

The Archival Apparatus: Professional Journals as an Interpretive Infrastructure of Architecture

Shao-Yu Huang, National Taipei University of Technology, Taiwan

The European Conference on Arts & Humanities 2026
Official Conference Proceedings

Abstract

Contemporary architectural development in Taiwan is defined by a compressed phenomenon, wherein the discipline operates as an externally transplanted and fragmented system rather than a linear cultural evolution. Within this landscape, architectural history manifests as an interpretive phenomenon—a constructed discourse necessitating an atypical historical archive. Consequently, professional journals in Taiwan perform a role distinct from Western traditions: they do not merely record history but produce it discursively. Endowed with a half-century legacy as the institutional organ of the National Association of Architects, Taiwan Architect (TA) functions as the definitive repository of professional memory. In the pre-globalisation era, TA operated as a critical discursive portal, facilitating the transnational translation of theoretical frameworks and anchoring a discipline in transition. By synthesising Colomina's (1994) proposition of media as a site of architectural construction and Speaks's (1993, p. 6) conceptualisation of writing as “invisible infrastructure”, this paper argues that TA's “fragmented assembly-like texts” constitute the primary ontological site of identity negotiation. These assemblages are not historical voids but the active material of Taiwan's modern architectural derivation. The critical argument posits that interpretive historiography emerges as an idiosyncratic manifestation of the Taiwanese condition, wherein the professional archive acts as a surrogate for traditional historical continuity. Within this framework, mediated representation functions as the primary historiographical act. This research proposes that in compressed modernities, this “Taiwanese method” establishes the institutional archive as the foundational site for an indigenous tradition—one born from, and sustained by, the continuous process of mediated interpretation.

Keywords: archival apparatus, interpretive infrastructure, Taiwan Architect

iafor

The International Academic Forum
www.iafor.org

Introduction

Architecture Beyond Buildings

Architectural history is conventionally written through buildings. Canonical works, urban transformations and material artefacts are frequently treated as the principal evidence through which architectural development is understood. Yet architecture has never been constituted by buildings alone. As architectural ideas circulate through criticism, editorial practice and professional publication, they are interpreted, reorganised and legitimised as disciplinary knowledge. Architectural journals therefore perform a role that extends beyond documentation: they provide intellectual conditions through which architecture becomes visible as a discipline. As Colomina (1994) argues, modern architecture cannot be separated from the media through which it is represented, while Speaks (1993, p. 6) similarly identifies architectural writing as an “invisible infrastructure” through which the discipline continuously reproduces itself. From this perspective, professional journals are not passive records of architectural production but active sites in the production and organisation of architectural knowledge.

This proposition has been extensively discussed in relation to European and North American architectural cultures (Colomina, 1994; Crysler et al., 2012; Rattenbury, 2002). It raises a different theoretical question, however, in societies where modern architecture did not emerge through a continuous historical tradition. Taiwan represents such a condition. Rather than evolving through the gradual accumulation of institutions, theoretical schools and professional conventions, Taiwanese architecture developed through successive episodes of colonial rule, political realignment and rapid modernisation. Architectural education, professional organisations and theoretical frameworks were introduced from external contexts and subsequently adapted to local practice. Under these circumstances, architectural history cannot simply be understood as the chronological accumulation of buildings. It is equally a history of how architectural knowledge has been organised, interpreted and reconstructed across discontinuous historical conditions.

The production of disciplinary knowledge therefore involves more than the preservation of architectural objects or the transmission of established ideas. It also requires mechanisms through which different forms of architectural activity can be brought into relation. Projects, theoretical positions, professional debates and institutional developments do not automatically form a coherent historical narrative simply by occurring within the same period. Their significance is produced through acts of interpretation that establish connections between otherwise separate events. Architectural media become important precisely at this point: they provide recurring sites in which architectural activities can be selected, compared, contextualised and incorporated into broader professional conversations.

Such processes also involve acts of inclusion and exclusion. No publication can represent the entirety of architectural production, and editorial space necessarily requires decisions about what merits attention and how particular material should be presented. Selection therefore has epistemological consequences. The repeated publication of particular themes, forms of practice or modes of criticism can contribute to their recognition as significant disciplinary concerns, while subjects that receive limited attention may remain peripheral to the dominant professional narrative. This does not imply that editorial practice determines architectural value in a straightforward or absolute manner. Rather, it suggests that publication participates in the institutional processes through which architectural significance is negotiated and stabilised.

The temporal dimension of publication is equally important. Unlike a single exhibition or isolated critical text, a professional journal operates through repetition and succession. Issues accumulate, editorial positions change, and previously established concerns can be revisited from new perspectives. Through this cumulative process, publication creates relationships across time, allowing architectural discourse to acquire a degree of continuity even when the wider conditions of architectural production are subject to disruption. Editorial continuity therefore provides not simply a record of disciplinary change but a means through which change itself can be interpreted as part of an ongoing architectural discourse.

Architectural history is conventionally written through buildings. Canonical works, urban transformations and material artefacts are frequently treated as the principal evidence through which architectural development is understood. Yet architecture has never been constituted by buildings alone. As architectural ideas circulate through criticism, editorial practice and professional publication, they are interpreted, reorganised and legitimised as disciplinary knowledge. Architectural journals therefore perform a role that extends beyond documentation: they provide intellectual conditions through which architecture becomes visible as a discipline. As Colomina (1994) argues, modern architecture cannot be separated from the media through which it is represented, while Speaks (1993, p. 6) similarly identifies architectural writing as an “invisible infrastructure” through which the discipline continuously reproduces itself. From this perspective, professional journals are not passive records of architectural production but active sites in the production and organisation of architectural knowledge.

This proposition has been extensively discussed in relation to European and North American architectural cultures (Colomina, 1994; Crysler et al., 2012; Rattenbury, 2002). It raises a different theoretical question, however, in societies where modern architecture did not emerge through a continuous historical tradition. Taiwan represents such a condition. Rather than evolving through the gradual accumulation of institutions, theoretical schools and professional conventions, Taiwanese architecture developed through successive episodes of colonial rule, political realignment and rapid modernisation. Architectural education, professional organisations and theoretical frameworks were introduced from external contexts and subsequently adapted to local practice. Under these circumstances, architectural history cannot simply be understood as the chronological accumulation of buildings. It is equally a history of how architectural knowledge has been organised, interpreted and reconstructed across discontinuous historical conditions.

The production of disciplinary knowledge therefore involves more than the preservation of architectural objects or the transmission of established ideas. It also requires mechanisms through which different forms of architectural activity can be brought into relation. Projects, theoretical positions, professional debates and institutional developments do not automatically form a coherent historical narrative simply by occurring within the same period. Their significance is produced through acts of interpretation that establish connections between otherwise separate events. Architectural media become important precisely at this point: they provide recurring sites in which architectural activities can be selected, compared, contextualised and incorporated into broader professional conversations.

Such processes also involve acts of inclusion and exclusion. No publication can represent the entirety of architectural production, and editorial space necessarily requires decisions about what merits attention and how particular material should be presented. Selection therefore has epistemological consequences. The repeated publication of particular themes, forms of practice or modes of criticism can contribute to their recognition as significant disciplinary concerns,

while subjects that receive limited attention may remain peripheral to the dominant professional narrative. This does not imply that editorial practice determines architectural value in a straightforward or absolute manner. Rather, it suggests that publication participates in the institutional processes through which architectural significance is negotiated and stabilised.

The temporal dimension of publication is equally important. Unlike a single exhibition or isolated critical text, a professional journal operates through repetition and succession. Issues accumulate, editorial positions change, and previously established concerns can be revisited from new perspectives. Through this cumulative process, publication creates relationships across time, allowing architectural discourse to acquire a degree of continuity even when the wider conditions of architectural production are subject to disruption. Editorial continuity therefore provides not simply a record of disciplinary change but a means through which change itself can be interpreted as part of an ongoing architectural discourse.

Constructing Disciplinary Coherence

The question, then, is how an architectural discipline constructs coherence when historical continuity itself is fragmented. In such contexts, disciplinary coherence cannot be located solely in buildings, institutions or individual architects. Professional journals constitute one of the principal mechanisms through which disparate projects, debates and professional experiences are brought into relation. Through editorial selection, thematic organisation and critical writing, they establish connections across otherwise disconnected forms of architectural activity. The journal thus does more than preserve architectural knowledge after its production; it participates in organising the conditions through which such knowledge becomes recognisable and acquires disciplinary significance.

This process should not be understood as the production of a singular or unified architectural position. Disciplinary coherence can instead emerge through the continued juxtaposition of different perspectives, debates and professional priorities. A journal provides an institutional setting in which disagreements and shifts in architectural thinking can be recorded alongside one another, allowing changing positions to become legible within a broader historical sequence. Coherence, in this sense, does not mean consensus. It refers to the capacity to establish relationships among heterogeneous forms of knowledge so that they can participate in an ongoing disciplinary conversation.

Within Taiwan, *Taiwan Architect* provides a significant case through which to examine this process. Founded in 1975 by the National Association of Architects, it has served as a sustained institutional platform for professional communication and architectural discourse (Huang & Lin, 2024). Across changing political, economic and cultural circumstances, the journal has maintained an editorial project extending beyond the reporting of architectural practice. Through thematic issues, editorial commentary, critical essays and professional debate, it has selected, connected and framed architectural concerns, contributing to a shared framework through which Taiwanese architecture has understood itself as a discipline.

Historical evidence from the journal's editorial development makes this cumulative function more concrete. Established in 1975, *Taiwan Architect* extended the systematic reporting practices of earlier professional publications while providing a continuing platform for professional reporting and architectural journalism. During the stabilisation period from 1979 to 1985, its editorial strategy increasingly treated the journal as a form of documentation through which Taiwanese architectural development could be retrospectively organised. The

number of theoretical and historical articles grew, coverage of local works expanded, and international architectural ideas were increasingly reframed through the interpretations of local professionals rather than reproduced simply through translation (Huang, 2023).

The journal's editorial structure also became progressively more deliberate. From 1980, news, essays and architectural works were organised into a three-part structure, accompanied by special issues on architectural criticism and theory. Later editorial phases expanded the use of criticism, interviews and editorial committees, and by the 1990s works, practitioners and commentary were increasingly brought together within a shared editorial framework. Across more than four decades of change, these accumulated practices produced what can be understood as an editorial tradition: a continuing body of professional knowledge about how architectural material could be selected, contextualised and connected. This historical development gives empirical substance to the notion of interpretive infrastructure, showing that disciplinary continuity was not merely recorded by *Taiwan Architect* but actively produced through changing editorial practices (Huang, 2023).

The significance of such continuity lies not simply in the duration of publication but in the possibility of cumulative interpretation. A long-running professional journal can allow architectural questions to be revisited, reframed and placed into relation with subsequent developments. Earlier debates may acquire new meanings when viewed through later professional concerns, while emerging issues can be positioned within an existing field of disciplinary reference. Publication thus creates a temporal structure through which architectural knowledge can accumulate without requiring the discipline itself to remain intellectually static.

Editorial Practice as Interpretive Infrastructure

Although previous scholarship has examined Taiwanese architectural magazines as historical records, professional media and cultural representations (Hsiao, 2001; Jiang, 2003; Su, 2014), considerably less attention has been devoted to the epistemological function of editorial practice. Existing studies have primarily analysed what professional journals contain, whereas comparatively little research has examined how editorial organisation itself shapes relationships between different forms of architectural knowledge. Editorial decisions concerning selection, omission, sequencing and thematic framing influence which architectural issues acquire disciplinary significance, how professional debates are structured and which forms of knowledge become institutionally legitimate. Editorial practice therefore participates in the construction of architectural discourse rather than merely documenting architectural activity.

This function becomes particularly significant when editorial practice is understood as cumulative rather than episodic. An individual editorial decision may have limited significance in isolation, yet repeated acts of selection and framing can establish enduring patterns through which particular architectural concerns become associated with professional identity, historical memory or disciplinary debate. Editorial organisation therefore operates across both individual issues and longer sequences of publication. It provides a structure through which architectural knowledge can be repeatedly encountered, reconsidered and connected to changing professional contexts.

To address this dimension of professional publication, the study develops the concept of interpretive infrastructure. The concept builds upon the understanding of architectural media

as constitutive of architectural knowledge and of architectural writing as an infrastructural practice within the discipline. It directs attention to the editorial structures and practices through which architectural knowledge is organised, connected and sustained over time. Interpretive infrastructure is therefore understood not as a fixed institutional apparatus, but as an ongoing process of mediation through which architectural ideas acquire relationships, continuity and disciplinary visibility.

Accordingly, *Taiwan Architect* is examined not principally as an archival repository of Taiwanese architecture, but as an interpretive infrastructure through which architectural knowledge has been organised and reproduced. Its significance lies not only in the material it preserves, but also in the editorial practices through which disparate forms of architectural activity are brought into relation. By examining the journal's editorial organisation, institutional continuity and modes of knowledge production, this study considers how professional publication has contributed to the construction of disciplinary coherence within the context of Taiwan's discontinuous modernisation.

From Architectural Media to Interpretive Infrastructure

Media and the Production of Architectural Knowledge

The recognition that architectural media are constitutive of architectural knowledge has shifted attention from the building as an autonomous object towards the processes through which architecture acquires disciplinary meaning. Colomina (1994) demonstrates that modern architecture emerged alongside systems of mass communication through which buildings were photographed, published, exhibited and interpreted. These media did not simply communicate architectural works after their completion; they shaped the ways in which architecture was conceived, experienced and understood. Publication consequently became an important site through which architectural ideas acquired cultural and disciplinary significance.

Speaks (1993) extends this understanding by drawing attention to the infrastructural role of architectural writing. Writing, criticism and theoretical discourse provide the conceptual means through which architectural ideas are organised and transmitted within the profession. Their significance therefore lies not only in the representation of architectural production, but also in the relationships they establish among ideas, projects and professional debates. Architecture is consequently constituted through processes of mediation in which knowledge is continually selected, interpreted and circulated.

This process of mediation is not limited to the communication of completed works. Architectural media also establish the conditions under which particular forms of architectural activity become available for disciplinary recognition. To be published is not simply to be made visible; it is to be positioned within a field of professional attention. A project may acquire significance through the way it is associated with a particular debate, placed alongside other projects, or interpreted through a specific conceptual framework. Media therefore participate in transforming individual architectural events into objects of shared disciplinary knowledge.

For professional journals, this process takes place through an ongoing editorial structure rather than through individual acts of representation. Each issue involves decisions concerning what is selected for publication, what is omitted, how materials are sequenced and which themes are given emphasis. Such decisions shape the relationships through which architectural events become intelligible within a broader professional discourse. Editorial practice thus forms an

important dimension of architectural knowledge production, linking individual projects and dispersed professional activities to wider disciplinary concerns.

The importance of this process lies partly in its capacity to produce relationships across otherwise separate forms of architectural activity. A building can be connected to a professional debate; a design approach can be situated within a broader historical development; and the work of an individual practitioner can be related to institutional or disciplinary transformations. Through such connections, architectural knowledge is not merely accumulated as information but organised into patterns of meaning. The journal therefore occupies a position between architectural production and disciplinary interpretation, mediating how particular practices enter into a wider field of architectural knowledge.

Editorial Practice and Disciplinary Organisation

The epistemological significance of the journal lies precisely in this capacity to organise. Editorial selection does not simply determine what enters the public record; it also influences how architectural issues are framed and related to one another. Thematic organisation can connect projects produced in different contexts, while editorial commentary can position particular architectural concerns within broader professional debates. Through repetition and continuity across successive issues, such relationships can acquire a degree of stability and become part of the discipline's shared conceptual framework.

Editorial organisation is therefore relational rather than merely classificatory. To select a project is to bring it into a particular field of comparison and interpretation. To place two projects within the same thematic framework is to suggest a relationship between them, even where no such relationship exists at the level of architectural production itself. Similarly, recurring attention to a particular issue can gradually establish that issue as a matter of disciplinary concern. The editorial process thus contributes to the construction of categories, associations and priorities through which architectural knowledge becomes intelligible.

The journal therefore operates through an accumulation of editorial decisions rather than through any single publication. Selection, classification, sequencing and thematic framing establish patterns through which architectural knowledge can be recognised and retained. What appears as a coherent professional discourse is consequently produced through the continuous organisation of dispersed material. Editorial practice is not simply an intermediary between architectural production and its audience; it is part of the institutional process through which architectural knowledge is structured.

This cumulative process also gives the journal a particular temporal character. Individual issues are temporary interventions in professional discourse, but their repetition creates a longer institutional sequence. Later publications can refer implicitly or explicitly to earlier concerns, while recurring themes can acquire different meanings as professional and institutional circumstances change. The significance of the journal therefore emerges not only from the content of individual issues but from the relationships that become possible across issues and across time.

This perspective also shifts the understanding of the architectural journal as an archive. An archive is commonly associated with the preservation of existing records, whereas editorial practice involves an active process of selection and interpretation. The journal does not simply retain disciplinary memory but participates in determining what constitutes that memory and

how its different elements are connected. Its archival function is therefore inseparable from its interpretative function.

This distinction is important because preservation alone does not guarantee disciplinary continuity. Architectural materials may survive without continuing to participate in architectural discourse. For knowledge to remain disciplinary, it must remain available for circulation, comparison and reinterpretation. Editorial organisation contributes to this process by repeatedly bringing selected materials into relation with changing professional concerns. The journal can therefore function not simply as a repository of what has already been produced, but as an institutional mechanism through which past and present architectural knowledge remain connected.

Interpretive Infrastructure

These processes are conceptualised here through the notion of interpretive infrastructure. The term refers to the enduring editorial structures and practices through which architectural knowledge is organised, connected and reproduced as disciplinary knowledge. It extends the understanding of media as constitutive of architecture by directing attention to the institutional processes that allow particular interpretations to persist across time.

Interpretive infrastructure is not material or technological infrastructure. Its operation depends instead upon institutional continuity and recurring practices of publication, thematic curation, editorial commentary and critical reflection. Through these practices, relationships among projects, ideas and professional debates can be established and maintained beyond individual acts of architectural production. The concept therefore emphasises continuity as an outcome of repeated editorial organisation rather than as a given historical condition.

The concept also differs from a conventional understanding of the archive. While an archive primarily implies the preservation and accessibility of records, an interpretive infrastructure concerns the conditions through which preserved materials can continue to acquire disciplinary meaning. Its operation is therefore both cumulative and relational. It accumulates materials over time while simultaneously establishing connections among them. What matters is not simply that architectural projects and debates are retained, but that they remain capable of being brought into new configurations of meaning.

Such an infrastructure performs several related functions. It selects and orders material, establishes connections among otherwise dispersed forms of architectural activity, and provides interpretative frameworks through which professional concerns can be understood collectively. It also facilitates circulation: architectural ideas move from individual projects into professional discourse, from one issue to another, and from contemporary discussion into longer-term disciplinary memory. Through these processes, architectural knowledge can accumulate rather than remain a series of isolated observations.

Circulation is particularly important because disciplinary knowledge depends upon more than initial production. An architectural idea becomes part of a professional field through its ability to move between different contexts of discussion and interpretation. Publication provides one of the institutional mechanisms through which such movement can occur. The journal brings architectural production into contact with criticism, professional debate and historical reflection, allowing material produced for one immediate context to acquire significance within another.

Interpretive infrastructure therefore operates across different temporal scales. At the level of the individual issue, it responds to contemporary architectural concerns. Across successive issues, it establishes patterns of repetition and difference. Over longer periods, these accumulated materials become part of the discipline's memory and can be revisited from new historical perspectives. The infrastructure is consequently not static: its meaning changes as the materials it contains are reinterpreted and as the professional conditions surrounding them are transformed.

This temporal dimension makes continuity an active institutional achievement. Continuity does not simply result from the uninterrupted survival of a professional institution or the existence of a stable disciplinary tradition. It can be produced through repeated acts of selection, organisation, circulation and interpretation that allow knowledge to remain connected across changing circumstances. The concept of interpretive infrastructure thus shifts attention from continuity as a historical given towards continuity as something that is institutionally maintained.

The significance of the journal consequently lies not only in the information it contains, but in the organisational structures through which that information becomes meaningful within the discipline. It provides a recurring framework through which architectural materials can be connected, revisited and interpreted. In this sense, the journal functions as an interpretive infrastructure because it mediates between architectural production and disciplinary memory while sustaining the possibility of continued interpretation.

Interpretive Infrastructure Under Conditions of Discontinuity

The theoretical significance of interpretive infrastructure becomes particularly evident where architectural development has not followed a continuous institutional trajectory. In Taiwan, modern architectural development was shaped by successive political transformations, institutional reconfigurations and the introduction and adaptation of architectural ideas from external contexts. Architectural education, professional organisations and theoretical frameworks were consequently formed through multiple and sometimes discontinuous processes rather than through a single accumulated tradition.

Under such conditions, the continuity of architectural discourse cannot be assumed to emerge automatically from established institutions or long-standing theoretical schools. The transmission of architectural knowledge may instead involve interruptions, reorganisations and changes in the institutional frameworks through which professional knowledge is produced. This makes the mechanisms through which knowledge is connected across different periods particularly significant.

Professional publication provides one such mechanism. Through sustained editorial activity, architectural journals can establish relationships across otherwise fragmented historical contexts and provide a framework through which architectural knowledge remains available for circulation and reinterpretation. This does not mean that a journal can resolve institutional discontinuities or create a unified architectural tradition. Rather, its significance lies in its capacity to provide a continuing site in which heterogeneous forms of professional experience and architectural knowledge can be assembled and connected.

This perspective also complicates an understanding of disciplinary history as a linear accumulation of ideas. Where institutional conditions change, the meaning of architectural

knowledge may also be reorganised. Earlier practices may be forgotten, recovered or reinterpreted; professional concerns may acquire new significance; and relationships between local and external forms of knowledge may be repeatedly renegotiated. An interpretive infrastructure provides one of the institutional settings in which these processes can occur, allowing architectural materials from different moments to remain available for comparison and reinterpretation.

The role of the journal under such conditions is therefore not simply to preserve a continuous historical record. Its more significant function may be to mediate discontinuity by creating connections among materials that emerge from different institutional and historical circumstances. Such connections do not erase differences between periods. Instead, they make those differences legible within a continuing field of disciplinary discussion.

This perspective provides the basis for understanding Taiwan Architect as an interpretive infrastructure. Rather than approaching the journal primarily as a repository of historical information, its significance can be considered in relation to the editorial structures through which architectural ideas, professional practices and disciplinary concerns may be organised and sustained across changing historical circumstances. The focus therefore rests not on what the journal records alone, but on how editorial practices can organise relationships among architectural production, professional discourse and disciplinary memory.

The following section turns from this theoretical proposition to the historical conditions in which such an infrastructure became significant. Rather than assuming a continuous formation of architectural knowledge in Taiwan, it examines the institutional and historical discontinuities through which professional knowledge was produced, reorganised and transmitted. This provides the context for considering how Taiwan Architect operated within, and responded to, these changing conditions.

Conclusion

Reconsidering the Formation of Architectural Knowledge

The preceding discussion has situated interpretive infrastructure within the historical problem of discontinuous architectural development. In contexts where architectural knowledge has been formed through successive institutional transformations, the continuity of disciplinary knowledge cannot simply be assumed. It depends, at least in part, upon the institutional practices through which architectural ideas, professional experiences and historical records are connected and made available for continued interpretation. The argument developed in this paper therefore begins with a reconsideration of how architectural knowledge is understood.

If architecture is constituted not only through buildings and professional practice but also through the processes by which architectural ideas are selected, interpreted and circulated, then the institutional conditions of publication become integral to the formation of the discipline. Professional journals should consequently be understood as more than documentary media. Through sustained editorial practices, they provide frameworks within which architectural projects, debates and professional experiences can acquire continuity and disciplinary meaning.

The concept of interpretive infrastructure offers a way of conceptualising this role. Unlike conventional understandings of infrastructure as material or technical systems, interpretive infrastructure operates through the organisation and continuity of knowledge. Its significance

lies in the capacity of recurring editorial practices to establish relationships among otherwise dispersed forms of architectural activity. Selection, classification, thematic organisation and critical interpretation enable architectural knowledge to accumulate across time rather than remain confined to individual projects, practitioners or historical moments.

This perspective also suggests that disciplinary continuity should not necessarily be understood as the uninterrupted development of a stable intellectual tradition. Continuity may instead be actively produced through institutional practices that connect different periods, ideas and professional experiences. The history of a discipline is therefore shaped not only by what is built, taught or theorised, but also by the institutional mechanisms through which these activities are interpreted and brought into relation.

Seen in this way, publication becomes part of the institutional history of architecture rather than simply a means through which that history is documented. The significance of a professional journal lies partly in its capacity to sustain connections between architectural production and disciplinary memory. What is published can remain available for later interpretation, while recurring editorial attention can establish relationships between different moments of architectural practice. The journal therefore contributes to the conditions under which architectural knowledge can acquire continuity and historical significance.

Architectural Publication and Discontinuous Modernisation

This proposition is particularly relevant to architectural contexts characterised by historical and institutional discontinuity. Where disciplinary traditions have developed through successive political transformations, institutional reconfigurations and the adaptation of knowledge from multiple external contexts, coherence cannot simply be assumed as the natural outcome of historical accumulation. It may instead depend upon institutions capable of sustaining professional communication and organising heterogeneous forms of knowledge over time.

In such contexts, continuity becomes an institutional problem. Architectural knowledge may persist through buildings, educational institutions, professional organisations and individual practices, but these forms of continuity can themselves be disrupted or transformed by broader political and institutional change. The question is therefore not simply whether architectural knowledge survives periods of transformation, but how relationships between different forms of knowledge can be maintained, reorganised and interpreted across such changes.

Publication provides one important mechanism through which this process can take place. A professional journal operates within the immediate conditions of architectural practice while simultaneously contributing to longer processes of disciplinary memory. Through recurring publication, architectural projects, professional debates and institutional developments can remain available for subsequent reference and reinterpretation. Publication can therefore provide a continuing framework through which heterogeneous forms of architectural knowledge are brought into relation, even when the institutional conditions surrounding them have changed.

From this perspective, the significance of Taiwan Architect extends beyond its function as a professional publication or historical record. Its importance can be understood in relation to the broader institutional problem of how architectural knowledge acquires continuity under conditions in which disciplinary formation itself has been discontinuous. The journal provides a particularly productive case through which to consider how editorial institutions may connect

dispersed professional experiences and contribute to the construction of a shared disciplinary framework.

This does not imply that Taiwan Architect produced a unified or uninterrupted account of Taiwanese architecture. Nor does it suggest that publication could overcome the institutional discontinuities through which architectural knowledge was formed. Rather, its significance lies in the continuing editorial framework through which different architectural practices, professional concerns and historical circumstances could be brought into relation. In this sense, publication does not eliminate discontinuity; it provides a means through which discontinuous forms of architectural knowledge can remain visible, connected and open to reinterpretation.

The broader implication is that architectural modernisation should not be understood only through changes in architectural form, professional practice or institutional organisation. It can also be examined through the mechanisms by which architectural knowledge is transmitted, organised and made durable. Such an approach shifts attention from modernisation as a linear process of disciplinary development towards the institutional processes through which different forms of knowledge are connected, negotiated and given historical significance.

Towards an Editorial History of Architecture

The argument proposed here does not claim that professional journals alone determine the development of architectural knowledge. Rather, it identifies editorial practice as an often overlooked institutional dimension through which disciplinary coherence can be produced and maintained. This opens a broader line of enquiry into the relationship between architectural publication, institutional continuity and the formation of professional knowledge, particularly in contexts where established disciplinary traditions have been fragmented or repeatedly reconfigured.

For Taiwan Architect, this conceptual framework provides the basis for a more detailed examination of its editorial history. Future research can investigate how particular editorial decisions, thematic programmes, professional debates and forms of archival selection contributed to the construction of disciplinary narratives at different historical moments. Such an examination would make it possible to trace more precisely how interpretive infrastructure operates in practice and how its effects may change across different institutional and political contexts.

An editorial history of architecture would therefore complement rather than replace conventional histories centred on buildings, architects and institutions. It would ask how particular architectural practices became visible within professional discourse, how certain debates acquired continuity, and how different forms of architectural knowledge were connected through publication. This approach may also provide a basis for comparative studies of professional journals operating under different institutional conditions, particularly where disciplinary formation has been shaped by discontinuity or repeated transformation.

The significance of this approach also extends beyond the preservation of professional memory. To examine editorial history is to consider how a discipline constructs relationships between its present practices and its accumulated past. The architectural record is not simply inherited; it is continually reorganised through the ways in which projects, debates and professional experiences are selected and revisited. Editorial institutions therefore participate

in shaping not only what a discipline remembers, but also the terms through which that memory can be interpreted.

The central proposition, therefore, is that architectural history is constituted not only through what a discipline builds, but also through the institutional practices through which it remembers, interprets and connects what it has produced. Professional journals occupy an important position within these practices. In contexts of discontinuous modernisation, they may function not simply as repositories of architectural history but as infrastructures through which the discipline establishes continuity, negotiates meaning and reproduces itself over time.

Acknowledgements

This research was generously supported by a grant from the National Science and Technology Council (NSTC), Taiwan (Project No. NSTC 114-2410-H-027-023). The author would like to express profound gratitude to the Department of Architecture at the National Taipei University of Technology for their institutional support, and to the dedicated research assistants for their invaluable contributions to this project. Special thanks are also extended to the editorial team and related personnel at Taiwan Architect magazine. Their assistance in providing access to extensive archival materials and facilitating comprehensive data compilation was instrumental in bringing this research to fruition.

Declaration of Generative AI and AI-Assisted Technologies in the Writing Process

During the preparation of this manuscript, the author used ChatGPT (OpenAI), a generative AI tool, solely to support language editing, stylistic refinement, and the organisation of written material. The tool was not used to generate research data or determine the conceptual framework, scholarly arguments, source selection, analysis, or conclusions. All content was reviewed, verified, and approved by the author, who takes full responsibility for the final manuscript.

References

- Colomina, B. (1994). *Privacy and publicity: Modern architecture as mass media*. MIT Press.
- Crysler, C. G., Cairns, S., & Heynen, H. (2012). Introduction – 1: Architectural theory in an expanded field. In C. G. Chrysler, S. Cairns, & H. Heynen (Eds.), *The SAGE handbook of architectural theory* (pp. 1–22). SAGE.
- Hsiao, J.-C. (2001). *1954–76 Tái wān jiàn zhù kān wù lùn shù yì yì zhī tàn tǎo* [A study of the discursive significance of Taiwanese architectural publications, 1954–1976] [Master's thesis, Tunghai University]. National Digital Library of Theses and Dissertations in Taiwan. <https://hdl.handle.net/11296/8umw47>
- Huang, S.-Y. (2023). Dì sān kōng jiān de yì yǔ xíng dòng: 21 shì jì Tái wān jiàn zhù zhuān yè kān wù de lùn shù yǔ jìng xíng chéng chū tàn [Translation action in the third space: A preliminary study of emerging architectural discourses in professional publications in twenty-first century Taiwan]. *Journal of TFAM*, 46, 43–84.
- Huang, S.-Y., & Lin, W.-H. (2024). 50 nián huí gù: 1975–2024 nián Jiàn zhù shī zá zhì nián biǎo [A 50-year retrospective—Chronology of *Taiwan Architect* magazine, 1975–2024]. *Taiwan Architect*, 50(12), 67–117.
- Jiang, B.-H. (2003). *Jiàn zhù shī zá zhì jiàn zhù lùn shù de xíng chéng yǔ zhuǎn biàn (1975–1999 nián)* [The formation and transformation of architectural discourse in *Taiwan Architect*, 1975–1999] [Master's thesis, Tamkang University]. National Digital Library of Theses and Dissertations in Taiwan. <https://ndltd.ncl.edu.tw/handle/28574040460323024557>
- Rattenbury, K. (Ed.). (2002). *This is not architecture: Media constructions*. Routledge.
- Speaks, M. (1993). Writing in architecture. *ANY: Architecture New York*, (0), 6–7.
- Su, Y.-L. (2014). *Xiāo fèi nián dài zhōng de Jiàn zhù shī zá zhì zài xiàn yán jiū* [A study of the representation of *Taiwan Architect* in the age of consumption] [Master's thesis, Chung Yuan Christian University]. Airiti Library. <https://doi.org/10.6840/cycu201400938>

Contact email: shaoyuhuang@mail.ntut.edu.tw