materials, essentially in the same arrangement, have simply been appropriated from his predecessor without his being so much as named even once, the other sources to which Sozomen was indebted being, however, expressly cited. All that can be said to the credit of Sozomen is that he has been himself at the trouble to refer to the principal sources used by Socrates (Rufinus, Eusebius, Athanasius, Sabinus, the collections of epistles, Palladius), and has not unfrequently supplemented Socrates from them, and also that he has adduced some new authorities, in particular sources relating to Christianity in Persia, Arian history, monkish histories, the *Vita Martini* of Sulpicius, books of Hilarius; the whole of the ninth book is entirely drawn from Olympiodorus.

It is difficult to discern the motive for a work which was merely an enlarged edition of Socrates. But it is probable that Sozomen did not approve of Socrates’s freer attitude towards Greek science, and that he wished to present a picture in which the clergy should be still further glorified, and, above all, monasticism brought into still stronger prominence. In Sozomen everything is a shade more ecclesiastical—but only a shade—than in Socrates. Perhaps also he wrote for a different circle,— say, the monks in Palestine,—and could be sure that in it the work of his predecessor would not be known.

Sozomen is everywhere an inferior Socrates. What in Socrates still betrays some vestiges of historical sense, his moderation, his reserve in questions of dogma, his impartiality,—all this is wanting in Sozomen. In many cases he has repeated the exact words of Socrates, but with him they have passed almost into mere phrases. The inferiority of Sozomen to Socrates as an historian appears as much in the manner in which he transcribed him as in those passages where he introduces something new. The chronological scrupulosity of the earlier writer has made no impression on his follower; he has either wholly omitted or inaccurately repeated the chronological data. He writes more wordily and diffusely. In his characterizations of persons, borrowed from Socrates, he is more dull and colourless. After Socrates he has indeed repeated the caution not to be too rash in discerning the linger of God ; but his way of looking at things is throughout mean and rustic. Two souls inhabit his book : one, the better, is borrowed from Socrates ; another, the worse, is his own. Wherever he abandons his leader he frequently falls into mere retailing of stories, and prostrates him­self in reverence before the poorest products of the religious fantasy of a degenerating age. Evidence of a boundless credulity with regard to all sorts of monkish fables is to be met with everywhere. Raisings of the dead are quite common occurrences with him, and he repeatedly gives accounts of enormous dragons. In the finding of the bones of saints he takes the highest interest, and even be­lieves in the rediscovery of the tombs of the Old Testament prophets.

Where we still possess Socrates’s account that of Sozomen very sel­dom has any consequence, but some of the additions he has made are instructive and important. The number of new acts of councils introduced by him is small. His monkish histories are as sources almost utterly valueless ; his account of the Christians in Persia absolutely swarms with mistakes. It must, however, be noted that for the period from Theodosius I. onward he has emancipated himself more fully from Socrates and has followed Olympiodorus in part, partly also oral tradition ; here accordingly his statements possess greater value.

*Editions and Literature.—*Socrates and Sozomen have been edited by Stephanus (Paris, 1544; Geneva, 1612), Valesius (Paris, 1659-73), Reading (Cambridge, 1720), Hussey (Oxford, 1853, 1860). They are also to be found in vol. lxvii. of Migne’s *Patrologia,* and there is an Oxford school edition (1844) after Reading. Bright edited Socrates according to the text of Hussey in 1878. There are “ Testimonia Veterum ” in Valesius ; and Nolte’s papers in *Tubing. Quartalschr.,* (1859) p. 518 *sq.,* (1861) p. 417 *sq.,* contain emendations in Hussey’s text, and notes towards the history of the text and editions ; see also Overbeck, in *Theol. Lit. Ztung.* (1879), No. 20.

Special studies have been made by Baronius, Miræus, Labbé, Valesius, Halloix, Scaliger, Ceillier, Cave, Dupin, Pagi, Ittig, Tillemont, Walch, Gibbon, Schroeckh, Lardner. See also Voss, *De Histor. Græcis·,* Fabricius-Harless, *Biblioth. Gr.,* vol. vii.; Rössler, *Bibliothek d. Kirchenväter;* Holzhausen, *De Fontibus quibus Socr., Soz., ac Theod. in scribenda Historia Sacra usi sunt,* (Göttingen, 1825; Stäudlin, *Gesch. u. Lit. d. K.-G.,* Hanover, 1827; Baur, *Epochen* (1825); Hamack, “Socr. u. Soz.,” in Herzog-Plitt's *Theol. Encykl.* Detached details are given also in works upon Constantine (Manso), Julian (Mücke, Rode, Neumann, Rendall), Damasus (Rade), Arianism (Gwatkin’s *Studies of Arianism,* 1882, gives a severe but trustworthy criticism of Rufinus and discusses the manner in which Socrates was related to him), the emperors after Julian (De Broglie, Richter, Clinton, the *Weltgeschichte* of Ranke, the *Gesch. d. Kaiser Arcadius u. Theod. II.,* 1885, of Güldenpenning, and the *Kaiser Theodosius d. Gr.,* Halle, 1878, of Iffland, the last-named work discussing the relation of Socrates to Sozomen), the barbarian migrations (Wietersheim, Dahn), the Goths (Waitz, Bessel, Kauffmann, and Scott’s *Ulfilas,* 1885). Lastly, re­ference may be made to Rosenstein, *Forsch.* z. *deutsch. Gesch.,* vol. i.,—*Krit.*

Untersuch. üb. d. Verhältnis\* zu Olympiodor, Zosimus, u. Soz.; Sarrazin, De Theodoro Lectore, Theophanis Fonte Præcipuo, 1881 (treats of the relation bet ween Socrates and Sozomen, and of the completeness of the former’s work) ; Jeep, Quellenuntersuch. z. d. griech. Kirchenhistorikern, Leipsic, 1884. (A HA.)

SPA, a watering-place of Belgium, in the province of Liége, 20 miles by rail from Liége *via* Pepinster, is beauti­fully situated, at a height of 814 feet above the sea, in the valley of the Wayai (a small sub-tributary of the Meuse). On the north and north-east it is protected by the wooded range of hills known as the Spaloumont, or in its several parts as Bois de la Reid, Bois du Chiencul, &c. ; and on the south are a number of beautiful ravines cut in the Primary rocks of the district by small affluents of the Wayai. Much of the charm of the place is due to the promenades and drives along the sides and crests of the hills. The principal mineral spring called the Pouhon (a local word for “ well ”) is enclosed in a pump-room in the centre of the Place Pierre le Grand. Public baths, fed by chalybeate streams collected in a remarkable reservoir at the hamlet of Nivesé, occupy a large building in Place Royale, erected in 1868 ; and in the same neighbourhood is the casino, with ball and concert rooms. An English church was built in 1872-76. A local industry is the production of fancy articles in lacquered wood (bois de Spa). A liqueur resembling Chartreuse is also manufactured under the name of “ elixir de Spa.” The population of the commune was 6930 in 1884. Several springs in the neighbouring district are nearly as celebrated as those of Spa proper ; the Sauvenière waters, supposed to be effective against sterility, are half a mile distant.

Spa, said to derive its name from a Walloon word, *Espa,* for “ fountain, ” was practically founded by a certain Wolf, or Collin le Loup, iron-master of Breda, who had obtained benefit from the waters, and purchased the piece of ground containing the Pouhon spring from Erard de la Marck, bishop of Liége, in 1326. At the beginning of the 15th century the little town numbered 250 houses. The European celebrity of the waters dates from the 16th century, when they were drunk by the duke of Nevers, Margaret of Valois, Henry III. of France, and Alexander Farnese, and the fashion of visiting Spa became thoroughly established in the 18th century. The French Revolution, and, as far as English visitors were con­cerned, the attractions of the German watering-places made known by Sir Francis Head, for a time turned the tide elsewhere ; but since the middle of the century Spa has taken a new lease of prosperity.

SPAGNA, Lo (?–c. 1529), the usual designation (due to his Spanish origin) of Giovanni di Pietro, one of the chief followers of Perugino. Nothing whatever is known of his early life, or of the circumstances under which he became a member of the Perugian school. A large number of panel pictures by him exist, of which some are painted with much grace and refinement of touch. There is, however, a very marked absence of individuality about his style, which seems like an imitation of the earliest manner of Raphael and that of Pinturicchio in a weaker and less virile form. The chief of his numerous panel paintings are the Nativity, in the Vatican, and the Adoration of the Magi, at Berlin. In 1510 Lo Spagna executed many frescos at Todi, and in 1512 several other mural paintings in and near Trevi. His most important works were frescos at Assisi and Spoleto, of which some exist in good preser­vation. He received the freedom of the city of Spoleto in 1516, as a reward for his work there. As is so often the case, Lo Spagna’s frescos reach a much higher standard of merit than his panel pictures. The museum of the Capitol in Rome now possesses a very beautiful series of life-sized fresco figures by him, representing Apollo and the Nine Muses. These are drawn with a strong feeling for grace of pose and beauty of expression, and are very remarkable for the delicate refinement of their colouring ; in style they strongly recall Raphael’s earliest manner. Lo Spagna was alive in 1528, but he appears to have died before 1530, as in that year a pupil of his named Doni completed a fresco

in S. Jacopo, near Spoleto, which Lo Spagna had begun.

SPAGNOLETTO. See Ribera.