

Crane's Material

1. Notes recorded in field are of following type:
 - from given positions, certain objects perceived, most always named & perhaps hard to map.
 - “ “ “ or proceeding in given way, certain relationships or contrasts between objects are remarked. These may or may not fall easily into principles categories.
 - from successive contacts with the same object, a sense of its character is built up
 - from successive contacts with the same object, the picture of it is cast differently according to the lighting , position of viewing it, the visual context in which it is seen.
 - from given positions, information is sought because it is needed, yet found to be masked or elusive.
 - relationships between objects that are remarked can lead to a sense of hierarchical organization, such as Mass. Ave. (lower) belonging to South End and yet different and distinct
 - many evidences of general, continuous qualities vs. isolated “categories of one.”
 - evidences of the constant struggle to retain and memorize directions, positions, relationships.
 - evidences of corrections & surprises from prior misconceptions.
 - various pieces of positional and directional information derived from given objects or perceived relations between objects.

2. Maps from memory

1. – starts with peninsula shape, Beacon Hill, Mass. Ave. and lines running E-W along peninsula length, especially Back bay & So. End.
 - then brings joining of 2 basic sets of E-W sts. into the picture, revising Mass. Ave. bend.
 - then is preoccupied further with joinings of So. End E-W Sts. with rail lines, Washington and Tremont. These struggles based on problem of resolving relation between Mass Ave; the Back Bay orient; the So. End orientation and Commons area.
 - finished product greatly concerned with 2 networks of lines (Back Bay & So. End) as related to each other & to Commons-Gardens and Beacon Hill complex — largely vacant in detail north & east of the Commons & Beacon Hill, south and east of Washington St.
 - superimposed on this pattern of lines, points, and one or 2 areas is

{margin: For these, descriptive mat'l gives qualitative basis for vividness}

- system of individually-distinctive elements with types of locational & positional info they give.
- subdivision of city into general subareas & “foci”.

2. – in sequence of build-up, generally same early preoccupations as 1.{circled}, but carried further with respect to lines & networks of these in the downtown area, as far as State St.
 - greater richness in quantity of detail — points, lines, and areas than in 1{circled}.
 - greater accuracy for city as a whole, as well as for individual parts
 - greater precision of area boundaries
 - no additional descriptive matter to show qualitative bases for vividness.

3. – in sequence of buildup. generally same early preoccupations as in 1{circled}, but in first 10 minutes, more is included — transverse relations between Back Bay & So. End systems, the transverse sts. parallel to Winter-Summer,
 - gets more quickly to specific points, reference forms, areas.
 - ditto 2{circled} for quantity of detail, accuracy, definition of boundaries
 - here, there is no overlay for individually-distinctive elements and no supporting descriptive matter.

Kevin's Observation:

- memory, other aspects in Dober & Crane procedure not present — used base map — therefore, most nearly comparable to Crane recorded notes in field — might compare map & written notes vs. a diagram by Crane's latest remarks based on an objective map
- importance here not sequence or accuracy but in absolute quality of structure & individual importance of elements — therefore, should be compared only on an objective map and only against the first-sequences of lines, points, and areas in Crane's and Dober's latest mapping occasion.
- descriptive material for only those objects for which there is 3-way consensus should be compared.