

Carlo Lodoli (1690–1761) exists as a footnote in most major books on the history of modern architecture—typically noted either as an early prophet to structurally determined functionalism or as a continuation of the Italian Humanist tradition.¹ Few of his writings have survived and his built work amounts to a couple of windowsills; he did, however, teach architecture.

Architectural education in the Veneto had begun in the seventeenth century when Galileo taught the theory of civil and military architecture;² it was studied in Padua, albeit sporadically, for the next hundred years. By the mid-eighteenth century, various means of architectural instruction had developed—an education that typically was seen variously as an attempt at recognition for artists separate from the guilds; a political means of reform; or a continuation of the Venetian tradition with respect to craft. Between the poles of Venice and Padua, several individuals emerged who focused on teaching architecture within the University, the Academy, and the city of Venice itself: Giovanni Poleni’s demonstrations of various *machinae* in his theater of physics in Padua, Domenico Cerato’s professional practices at La Specola, and Antonio Visentini’s visual corrections of Venice each offered a competing vision of how the architect could be taught.³ It was in this context that Lodoli began teaching architectural rhetoric to young Venetians.

Born in Venice, Lodoli had been educated as a Franciscan in Dalmatia and then traveled the Italian peninsula until he returned to Venice in 1720 as a well-

respected tutor of young patricians—that is, future leaders whom the Republic guaranteed an education regardless of their often-precarious financial situations. Lodoli's *scuola di conversazione*, as the lessons were named, took place on walks through the city and within the garden of San Francesco della Vigna. His approach was not necessarily professional: he did not instruct his students in the methods of drawing or techniques of construction. Rather, by questioning the nature of truth and materials, one might discover the meaning of architecture. While the majority of scholarship on Lodoli tends to focus on his discussions of the nature of materials, little has been written on his teaching methods.⁴ This essay examines one of the more unique attributes of his pedagogy: his use of the word *indole* to refer to the inherent disposition of his students. The intention is to flesh out the nature of *indole*, as Lodoli understood it, from the *apologhi*—apologues, or allegorical tales—that he used in his lessons.

Apologhi

Lodoli's apologues are preserved in two works: the *Apologhi immaginati* (1787) and the *Elementi dell'architettura Lodoliana* (1786)⁵—both of which were published by Lodoli's most faithful pupil, Andrea Memmo. Admiration for his teacher's use of apologues as a teaching device is evident in the introduction to the *Apologhi*, where he states, "I shall not waste any time demonstrating the usefulness of these imaginings [the apologues], which are founded on a well-understood analogy, and that are masterfully directed to practical use in life, and which by the same road of delight, make intelligence and purification of the heart easier."⁶

Similar to a fable, an apologue is an allegorical tale often intended to express a moral lesson. In his *Dizionario universale delle arti e delle scienze* (1749), Ephraim Chambers listed three characteristics inherent to fables: that the truth was masked to reveal an ingenious invention; that fables were the most ancient way to teach; and that the language, simple but precise, originated in poetic speech and came from the Gods.⁷ Common to all apologues is the character of the fool, as an ass, a turkey, and even a crab. The fool educates through inversion—an “a-ha moment” when the fool realizes the mistake or error in judgment. The student may then recognize that although the fool may be ignorant, one may overcome that ignorance and act wisely. Chambers also referred to Aristotle, who claimed that fables contain two components: truth and that which cloaks the truth.⁸ The latter is an essential characteristic of the genre. For the fable to be educational, it must be clear that the story is not simply about animals. Rather, an allegoric relationship is proposed: one may act like an ass or an eagle. Certainly, the “clothed” words of the apologues also allowed for Lodoli’s well-known caustic wit. The epigraph of the *Apologhi* refers to this explicitly:

You pursue toga’d words, skilled at the sharp connection,
rounding a modest mouth, adept at trimming pallid habits,
and nailing every fault with a freeborn humor.⁹

Yet Lodoli employed these tales not *only* for the purpose of sarcastic commentary, popular enjoyment, or educating young patricians in the art of architecture but also to state his position.

Chambers also related *apologo* (apologue) to *apologia* (apology), which are both derived from a common Greek root.¹⁰ The use of *apologia* to mean “a justification of one’s position”—as most famously used by Plato—seems to have contributed to the naming of Lodoli’s lessons as *apologhi* and not fables. Indeed, the frontispiece of the *Apologhi* identifies Lodoli as “Forse Il Socrate Architetto”—perhaps the Socratic Architect (fig. 1). The reference to Socrates is not due to Lodoli’s apparent lack of writing.¹¹ According to Lodoli’s contemporaries, specifically Francesco Algarotti, the Socratic comparison derives from his difficult character, his desire to form a new Republic, and his interest in the education of the youth.¹² In the introduction to the *Apologhi*, Memmo stated that Lodoli was an insatiable admirer of Socrates and wished to imitate him. The more temperate Memmo, however, did not hold himself to the same historical standards. In a letter to his friend Giulio Perini, Memmo explained that his “Lodolian work was already finished and he was content to have done it.” He continued to state. “I will not be a Plato, but I am certain that the Socrates of architecture will be disinterred.”¹³

Typical of such collections, Lodoli’s *Apologhi* begins with “L’Apologo dell’Apologo, ossia il Proemio” (the Apologue of the Apologue, that is, an Introduction) intended to explain the nature and origin of the Apologue.¹⁴ The story is set in a time when there was a need to restore some sense of order and custom to the world. The father of men and gods proposes that a subordinate deity, the Apologue, be employed to name the precise nature of each animal that inhabits the sublunar world. To assist the Apologue, it is given a companion, Analogy, who is to act like a veil to determine the nature and qualities of each of

the animals. Apologue and Analogy descend from the heavens, and the animals line up before them. Only the ass does not conform, walking four paces forward and three back. When the ass finally arrives, the Apologue tries to encourage the ass with praise for his noble heritage. Thinking that he is being tricked, the ass recoils and runs away. Lodoli concludes: “The evidence itself of these things, pronounced with skill and sweetness, is yet not enough to enlighten those who resemble the ass. It is good to know from the beginning that it is not wise to waste one’s time with them because they need large sticks or a good rope rather than pure Apologues to be led to reason.”¹⁵

In many ways, Lodoli’s “Apologue of the Apologue” echoes the relationship he cultivated with his students. First, it was imperative that students want to learn. Next, and in an effort to keep the school small, Lodoli became acquainted with students prior to accepting them into his tutelage.¹⁶ Students would then receive direction particular their interests and abilities. This led the printer Giovanni-Alberto Tumermani to remark, in reference to Lodoli’s specificity and breadth, “It seemed as if he [Lodoli] was many people and not only one.”¹⁷ The oral nature of the apologies supported this last remark. Years later, Memmo found it difficult to write down all of the apologies because Lodoli would tell the same one in different ways depending on the student and the situation.¹⁸ The recognition of and attention to the specific nature of each student was referred to as *indole*—and it was central to Lodoli’s pedagogy.

Indole

The word *indole* was in use, but not widespread in the eighteenth century;¹⁹ its use, however, varied considerably. Francesco Algarotti used the term to describe the specific and distinct movements of the planets.²⁰ Giuseppe Baretti, a scholar of the Italian language prior to its standardization, used the word *indole* when discussing translation between two languages. He explained that languages each have their own nature and direct translation is simply not possible.²¹

Though Lodoli's use of *indole* with respect to pedagogy may be unique, he was not the first architect to use the term. In a retelling of Aesop's fables, *Centum Apologi* (1437), Leon Battista Alberti referred to the nature of animals as *indole*.²²

The ninety-fourth apologue tells the story of a cricket and a frog that mock a snake because it has no legs and is, presumably, incapable of movement.

Amazed when the snake leaves quickly and with great agility, the two scold themselves for judging others by their own *indole*.²³ Lodoli described a similar situation in the apologue "Il Granciporro, e la Seppia" (the hermit crab and the cuttlefish [Should the English titles here and those that follow be capitalized to match above?]).²⁴ The two animals come together without speaking and without knowledge of what the other is. The cuttlefish, believing the other creature not to be dangerous, stretches out one of her arms to touch the arms of the other.

Expecting to find something soft, the cuttlefish is surprised: "They are so hard!?"

The crab stretches out one of his arms, expecting to find something crustaceous.

On feeling the cuttlefish's flabby body, he responds quickly, "Your legs are so flexible!" Lodoli explained that to the cuttlefish, all is tentacles; to the crab, all is claws. He then concluded that there is nothing more common than to interpret

another's nature by one's own. Both Lodoli and Alberti use *indole* to describe the specific temperament and natural inclinations that characterize an individual and, further, to emphasize that one should be open to the perspective of another. Lodoli, however, is unique in that his lessons were offered in the context of an architectural education. As one should not understand another solely on one's own terms, architectural work must also be understood within its own context and not solely through one's own worldview.²⁵

Lodoli's use of *indole* with respect to his educational agenda was more expansive: it included not only an individual's nature but also his potential for development and growth. Lodoli defended this position through a series of apologues and, in doing so, more clearly articulated his understanding of the term. First, Lodoli broadened the definition of *indole* to refer to the qualities and characteristics of a certain age in life, such as youth.²⁶ In the story of "l'Ambasciatore Dindiottello" (the turkey ambassador), he described the diverse natures found among a group of turkeys of varying age.²⁷ The turkeys are fighting with the geese over a lack of space and food in a farmyard. An older turkey proposes a subdivision of the yard; in an attempt to share the proposal and make peace, a young turkey is sent as an ambassador to the geese. After successful negotiations, the young turkey returns but his youthful nervousness prevents him from communicating the terms of the settlement to the major council of turkeys. Though friends and family attempt to convince him that the older turkeys are the same as he, just older, he is still unable to speak. Observing the spectacle, the farmer orders the young turkey to the chopping block where he soon becomes the Sunday dinner. It is a typical, somewhat modern lesson:

underneath the layer of years, we are all the same. Lodoli, however, distinguishes different ages as having distinct *indole*. The fate of the young turkey ambassador is indeed connected to this—confident and capable when talking to others, less so when confronted by his elders. Remember, Lodoli was teaching young Venetian patricians who would become the leaders of the Republic.²⁸ Lodoli was not only aware of the distinct approach required when teaching youth; he deemed the youthful point of view as a potential strength.

Second, Lodoli demonstrated the value of educating the youth in a series of apologues of which “Aeolus” is one example.²⁹ Truth, the protagonist of the apologue, is depicted as a flame who wishes to illuminate everything, including the cavern of the winds. The flame travels to the kingdom of Aeolus, but as soon as the custodian of the winds notices the flame on the horizon, he expels it with one quick breath. Truth then tries to enter the caves of the other winds but is repelled quickly. Steadfast in his plan to illuminate the dark caves, he goes to the *zeffiretti* (young winds). Surprised by the arrival of the torch, these young winds blow out enough air to push away the flame, but breathe in just enough to keep it lit. Watching the young winds playing with the flame, Lodoli concludes: “Here you are sirs . . . the reason why I gladly turn to open-minded youth, those who take their principles from the truth as a game, having fun with it, almost swallowing and tasting the light, becoming, little by little, more familiar. Whereas the old people used to the dark don’t deign to receive in their big empty heads a heterogeneous [color of the flame] splendor for all.”³⁰

Third, one’s *indole* must be given time to develop. In the apologue of “i Genitori Irragionevolmente Amorosi” (the irrationally affectionate parents), a

healthy and happy young boy is learning how to speak.³¹ His rather proud parents are embarrassed to realize that the boy seems to have trouble pronouncing a few letters. The mother notices a delay in the “R” sound and the father detects the same in the boy’s “S.” Fearing that they might be the cause of the defect, they search for an instructor of language who might help their young son. After a long search, they finally secure an appointment with a well-known doctor from Pisa. The doctor listens to the boy and finds that he is actually able to pronounce labial words quite well. The doctor unearths no hindrance in the internal construction of the mouth and tells the parents: “I am useless. You have nothing to do other than to wait for him to grow a bit, and the ‘R’ and the ‘S’ will come out perfectly.” Lodoli concludes by condemning parents who impose the instruction of certain doctrines on their children too soon rather than allowing their children’s minds to develop naturally. He goes on to scold the ignorant teachers of young children who disingenuously earn their monthly assignments, teaching inappropriate nonsense and overburdening their pupils’ developing intelligence for no reason.³²

The final characteristic of *indole* relates to the possibility that one can overcome one’s own situation. “Il Asino ed i Bozzoli del Bigatto” (the mule and the silkworm’s cocoons) tells the story of a mule who is tired of carrying heavy loads for his master.³³ One day the mule refuses to carry two enormous—most likely heavy—baskets. The mule is beaten and eventually cedes to carry the loads, which he discovers are quite light. After some discussion with his master, the mule understands that the load is so light because it contains the cocoons of silkworms. After further discussion, he ascertains the process by which a worm

becomes a cocoon and eventually a butterfly. That night, amazed by the potential of such a transformation, the mule decides to mimic the silkworm and become a butterfly in order to fly away from his life on the farm. Knowing the location of the silkworm's mulberry grove from his work earlier in the day, he goes there, eats as much as possible, and becomes violently ill. Having passed out, he begins to emit a slimy viscous twine that over the course of the night covers his entire body. The next morning the farmer goes looking for the mule and discovers that his grove of mulberry trees has been destroyed. Next to the trees, the farmer notices a heap of what appears to be dried dung and approaches it just as the chrysalis begins to crack. After some excitement and several beatings from the farmer, a winged creature—a turkey!—finally emerges. Lodoli concludes, "With such a story, reflecting upon those youths, who after being nourished by good principles and who have also carried the weight of other's authority until now, want to free themselves and concentrate on themselves and their own nature and ingenuity should not give up hope to make a free flight if not like an eagle, than at least a pheasant or a partridge."³⁴ The analogy here is that the mule is like the silkworm or the young student. The worm overcomes its situation (the cocoon) to become a butterfly just as the mule did to become a turkey. Through ingenuity and an understanding of one's own nature, or *indole*, young students may be able to overcome their situations, but not themselves.

The question remains; what does it mean to practice an "examined architecture?" The answer, for Lodoli, would never be an aesthetic or form based response. I would propose, rather, that the value of an architecture education lies in the ability of the student to become professional in that they are enabled to

take responsibility for their own education and begin a career of life-long learning. The responsibility of the professor, then, is not to provide explicit knowledge to be applied in the future, but to develop a desire to live the examined life: the only life, according to Socrates, worth living.

I conclude with one final story, “Il nuovo Collegio, o gli Pseudo-Professori” (the new college or the pseudo-professors), that alludes to the nature of a school that might result from Lodoli’s teachings. The story describes the plan of a certain cleric in Venice who sought to gain political favors by building a new school for the patricians’ children. A building is found in a quiet campo and plans for renovation begin. Recognizing that the mothers will most likely make enrollment decisions, the cleric includes in the renovation small rooms adjacent to the students’ quarters for when the mothers would visit. Only a few women had visited the new school when word began to spread. Due to the school’s refinement and careful detail, not to mention the mothers’ quarters, the school becomes a topic of gossip among the mothers who believe that their children will receive a better education there. The college is quickly filled with students and showered with praise. Soon after, several mothers notice that their children are coming home dirty. Suspicions arise that the school is saving money by withholding soap. The school’s accountant offers his books to show that indeed the proper amount of soap has been bought. The parents’ concerns are assuaged for a time, and the students scolded for not washing well enough. After a few weeks, however, the students again appear dirty to their parents. Recognizing that a firsthand investigation is required, the headmaster goes to the washroom. There, he discovers that the youngest students are making bubbles with soap

and straws, the middle students are playing a game similar to bocce, and the older students are throwing the soap at one another's heads.

Lodoli proposes that scholars of all ages observe the following: Young scholars do not rectify their minds and purify their spirits by using the soap of good discipline to remove intellectual spots. Rather, they use this to make sonnets and songs, the true bubbles of youth. The middle scholars play with academic discourse, translating from one language to another, commenting on old work, and mixing old truths with new ones. The older scholars, among whom there are, unfortunately, many academics, write with biting criticism and abuse, only to throw their heavy works at each other's heads. If we are not convinced, Lodoli tells us that he can give examples.

Notes

I wish to thank the two anonymous readers for their generous comments and Michele Ciaccio for her excellent editorial suggestions. I am very grateful to Denise McGimsey for her careful and precise reading of the text and suggestions for its improvement. All translations are my own, unless otherwise noted.

1. Though Michele de Benedetti in, "Un precursore dell'architettura funzionale nel Settecento," *Actes du xii Congrès International d'Histoire de l'Art* 1, (1930): 225–26 was the first critic to mention Lodoli in a modern context, it was Julius Von Schlosser who, in 1924, was the first historian to find any real import in Lodoli's theories of architecture. Von Schlosser claimed that Lodoli anticipated many modern architects and concepts, specifically Semper. See Julius Von

Schlosser, *La letteratura artistica: manuale delle fonti della storia dell'arte moderna* Trans. Filippo Rossi (Florence, La Nuova Italia, 1979), 666. After some interest by the Italian rationalists, Emil Kaufmann presented Lodoli strictly as a modern functionalist in a series of articles and within the larger context of his landmark study, *Architecture in the age of reason: baroque and postbaroque in Italy, England and France* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard Univ. Press, 1955). Rudolf Wittkower agreed with Kaufmann and in his *Art and architecture in Italy 1600-1750* (New Haven: Yale Univ. Press, 1958) named Lodoli as a “prophet of rationalism.” Diana Bitz in her dissertation entitled “Architettura Lodoliana: Topical Mathematics as Architecture,” (PhD diss., Emory University, 1992), located Lodoli’s theoretical position squarely within the thought of Italian Humanism. Manlio Brusatin’s *Venezia nel settecento: stato, architettura, territorio* (Turin: Giulio Einaudi, 1980) and Joseph Rykwert’s *First moderns: architects of the eighteenth century* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1980) read Lodoli both within the complex context of the Venetian eighteenth century and as a precursor to modernism. Both are invaluable sources. For a complete review of existing secondary source scholarship on Lodoli, see Marc J. Neveu, “Architectural Lessons of Carlo Lodoli,” (PhD diss., McGill University, 2006), 359–98.

2. Architecture was studied within the *studium* of the chair of mathematics. For further discussion, see Antonio Favaro, “I successori di Galileo nello studio di Padova fino alla caduta della Repubblica,” *Nuovo Archivio Veneto* 33 (1917): 96–182; and Marco Frascari, “Sortes Architectii in the Eighteenth Century Veneto,” (PhD diss., University of Pennsylvania, 1981), 179–206.

3. For a more complete discussion of architectural education in the Veneto see Giulio Brunetta, *Gli inizi dell'insegnamento pubblico dell'architettura a Padova e Venezia* (Padua: Editrice Antenore, 1976), 9–37.

4. The issue of the nature and truth of materials is central to Lodoli's position. Memmo outlines the argument and makes a sweeping critique of the orders—as an architecture in stone that imitates an architecture of wood. See Andrea Memmo, *Elementi d'architettura Lodoliana: Ossia l'arte del fabbricare con solidità scientifica e con eleganza non capricciosa libri due*, 2 vols. (Zara: Coi Tipi dei Fratelli Battara, 1834), 1:289–306. Most secondary sources, however, simply reference the quote that wraps his image in the frontispiece of the *Elementi* and *Apologhi*, which states “Devonsi unire fabrica e ragione—e sia funzion[e] la rappresentazione.” This is often and erroneously read as the origin of the modern dictum, “form follows function.” Joseph Rykwert has clarified this misunderstanding. See his essays, “Lodoli on Function and Form,” *Architectural Review* 160, (1976): 21–26 and “Organic and Mechanical,” *Res* 22, (Autumn, 1992): 10–18.

5. There are two editions of the *Apologhi immaginati*. The first was published on the occasion of Memmo being elected as Procuratore di S Marco in 1787. Gio Claudio Molini published another edition in Paris in 1800; it contains minimal grammatical corrections to the first edition and is printed in a smaller format. This paper cites the 1787 edition held by the Research Library of the Getty Research Institute. The first volume of the *Elementi dell'architettura Lodoliana* was published in Rome in 1786. Memmo's daughter, Lucia Mocenigo,

published the second edition in Zara in 1834; this edition included a second volume. As it contains both volumes and there is minimal difference between the first edition and the first volume of the second edition, I am using the Zara edition. The original manuscripts of both volumes are reported to have been in the Biblioteca Municipale in Treviso where they were either lost or destroyed during World War II. For a complete translation of the apologues contained in the *Apologhi immaginati* and the *Elementi*, see Marc J. Neveu, “Architectural Lessons of Carlo Lodoli” (PhD diss., McGill University, 2006), 237–358.

6. Andrea Memmo, *Apologhi immaginati, e sol estemporaneamente in voce esposti agli amici suoi . . . l'eccellentissimo signor Andrea Memmo cavaliere della stola d'oro* (Bassano: [s.n.], 1787), 5–6: “Non perderò ora tempo a mostrar quali utilità possano derivar dale immagini, che fondata sopra una ben intesa analogia, e con industria dirette all'uso pratico della vita per la stessa via del diletto agevolano l'intelligenza, o purificano il cuore.”

7. I am not aware of other collections of so-called apologues published in the Veneto. There was, however, a rich tradition of fable telling and publication within the peninsula to draw upon. Such publications were numerous but can be roughly divided between reprints of existing compilations and original fables with the latter including, at least, Giambattista Roberti, *Favole Esopiane* (Bologna, 1773; Bassano, 1782); Aurelio de Giorgi Bertòla, *Favole* (Pavia, 1779) and *Saggio sopra la favola* (Pavia, 1788); Lorenzo Pignotti, *Favole e novelle* (Florence, 1782); Giovanni Gherardo de Rossi, *Favole* (Rome, 1788); and Luigi Fiacchi, *Favole* (Florence, 1795).

8. Ephraim Chambers, *Dizionario universale delle arti e delle scienze*, 9 vols. (Venice: Presso Giambattista Pasquali, 1748–49), 4:34.

9. The translation is by Guy Lee. See *Satires of Persius*, trans. Guy Lee (Liverpool: Francis Cairns, 1987), 39. The quote is taken from Persius's fifth satire:

Verba togae sequeris, junctura callidus acri,
Ore teres modico: pallentes radere mores
Doctus, ed ingenuo culpam defigure ludo.

10. See Chambers, *Dizionario* (note 8), 1:264, for both *apologia* and *apologo*. The *Oxford English Dictionary* lists *apologue* as an obsolete form of *apology*. See Oxford English Dictionary Online, s.v. "apology," at dictionary.oed.com (subscriber access only; accessed 28 May 2008).

11. Almost all scholarship on Lodoli notes the difficulty regarding primary sources. Though early evidence and recent publication supports the view that Lodoli did, in fact, write, very little remains. Memmo reported that Lodoli had written lessons for his students; not one, but many treatises on architecture; and a book of architectural substitutions. See Memmo, *Elementi* (note 4), 1:118–22, for a full account. Four texts written by Lodoli for the *Riformatori dello Studio di Padova* regarding his role as censor have been recently published by Mario Infelise, *Carlo Lodoli: Della censura dei libri* (Venice: Marsilio, 2001).

Correspondence exists in the between Lodoli and Carlo Ruzzini concerning the history of Venice. See Memmo, *Elementi* (note 4), 1:40. Most famously, Lodoli

corresponded with Giambattista Vico concerning the publication of Vico's *periautografia*. See the introduction to the *Autobiography of Giambattista Vico*, trans. Max Harold Fisch and Thomas Goddard Bergin (Ithaca: Cornell Univ Press, 1962) for a discussion of their correspondence. After Lodoli's death all of his papers were confiscated and left to rot in the Piombe prison in Venice.

12. Francesco Algarotti described Lodoli's students as the "Socratic Army." See Memmo, *Elementi* (note 4), 2:8. He compared Lodoli to Socrates in their shared desire to purge all vice from architecture (for Lodoli) and philosophy (for Socrates). See Memmo, *Elementi* (note 4), 2:13. Algarotti also made the claim that Lodoli wished to form a "new Republic" as, Algarotti maintained, did Socrates. See Memmo, *Elementi* (note 4), 2:42. Socrates is a character in at least three apologies: "Socrates and the Snail," "Balancing Socrates," and "Socrates' Horoscope." See Memmo, *Apologhi* (note 6), 38–39, 41–42, and 45. Each of the stories describes a Socrates whose personality and temperament is very similar to Lodoli.

13. See Susanna Pasqualli, "Scrivere di architettura intorno al 1780: Andrea Memmo e Francesco Milizia tra il Veneto e Roma," *Zeitenblicke* 2 (2003): 10, note 121: "La mia opera Lodoliana è già terminata, e sono contento d'averla fatta. Io non sarò un Platone, ma sono certo che il Socrate architetto sarà disotterato." The work to which Memmo is referring is the first edition of the *Elementi*.

14. Marsilio Ficino wrote an "Apologus de Apologo" and also used the word *indole* to describe the nature of Apologus, a young boy whose salubrious

charms were meant to benefit mankind. Ficino names Apologus as the counterpoint to his brother Cupid (Eros) whose actions have harmed mankind. See *Renaissance Fables*, trans. David Marsh (Tempe: Arizona Center for Medieval & Renaissance Studies, 2004), 8 for translation and further reference.

15. Memmo, *Apologhi* (note 6), 14: “La evidenza stessa della cose pronunziate pur con desterità, e con dolcezza non bastando ad illuminar coloro, che agli Asini assomigliano, sappiasi da bel principio, che non s’intende di perdere il tempo per essi, i quali abbisognano di grossi bastoni, o di ritorti capestri, piuttosto che de’ casti Apologhi per esser condotti alla ragione.”

16. Memmo explained: “Prima d’insegnare ad essi qualche cosa, se ne stava in lor compagnia discorrendo, o facendo loro ascoltare quanto rivolgeva ad altri, finchè avesse meglio distinto la capacità, e dove più il genio loro inclinasse.” Memmo, *Elementi* (note 4), 1:52.

17. Memmo, *Elementi* (note 4), 1:52: “che pareva ch’egli fosse molti e non solo uno.”

18. For full reference, see Memmo, *Apologhi* (note 6), 7: “Con questo nuovo metodo, mentre tenevasi libero nella maniera di esporre i suoi Apologhi, onde meglio adattarne il frasario ancora alla diversa capacità degli ascoltatori, od alle varie loro inclinazioni, nasceva, che lo stessissimo Apologo, a chi in separata società l’aveva un’altra volta udito, paresse un altro. Un sí fatto cambiamento di stile potrebbe ancora far prendere in sospetto chi scrive per quanto fosse esatto, di non esserne fedel espositore.”

19. The *Vocabolario degli Accademici della Crusca* (Venice: Giovanni Alberti, 1612), s.v. “indole,” defines *indole* as “Naturale disposizione, e inclinazione allo’mparare, e dicesi de fanciulli.” *Indole* does not appear in Chambers’s *Dizionario*.

20. Algarotti explains, “Se i pianeti non facessero altro che girare, o danzare a tondo, non ci saria che dire. Il male si è che il fanno con certe particolarità, con certe tali leggi, le quali non ci è verso, per quanti tentativi sieno stati fatti, di aggiustarle con quello che vorrebbe la propria natura e l’indole del vortice; e guastano ogni cosa.” See Francesco Algarotti, *Il Newtonismo per le dame* (Napoli, 1737), 17.

21. See Arthur Sherbo, “Samuel Johnson and Giuseppe Baretti: A Question of Translation,” *Review of English Studies* 19, no. 76 (1968): 407.

22. The original version of the *Centum Apologi* was written in Latin and composed over nine days in December 1437. An Italian version appeared in 1568 in an anthology by Cosimo Bartoli. See Paola Testa Massetani, “Ricerche sugli’Apologhi’ di Leon Battista Alberti,” *Rinascimento* 12 (1972): 79-134, and Cesarini Lucia Martinelli, “Philodoxeos Fabula, Edizione critica,” *Rinascimento* 17 (1977): 144-147., and *Renaissance Fables* (note 14).

23. “O dei, veramente valutiamo l’attitudine e l’indole degli altri in conformità ai nostri sensi e alle nostre forze!” See *Apologhi ed Elogi*, Ed. Rosario Contarino (Genoa: Costa & Nolan, 1984), 48.

24. For the complete apologue, see Memmo, *Apologhi* (note 6), 40–41.

25. The errors of contemporary architecture, according to Lodoli, were often based on such misreadings and Memmo describes many throughout the *Elementi*. Memmo cites specific passages from Vitruvius that Lodoli corrected to more truthful to the original. See, for example, Memmo, *Elementi* (note 4), 1:273–76, 1:330–33, 2:120–21. All blame, however, should not be placed on architects reading Vitruvius with a modern eye. Memmo cites a slew of authors who describe Vitruvius as a notoriously confusing writer. See Memmo, *Elementi* (note 4), 140–52.

26. The etymology of *indole* as described in the *Dizionario etimologico della lingua italiana* confirms this interpretation: “temperamento di un individuo nell’insieme delle inclinazioni naturali che lo caratterizzano” (1437–8, L.B. Alberti; l’es. di A Pandolfini, cit. dai vocabolari, ne è la ripetizione) Vc. Dotta, lat. *Indole* (m), comp. di *indu-* ‘dentro’ e di un der. del v. *alere* ‘nutrire.’ Il sign. orig., infatti, era, ‘accrescimento, incremento’ attribuito tanto agli uomini, quanto alle piante, ma pop. si collegava la vc. a *dolore* (m), avvicinandola a *indolente* (m), perchè si riferiva all’età giovanile, che non conosce il dolore.” See Manlio Cortelazzo and Paolo Zolli, *Dizionario etimologico della lingua italiana*, 5 vols. (Bologna: Zanichelli, 1979–88), s.v. “indole.”

27. For the complete apologue, see Memmo, *Apologhi* (note 6), 48–50.

28. Architecture was understood to be part of patricians’ political duties. Andrea Memmo, for example, planned and constructed the Prato della Valle in Padua and also the residence for the Venetian Ambassador to Constantinople.

29. For the complete apologue, see Memmo, *Elementi* (note 4), 1:77–78.

30. Memmo, *Elementi* (note 4), 1:78: “Eccovi, signori (diceva), il perchè mi rivolgo più volentieri a’ giovani ben disposti, i quali da principio prendendo la verità or per un giuoco o come una cosa nuova, trattengonsi di buon grado con essa e quasi ingoiandone qualche parte e gustando del suo lume, a poco a poco lor diventa familiare. Laddove i vecchi abituati al buio non soffrono di ricevere nelle cavernose loro menti uno splendore tutto eterogeneo per essi.”

31. For the complete apologue, see Memmo, *Apologhi* (note 6), 26–27.

32. The thirteenth apologue “Ercole e le Mosche” (Hercules and the flies) describes a similar situation. Hercules is overcome by a swarm of flies just as a passionate youth, according to Lodoli’s conclusion, may be overcome by the minutiae of a nonphilosophic education given too early. For the complete apologue, see Memmo, *Apologhi* (note 6), 23.

33. For the complete apologue, see Memmo, *Elementi* (note 4), 2:166–71.

34. Memmo, *Elementi* (note 4), 2:171: “Col mezzo di tale immagine facendo riflettere a quel giovane, che se dopo di essersi nutrito di buoni principii, e di aver anche portato dell’altrui autorità sino allora, volesse alfine scuoterla, e concentrarsi in sè stesso a proporzione della sua natura e del suo ingegno, non avrebbe potuto più disperare di fare un libero volo, se non da aquila, almeno da fagiano o da pernice.”



Fig. 1. Pietro Vitale (Italian, 1759–1839), after Ant. [sic. Alessandro] Longhi (Italian, 1733–1813)

Carlo de conti Lodoli Veneziano, Forse Il Socrate Architetto, 1787, etching

From Andrea Memmo, Apologhi immaginati, e sol estemporaneamente in voce esposti agli amici suoi dal fu fra Carlo de' conti Lodoli (Bassano: n.p., 1787), frontispiece.