

REINVENTING ARCHITECTURE THROUGH INTERPRETATION AND REPRODUCTION

Kristanti Dewi Paramita

*Department of Architecture
Universitas Indonesia
Indonesia*

ARSNET, 2022, Vol. 3, No. 2, 78–83

DOI: [10.7454/arsnet.v3i2.91](https://doi.org/10.7454/arsnet.v3i2.91)

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

The articles in this edition discuss how architecture reinvents its practices and meanings through the act of interpretation and reproduction. Architecture has been discussed as a three-part system; the material product, the representational image and the surrounding critical discourse (Forty, 2004). The reinvention of architecture signifies the ability for architecture to alternate or evolve, in which new interpretations and reproductions are continuously being made to the materiality, representation, and discourse of architecture. This study explores such acts of interpretations and reproductions and their possibilities in reinventing the practices of architecture.

The acts of interpretation and reproduction in architecture recognise how experiencing architecture as a whole requires individuals to capture those different dimensions and portray relations between them. The act of interpretation is tightly related to the representation and critical discourse of architecture, where certain language or codes are utilised to interpret and generate significance and meaning of architecture to the society (Forty, 2004). Such embedded meaning accumulates over time, critically driven by the encounter with things that generate a structured experience (Forty, 2004; Jencks & Baird, 1970). Interpretation of architecture takes particular interest in 'reading' architecture as a readable text, demonstrating arguments, shared expectations, and other social functions of architecture (Jencks & Baird, 1970).

The representation image and the critical discourse of architecture are not a consequential outcome of the material product, as the drawing and reading of architecture have significance and influence on its own rights (Evans, 1984). Representations can become the catalyst of the critical discussion of architecture and vice versa. For example, a photographic representation of an environment can become an instrument to develop the theoretical framework of architecture (Meninato, 2023). On the other hand, Archigram's criticality in the need to challenge the dominating paradigm of society has led to their provocative drawing works that reorient the course of architecture (Sadler, 2005). Therefore, the representation and critical discourse of architecture are not simply the accessories of the material product (Evans, 1984; Forty, 2004), but they interrelate with each other in projecting the various dimensions of understanding and experiencing architecture.

The act of reproduction is rooted in the creative processes that produce the physicality of architecture and its related representation and imagery in different scales, forms and

processes. The material product of architecture transcends from space to the city, and on the other hand, architectural representations may take forms in various media of photographs, drawings, or even digital data (Keslacy, 2017). Representations enable the articulation of architecture from multiple points of view, often not only about the architectural output but also the process of making and experiencing architecture itself (Evans, 2022). For example, representations of brick as a form of architectural material may take notes not only about the object itself but also its ecological production processes (Atmodiwirjo et al., 2018). The act of reproduction creates a translation or transformation of architecture and its representation of different needs of society.

Reinvention of architecture exists as a phenomenon due to the nature of space as an architectural paradox (Tschumi, 1975/2000; Zellner-Bassett, 2015). The paradox of architecture wrestles with the various dimensions of architecture, where architecture either emerges as a complete whole created through mental image or instead is navigated in parts based on perception (Tschumi, 1975/2000). Another paradox can also be perceived in how space tends to be designed as a closed system with fixed and precise formal vocabularies. However, on the other hand, in connection with the cultural system, such vocabularies may change when there is social and economic development in the society (Agrest, 1991). Architecture attempts to exist as an eternal and timeless entity, yet upon consideration, it is inherently a transient object (Till, 2013). The paradox of perception, production, and temporalities of architecture leads to the need to reinvent architecture to meet such a variety of agendas.

The urgency of reinventing architecture can also be driven by the technological shift that pushes the traditional boundaries of architecture (Steenon, 2017). To remain culturally relevant is to engage with innovations within the process of making, cooperating the qualitative aspects of design with quantitative measures of technologies (Rahim & Jamelle, 2020). Thus, the reinvention of architecture in the age of rapid technological shift repositions the material product, the representations and the critical discourse of architecture itself. For example, the new realm of digital realities, such as virtual and augmented realities, alters the idea of what the material product can be. Instead of as standalone objects, the digital realities are based on continuous interactive feedback between the real and the virtual (Arnaldi et al., 2018). Reinventions of the representations for such digital realities require strategies for reproducing spatial information to support the feedback loop.

This edition of ARSNET is interested in elaborating the various methods and processes of interpretations and reproductions as a form of architectural reinvention. The collection of articles in this volume discusses the digital reproduction of a cultural artefact, the construction of cognitive maps through various parts of the environment, translations of architecture in various forms of media, and the redefinition of traditional elements through time. The first article by Aiman Mohd Rashid, Lisa

Sidyawati, Nor Izura Tukiman, Norhaida Mohd Suaib, and Mohd Farid Mohd Ariff explores the creation process of augmented reality of Rumah Tukang Kahar, a traditional house built by local master craftsman as part of preserving cultural heritage. This study analyses the process of virtual collaboration happening in the creation of cultural heritage package outputs, consisting of a mobile application, a website, and AR-marked pamphlets. In the production of such augmented reality interfaces, the study focuses on finding new ways of accessing information and enabling the application users to manipulate the heritage object. Virtual collaboration between multidisciplinary researchers becomes vital to interpret the needs of visitors and to reproduce the different forms of architectural representations, expanding how cultural heritage can be engaged by society.

The second article by Putri Mahsa Gantari and Ferro Yudistira explores the notion of legibility as the coherence quality of the built environment driven by dynamic reading of the environment. Using the case study of an indoor environment, the study investigates the subjective process of reading the context to address a cognitive map, a mental map generated by individuals that requires the legibility of its surroundings. The study identifies how subjective reading allows the reciprocal relationship between individuals and the environment, informed by two-dimensional spatial knowledge in the form of landmark saliency and three-dimensional knowledge in the form of topological connection within the built form. The study indicates that the legibility of the built form happened in a multidimensional way, which is driven by the ability of the individuals to interpret the built environment objectively and subjectively.

The third article by Anissa Febrina, Muhammad Heru Arie Edytia, and Zia Faizurrahmany El Faridy explores the quantitative proportional contribution of architectural backgrounds in digital comics. The study investigates the different roles of architectural drawing as the background that supports comprehension of the storyline, representing reality, and creating points of interest and focus. The study conducts statistical comparative analysis to understand the significance of digital comics with and without such architectural background to fulfil such roles. This study provides a reflection on the way the interpretation of architectural representation that is reproduced in other media enables deep engagements between users and the narrative of architecture.

The fourth article by Luthfia Hananti and Resza Riskiyanto similarly explores the reproduction of architecture in the media, exploring the contrasting naturalistic and theatrical narratives of Tim Burton's *Edward Scissorhands* film. The story depicts two separate narratives of characters with contrasting spatialities, which then intersect and exchange at some point in the film, creating an intersection of narratives. Such intersections indicate how humans interact and adapt to their surroundings, appropriating the space despite initial unsuitability. The study suggests how the adaptation of space by users demonstrates changing interpretation and reproduction of space from one

contrasting setting to another, providing a possibility of the context-based narrative design approach.

The fifth article by Titihan Sarihati, I Made Gede Arimbawa, and Rexha Septine Faril Nanda discusses the transformation of *gebyok* Kudus as a traditional architectural element from the past to the present times. The study discusses the hermeneutic intertextuality of the meaning of such elements from different periods, which creates transformation and transposition towards the form, use, and position of *gebyok* Kudus across societies. The transformation and transposition analysis of *gebyok* Kudus highlights the various degrees of changes from a sacred architectural element used in a domestic context and imbued with various symbolic meanings, into a mass-produced element for temporary events in at public context in the current time. The study provides an overview of the changing interpretation of traditional elements in modern society, which alters the significance of *gebyok* Kudus in relation to the social, cultural, and environmental shifts happening across periods. In subsequent, new reproduction of *gebyok* with different forms and ways of making became necessary.

This edition of ARSNET redefines the possibilities of architectural reinvention driven by new interpretation and reproduction of the material product, representation, and critical discourse of architecture. Exploring technological shifts, emphasising relations and interaction between humans and context, and understanding cultural evolution becomes necessary to understand the various means and driving forces of architectural reinvention. Understanding such driving forces enables individuals to acquire a thorough but dynamic experience of architecture, with deep articulation of meaning.

References

- Agrest, D. (1991). *Architecture from without: Theoretical framings for a critical practice*. MIT Press.
- Arnaldi, B., Guitton, P., & Moreau, G. (2018). *Virtual reality and augmented reality: Myths and realities*. John Wiley & Sons.
- Atmodiwirjo, P., Johaness, M., Saginatari, D. P., & Yatmo, Y. A. (2018). Ecological aspects of the traditional brick making process in Pedurungan Kidul, Central Java. *E3S Web of Conferences*, 67, Article 04034. <https://doi.org/10.1051/e3sconf/20186704034>
- Evans, R. (1984). In front of lines that leave nothing behind: Daniel Libeskind Chamber Works. *AA Files*, 6, 89–96. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/29543404>
- Evans, R. (2022). *Translations from drawing to building and other essays*. AA Publications.
- Forty, A. (2004). *Words and buildings: A vocabulary of modern architecture*. Thames & Hudson.
- Jencks, C., & Baird, G. (1970). *Meaning in architecture*. Barrie & Rockcliff The Cresset Press.
- Keslacy, E. M. (2017). The legibility of environment: Cooper Hewitt, Smithsonian Design Museum (1968-1976). *Journal of Architectural Education*, 71(2), 154–170. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10464883.2017.1340769>
- Meninato, P. (2023). Theory follows photography: The evolving gaze of Denise Scott Brown. *Interiority*, 6(1), 5–20. <https://doi.org/10.7454/in.v6i1.233>

- Rahim, A., & Jamelle, H. (2020). Architectural impact after the digital. *Architectural Design*, 90(5), 6–13. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ad.2605>
- Sadler, S. (2005). *Archigram: Architecture without architecture*. The MIT Press.
- Steenson, M. W. (2017). *Architectural intelligence: How designers and architects created the digital landscape*. The MIT Press.
- Till, J. (2013). *Architecture depends*. MIT Press.
- Tschumi, B. (2000). The architectural paradox. In K. M. Hays (Ed.), *Architecture theory since 1968* (pp. 214–229). The MIT Press. (Original work published 1975)
- Zellner-Bassett, P. (2015). Between the pyramid and the labyrinth: Exploring the ‘third condition.’ *103rd ACSA Annual Meeting Proceedings, The Expanding Periphery and the Migrating Center*, 457–464. <https://www.acsa-arch.org/chapter/between-the-pyramid-and-the-labyrinth-exploring-the-third-condition/>