

following names belonged, however, to the same family at different epochs, Q. Fabius Vibulanus, who was consul in 412 B.C., having been the first to assume the cognomen of Ambustus; while Rullianus, according to some accounts, changed the latter into Maximus, in 312 B.C.—his full name thus being Q. Fabius Maximus Rullianus. Of the Vibulani, first noticed about the year 486 B.C., the most distinguished were the three brothers, Quintus, Kæso, and Marcus, one or other of whom filled one of the two consulships from that date to 479. In that year the Fabii—to the number, it is said, of 306 patricians, exclusive of their numerous dependents—emigrated from Rome under the leadership of Kæso, who had just been consul for the third time, and settled on the banks of the Cremera, a few miles above Rome. Some accounts have attributed that secession to the opposition which the Fabian support of the plebs had aroused among the old patrician families. For two years the exiles or seceders continued to be the city's chief defence against the Veientes, until at last they were surprised by the latter, and cut off to a man. The only survivor of the gens was the son of Marcus, who had been left behind at Rome, and who thus became the ancestor of the succeeding Fabii. He was consul in 467 B.C., and a member of the second decemvirate in 450. When the Gauls captured Rome in 390 the pontifex maximus was a Fabius Ambustus. The most famous of this line—i.e., supposing Rullianus to have been the first Maximus—was the father of Rullianus. He was thrice consul, and was dictator in 351 B.C. His son, Rullianus, called by Arnold the "Talbot of the 5th century of Rome," was master of the horse in 365 B.C. to Papirius Cursor, by whom he was degraded for having fought and beaten the Samnites contrary to orders. In 296, when consul for the sixth time, he defeated, at the great battle of Sentinum, the combined forces of the Etrurians, Umbrians, Samnites, and Gauls. But the greatest Roman who bore the name of Fabius—one of the most illustrious Romans of the republic—was Q. Fabius Maximus Verrucosus (see below). Of the later Fabii, Q. Fabius Maximus Æmilianus and Q. Fabius Maximus Allobrogicus were among the most distinguished. The former, a Fabius only by adoption, served in the last Macedonian war, 168 B.C., and was consul in Spain 145 B.C., when he conquered Viriathus. He was the pupil and the patron of the historian Polybius. The Fabius named Allobrogicus (after his victory over the Allobroges and their ally Bituitus, king of the Arverni) was consul in 121 B.C. The Fabian name is occasionally met with as late as the 2d century A.D.

Perhaps the most complete work on this family is the *Disputatio de Gente Fabia*, by G. N. Du Rieu, Leyden, 1856, where may also be found a list of previous writers on the same subject.

FABIUS MAXIMUS VERRUCOSUS, QUINTUS, also named *Cunctator* and *Ovicula*, was one of the most distinguished Romans of the republic,—the incarnation of all that a Roman meant by patriotism. It appears that he served his first consulship in Liguria, 233 B.C., that he was censor in 230, and consul for the second time in 228. In 218 he was sent to Carthage to inquire whether that state approved of Hannibal's conduct in attacking Saguntum. The answer proved unsatisfactory; and Fabius, assuming the haughty dignity of a Roman senator, and folding up his cloak so as to form a cavity, thus addressed the nobles of Carthage: "Hic vobis bellum et pacem portamus; utrum placet sumite." Being answered that he might give which he pleased, he indignantly exclaimed, "Then I give you war;" and the deputies returned to Rome to state the result of their mission. The disastrous campaign on the Trebia, and the defeat on the banks of the Thrasymene Lake, warned the Romans that their successful resistance to Hannibal, and even their existence, depended on the wisdom of the general to whom they entrusted their troops.

So Fabius was named dictator in 271, and began his tactics of "masterly inactivity." Manœuvring among the hills, where Hannibal's horse were useless, he cut off his supplies, harassed him incessantly, did everything except fight. His steady adherence to this plan, in spite of all the misconceptions which his caution had aroused at Rome, evinced the moral strength of the man. He was suspected of an ambition for the prolongation of his command. Hannibal was one of the few men in Italy who understood him. Even Minucius, the master of the horse, ridiculed the proceedings of Fabius; and he seized the opportunity of the latter's absence at Rome to attack the enemy, and win a victory. This tended only more strongly to confirm the opponents of Fabius in their opinion, and the command was divided between Minucius and Fabius. The result was exactly such as might have been anticipated. Minucius engaged in battle with Hannibal, and his army was on the verge of ruin when the opportune arrival of Fabius changed the aspect of affairs. Minucius seems to have had the moral courage to confess his folly, and cheerfully to submit to the orders of Fabius. Fabius having retired at the end of the legal time of six months, the conduct of the war was entrusted to Æmilius, who followed the ex-dictator's plan, and Varro, who did not. "You must beware of Varro, as well as of Hannibal," said Fabius; and the warning was followed by the disaster of Cannæ. Fabius might have accused him; but it is narrated that the magnanimous Roman thanked his rival "because he had not despaired of the republic." After the defeat at Cannæ (216 B.C.) he was appointed to the command of the armies with Marcellus, "the sword," as Fabius himself was "the shield," of the republic. He laid siege to the important city of Capua; and when Hannibal marched towards Rome, threatening the city itself, Fabius remained firmly at his post. In 214 B.C. when consul for the fourth time, he captured Casilinum in Samnium. In his fifth consulship, 209, he took the city of Tarentum; and when it was proposed, towards the conclusion of the war, that Scipio should pass into Africa, Fabius was decidedly opposed to the scheme. He did not live to witness the final success of Scipio, having died at an advanced age, 203 B.C. In the previously named year he became *princeps senatus*, a dignity almost hereditary in the family of the Fabii Maximi.

FABIUS PICTOR, QUINTUS, the father of Roman history, was the grandson of the Fabius who, surnamed Pictor for his artistic skill, bequeathed that name to a family of the Fabian gens. In the interval between the first and second Punic wars we find him taking an active part in the subjugation of the Gauls in the north of Italy (225 B.C.); and after the battle of Cannæ (216), he was employed by the Romans to proceed to Delphi in order to consult the oracle of Apollo. The rude muse of Nævius had already celebrated in verse the glory acquired by the Roman arms in the first Punic war, and Ennius had clothed the annals of his adopted country in the language of poetry. But till the time of Fabius Pictor, no one had appeared to chronicle in simple prose the *res gestæ* of Rome and the Romans. The historian's materials consisted of the *Annales Maximi*, *Commentarii Consulares*, and similar records (see FASTI) of names, feasts, battles, prodigies, and the like, together with such chronicles as every great Roman family preserved of its own deeds; as also—what furnished the most valuable part of his work—his own experiences in the second Punic war. His *Annals*, as they were called, existed in the time of Pliny the Elder, but are now known only from a few fragments and allusions. According to Livy, they contained a description of the battle of Thrasymene, and Niebuhr even conjectures that Dion Cassius derived his knowledge of Roman constitutional history from Pictor's

work. It seems certain, however, that Fabius wrote his *Annals* in Greek. Dionysius expressly asserts this to be the fact; and Cicero's allusion to the Latin prose writer who lived between the time of Cato and that of Piso probably refers to Servius Fabius Pictor.

See C. T. Cruttwell's *History of Roman Literature*, London, 1877, Du Rieu's *Disputatio*, and especially Wagner's *History of Roman Literature*, 1873, translated from Teuffel's *Geschichte*, 1870.

FABLE. With certain restrictions, the necessity of which will be shown in the course of the article, we may accept the definition which Dr Johnson proposes in his life of Gay:—"A fable or apologue seems to be, in its genuine state, a narrative in which beings irrational, and sometimes inanimate (*arbores loquuntur, non tantum feræ*), are, for the purpose of moral instruction, feigned to act and speak with human interests and passions." Before tracing the history of the fable we may compare it with its nearest congeners in literature, the myth, the allegory, and the parable. The myth, whether, as is most commonly the case, it has its origin in some physical phenomenon, or can be traced to mistaken metaphor or distorted history, or is merely a play of the imagination, is always the unconscious product of the race, never like the fable invented expressly for a moral or didactic purpose. A closer analogy to the fable is to be found in the literary myth, the artificial product of a later age, such, for instance, as the *Æra* of the *Iliad*, the Hesiodic legend of Pandora, or the story of Er in the *Republic* of Plato. Yet these allegorical myths are clearly distinguished from the fable, inasmuch as the story and the moral are intermingled throughout. Between the parable and the fable there is no clear line of distinction. Archbishop Trench insists on two essential differences,—first, that the parable teaches spiritual truths, whereas the fable never lifts itself above the earth, and secondly, that the parable never transgresses the actual order of nature. But, though the parables of the New Testament may well be set in a class by themselves, a comparative study of religious writings will show that the parable is one of the commonest forms of religious teaching, and that no hard or fast line can be drawn between moral and spiritual truths. The second difference we should regard as accidental, and it is not altogether borne out by facts.

Most writers on the history of the fable are content to trace its origin to Æsop or the *Panca Tantra* of the mythical Vishnu Sarman, and these are doubtless the oldest collections which have been preserved in writing; but though we possess no earlier record, we may, from its wide diffusion, regard it as a natural growth of the imagination, and one of the most primitive forms of literature. It springs from the universal need of men to express their thoughts by concrete images and emblems, and thus is strictly parallel to the use of metaphor in language. Even now fables are made every day, and a quick-witted race like the Arabs will invent fables at every turn as the readiest form of argument. To take a familiar illustration, the wise saws and modern instances of Sam Weller would only need a slight expansion to form a very respectable book of fables. Our most familiar proverbs are often fables in miniature.

With the fable, as we know it, the moral is indispensable. As La Fontaine puts it, an apologue is composed of two parts, one of which may be called the body, the other the soul. The body is the fable, the soul the morality. But if we revert to the earliest type we shall find that is no longer the case. In the primitive beast-fable, which is the direct progenitor of the Æsopian fable, the story is told simply for its own sake, and is as innocent of any moral as our fairy tales of Little Red Ridinghood and Jack and the Beanstalk. Thus, in a legend of the Flathead Indians, the Little Wolf found in cloud-land his grandsires the Spiders with their grizzled hair and long crooked nails,

and they spun balls of thread to let him down to earth; when he came down and found his wife the Speckled Duck, whom the Old Wolf had taken from him, she fled in confusion, and this is why she lives and dives alone to this very day. Such animal myths are as common in the New World as in the Old, and abound from Finland and Kamtchatka to the Hottentots and Australasians. From the story invented, as the one above quoted, to account for some peculiarity of the animal world, or told as a pure exercise of the imagination, just as a sailor spins a yarn about the sea-serpent, to the moral apologue the transition is easy; and that it has been effected by savages unaided by the example of higher races seems sufficiently proved by the tales quoted by E. B. Tylor (*Primitive Culture*, vol. i. p. 411). From the beast-fables of savages we come next to the Oriental apologues which are still extant in their original form. The East, the land of myth and legend, is the natural home of the fable, and Hindustan was the birth-place, if not of the original, of these tales, at least of the oldest shape in which they still exist. The *Panca Tantra*, or fables of the Brahma Vishnu Sarman, have been translated into almost every language and adapted by most modern fabulists. The *Kalila wa Dama* (names of two jackals), or fables of Bidpai, is an Arab version made about 760 A.D. From the Hebrew version of Rabbi Joel, John of Capua produced a Latin translation about the end of the 15th century, whence all later imitations are derived. (See Monier Williams, *Indian Wisdom*, p. 508.) The *Hitopadesa*, or "friendly instruction," is a modernized form of the same work, and of it there are three translations into English by Dr Charles Wilkins, Sir William Jones, and Professor F. Johnson. The *Hitopadesa* is a complete chaplet of fables loosely strung together, but connected so as to form something of a continuous story, with moral reflections freely interspersed, purporting to be written for the instruction of some dissolute young princes. Thus, in the first fable a flock of pigeons see the grains of rice which a fowler has scattered, and are about to descend on them, when the king of the pigeons warns them by telling the fable of a traveller who being greedy of a bracelet was devoured by a tiger. They neglect his warning and are caught in the net, but are afterwards delivered by the king of the mice, who tells the story of the Deer, the Jackal, and the Crow, to show that no real friendship can exist between the strong and the weak, the beast of prey and his quarry, and so on to the end of the volume. Another book of Eastern fables is well worthy of notice, *Buddhaghosha's Parables*, a commentary on the *Dhammapada*, or *Buddha's Paths of Virtue*. The original is in Pali, but an English translation of the Burmese version has been made by Captain T. Rogers, R.E. As the work is little known we may venture to extract a single gem. A young mother, disconsolate for the death of her first-born son, carries the dead body of her child from house to house seeking medicine to restore it. At last she is sent to Para Takem, the lord and master of the Buddhists, who promises to help her, but she must herself fetch the medicine, which is some mustard seed taken from a house where no son, husband, parent, or slave has died. Gladly the girl speeds on her errand, carrying the dead body of her son on her hip. By degrees she is taught that she is not the only mourner. In the whole of the Savetthi country everywhere children are dying, parents are dying. She leaves her dead son and returns to Para Takem, having learnt the first and last commandment of the Buddhist creed.

From Hindustan the Sanskrit fables passed to China, Thibet, and Persia; and they must have reached Greece at an early age, for many of the fables which passed under the name of Æsop are identical with those of the East. Æsop to us is little more than a name, though, if we may trust

a passing notice in Herodotus (ii. 134), he must have lived in the 6th century B.C. Probably his fables were never written down, though several are ascribed to him by Xenophon, Aristotle, Plutarch, and other Greek writers, and Plato represents Socrates as beguiling his last days by versifying such as he remembered. Aristophanes alludes to them as merry tales, and Plato, while excluding the poets from his ideal republic, admits Æsop as a moral teacher. Of the various versions of *Æsop's Fables*, by far the most trustworthy is that of Babrius or Babrius, a Greek of the 1st century A.D., who rendered them in choliambic verse. These, which were long known in fragments only, were recovered in a MS. found by M. Minas in a monastery on Mount Athos in 1842, and have been edited by Sir G. C. Lewis.¹ An inferior version of the same in Latin iambs was made by Phædrus, a slave of Thracian origin, brought to Rome in the time of Augustus, and manumitted by him, who tells us that he published in senarian verse the rude materials produced by Æsop; but the numerous allusions to contemporary events, as, for example, that to Sejanus in the Frogs and the Sun, which brought upon the author disgrace and imprisonment, show that many of them are original or free adaptations. For some time scholars doubted as to the genuineness of Phædrus's fables, but their doubts have been lately dispelled by a closer examination of the MSS. and by the discovery of two verses of a fable on a tomb at Apulum in Dacia. Phædrus's style is simple, clear, and brief, but dry and unpoetical; and, as Lessing has pointed out, he often falls into absurdities when he deserts his original. For instance, in Æsop the dog with the meat in his mouth sees his reflexion in the water as he passes over a bridge; Phædrus makes him see it as he swims across the river.

To sum up the characteristics of the Æsopian fable, it is artless, simple, and transparent. It affects no graces of style, and we hardly need the moral with which each concludes, ὁ μῦθος δηλοῖ ὅτι, κ. τ. λ. The moral inculcated is that of worldly wisdom and reasonable self-interest. Æsop is no maker of phrases, but an orator who wishes to gain some point or induce some course of action. It is the Æsopian type that Aristotle has in view when he treats of the fable as a branch of rhetoric, not of poetry.

If we consider their striking gift of narrative and their love of moralizing, it is strange that the Romans should have produced no body of national fables. But, with the doubtful exception of Phædrus, we possess nothing but solitary fables, such as the famous apologue of Menenius Agrippa to the Plebs, and the exquisite Town Mouse and Country Mouse of Horace's *Satires*.

The fables of the rhetorician Aphthonius in Greek prose, and those in Latin elegiac verse attributed to Avianus or Avienus, make, in the history of the apologue, a sort of link between the classical and the dark ages. In that overflowing chaos which constitutes the literature of the Middle Ages, the fable reappears in several aspects. In a Latin dress, sometimes in prose, sometimes in regular verse, and sometimes in rhymed stanzas, it contributed, with other kinds of narratives, to make up the huge mass of stories which has been bequeathed to us by the monastic libraries. These served more uses than one. They were always easier reading, and were often held to be safer and more instructive reading also, than the difficult and slippery classics, for those monks who cared for reading at all, and were not learned enough for any pursuit deserving the name of study. For those who were a little more active-minded, they aided the *Gesta Romanorum* and other collec-

¹ M. Minas professed to have discovered under the same circumstances another collection of ninety-four fables by Babrius. This second part was accepted by Sir G. C. Lewis, but J. Conington has conclusively proved that it is spurious, and probably a forgery. See article BABRIUS.

tions of fabliaux or short novels, in suggesting illustrations available for popular preaching. Among those mediæval fables in Latin, very little of originality is to be detected. The writers contented themselves with working up the old fables into new shapes, with rendering from prose into verse, or from verse into prose,—a species of attempts which had its merits in such hands as those of Babrius or Phædrus, but from which no fruit could be expected to be gathered in the convents. The few monks who could have performed such a task well aimed wisely at something higher. It might be enough to name, among the monkish fabulists, Vincent of Beauvais, a Dominican of the 12th century, in whose *Speculum Doctrinale* are a good many prose fables, more than half of them from Phædrus. About the end of the same century, too, a considerable number of fables, some of which have been printed, were compiled by an English Cistercian monk, Odo de Cerinton. Nor was this the only collection that arose in England.

As the modern languages became by degrees applicable to literary use, fables began to appear in them. A good many still exist in Norman-French, of which may be noted the fables called those of Ysopet, and those composed by Marie de France, the authoress of the well-known fabliaux. Later, also, they were not wanting, though not numerous, in our own tongue. Chaucer has given us one, in his *Nonne Prestre's Tale*, which is an expansion of the fable "Don Coc et don Werpil" of Marie of France; another is Lidgate's tale of The Churl and the Bird. But the course of the short and isolated fables through the Middle Ages is not here worth prosecuting.

Several of Odo's tales, like Chaucer's story, can be ultimately traced to a work, or series of works, for the sake of which chiefly the mediæval history of the apologue is interesting—the History of Reynard the Fox. This great beast-epic has been referred by Grimm as far back as the 10th century, and is known to us in three forms, each having independent episodes, but all woven upon a common basis. The Latin form is probably the earliest, and the poem *Reinardus et Ysengrinus* dates from the 10th or 11th century. Next come the German versions. The most ancient, that of a minnesinger Heinrich der Glichesære (probably a Swabian), was analysed and edited by Grimm in 1840. In 1498 appeared *Reynke de Voss*, almost a literal version in Low Saxon of the Flemish poem of the 12th century, *Reinaert de Vos*. Hence the well-known version of Goethe into modern German hexameters was taken. It was written in 1793, during the siege of Mainz, and the philosophic poet sought, in the study of animal nature and passions, to divert his thoughts from the bloody scenes of the Reign of Terror. The poem has been well named "an unholy world bible." In it the Æsopian fable received a development which was in several respects quite original. We have here no short and unconnected stories. Materials, partly borrowed from older apologues, but in a much greater proportion new, are worked up into one long and systematic tale, so as to form what has been quaintly called an animal-romance. The moral, so prominent in the fable proper, shrinks so far into the background, that the work might be considered as a mere allegory. Indeed, while the suspicion of its having contained personal satires has been convincingly set aside, some writers deny even the design to represent human conduct at all; and we can scarcely get nearer to its signification than by regarding it as being, in a general way, what Carlyle has called "a parody of human life." It represents a contest maintained successfully, by selfish craft and audacity, against enemies of all sorts, in a half-barbarous and ill-organized society. With his weakest foes, like Chaunteclere the Cock, Reynard uses brute-force; over the weak who are protected, like Kiward the Hare and

Belin the Ram, he is victorious by uniting violence with cunning; Bruin, the dull, strong, formidable Bear, is humbled by having greater power than his own enlisted against him; and the most dangerous of all the fox's enemies, Isengrim, the obstinate, greedy, and implacable Wolf, after being baffled by repeated strokes of malicious ingenuity, forces Reynard to a single combat, but even thus is not a match for his dexterous adversary. The knavish fox has allies worthy of him in Grimbart the watchful badger, and in his own aunt Dame Rukenawe, the learned She-ape; and he plays at his pleasure on the simple credulity of the Lion-King, the image of an impotent feudal sovereign. The characters of these and other brutes are kept up with a rude kind of consistency, which gives them great liveliness; many of the incidents are devised with much force of humour; and the sly hits at the weak points of mediæval polity and manners and religion are incessant and palpable.

It is needless, as has already been said, to attempt tracing the appearance which fables, or incidents borrowed from them, make so frequently as incidental ornaments in the older literature of our own country and others. Nor is there here fit occasion for dwelling minutely on the cultivation of the apologue in modern times, as a special form of poetical composition. It has appeared in every modern nation of Europe, but has nowhere become very important, and has hardly ever exhibited much originality either of spirit or of manner. In our own language, Prior indicated the possession of much aptitude for it; but neither the fables of Moore, nor even the much more lively ones of Gay, possess any distinguished merit. To Dryden's spirited remodellings of old poems, romances, and fabliaux, the name of fables, which he was pleased to give them, is quite inapplicable. In German, Hagedorn and Gellert are quite forgotten; and even Lessing's fables are read by few but schoolboys. In Spanish, Yriarte's fables on literary subjects are sprightly and graceful. A spirited version of the best appeared in *Blackwood's Magazine*, 1839. Among Italians Pignotti is famous for versatility and command of rhythm, as amongst Russians is Kriloff for his keen satire on Russian society. He has been translated into English by Mr. Ralston.

France alone in modern times has attained any pre-eminence in the fable, and this distinction is almost entirely owing to one author. Marie de France in the 13th century, Gilles Corrozet, Guillaume Haudent, and Guillaume Guerout in the 16th, are now studied only as the precursors of La Fontaine, from whom he may have borrowed a stray hint or the outline of a story. The unique character of his work has given a new word to the French language: other writers of fables are called *fabulistes*, La Fontaine is named *le fablier*. Referring for fuller details to the article LA FONTAINE, we must content ourselves here with briefly indicating his chief characteristics. He is a true poet; his verse is exquisitely modulated; his love of nature often reminds us of Virgil, as does his tenderness and pathos (see, for instance, The Two Pigeons and Death and the Woodcutter). He is full of sly fun and delicate humour; like Horace he satirizes without wounding, and "plays around the heart." Lastly, he is a keen observer of men. The whole society of the 17th century, its greatness and its foibles, its luxury and its squalor, from *Le grand monarque* to the poor *manant*, from his majesty the lion to the courtier of an ape, is painted to the life. To borrow his own phrase, La Fontaine's fables are "une ample comédie à cent actes divers."

The fables of Lessing represent the reaction against the French school of fabulists. "With La Fontaine himself," says Lessing, "I have no quarrel, but against the imitators of La Fontaine I enter my protest." His attention was

first called to the fable by Gellert's popular work published in 1746. Gellert's fables were closely modelled after La Fontaine's, and were a vehicle for lively railings against the fair sex, and hits at contemporary follies. Lessing's early essays were in the same style, but his subsequent study of the history and theory of the fable led him to discard his former model as a perversion of later times, and the "Fabeln," published in 1759, are the outcome of his riper views. Lessing's fables, like all that he wrote, display his vigorous common sense. He has, it is true, little of La Fontaine's *curiosa felicitas*, his sly humour and lightness of touch; and Frenchmen would say that his criticism of La Fontaine is an illustration of the fable of the sour grapes. On the other hand he has the rare power of looking at both sides of a moral problem; he holds a brief for the stupid and the feeble, the ass and the lamb; and in spite of his formal protest against poetical ornament, there is in not a few of his fables a vein of true poetry, as in the Sheep (ii. 13) and Jupiter and the Sheep (ii. 18). But the value of the work is infinitely enhanced by the monograph on the essence of the fable which appeared at the same time, and as an illustration of which the fables were written. Much of the essay is taken up with the refutation of the theories of contemporary fabulists, De la Motte, Richer, Breitinger, Batteux, who only survive in Lessing's pages like the fly in amber. Passing over this negative criticism we may briefly state the results of Lessing's investigation. According to Lessing the ideal fable is that of Æsop. All the elaborations and refinements of later authors, from Phædrus to La Fontaine, are perversions of this original. The fable is essentially a moral precept illustrated by a single example, and it is the lesson thus enforced which gives to the fable its unity and makes it a work of art. The illustration must be either an actual occurrence or represented as such, because a fictitious case invented *ad hoc* can appeal but feebly to the reader's judgment. Lastly, the fable requires a story or connected chain of events. A single fact will not make a fable, but is only an emblem. We thus arrive at the following definition:—"A fable is a relation of a series of changes which together form a whole. The unity of the fable consists herein, that all the parts lead up to an end, the end for which the fable was invented being the moral precept."

We may notice in passing a problem in connexion with the fable which had long been debated, but never satisfactorily resolved till Lessing took it in hand,—Why should animals have been almost universally chosen as the chief *dramatis personæ*? The reason, according to Lessing, is that animals have distinct characters which are known and recognized by all. The fabulist who writes of Britannicus and Nero appeals to the few who know Roman history. The Wolf and the Lamb comes home to every one whether learned or simple. But, besides this, human sympathies obscure the moral judgment; hence it follows that the fable, unlike the drama and the epos, should abstain from all that is likely to arouse our prejudices or our passions. In this respect the Wolf and the Lamb of Æsop is a more perfect fable than the Rich Man and the Poor Man's Ewe Lamb of Nathan.

Lessing's analysis and definition of the fable, though he seems himself unconscious of the scope of his argument, is in truth its death-warrant. The beast-fable arose in a primitive age when men firmly believed that beasts could talk and reason, that any wolf they met might be a were-wolf, that a peacock might be a Pythagoras in disguise, and an ox or even a cat a being worthy of their worship. To this succeeded the second age of the fable, which belongs to the same stage of culture as the Hebrew proverbs and the gnomic poets of Greece. That honesty is the best policy, that death is common to all, seemed to the men of

that day profound truths worthy to be embalmed in verse or set off by the aid of story or anecdote. Last comes an age of high literary culture which tolerates the trite morals and hackneyed tales for the sake of the exquisite setting, and is amused at the wit which introduces topics and characters of the day under the transparent veil of animal life. Such an artificial product can be nothing more than the fashion of a day, and must, like pastoral poetry, die a natural death. A serious moralist would hardly choose that form to inculcate, like Mandeville in his *Fable of the Bees*, a new doctrine in morals, for the moral of the fable must be such that he who runs may read. A true poet will not care to masquerade as a moral teacher, or show his wit by refurbishing some old-world maxim. (F. s.)

FABRE D'ÉGLANTINE, PHILIPPE FRANÇOIS NAZARE (1755–1794), a French dramatist and revolutionist, was born at Carcassonne, December 28, 1755. His real name was simple Fabre, the "d'Églantine" being an addition which he adopted in commemoration of his receiving the golden eglantine of Clemence Isaire from the academy of the floral games at Toulouse. After travelling through the provinces as an actor, he came to Paris when about thirty years of age with the intention of continuing the same career, but being ignored by the critics he ventured to take his revenge by a comedy entitled *Les gens des Lettres ou le Provincial à Paris*, and in spite of its failure continued to bring piece after piece on the boards. Shortly after the outbreak of the revolutionary movement he entered the political arena, was chosen by Danton as his private secretary, and obtained from the electors of Paris a place in the National Convention. He distinguished himself by the extravagance of his speeches and measures, voting for the king's death, supporting the *maximum* and the law of the suspected, and giving distorted evidence against the Girondins. On the abolition of the Gregorian calendar he was one of the most active members of the committee entrusted with the formation of the republican substitute, and to him was due a large part of the new nomenclature, with its poetic *Prairial* and *Floreal*, its prosaic *Primidi* and *Duodi*, and its absurd substitution of the names of trees and beasts and implements for those of saints and heroes. The report which he made on the subject on 24th October is not without scientific value. On January 12, 1794 he was arrested by order of the committee of public safety on a charge of malversation and forgery in connexion with the affairs of the Compagnie des Indes. During his trial he displayed the greatest apparent nonchalance, sitting in an arm chair, looking out dreamily at the rain, and singing his own well-known song of *Il pleut, il pleut, bergère, rentre tes blancs moutons*. On his way to the scaffold he distributed his manuscript poems to the people.

Fabre d'Églantine left behind him seventeen plays and a number of miscellaneous productions. One only of the plays, *Le Philinte de Molière*, still preserves its reputation as a good specimen of the second class. It professes to be a continuation of Molière's *Le Misanthrope*, but the hero of the piece is of a different character from the nominal prototype—an impersonation, indeed, of pure and simple egotism. On its publication the play was introduced by a preface, in which the author mercilessly satirizes the *Optimiste* of his rival Collin d'Harleville, whose *Châteaux en Espagne* had gained the applause which D'Églantine's *Présumptueux* had failed to win. A posthumous play, *Les Précepteurs*, steeped with the doctrines of Rousseau's *Émile*, was performed on 17th September 1794, and met with an enthusiastic reception. The author's *Œuvres mêlées et posthumes* were published at Paris 1802, 2 vols.

See Albert Maurin, *Galerie hist. de la Révolution française*, tome II.; Jules Janin, *Hist. de la Litt. dram.* Chénier, *Tableau de la Litt. française*.

FABRETTI, RAPHAEL (1618–1700), a celebrated Italian antiquary, was born in 1618, at Urbino in Umbria. A younger son, and destined to the pursuit of the law, he studied first at Cagli, and afterwards in his native city, where he took the degree of doctor at the age of eighteen years. While in Rome, preparing for practice at the bar, he early attracted the notice of Cardinal Lorenzo Imperiali, who employed him on important and difficult political affairs in Spain. He was named successively treasurer and auditor of the papal legation in that country, where he remained thirteen years. During all this time, however, his favourite classical and antiquarian studies were not neglected; and returning to Rome with the legate, Bonelli, who had been made cardinal, he was able on the journey to make important observations of the relics and monuments of Spain, France, and Italy, and to converse with the many eminent scholars of those countries who afterwards corresponded with him. At Rome he was appointed judge of appellation of the Capitol, which post he left to be, under the legate, Cardinal Cerri, auditor of the legation at his native city, Urbino. After three years he returned to Rome, on the invitation of Cardinal Carpegna, vicar of Innocent XI., a great lover of antiquities and learning, and now found that fullness of leisure which enabled him to carry on those studies and produce those works which have made him famous. He examined with minute care the monuments and inscriptions of the Campagna. In his solitary expeditions he always rode a horse which his friends nicknamed Marco Polo, after the celebrated Venetian traveller, saying that it could discover half-hidden monuments by smelling only, and thus frequently led its master to notice what he would otherwise have passed by. Fabretti was delighted with the name, and used it himself in a letter on the study of antiquity, still in manuscript. By Innocent XII. Fabretti was made keeper of the archives of the castle St Angelo, a charge of great responsibility and trust, which he retained till his death.

His work *De Aquis et Aquæ-ductibus veteris Romæ*, 1680, three dissertations which cleared up a number of obscurities as to the topography of ancient Latium, is inserted in Grævius's *Thesaurus*, iv. 1677. His interpretation in this work of certain passages in Livy and other classical authors involved him in a dispute with Gronovius, which bore a strong resemblance to that between Milton and Salmasius, Gronovius addressing Fabretti as *Faber Rusticus*, and the latter, in reply, speaking of *Gronovius* and his *titivilitia*. In this controversy Fabretti used the pseudonym Iasitheus, which he afterwards took as his pastoral name in the Academy of the Arcadians. His other works, *De Columna Trajani Syntagma*, Rome, 1683, and *Inscriptionum Antiquarum Explicatio*, Rome, 1699, throw much light on Roman antiquity, especially with the aid of the principle which he himself employed of making one monument interpret another. In the former of these works is also to be found his explication of a bas-relief, with inscriptions, now in the Capitol at Rome, representing the war and taking of Troy, known as the Iliac table. Letters and other shorter works of Fabretti are to be found in some miscellaneous publications of the time, as the *Journal des Savants*. He died at Rome, January 1700. His collection of inscriptions and monuments was purchased from his relatives by Cardinal Stoppani, and placed in the ducal palace at Urbino, where they may still be seen.

Crescimbeni, *Le Vite degli Arcadi illustri*; Fabroni, *Vite Italianorum*, vi. 174; Nicéron, iv. 372.

FABRIANO, a town of central Italy, province of Ancona, is situated at the foot of the Apennines, and on the railway from Ancona to Rome, 35 miles S.W. of Ancona. It has paper and parchment works, tanneries, and powder mills. Among its principal buildings are the cathedral, several

churches with pictures by the Fabriano school of artists, the town hall, which contains ancient inscriptions, and the museum of the Count of Rossetti, where may be seen a very fine collection of objects in ivory. Fabriano is the birth-place of the painter Gentile da Fabriano. The population of the town proper in 1870 was 6071, or including the outskirts, 7612.

FABRIANO, GENTILE DA, an Italian painter, was born at Fabriano about 1370. He is said to have been a pupil of Allegretto di Nuzio, but there is every probability that he received most of his early instruction from Fra Giovanni, surnamed Angelico, to whose manner his bears in some respects a close similarity. About 1411 he went to Venice, where by order of the doge and senate he was engaged to adorn the great hall of the ducal palace with frescoes from the life of Barbarossa. He executed this work so entirely to the satisfaction of his employers that they granted him a pension for life, and accorded him the privilege of wearing the habit of a Venetian noble. About 1422 he went to Florence, where in 1423 he painted an Adoration of the Kings for the church of Santa Trinita, which is preserved in the Florence gallery of paintings, and is considered his best work now extant. To the same period belongs a Madonna and Child which is now in the Berlin Museum. Fabriano had by this time attained a wide reputation, and was engaged to paint pictures for various churches, more particularly Siena, Perugia, Gubbio, and Fabriano. About 1426 he was called to Rome by Martin V. to adorn the church of St John Lateran with frescoes from the life of John the Baptist. He also executed a portrait of the pope attended by ten cardinals, and in the church of St Francesco Romano a painting of the Virgin and Child attended by St Benedict and St Joseph, which was much esteemed by Michelangelo, but is no longer in existence. Fabriano died about 1450. Michelangelo said of him that his works resembled his surname Gentile, noble or refined. They are full of a quiet and serene joyousness, and he has a naïve and innocent delight in splendour and in gold ornaments, with which, however, his pictures are not overloaded.

FABRICIUS, CAIUS LUSCINUS, a Roman general and consul, was perhaps the first member of the Fabricia gens who settled in Rome. He makes his earliest appearance in history as one of the ambassadors sent to the Tarentines to dissuade them from making war on the Romans. Elected consul in 282 B.C., he in the same year defeated the Boii and the Etruscans. When in the following year the Romans were defeated by Pyrrhus, Fabricius was sent to treat for the ransom and exchange of the prisoners, and Pyrrhus endeavoured unsuccessfully to bribe him with large offers to enter his service. In 278 Fabricius was elected consul for the second time, and was successful in negotiating terms of peace with Pyrrhus, who sailed away to Italy. Fabricius afterwards gained a series of victories over the Samnites, the Lucanians, and the Bruttii, and on his return to Rome received the honour of a triumph. Notwithstanding the offices he had filled he died poor, and provision had to be made for his daughter out of the funds of the state. In honour of his military achievements and his incorruptible integrity, the senate also decreed that he and his descendants should have a burial place inside the city.

FABRICIUS, GEORGE (1516–1571), poet, historian, and archaeologist, was born at Chemnitz in Upper Saxony, on the 24th April 1516. He completed his studies at Freiberg and Leipzig. Travelling into Italy with one of his pupils, he made an exhaustive study of the antiquities of Rome. The result was the second work named below, in which the correspondence between every discoverable relic of the old city and the references and descriptions which lay scattered throughout ancient literature was

traced with the minutest detail. Even learned Germans suspected that the work was in reality an ancient performance. Having returned to Germany in 1553, he was appointed director of the college of Meissen, where he died on the 13th July 1571. In his sacred poems, which obtained for him considerable distinction, he affected to avoid every word with the slightest savour of paganism; and he blamed the poets for their allusions to pagan divinities.

The following list includes the principal works which he published, either as author or as editor:—(1) *Terentii Afri Comœdiæ sex cum castigatione duplici Joannis Rivii et G. Fabricii*, Strasburg, 1548, 8vo; (2) *Roma, sive Liber utilissimus de veteris Romæ situ, regionibus, viis, templis, aliisque edificis*, Basel, 1550, 8vo; (3) *Virgilii Opera cum commentariis Servii et T. C. Donati*, Basel, 1551, fol.; (4) *Virgilii Opera a Fabricio castigata*, Leipsic, 1551, 1591, 8vo; (5) *Pœmatum sacrorum libri quindecim*, Basel, 1560, 16mo; (6) *Pœmatum veterum ecclesiasticorum opera Christiana et operum reliquæ ac fragmenta*, 1562, 4to; (7) *De Re Poëtica libri septem*, 1566, 8vo; (8) *Rerum Misnicarum libri septem*, 1569, 4to; (9) *Originum illustrissima stirpis Saxonica libri septem*, 1597, fol.; (10) *Rerum Germanica magna et Saxonica universa memorabilium volumina duo*, Leipsic, 1609, fol. A life of George Fabricius was published in 1839, at Leipsic, by Professor C. G. Baumgarten Crusius. In 1845 the same biographer issued an edition of Fabricius's *Epistolæ ad Wolf. Meurerum et alios aequales*, prefixed to which there is also a short sketch *De Vita G. Fabricii et de gente Fabriciorum*.

FABRICIUS, HIERONYMUS (1537–1619), a celebrated Italian anatomist and surgeon, was surnamed Acquapendente from the episcopal city of that name, where he was born in 1537. At Padua, after a course of philosophy, he studied medicine under Fallopius, whose successor as teacher of anatomy and surgery he became in 1562. From the senators of Venice he received numerous honours, and an anatomical theatre was built by them for his accommodation. He died May 21, 1619.

The collective works of Fabricius were printed by Bohn under the title of *Opera omnia Anatomica et Physiologica*, Leipsic, 1687. The Leyden edition, published by Albinus in 1733, folio, is preferred to that of Bohn, as containing a life of the author and the prefaces of his treatises. See ANATOMY, vol. i., p. 809, and SURGERY.

FABRICIUS, JOANNES ALBERTUS (1668–1736), one of the most learned, laborious, and useful of bibliographers, was born at Leipsic, November 11, 1668. His father, Werner Fabricius, director of music in the church of St Paul at Leipsic, was the author of several works, particularly *Delicia Harmonica*, published in 1657. Joannes Albertus himself commenced his studies under his father, who on his deathbed recommended him to the care of Valentine Alberti. He studied under Wenceslas Bull and J. S. Herrichen, and afterwards at Quedlinburg under Samuel Schmidt. It was in Schmidt's library, as he afterwards said, that he found the two works, Barthuis's *Adversaria* and Morhous's *Polyhistor*, which suggested to him the idea of his *Bibliotheca*, the kind of work for which he stands pre-eminent among scholars. Having returned to Leipsic in 1686, he was the same year admitted bachelor in philosophy; and in the beginning of 1688 he took the degree of master in the same faculty, shortly after which he published his first work, *Scriptorum recentium decas*, an attack on ten writers of the day, Thomasius among them. His *Decas Decadum, sive plagiarorum et pseudonymorum centuria*, published in the following year, is the only one of his works to which he signs the name Faber. He then applied himself to the study of medicine, which, however, he relinquished for that of theology; and having gone to Hamburg in 1693, he proposed to travel abroad, when the unexpected tidings that the expense of his education had absorbed his whole patrimony, and even left him in debt to his trustee, forced him to abandon his project. He therefore remained at Hamburg, where J. F. Mayer employed him in the capacity of librarian. In 1696 he accompanied his patron to Sweden;