

Dober's Material

1.3 Std. Trips

- post-walk has no descriptive data to prove significance or recog. quality of points - only location
- field notes have little or nothing to show in respect to directional & positional info affecting decisions - are mostly a series of perceptions which are potential reference elements but which aren't proven as such.

2. Memory mapping of city as a whole

- ① - accurate for part near his route
 - strong use of lines and line networks, especially Back Bay, Tremont, Washington, Cambridge, Mass Ave, and the Artery.
 - 5 or 6 points, most of which were previously involved with his interview trips
 - peninsula shape highly inaccurate, elongated.
- ② - many additions of lines and networks along & near his route, including Harrison, transverse So. End sts, sts paralleling &, including ~~the~~ Winter Summer
 - addition of only one or 2 points, plus Beacon Hill as an area.
 - peninsula shape even more elongated & distorted by bellings out on North End.

- ③ - continuing preoccupation with lines & networks
- retrogression in quantity of points but addition of some new ones
 - incomplete peninsula, indicating its lack of control over his structure - part drawn is still greatly elongated.
- ④ - description on a number of different bases: reference areas, points, reference forms, lines, and a confusing miscellany - seems extremely doubtful that there is a clear idea of what "reference forms" are - his miscellany are really sub-areas of heightened recognition within "reference areas" he drew first.
- peninsula shape is squat, short and fat, again distorted but in opposite way - since he began with a patchwork of reference areas, suggests that accuracy is dependent on the more precise features such as lines - their joints & remembered distances along them.
- ⑤ - map based on lines & networks, then filled in with land-use or status indications for large areas.
- very few additional points, & these not given proper names but the term "institutional".
 - peninsula greatly elongated & distorted.

structure as against theme and cue.

General trends in Dober's maps

1. importance of sequence of building-up picture of the city

- lines and line networks first, then
- points, dependent on lines as a locational framework
- general-area qualities as an effort toward summary of many precise, minute relationships

2. accuracy and distortion as related to

- length of total acquaintance with city.
- fluctuation in size and shape of various parts of city, ~~by~~ relation to parts most recently traversed.
- the method by which the total picture is built-up: the peninsula vs. internal relations as a beginning vs. various basic internal relations used as beginnings.

3. qualitative difference among reference forms ^{inferred} according to the sequence in which they are individually included:

- Washington and Tremont come before Summer & Winter; the State House comes before Symphony Hall, etc.

- (5A) - increased preoccupation with precision of linear relationships, networks
- few if any points & no areas indicated
 - incomplete peninsula, elongation of part drawn
 - scale of parts (like Back Bay) fluctuates from relatively-long, large to relatively-short, small w/ resp. to city as a whole.
- (6) - most accurate peninsula shape yet, preoccupation with precise shape, but still elongated.
- ditto (5A) above / respect to scale of parts like Back Bay.
 - greater preoccupation with precise lines & networks as a base upon which huge no. of points are placed.
 - strong absence of detail in city north and east of Commons.
- (7) ditto (6) above except here there is a retrogression in accuracy of the peninsula - still extremely elongated.

NOTE: Throughout, there is absence of descriptive data sufficient to show recognition quality of one element versus another. A large number of elements are listed, and only the time sequence of drawing to indicate which are more distinctive than others. The only level of usefulness, beyond this sequence criterion, is the indication of locational