS, a martyr in the cause of image worship. III. LEO GRAMMATICUS and IV. GEORGIUS MONACHUS continued Theophanes to 948 and 944 respectively. V. The chronicle of the Syrian JOANNES MALALAS extends from the beginning of the world to the year 566. Malalas is usually supposed to have lived in the 9th century, and to have left his work incomplete, but some regard him as contemporary of Justinian. VI. NICEPHORUS PATRIARCHA, Patriarch of Constantinople under Leo the Armenian, early in the 9th century, compiled a chronological history from the murder of the Emperor Maurice to his own times, and an abridged chronological manual of events from the Creation. VII. JULIUS POLLUX, a writer of the 10th century, compiled a chronology, chiefly of ecclesiastical occurrences, to the year 963, which has only been printed as far as the death of Valens (377). VIII. The contemporary chronicle of HIPPOLYTUS of Thebes is of little value. IX. The valuable *Chronicon Paschale*, which extends to 1042, is the work of three anonymous writers. There has been considerable difficulty in settling the respective claims to originality of X. JOANNES SCYLITZA and XI. GEORGIUS CEDRENUS, but the latter was probably the copyist. The contrary opinion has prevented the publication of Scylitza's work, with the exception of the portions not transcribed by Cedrenus. These extend from 1057 to 1080. The chronicle of Cedrenus reaches from the Creation to the former of these dates. XII. The chronicle of CONSTANTINE MANASSES is written in political verses, and extends from the beginning of the world to the accession of Alexius Comnenus in 1281. XIII. MICHAEL GLYCAS, a writer of uncertain date, published a general chronology down to the year 1118. XIV. The abbreviated chronicle of JOEL reaches the capture of Constantinople by the Latins in 1204. XV. The chronicle of GEORGIUS CODINUS, a writer of the 15th century, comes down to the capture of Constantinople, and

is associated with a compilation respecting the antiquities of the city, which is of much greater value.

The contribution of the Byzantine historians to literature may be compared with the part enacted by the Byzantine empire in the history of the world. That empire added nothing to the treasures of civilization, but it preserved much. Like the earth in winter, it seemed barren and unlovely, but it kept the good seed hidden in its bosom for better days. Had it perished before the intellectual revival of Western Europe, the solution of continuity between ancient and modern culture would have been irreparable. In like manner the Byzantine historians preserved the traditions of historical composition, while their brethren of the West were merely chroniclers and annalists. They have safely embalmed in their generally unattractive pages a vast mass of most valuable information, for which we are in most cases solely dependent upon them, and they aid us to reconstruct the polity, and to some extent the social life, of what was for several centuries the only really civilized Christian state in the world. They are undoubtedly for the most part perfectly ignorant of the significance of their own times; they have postponed what was really interesting to barren details of battles and court intrigues, and have wasted opportunities which would have been invaluable to a philosophic historian. Cinnamus and Ducas are the only two with any claim to this character, and Anna Comnena is the only artist. When, however, all their disadvantages are taken into consideration, it will probably be deemed that they are much better than might have been expected. They were isolated from all the rest of the known world by prejudice, policy, and religious hatred. There was no scientific or other intellectual movement in their times, no aspiration for liberty, no conception of a more liberal culture; they were crushed by a rigid despotism, and enthralled by an abject superstition. Under these circumstances the good sense and sagacity of many among them are very remarkable, and are chiefly to be explained by the large proportion among them of men accustomed to practical life and public affairs. Their roll includes sovereigns, generals, prime ministers, secretaries of state, diplomatists, and other important public officers; even the ecclesiastics among them are not recluses but men versed in business. The Byzantine civil service was the strong point of the empire, and its solid, if prosaic qualities are admirably reflected by its literary representatives.

The first collective edition of the Byzantine historians was published at Paris, 1648-1702, in 27 volumes, with a preface by Labbe, and notes and translations by Fabrotus, Combefisus, and others. It was reprinted, with additions, at Venice, 1729-33. These editions are superseded by the great edition of Bonn, 1828-55, in 48 volumes, undertaken at the recommendation and under the superintendence of Niebuhr, and continued after his death under the patronage of the Royal Prussian Academy. The separate volumes are edited by Bekker, Dindorf, Hase, and other distinguished scholars; nevertheless, according to Brunet, "de bons textes des historiens byzantins restent encore à donner." Like former collections it contains several works of value not strictly belonging to Byzantine history, but illustrative of it. No guide to Byzantine history is comparable to Gibbon, whose narrative of this period is an unparalleled literary feat of masterly and impartial condensation. See likewise Lebeau, *Histoire du Bas Empire*, Paris, 1824-36. Mr Finlay's volumes are also invaluable companions to the Byzantine historians. Of special works on the subject, the most important is Hankins, *De Byzantinorum rerum scriptoribus Græcis*, I eipsic, 1677, a book distinguished by extensive and accurate erudition, but necessarily deficient as respects the writers not published in the author's day. It contains notices of Byzantine ecclesiastical writers also. Special points of interest are discussed in Von Hammer's essay in the *Göttingen Annals*, (vol. 6) on the correction of the Byzantine historians from Ottoman sources; in Heyne's *Antiquitates Byzantinæ* (1808-11); and in Hullman's *Geschichte des Byzantinischen Handels* (1808). Sabatier's great work on Byzantine numismatics also affords much illustrative matter, and there is a lively sketch of the general social condition of the Eastern Empire in Augustin Marrass's *Esquisses Byzantines*. (Paris, 1874.) (R. G.)

BYZANTIUM, an ancient Greek city on the shores of the Bosphorus, occupied the most easterly of the seven hills on which the modern Constantinople has been built. It is said to have been founded by a band of Megarians, 667 B.C., but the original settlement having been destroyed in the reign of Darius Hystaspes by the Satrap Otanes, it was recolonized by Pausanias, who wrested it from the hands of the Medes after the battle of Platea (479 B.C.)—a circumstance which has led several ancient chroniclers to ascribe its foundation to him. Its situation, said to have been fixed by the oracle of Apollo, was remarkable for beauty and security. Its position on the Bosphorus gave it complete control over the extensive corn-trade carried on by the merchants of the West with the northern shores of the Euxine; the absence of tides and the depth of its harbour rendered its quays accessible to vessels of large burden; while the tunny and other fisheries at the mouth of the Lycus were so lucrative as to procure for the deeply-curved bay into which that river fell the appellation of the Golden Horn. The greatest hindrance to its continued prosperity consisted in the miscellaneous character of the population, partly Lacedæmonian and partly Athenian, who flocked to it under Pausanias. From this circumstance it was a subject of dispute between these states, and was alternately in the possession of each, till it achieved its independence of both only to fall into the hands of the Macedonians; and from the same cause arose the violent contests of its intestine factions, which ended in the establishment of a rude and turbulent democracy. About seven years after its second colonization, Cimon wrested it from the Lacedæmonians; but in 440 B.C. it revolted and returned to its former allegiance. Alcibiades, after a severe blockade (403 B.C.), gained possession of the city through the treachery of the Athenian party; and it continued an ally of Athens until 405 B.C., when it was retaken by Lysander after the battle of Ægos-potami, and placed under a Spartan harvest. It was under the Lacedæmonian power when the Ten Thousand, exasperated by the conduct of the governor, made themselves masters of the city, and would have pillaged it had they not been repressed by the firmness and promptitude of Xenophon. In 390 B.C. Thrasybulus, with the assistance of Heraclides and Archebius, succeeded in expelling the Lacedæmonian oligarchy, and in restoring democracy and the Athenian influence both in Byzantium and Chalcedon. After having withstood an attempt under Epaminondas to restore it to the Lacedæmonians, Byzantium joined with Rhodes, Chios, Cos, and Mausolus, king of Caria, in throwing off the yoke of Athens, but soon after sought Athenian assistance when Philip of Macedon, having overrun Thrace, advanced against it. The succours which were sent from Athens under Chares, on their arrival suffered a severe defeat from Amyntas, the Macedonian admiral, but in the following year gained a decisive victory under Phocion, and compelled Philip to raise the siege. The deliverance of the besieged from a surprise, by means of a flash of light which revealed the advancing masses of the Macedonian army, has rendered this siege peculiarly memorable. As a memorial of the miraculous interference the Byzantines erected an altar to Torch-bearing Hecate, and stamped a crescent on their coins as a symbol of the portent, a device which is retained by the Turks to this day. They also granted the Athenians extraordinary privileges, and erected a monument in honour of the event in a public part of the city. During the reign of Alexander, Byzantium was compelled to acknowledge the Macedonian supremacy; after the decay of the Macedonian power, it regained its independence, but suffered from the repeated incursions of the Scythians. The losses which they sustained by land roused the Byzantines to indemnify themselves on the vessels which

still crowded the harbour, and the merchantmen which cleared the straits; but this had the effect of provoking a war with the neighbouring naval powers. The exchequer being drained by the payment of 10,000 pieces of gold to buy off the Gauls who had invaded their territories about 279 B.C., and by the imposition of an annual tribute which was ultimately raised to 80 talents, they were compelled to exact a toll on all the ships which passed the Bosphorus,—a measure which the Rhodians resented and avenged by a war, wherein the Byzantines were defeated. The retreat of the Gauls enabled Byzantium to render considerable services to Rome in the contests with Philip II., Antiochus, and Mithridates. During the first years of its alliance with Rome it held the rank of a free and confederate city; but having sought the arbitration of the capital on some of its domestic disputes, it was subjected to the imperial jurisdiction, and gradually stripped of its privileges, until reduced to the status of an ordinary Roman colony. In recollection of its former services, the Emperor Claudius remitted the heavy tribute which had been imposed on it; but the last remnant of its independence was taken away by Vespasian, who, in answer to a remonstrance from Apollonius of Tyana, taunted the inhabitants with having "forgotten to be free." During the civil wars, it espoused the party of Pescennius Niger; and though skilfully defended by the engineer Periscus, it was besieged and taken (196 A.D.) by Severus, who destroyed the city, demolished the famous wall, which was built of massive stones so closely rivetted together as to appear one block, put the principal inhabitants to the sword, and subjected the remainder to the Perinthians. This overthrow of Byzantium was a great loss to the empire, since it might have served as an effective protection against the Goths, who afterwards sailed past it into the Mediterranean. Severus, however, afterwards relented, and, rebuilding a large portion of the town, gave it the name of Augusta Antonina. He ornamented the city with baths, and surrounded the hippodrome with porticoes; but it was not till the time of Caracalla that it was restored to its former political privileges. It had scarcely begun to recover its former flourishing position when, from the capricious resentment of Gallienus, the inhabitants were once more put to the sword, and the town given up to be pillaged. From this disaster the inhabitants recovered so far as to be able to give an effectual check to an invasion of the Goths in the reign of Claudius II., and its fortifications were greatly strengthened during the civil wars which followed the abdication of Diocletian. Licinius, after his defeat before Adrianople, retired to Byzantium, where he was besieged by Constantine, and compelled to surrender. To check the inroads of the barbarians on the north of the Black Sea, Diocletian had resolved to transfer his capital to Nicomedia; but Constantine, struck with the advantages which the situation of Byzantium presented, resolved to build a new city there on the site of the old, and transfer the seat of government to it. The design was quickly put into execution, and the new capital was inaugurated with special ceremonies 330 A.D. See CONSTANTINOPLE.

The ancient historians invariably note the profligacy of the inhabitants of Byzantium. They are described as an idle and depraved people, spending their time for the most part in loitering about the harbour, or carousing over the fine wine of Maronea. In war they trembled at the sound of a trumpet, in peace they quaked before the shouting of their own demagogues; and during the assault of Philip II. they could only be prevailed on to man the walls by the savour of extempore cook-shops distributed along the ramparts. The modern Greeks attribute the introduction of Christianity into Byzantium to St Andrew; and it certainly had some hold there in the time of Severus.