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The objective of my thesis is to demonstrate the complexity of studying an ancient graphical and textual source that may not be easy to understand to a contemporary ‘reader’. In this work I studied the *edition princeps* [1562] of the *Regola delli cinque ordini d’architettura* di M. Iacomo Barozzio da Vignola (first edition of the *Canon of the five orders of architecture*).

I need to underline that I examined the formal and graphical structure of the *Regola*, not the proportional canon. I analyzed the *Regola* by a formal/syntactic study and by a redrawing the original plates. This involves to place the *Regola* inside its cultural context and background, starting from the examination of Giacomo Barozzi’s figure, going through scrutinize the *Regola* as ‘architectural book’, describing its technical realization (engraving and printing) and understanding which treatises inspired or influenced Vignola’s work.

The fundamental steps of the analysis had been:

- study the formal structure of the *Regola* by filing the plates. This filing has been done using an existing scientific model, the file ‘S: Stampa’ defined by the ICCD, which has been modified to better fit my purposes;

- discriminating redrawing the graphical plates (frontispiece excluded).

Thanks to filing the plates it has been possible to highlight the formal characters of the *Regola*, for example the number of projective planes Vignola used to describe objects on the plates, or surfaces texturing. This operation has been preparatory for the graphical analysis and helped me to proceed easily in redrawing.
While reproducing Vignola’s plates has been possible to observe the fundamental aspects of Vignola’s architectural book, such as the geometrical constructions, or the different dimensions styles he used, or the necessity of using other graphical sources in order to complete the redrawing.

Analysing the *Regola* leads to understand that a contemporary, revised reproduction of this treatise is possible only by understanding all-around Vignola’s dissertation. I had the opportunity to underline how the typological characteristics of architectural representation of the 16th century influenced Vignola’s graphical results. Moreover I demonstrated how Vignola’s rigorous graphical description of the *Canon* had been depicted following a clear logic scheme which has not been strictly followed, for example on surfaces texturing ‘meaning’.
Compared representation of the cornice of an order, detail. On the left: G. da Sangallo [post 1464-ante 1516], on the right: G. B. da Vignola [1562]

Updating Vignola’s graphical ‘idea’ require an important revision and a critical analysis of the semantic of Vignola’s sign. This passage has not to be seen as a simple graphical standardization of the original drawings, but a critical render (and that’s why I decided to diversify my sign and Vignola’s one).
Comparing Vignola’s drawing with personal redrawing, detail. On the left reproduction of Vignola’s etching, on the right personal render
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