

# TRANSLATING THE ARCHITECTURAL LANGUAGE OF LOCALITIES

*Kristanti Dewi Paramita*

*Department of Architecture  
Universitas Indonesia  
Indonesia*

*ARSNET, 2025, Vol. 5, No. 1, 1–5  
DOI: 10.7454/arsnet/v5i1.149  
ISSN 2777-0710 (online)  
ISSN 2777-0702 (print)*

---

Correspondence Address: Kristanti Dewi Paramita, Department of Architecture, Faculty of Engineering, Universitas Indonesia, Kampus UI, Depok 16424, Indonesia. Email: [kristanti.dewi@ui.ac.id](mailto:kristanti.dewi@ui.ac.id)

2

The articles in this ARSNET edition discuss the understanding and mechanisms of architectural language in conveying the notion of localities. Language is a vital means of understanding, occupying, and designing architecture (Forty, 2004). The appearance and construction of architecture is based on a particularly universal language, with some variations across the regions (Unwin, 2014). On the other hand, the language of architecture consists of vocabularies and concepts through which people may communicate and understand space, enabling potential dialogue of how the space can be reconfigured (Bhatt, 2010). In this sense, language exists in the text and drawing required to communicate the ideas, meaning, and experience of architecture, yet it is also embedded in the physicalities of architecture itself. The use of language in understanding or designing architecture is aimed to clarify uses or functions, provide expressive qualities, or exist simply as a singular symbol of the design work (Donougho, 1987).

The language of architecture projects the distinctive meaning of experience in a spatial context (Terzoglou, 2018). This edition focuses on how the idea of localities manifests through various architectural languages. Just as language carries meaning, localities bring significance to architecture (Unwin, 2014). The ideas of locality are created through systems of architectural language that builds connections and correlations of all of its elements (Terzoglou, 2018). Architectural language, created from physical elements, patterns, and structures of architecture constructs localities through the familiarity and the shared meaning it provides (Unwin, 2014).

The materiality of architecture is a form of language that gives an impression and reflects a form of social and cultural meaning; constituted through material relations with society and the surrounding landscape (Moravánszky, 1996; Schröpfer, 2012; Wahid et al., 2021). The language of material strengthens the articulation of form and draws its meaning, on the other hand, it may also be celebrated on how it provides values and character from its fabrication process (Harahap et al., 2020). The localities of architectural material exist in its singular meaning or evolve from its sourcing process.

The language of architecture constructs local identities in context through cultural practices as its medium (Atmodiwirjo & Yatmo, 2021), knitting everyday elements of architecture, and creating a dialogue between techniques and material (Paramita et al., 2022; Riskiyanto et al., 2021). Cultural practices reflect the collective and use of language that frames its localities.

However, architectural language may also be utilised as a way to exercise self-understanding. For example, current discourse has highlighted various communication techniques to make sense of and solve architectural problems through its language, among them notably through the use of metaphoric language (Hadian & Arefi, 2016). Metaphors blur between the imagination of the self and reality, creating a unified comparison between them to clarify the design intent (Unwin, 2019).

A correlated approach is understanding the language of architecture by establishing its semiotic meaning through a system of signs (Terzoglou, 2018). This approach differs from metaphors as building can be divided into parts and separately analysed as a sign language that forms overall local identities (Donougho, 1987). Such individual imaginaries potentially transform between one form of localities, projecting it to other contexts with different forms of meaning. Other forms of imagination are exercised through the architectural language that enables growth and speculation, bringing indeterminacy and transience to its architecture (Sadler, 2005). Such speculative language brings the possibility of new localities to emerge. Developing new localities requires the use of drawings to inform qualities that are difficult or imprecise, displaying indistinctness and ambiguity (Forty, 2004).

The articles in this issue of ARSNET interrogate the language-based methods and approaches to constructing meaningful ideas of localities in architecture. The study explores localities shaped by cultural and material practices, appropriation of cultural representations, speculation of new human-nature connections, and transformation of identities. The first article by Muhammad Amir Akram, Arnis Rochma Harani, and Syahrul Nizam Kamaruzzaman explores the creation of a playful public interior through understanding traditional games as a form of cultural practice. The localities of traditional games are driven by their rules and processes, enabling user participation and spatial flexibility.

The next article by Imtihan Hanom, I Gede Mugi Raharja, I Made Pande Artadi, and I Ketut Sida Arsa explores the aesthetic representation of Pinisi as the basis of an attractive urban experience. Pinisi is a form of traditional boat craftsmanship of the Makassar people, South Sulawesi, Indonesia. The appropriation of its aesthetic elements within urban facilities in the city of Jakarta expands the roles of such facilities in an urban context and provides added value for its users. The existence of architectural elements that reproduce the aesthetics of Pinisi as a form of locality become something that enriches the urban experience.

Speculating on a new form of locality, the third paper by Heidy Sekardini and Rini Suryantini experiments with a form of symbiotic architecture which shifts the ecological idea of connecting with nature into being as nature. The study creates an architectural proposition where its living beings grow in integration with its surrounding environment, generated using computational scripting methods. This study questions

and challenges current idea of locality, creating predictions of situations that bring new contextual meaning.

The subsequent article by Audrey Natasya, Phebe Valencia, Agnes Satyawati Azarja, and Bambang Tutuka Adi Nugroho focuses on the material practices of a sustainable workplace interior. This study elaborates on the implementation of sustainability principles for designing an interior working environment. Expression of materials becomes necessary to achieve a sustainable workplace environment, establishing environmental balance and supporting the well-being of its users. Through such expression, the idea of localities is situated as an embedded aspect of how the material is sourced and utilised in the design process.

The last article by Miftahul Karima, Agus S. Ekomadyo, Alfathri Adlin, and Zahrul Athanafi explores the reinterpretation of Riau architectural identities. The study conducts a semiotic study of traditional Riau architecture and how it can be transformed in contemporary public buildings. The study explores particular building elements and their associated meanings in accordance with the local culture. Appropriation of such elements in other contexts creates new meanings that are then defined as myths. The existence of myths enables the reproduction of the idea of localities, between traditional to contemporary buildings, and between past and future.

This edition of ARSNET focuses on investigating how ideas of localities do not exist in static form within architectural artefacts or are limited to particular contextual settings. Instead, through various language-based design methods, the notion of architectural localities becomes dynamic, can be reinterpreted across contexts and temporalities, and are open to questions and speculations. The locality of architecture expands beyond the physicality of the building itself, incorporating overall systems of production and use of such building. The various approaches and methods of revealing, translating, and reinterpreting the notion of localities contribute to the ways language becomes meaningful in the experience and production of architecture.

## References

- Atmodiwirjo, P., & Yatmo, Y. A. (2021). Urban interiority: Emerging cultural and spatial practices. *Interiority*, 4(1), 1–4. <https://doi.org/10.7454/in.v4i1.131>
- Bhatt, R. (2010). Christopher Alexander's pattern language: An alternative exploration of space-making practices. *The Journal of Architecture*, 15(6), 711–729. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13602365.2011.533537>
- Donougho, M. (1987). The language of architecture. *Journal of Aesthetic Education*, 21(3), 53–67. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3332870>
- Forty, A. (2004). *Words and buildings: A vocabulary of modern architecture*. Thames & Hudson.
- Hadian, A. S., & Arefi, M. (2016). Metaphor, analogy, and the discourse of originality: Five Iranian case studies. *Social Semiotics*, 26(5), 541–562. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10350330.2015.1137162>
- Harahap, M. M. Y., Suryantini, R., Paramita, K. D., & Yatmo, Y. A. (2020). Sun-drying in traditional brickmaking: Strategies for achieving efficiency. *International Journal of Technology*, 11(7), Article 1414. <https://doi.org/10.14716/ijtech.v11i7.4458>

Moravánszky, Á. (1996). 'Truth to material' vs 'the principle of cladding': The language of materials in architecture. *AA Files*, 31, 39–46.

Paramita, K. D., Yatmo, Y. A., & Saginatari, D. P. (2022). Living with smoke: A fluid domestic environment. *Home Cultures*, 19(2), 79–102. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17406315.2022.2115753>

Riskiyanto, R., Yatmo, Y. A., & Atmodiwirjo, P. (2021). Reading (hidden) dialogue of organic tectonics. *The Plan Journal*, 6(2), 415–435. <https://doi.org/10.15274/tpj.2021.06.02.5>

Sadler, S. (2005). *Archigram: Architecture without architecture*. MIT Press.

Schröpfer, T. (Ed.). (2012). *Material design: Informing architecture by materiality*. Birkhäuser.

Terzoglou, N.-I. (2018). Architecture as meaningful language: Space, place and narrativity. *Linguistics and Literature Studies*, 6(3), 120–132. <https://doi.org/10.13189/lls.2018.060303>

Unwin, S. (2014). *Analysing architecture* (4th ed.). Routledge.

Unwin, S. (2019). *Metaphor: An exploration of the metaphorical dimensions and potential of architecture*. Routledge.

Wahid, A. R., Paramita, K. D., & Yatmo, Y. A. (2021). Inscriptions: Narrating the spatial dynamics of the immaterial interior. *Interiority*, 4(1), 43–62. <https://doi.org/10.7454/in.v4i1.87>