Editorial

Francesca Fatta

This issue is dedicated to the memory of Cesare Cundari, who suddenly left us on November 23, 2020, in the days during which the editing and the preparation of the texts for publication were nearing completion.
Measurement and Cesare form a very intimate bond, both scientific and in terms of character.
He founded his activity as a researcher on measurement, from descriptive geometry to the elements of photogrammetry, to architectural survey, revealing the dimensions of great monumental complexes such as Monteoliveto in Naples, and Castel Sant'Angelo in Rome.
And measure could also be read in the traits of his character, like a polyhedron with many edges. He moved with measured gestures, waiting for the right moment to open himself with generosity and much affection.
With him, UID has lost a Maestro and a Friend.

"Measure what is measurable,
and make measurable what is not so"
Galileo Galilei
Cit. in AA.VV. (2018). *Il libro della scienza*
(tran. M. Dominici e O. Amagliani). Milano: Gribaudo, p. 43.

The theme of Issue No. 7 of *diségno* originates from former solicitations that always regain a great sense of relevance. The return to the term measure is an authentic aspect of the present condition that tends to become lost in less and less measurable liquid spaces.
Today the uniform nature imagined by the mathematicians of the seventeenth century presents less linear measures in a space where the qualitative apparatus has, in any case, also substantiated the quantitative one of measure itself; a complementarity is sought between the two categories that in synthesis again find the harmony of measure.
The antecedents that I would like to recall date back to 1989, when Adriana Baculo, in Issue No. 9 of *Quaderni Di* entitled *Smisurate misure!* (Immeasurable dimensions!) wrote: "To obtain a sum or a remainder it is necessary to establish measured limits, created in relation to conventions, customs, traditions, languages. These are the rules capable of tracing the horizons within which we move, not without falling into the temptation to go forward and backward, weaving a weave of threads straddling that limit. […] To calculate differences means to catalogue and compare, to measure and then recognize that measurement itself can be abandoned, that the rule can be replaced by another rule." [Baculo, A. (1989). Premessa. In *Quaderni Di* 9/1989. *Smisurate misure! Differenze di scala di fattura di ruolo informativo di significato*, p. 3].
A few years later, in 1991, the Fifth Spring Seminar organized by Rosalia La Franca and dedicated to *Il disegno di architettura come misura della qualità* (Architectural drawing as a measure of quality), the theme of measurement was confronted with the two categories of quality and quantity: "architectural drawing measures quality because drawing is essentially projectual, that is, it allows us to represent, with decipherable forms, what is announced by the project itself, but which does not yet exist in reality. Through drawing, therefore, the choice of the project is made as, on the other hand, through drawing, the interpretation of the belonging, the recognizability of the universe of the forms already produced is made. This means that drawing gives form to quality with the expedient of measurement, therefore of quantity" [La Franca, R. (1993). L'intero come eccedenza della somma delle parti. In AA.VV. *Il disegno di architettura come*

misura della qualità. Atti del Quinto Seminario di Primavera, Palermo, 16, 17 e 18 maggio 1991. Palermo: Flaccovio editore, p. 32]. Twenty years later, Franco Purini presented the exhibition *Gli Spazi del tempo. Il disegno come memoria e misura delle cose*, which featured twenty ink drawings in which the sense of measure was interpreted with the citation of just a few architectural elements: walls, stairs, windows, which observe a deliberate dimensional ambiguity between measure and immoderation, space and time, memory and project [Purini, F. (2011). *Gli Spazi del tempo. Il disegno come memoria e misura delle cose*. Roma: Gangemi editore].

There are three interpretations of the relationship between drawing and measurement that we would like to highlight. Three events that can be considered independent, given the different meanings given to the word 'measure', but closely connected since they refer to the practice of 'drawing.'

The act of measuring has an ancient depth supported by the epistemological thought of the great philosophers, mathematicians, scientists. The sensitive–therefore subjective–sphere of drawing is confronted with the phenomenological therefore objective–sphere of measurement. A dialectic that, in parallel with the word, only drawing can be able to unravel.

For those who express themselves through drawing, and with drawing do research, measurement is a value that is expressed through a graphic description and relates in a multidimensional context by implementing algorithms that are formalized in compositions substantiated by deep geometries.

Measurement is the certainty that anchors us to a present that can be quantified, systematized, classified, compared and modified according to scientific procedures that can be followed and that are comparable. If we take as an example the debate stemming from the themes of architectural surveying, the question of measurement is always ignited (and set ablaze) with renewed interest, in relation to the refinement of the instruments and to the growing number of experts from different scientific disciplines increasingly involved in the science of metrology.

But measurement cannot be reduced to a merely quantitative characteristic, its qualitative distinction must also be sought for. From the secret geometries of artists, to the art of composing, to the dimensions of the different contexts of 'doing architecture,' measurement establishes the link with the spatial dimensions according to the rules and geometric-mathematical models (Euclid, topological, fractal, differential) that have a refined and superior theoretical consistency in which the imaginative action operates with great incisiveness.

The contributions have been divided into four topics in order to articulate this extensive discourse: the first, *Drawing and measurement for building a cosmic harmony*, is opened by Roberto de Rubertis, who invites us to refer today to a harmony that considers drawing more as intention (program, purpose), and measure as balance.

This is followed by the second topic *Drawing and measurement for structuring scientific knowledge*, entrusted to Stefano Brusaporci, which deals with "instruments for measuring by sight."

Drawing and measurement for defining a reason between thought and project is the third topic, opened by Riccardo Florio in dealing with the necessary dialectic drawing/project, to bring into play a process of transformation between man and reality. The fourth and last topic, *Drawing and measurement for communicating the complexity of images* is approached by Edoardo Dotto who, in a play between the parts, relaunches the need for a synthesis between the need to govern large amounts of data and the need to identify and manage those essential for ensuring an immediate and effective understanding of the forms.

These are thematic openings that stand out for their freedom of approach and their way of interpreting the significant binomial between science and art and between ontological qualities and quantities. The authors of the essays outline a scientific path reflecting their specific interests on the subject according to a common thread that links the need to govern the large quantities of data related to measurement, and the need to identify and manage, through drawing, the essential elements that then define the quality of the artifacts.

The thematic section dedicated to the Image has been entrusted to Laura Carlevaris, who proposes a commentary on Luigi Ferdinando Marsigli's *Mappa Metallographica*; while Ornella Zerlenga, for Readings/Rereadings, deals with the classic text by Leon Battista Alberti, *Ludi matematici*.

The issue ends with the reviews of the events that have characterized these last months of 2020 and of several volumes received from authors working within our Scientific Disciplinary Sector.

As always, I would like to conclude with a heartfelt thanks to all the editorial staff for their work, and with the hope that the contributions of this issue will increase our knowledge and create new perspectives for research on the theme.