

Kevin Lynch:

THE
IMAGE
OF
THE
CITY



I.

THE IMAGE OF THE ENVIRONMENT

Looking at cities can give a special pleasure, however commonplace the sight may be. Like a piece of architecture, the city is a construction in space, but one of vast scale, a thing perceived only in the course of long spans of time. City design is therefore a temporal art, but it can rarely use the controlled and limited sequences of other temporal arts like music. On different occasions and for different people, the sequences are reversed, interrupted, abandoned, cut across. It is seen in all lights and all weathers.

At every instant, there is more than the eye can see, more than the ear can hear, a setting or a view waiting to be explored. Nothing is experienced by itself, but always in relation to its surroundings, the sequences of events leading up to it, the memory of past experiences. Washington Street set in a farmer's field might look like the shopping street in the heart of Boston, and yet it would seem utterly different. Every citizen has had long associations with some part of his city, and his image is soaked in memories and meanings.

Moving elements in a city, and in particular the people and their activities, are as important as the stationary physical parts. We are not simply observers of this spectacle, but are ourselves a part of it, on the stage with the other participants. Most often, our perception of the city is not sustained, but rather partial, fragmentary, mixed with other concerns. Nearly every sense is in operation, and the image is the composite of them all.

Not only is the city an object which is perceived (and perhaps enjoyed) by millions of people of widely diverse class and character, but it is the product of many builders who are constantly modifying the structure for reasons of their own. While it may be stable in general outlines for some time, it is ever changing in detail. Only partial control can be exercised over its growth and form. There is no final result, only a continuous succession of phases. No wonder, then, that the art of shaping cities for sensuous enjoyment is an art quite separate from architecture or music or literature. It may learn a great deal from these other arts, but it cannot imitate them.

A beautiful and delightful city environment is an oddity, some would say an impossibility. Not one American city larger than a village is of consistently fine quality, although a few towns have some pleasant fragments. It is hardly surprising, then, that most Americans have little idea of what it can mean to live in such an environment. They are clear enough about the ugliness of the world they live in, and they are quite vocal about the dirt, the smoke, the heat, and the congestion, the chaos and yet the monotony of it. But they are hardly aware of the potential value of harmonious surroundings, a world which they may have briefly glimpsed only as tourists or as escaped vacationers. They can have little sense of what a setting can mean in terms of daily delight, or as a continuous anchor for their lives, or as an extension of the meaningfulness and richness of the world.

Legibility

This book will consider the visual quality of the American city by studying the mental image of that city which is held by its citizens. It will concentrate especially on one particular visual quality: the apparent clarity or "legibility" of the cityscape. By this we mean the ease with which its parts can be recognized


and can be organized into a coherent pattern. Just as this printed page, if it is legible, can be visually grasped as a related pattern of recognizable symbols, so a legible city would be one whose districts or landmarks or pathways are easily identifiable and are easily grouped into an over-all pattern.

This book will assert that legibility is crucial in the city setting, will analyze it in some detail, and will try to show how this concept might be used today in rebuilding our cities. As will quickly become apparent to the reader, this study is a preliminary exploration, a first word not a last word, an attempt to capture ideas and to suggest how they might be developed and tested. Its tone will be speculative and perhaps a little irresponsible: at once tentative and presumptuous. This first chapter will develop some of the basic ideas; later chapters will apply them to several American cities and discuss their consequences for urban design.

Although clarity or legibility is by no means the only important property of a beautiful city, it is of special importance when considering environments at the urban scale of size, time, and complexity. To understand this, we must consider not just the city as a thing in itself, but the city being perceived by its inhabitants.

Structuring and identifying the environment is a vital ability among all mobile animals. Many kinds of cues are used: the visual sensations of color, shape, motion, or polarization of light, as well as other senses such as smell, sound, touch, kinesthesia, sense of gravity, and perhaps of electric or magnetic fields. These techniques of orientation, from the polar flight of a tern to the path-finding of a limpet over the micro-topography of a rock, are described and their importance underscored in an extensive literature.^{10, 20, 31, 59} Psychologists have also studied this ability in man, although rather sketchily or under limited laboratory conditions.^{1, 5, 8, 12, 37, 63, 65, 76, 81} Despite a few remaining puzzles, it now seems unlikely that there is any mystic "instinct" of way-finding. Rather there is a consistent use and organization of definite sensory cues from the external environment. This organization is fundamental to the efficiency and to the very survival of free-moving life.





To become completely lost is perhaps a rather rare experience for most people in the modern city. We are supported by the presence of others and by special way-finding devices: maps, street numbers, route signs, bus placards. But let the mishap of disorientation once occur, and the sense of anxiety and even terror that accompanies it reveals to us how closely it is linked to our sense of balance and well-being. The very word "lost" in our language means much more than simple geographical uncertainty; it carries overtones of utter disaster.

In the process of way-finding, the strategic link is the environmental image, the generalized mental picture of the exterior physical world that is held by an individual. This image is the product both of immediate sensation and of the memory of past experience, and it is used to interpret information and to guide action. The need to recognize and pattern our surroundings is so crucial, and has such long roots in the past, that this image has wide practical and emotional importance to the individual.

Obviously a clear image enables one to move about easily and quickly: to find a friend's house or a policeman or a button store. But an ordered environment can do more than this; it may serve as a broad frame of reference, an organizer of activity or belief or knowledge. On the basis of a structural understanding of Manhattan, for example, one can order a substantial quantity of facts and fancies about the nature of the world we live in. Like any good framework, such a structure gives the individual a possibility of choice and a starting-point for the acquisition of further information. A clear image of the surroundings is thus a useful basis for individual growth.

A vivid and integrated physical setting, capable of producing a sharp image, plays a social role as well. It can furnish the raw material for the symbols and collective memories of group communication. A striking landscape is the skeleton upon which many primitive races erect their socially important myths. Common memories of the "home town" were often the first and easiest point of contact between lonely soldiers during the war.

A good environmental image gives its possessor an important sense of emotional security. He can establish an harmonious relationship between himself and the outside world. This is the

obverse of the fear that comes with disorientation; it means that the sweet sense of home is strongest when home is not only familiar but distinctive as well.

Indeed, a distinctive and legible environment not only offers security but also heightens the potential depth and intensity of human experience. Although life is far from impossible in the visual chaos of the modern city, the same daily action could take on new meaning if carried out in a more vivid setting. Potentially, the city is in itself the powerful symbol of a complex society. If visually well set forth, it can also have strong expressive meaning.

It may be argued against the importance of physical legibility that the human brain is marvelously adaptable, that with some experience one can learn to pick one's way through the most disordered or featureless surroundings. There are abundant examples of precise navigation over the "trackless" wastes of sea, sand, or ice, or through a tangled maze of jungle.

Yet even the sea has the sun and stars, the winds, currents, birds, and sea-colors without which unaided navigation would be impossible. The fact that only skilled professionals could navigate among the Polynesian Islands, and this only after extensive training, indicates the difficulties imposed by this particular environment. Strain and anxiety accompanied even the best-prepared expeditions.

In our own world, we might say that almost everyone can, if attentive, learn to navigate in Jersey City, but only at the cost of some effort and uncertainty. Moreover, the positive values of legible surroundings are missing: the emotional satisfaction, the framework for communication or conceptual organization, the new depths that it may bring to everyday experience. These are pleasures we lack, even if our present city environment is not so disordered as to impose an intolerable strain on those who are familiar with it.

It must be granted that there is some value in mystification, labyrinth, or surprise in the environment. Many of us enjoy the House of Mirrors, and there is a certain charm in the crooked streets of Boston. This is so, however, only under two conditions. First, there must be no danger of losing basic form or

See Appendix A

Jersey City is discussed in Chapter 2



orientation, of never coming out. The surprise must occur in an over-all framework; the confusions must be small regions in a visible whole. Furthermore, the labyrinth or mystery must in itself have some form that can be explored and in time be apprehended. Complete chaos without hint of connection is never pleasurable.

These points are further illustrated in Appendix A

But these second thoughts point to an important qualification. The observer himself should play an active role in perceiving the world and have a creative part in developing his image. He should have the power to change that image to fit changing needs. An environment which is ordered in precise and final detail may inhibit new patterns of activity. A landscape whose every rock tells a story may make difficult the creation of fresh stories. Although this may not seem to be a critical issue in our present urban chaos, yet it indicates that what we seek is not a final but an open-ended order, capable of continuous further development.

Building the Image

Environmental images are the result of a two-way process between the observer and his environment. The environment suggests distinctions and relations, and the observer—with great adaptability and in the light of his own purposes—selects, organizes, and endows with meaning what he sees. The image so developed now limits and emphasizes what is seen, while the image itself is being tested against the filtered perceptual input in a constant interacting process. Thus the image of a given reality may vary significantly between different observers.

The coherence of the image may arise in several ways. There may be little in the real object that is ordered or remarkable, and yet its mental picture has gained identity and organization through long familiarity. One man may find objects easily on what seems to anyone else to be a totally disordered work table. Alternatively, an object seen for the first time may be identified and related not because it is individually familiar but because it conforms to a stereotype already constructed by the observer. An American can always spot the corner drugstore, however indistinguishable it might be to a Bushman. Again, a new object

may seem to have strong structure or identity because of striking physical features which suggest or impose their own pattern. Thus the sea or a great mountain can rivet the attention of one coming from the flat plains of the interior, even if he is so young or so parochial as to have no name for these great phenomena.

As manipulators of the physical environment, city planners are primarily interested in the external agent in the interaction which produces the environmental image. Different environments resist or facilitate the process of image-making. Any given form, a fine vase or a lump of clay, will have a high or a low probability of evoking a strong image among various observers. Presumably this probability can be stated with greater and greater precision as the observers are grouped in more and more homogeneous classes of age, sex, culture, occupation, temperament, or familiarity. Each individual creates and bears his own image, but there seems to be substantial agreement among members of the same group. It is these group images, exhibiting consensus among significant numbers, that interest city planners who aspire to model an environment that will be used by many people.

Therefore this study will tend to pass over individual differences, interesting as they might be to a psychologist. The first order of business will be what might be called the "public images," the common mental pictures carried by large numbers of a city's inhabitants: areas of agreement which might be expected to appear in the interaction of a single physical reality, a common culture, and a basic physiological nature.

The systems of orientation which have been used vary widely throughout the world, changing from culture to culture, and from landscape to landscape. Appendix A gives examples of many of them: the abstract and fixed directional systems, the moving systems, and those that are directed to the person, the home, or the sea. The world may be organized around a set of focal points, or be broken into named regions, or be linked by remembered routes. Varied as these methods are, and inexhaustible as seem to be the potential clues which a man may pick out to differentiate his world, they cast interesting side-lights on the means that we use today to locate ourselves in our own city world. For the

most part these examples seem to echo, curiously enough, the formal types of image elements into which we can conveniently divide the city image: path, landmark, edge, node, and district. These elements will be defined and discussed in Chapter 3.

Structure and Identity

An environmental image may be analyzed into three components: identity, structure, and meaning. It is useful to abstract these for analysis, if it is remembered that in reality they always appear together. A workable image requires first the identification of an object, which implies its distinction from other things, its recognition as a separable entity. This is called identity, not in the sense of equality with something else, but with the meaning of individuality or oneness. Second, the image must include the spatial or pattern relation of the object to the observer and to other objects. Finally, this object must have some meaning for the observer, whether practical or emotional. Meaning is also a relation, but quite a different one from spatial or pattern relation.

Thus an image useful for making an exit requires the recognition of a door as a distinct entity, of its spatial relation to the observer, and its meaning as a hole for getting out. These are not truly separable. The visual recognition of a door is matted together with its meaning as a door. It is possible, however, to analyze the door in terms of its identity of form and clarity of position, considered as if they were prior to its meaning.

Such an analytic feat might be pointless in the study of a door, but not in the study of the urban environment. To begin with, the question of meaning in the city is a complicated one. Group images of meaning are less likely to be consistent at this level than are the perceptions of entity and relationship. Meaning, moreover, is not so easily influenced by physical manipulation as are these other two components. If it is our purpose to build cities for the enjoyment of vast numbers of people of widely diverse background—and cities which will also be adaptable to future purposes—we may even be wise to concentrate on the physical clarity of the image and to allow meaning to develop without our direct guidance. The image of the Manhattan sky-

line may stand for vitality, power, decadence, mystery, congestion, greatness, or what you will, but in each case that sharp picture crystallizes and reinforces the meaning. So various are the individual meanings of a city, even while its form may be easily communicable, that it appears possible to separate meaning from form, at least in the early stages of analysis. This study will therefore concentrate on the identity and structure of city images.

If an image is to have value for orientation in the living space, it must have several qualities. It must be sufficient, true in a pragmatic sense, allowing the individual to operate within his environment to the extent desired. The map, whether exact or not, must be good enough to get one home. It must be sufficiently clear and well integrated to be economical of mental effort: the map must be readable. It should be safe, with a surplus of clues so that alternative actions are possible and the risk of failure is not too high. If a blinking light is the only sign for a critical turn, a power failure may cause disaster. The image should preferably be open-ended, adaptable to change, allowing the individual to continue to investigate and organize reality: there should be blank spaces where he can extend the drawing for himself. Finally, it should in some measure be communicable to other individuals. The relative importance of these criteria for a "good" image will vary with different persons in different situations; one will prize an economical and sufficient system, another an open-ended and communicable one.

Imageability

Since the emphasis here will be on the physical environment as the independent variable, this study will look for physical qualities which relate to the attributes of identity and structure in the mental image. This leads to the definition of what might be called *imageability*: that quality in a physical object which gives it a high probability of evoking a strong image in any given observer. It is that shape, color, or arrangement which facilitates the making of vividly identified, powerfully structured, highly useful mental images of the environment. It might also be called *legibility*, or perhaps *visibility* in a heightened sense,

where objects are not only able to be seen, but are presented sharply and intensely to the senses.

Half a century ago, Stern discussed this attribute of an artistic object and called it *apparency*.⁷⁴ While art is not limited to this single end, he felt that one of its two basic functions was "to create images which by clarity and harmony of form fulfill the need for vividly comprehensible appearance." In his mind, this was an essential first step toward the expression of inner meaning.

A highly imageable (apparent, legible, or visible) city in this peculiar sense would seem well formed, distinct, remarkable; it would invite the eye and the ear to greater attention and participation. The sensuous grasp upon such surroundings would not merely be simplified, but also extended and deepened. Such a city would be one that could be apprehended over time as a pattern of high continuity with many distinctive parts clearly interconnected. The perceptive and familiar observer could absorb new sensuous impacts without disruption of his basic image, and each new impact would touch upon many previous elements. He would be well oriented, and he could move easily. He would be highly aware of his environment. The city of Venice might be an example of such a highly imageable environment. In the United States, one is tempted to cite parts of Manhattan, San Francisco, Boston, or perhaps the lake front of Chicago.

These are characterizations that flow from our definitions. The concept of imageability does not necessarily connote something fixed, limited, precise, unified, or regularly ordered, although it may sometimes have these qualities. Nor does it mean apparent at a glance, obvious, patent, or plain. The total environment to be patterned is highly complex, while the obvious image is soon boring, and can point to only a few features of the living world.


The imageability of city form will be the center of the study to follow. There are other basic properties in a beautiful environment: meaning or expressiveness, sensuous delight, rhythm, stimulus, choice. Our concentration on imageability does not deny their importance. Our purpose is simply to consider the need for identity and structure in our perceptual world, and to illustrate the special relevance of this quality to the particular case of the complex, shifting urban environment.

Since image development is a two-way process between observer and observed, it is possible to strengthen the image either by symbolic devices, by the retraining of the perceiver, or by reshaping one's surroundings. You can provide the viewer with a symbolic diagram of how the world fits together: a map or a set of written instructions. As long as he can fit reality to the diagram, he has a clue to the relatedness of things. You can even install a machine for giving directions, as has recently been done in New York.⁴⁹ While such devices are extremely useful for providing condensed data on interconnections, they are also precarious, since orientation fails if the device is lost, and the device itself must constantly be referred and fitted to reality. The cases of brain injury noted in Appendix A illustrate the anxiety and effort that attend complete reliance on such means. Moreover, the complete experience of interconnection, the full depth of a vivid image, is lacking.

You may also train the observer. Brown remarks that a maze through which subjects were asked to move blindfolded seemed to them at first to be one unbroken problem. On repetition, parts of the pattern, particularly the beginning and end, became familiar and assumed the character of localities. Finally, when they could tread the maze without error, the whole system seemed to have become one locality.⁸ DeSilva describes the case of a boy who seemed to have "automatic" directional orientation, but proved to have been trained from infancy (by a mother who could not distinguish right from left) to respond to "the east side of the porch" or "the south end of the dresser."⁷¹

Shipton's account of the reconnaissance for the ascent of Everest offers a dramatic case of such learning. Approaching Everest from a new direction, Shipton immediately recognized the main peaks and saddles that he knew from the north side. But the Sherpa guide accompanying him, to whom both sides were long familiar, had never realized that these were the same features, and he greeted the revelation with surprise and delight.⁷⁰

Kilpatrick describes the process of perceptual learning forced on an observer by new stimuli that no longer fit into previous images.⁴¹ It begins with hypothetical forms that explain the new stimuli conceptually, while the illusion of the old forms persists.



The personal experience of most of us will testify to this persistence of an illusory image long after its inadequacy is conceptually realized. We stare into the jungle and see only the sunlight on the green leaves, but a warning noise tells us that an animal is hidden there. The observer then learns to interpret the scene by singling out "give-away" clues and by reweighting previous signals. The camouflaged animal may now be picked up by the reflection of his eyes. Finally by repeated experience the entire pattern of perception is changed, and the observer need no longer consciously search for give-aways, or add new data to an old framework. He has achieved an image which will operate successfully in the new situation, seeming natural and right. Quite suddenly the hidden animal appears among the leaves, "as plain as day."

In the same way, we must learn to see the hidden forms in the vast sprawl of our cities. We are not accustomed to organizing and imaging an artificial environment on such a large scale; yet our activities are pushing us toward that end. Curt Sachs gives an example of a failure to make connections beyond a certain level.⁶⁴ The voice and drumbeat of the North American Indian follow entirely different tempos, the two being perceived independently. Searching for a musical analogy of our own, he mentions our church services, where we do not think of coordinating the choir inside with the bells above.

In our vast metropolitan areas we do not connect the choir and the bells; like the Sherpa, we see only the sides of Everest and not the mountain. To extend and deepen our perception of the environment would be to continue a long biological and cultural development which has gone from the contact senses to the distant senses and from the distant senses to symbolic communications. Our thesis is that we are now able to develop our image of the environment by operation on the external physical shape as well as by an internal learning process. Indeed, the complexity of our environment now compels us to do so. Chapter 4 will discuss how this might be done.

Primitive man was forced to improve his environmental image by adapting his perception to the given landscape. He could effect minor changes in his environment with cairns, beacons,

or tree blazes, but substantial modifications for visual clarity or visual interconnection were confined to house sites or religious enclosures. Only powerful civilizations can begin to act on their total environment at a significant scale. The conscious remolding of the large-scale physical environment has been possible only recently, and so the problem of environmental imageability is a new one. Technically, we can now make completely new landscapes in a brief time, as in the Dutch polders. Here the designers are already at grips with the question of how to form the total scene so that it is easy for the human observer to identify its parts and to structure the whole.³⁰

We are rapidly building a new functional unit, the metropolitan region, but we have yet to grasp that this unit, too, should have its corresponding image. Suzanne Langer sets the problem in her capsule definition of architecture:

"It is the total environment made visible."⁴²

II.

THREE CITIES

To understand the role of environmental images in our own urban lives, it was necessary for us to look carefully at some city areas and to talk with their inhabitants. We needed to develop and test the idea of imageability, and also by a comparison of image with visual reality to learn what forms make for strong images, and thus to suggest some principles for urban design. The work was done in the conviction that analysis of existing form and its effects on the citizen is one of the foundation stones of city design, and in the hope that some useful techniques for field reconnaissance and citizen interview might be developed as a by-product. As in any small pilot study, the purpose was to develop ideas and methods, rather than to prove facts in a final and determinate way.

Analyses were therefore made of the central areas of three American cities: Boston, Massachusetts; Jersey City, New Jersey; and Los Angeles, California. Boston, the city directly at hand, is unique in character among American cities, being both vivid in form and full of locational difficulties. Jersey City was chosen

for its apparent formlessness, for what seemed, on first observation, to be its extremely low order of imageability. Los Angeles, on the other hand, is a new city, of an utterly different scale, and with a gridiron plan in its central area. In every case a central area of approximately $2\frac{1}{2}$ by $1\frac{1}{2}$ miles was taken for study.

In each of these cities, two basic analyses were carried out:

1. A systematic field reconnaissance of the area was made on foot by a trained observer, who mapped the presence of various elements, their visibility, their image strength or weakness, and their connections, disconnections, and other interrelations, and who noted any special successes or difficulties in the potential image structure. These were subjective judgments based on the immediate appearance of these elements in the field.

2. A lengthy interview was held with a small sample of city residents to evoke their own images of their physical environment. The interview included requests for descriptions, locations, and sketches, and for the performance of imaginary trips. The persons interviewed were people who were long resident or employed in the area, and whose residences or work places were distributed throughout the zone in question.

Some thirty persons were thus interviewed in Boston, and fifteen each in Jersey City and Los Angeles. In Boston the basic analyses were supplemented by photographic recognition tests, by actual trips in the field, and by numerous requests for directions made of passers-by in the streets. In addition, detailed field reconnaissance was made of several special elements of the Boston scene.

All these methods are described and evaluated in Appendix B. The small size of the samples and their bias toward the professional and managerial classes prevent us from stating that a true "public image" has been gained. But the material is rich in suggestion, and has sufficient internal consistency to indicate that substantial group images do exist and are, in part at least, discoverable by some such means. The independent field analyses predicted rather accurately the group image derived from the interviews, and so indicated the role of the physical forms themselves.

For details, see Appendix B

Undoubtedly, the common concentrations of travel paths or of work place tended to produce this consistency of the group image by presenting the same elements to the view of many individuals. Associations of status or of history, coming from non-visual sources, further reinforced these likenesses.

But there can be no doubt that the form of the environment itself played a tremendous role in the shaping of the image. The coincidences of description, of vividness, even of confusion where familiarity would seem to indicate knowledge, all make this clear. It is on this relation between image and physical form that our interest centers.

Distinct differences in the imageability of the three cities appeared, even though the persons interviewed had all made some sort of a working adjustment to their environment. Certain features—open space, vegetation, sense of motion on the paths, visual contrasts—seemed to be of particular importance in the cityscape.

From the data provided by the comparison of these group images with the visual reality, and from the speculations arising thereon, most of the remainder of this book derives. The concepts of imageability and of the element types (which will be discussed in Chapter 3) largely derive from, or were refined and developed in, the analysis of this material. While a discussion of the strengths and weaknesses of the methods are left to Appendix B, it is important to understand the basis on which the work rests.

Boston

The area chosen for study in Boston was all that part of the central peninsula within the line of Massachusetts Avenue. This is an area rather unusual among American cities because of its age, history, and somewhat European flavor. It includes the commercial core of the metropolitan area, as well as several high-density residential districts, ranging from slum to upper-class housing. Figure 1 is a general aerial view of the region, Figure 2 is an outline map of it, and Figure 3 is a diagrammatic representation of its major visual elements as derived from the field reconnaissance.

Figure 1


Figure 2, page 18

Figure 3, page 19

For almost all the persons interviewed, this Boston is a city of very distinctive districts and of crooked, confusing paths. It is a dirty city, of red-brick buildings, symbolized by the open space of the Boston Common, the State House with its gold dome, and the view across the Charles River from the Cambridge side. Most of them added that it is an old, historical place, full of worn-out buildings, yet containing some new structures among the old. Its narrow streets are congested with people and cars; there is no parking space, but there are striking contrasts between wide main streets and narrow side streets. The central city is a peninsula, surrounded by a water edge. In addition to the Common, the Charles River, and the State House, there are several other vivid elements, particularly Beacon Hill, Commonwealth Avenue, the Washington Street shopping and theater district,

FIG. 1. *The Boston peninsula from the north*





Copley Square, the Back Bay, Louisburg Square, the North End, the market district, and Atlantic Avenue bordered by the wharves. A substantial fraction added other characteristics about Boston: that it lacks open or recreational space; that it is an "individual," small, or medium-sized city; that it has large areas of mixed use; or that it is marked by bay windows, iron fences, or brownstone fronts.

The favorite views were usually the distant panoramas with the sense of water and space. The view from across the Charles River was often cited, and there were mentions of the river view down Pinckney Street, the vista from a hill in Brighton, the look of Boston from its harbor. Another favorite sight was that of

Figure 4, page 20

FIG. 2. Outline map of the Boston peninsula





FIG. 3. The visual form of Boston as seen in the field

the city lights at night, from near or far, when the city seems to take on an excitement that it normally lacks.

Boston has a structure which is understood by almost all of these people. The Charles River with its bridges makes a strong clear edge to which the principal Back Bay streets, particularly Beacon Street and Commonwealth Avenue, are parallel. These streets spring from Massachusetts Avenue, itself perpendicular to the Charles, and run to the Boston Common and Public Garden. Alongside this set of Back Bay streets is Copley Square, into which runs Huntington Avenue.

On the lower side of the Common are Tremont and Washington Streets, parallel to each other and interconnected by several smaller streets. Tremont Street goes as far as Scollay Square, and from this joint or node Cambridge Street runs back to another node at the Charles Street rotary which ties the framework back in to the river again. In so doing, it encloses Beacon Hill. Farther away from the river appears another strong water edge, Atlantic Avenue and the harbor front, which may be only

Figure 5, page 21




FIG. 4. *Boston from across the Charles River*

uncertainly connected to the rest. Although many subjects had an intellectual conception of Boston as a peninsula, they were unable to make a visual connection between river and harbor. Boston seems in some ways to be a "one-sided" city, which loses precision and content as one moves away from the Charles River edge.

If our sample is representative, almost any Bostonian can tell you this much of his city. Equally likely, he could *not* describe some other things, such as the triangular area between the Back Bay and the South End, the no-man's land south of North Station, how Boylston Street runs into Tremont Street, or what is the pattern of paths in the financial district.

One of the most interesting districts is one that isn't there: the triangular region between the Back Bay and the South End. This was a blank area on the map for every person interviewed, even the one who was born and raised there. It is an area of substantial size containing some known elements such as Huntington Avenue and occasional landmarks such as the Christian Science Church, but the matrix in which these might appear is absent and nameless. Presumably, the blocking by surrounding railroad tracks, and the conceptual squeezing-out of this area because the main streets of Back Bay and the South End are felt to be parallel, both contribute to this disappearance.

The Boston Common, on the other hand, is for many subjects the core of their image of the city, and, along with Beacon Hill, the Charles River, and Commonwealth Avenue, is most often mentioned as a particularly vivid place. Often, in making their cross-city trips, people would veer off course to touch base here as they went by. A large, planted open space bordering the most intensive district in Boston, a place full of associations, accessible to all, the Common is quite unmistakable. It is so located as to expose one edge of three important districts: Beacon Hill, the Back Bay, and the downtown shopping district, and is therefore a nucleus from which anyone can expand his knowledge of the environment. Furthermore, it is highly differentiated within itself, including the little subway plaza, the fountain, the Frog Pond, the bandstand, the cemetery, the "swan pond," and so on.

At the same time this open space has a most peculiar shape, difficult to remember: a five-sided, right-angled figure. Since it is also too large and well planted for the sides to be intervisible, people are often at sea in trying to cross it. And since two of the bounding paths, Boylston and Tremont Streets, are of city-

Figure 6, page 23




FIG. 5. *The Boston that everyone knows*





Figure 35, page 146



wide importance, the difficulty is compounded. Here they cross at right angles, but farther out they seem to be parallel, springing perpendicularly from a common base line, Massachusetts Avenue. In addition, the central shopping activity makes an awkward right-angled turn at this same Boylston-Tremont crossing, weakens, and then reappears farther up Boylston Street. All this adds up to a critical ambiguity of shape at the city core, a major orientation flaw.

Boston is a city of distinctive districts, and in most parts of the central area one knows where one is simply by the general character of the surrounding area. In one portion there is the unusual case of a continuous mosaic of such distinctive areas: the sequence Back Bay—Common—Beacon Hill—central shopping. Here place is never in question. Yet this thematic vividness is typically associated with formlessness or confusing arrangement. If Boston districts could be given structural clarity as well as distinctive character, they would be greatly strengthened. In this failure, incidentally, Boston is probably quite different from many American cities, where areas of formal order have little character.

While the districts tend to be vivid, the path system in Boston is generally confused. Nevertheless, so important is the function of circulation that the paths are still dominant in the total image, just as in the other cities tested. There is no basic order among these paths, except for the historically conditioned preponderance of main radials running inwards from the base of the peninsula. Through much of the central city it is easier to move east-west to and from Massachusetts Avenue than it is to move at right angles to this direction. In this sense, the city has a sort of grain that is reflected in the mental contortions which accompany various imaginary trips. Nevertheless, the path structure is an unusually difficult one, and its complications have furnished much material for the systematic consideration of paths in Chapter 3. The difficulty caused by the right-angled crossing of "parallel" Boylston and Tremont Streets has already been mentioned. The regular Back Bay grid, a banal characteristic of most American cities, takes on a special quality in Boston by virtue of its contrast with the remainder of the pattern.



FIG. 6. *The Boston Common*


Two high-speed highways pass through the central area, Storrow Drive and the Central Artery. Both are felt ambiguously either as barriers in reference to movement on the older streets, or as paths when one imagines oneself to be driving on them. Each aspect has an entirely different face: when thought of from below, the Artery is a massive green-painted wall, appearing fragmentarily at certain spots. As a path, it is a ribbon rising, dipping, and turning, studded with signs. In a curious way, both roads are felt to be "outside" the city, hardly related to it, even though they penetrate it, and there is a dizzying transition to be made at each interchange. Storrow Drive, however, is clearly related to the Charles River, and is thus tied to the general pattern of the city. The Central Artery, on the other hand, winds inexplicably through the center, and breaks the orientation link with the North End by blocking Hanover Street. Moreover, it was sometimes confused with the Causeway-Commercial-Atlantic sequence, even though the two paths are quite different, because both may logically be considered as extensions of Storrow Drive.

Figure 7, page 24



FIG. 7. *The Central Artery*

FIG. 8. *Problems of the Boston image*



In good Boston fashion, individual parts of the path system may have strong character. But this highly irregular system is made up of separate elements which are only linked one by one, or sometimes not at all. It is a difficult system to draw, or to image as a whole, and must usually be handled by concentrating on the sequence of joints. These joints or nodes are therefore quite important in Boston, and often rather pallid regions like the "Park Square area" will be named by the crossing that is their organizing focus.

Figure 8 is one way of summarizing this analysis of the Boston image, a summary which might be a first step toward the preparation of a design plan. It is a graphic compilation of what seem to be the major difficulties in the city image: confusions, floating points, weak boundaries, isolations, breaks in continuity, ambiguities, branchings, lacks of character or differentiation. Coupled with a presentation of the strengths and potentialities of the image, it corresponds to the site-analysis phase of a plan on a smaller scale. Like a site analysis, it does not determine a plan but is the background upon which creative decisions can be made. Since it is made at a more comprehensive level of analysis, it quite naturally contains a larger degree of interpretation than do previous diagrams.

Figure 8

Jersey City

Jersey City, New Jersey, lies between Newark and New York City, and is a fringe area of both, with little central activity of its own. Crisscrossed by railroads and elevated highways, it has the appearance of a place to pass through rather than to live in. It is divided into ethnic and class neighborhoods, and is cut by the ramparts of the Palisades. What might have been its natural shopping center was stifled by the artificial creation of Journal Square on the upper land, so that the city has no single center, but rather four or five. To the usual formlessness of space and heterogeneity of structure that mark the blighted area of any American city is added the complete confusion of an uncoordinated street system. The drabness, dirt, and smell of the town are at first overpowering. This, of course, is the first super-

Figure 9, page 27

ficial view of an outsider. It was interesting to see how those who had lived there for many years imaged it for themselves.

The visual structure of Jersey City as derived from the field reconnaissance is drawn to the same scale and uses the same symbols as the Boston diagram. The city has a little more shape and pattern than an outsider might think, as indeed it must if it is to be habitable at all. But it has rather little and boasts of many fewer recognized elements than does the same area of Boston. Much of the area is disrupted by strong edges. The essentials of the structure are Journal Square, one of the two main shopping centers, with the line of Hudson Boulevard passing through it. From Hudson Boulevard depends the "Bergen Section" and the important West Side Park. To the east, three paths pass down over the cliff edge to more or less converge in the lower area: Newark, Montgomery, and Communipaw-Grand. On the cliff stands the Medical Center. Everything stops at the barrier of the railroad-industrial-dock area on the Hudson. This is the essential pattern, and, except perhaps for one or two of the three downhill streets, is familiar to most subjects.

The lack of character is apparent from a glance when the consensus of elements thought distinctive by Jersey City people is compared with the same diagram for Boston. The Jersey City map is almost bare. Journal Square is strong because of its intensive shopping and entertainment activity, but its traffic and spatial chaos are confusing and unsettling. Hudson Boulevard rivals the Square for strength; West Side Park is next, the only large park in the city, cited again and again as a distinctive region, a relief in the general texture. The "Bergen Section" stands out primarily as a class area. The New Jersey Medical Center is visually unmistakable, rising tall and white from the edge of the cliff, a haphazardly located giant.

Little more can be cited as distinctive with any unanimity, except for the awe-inspiring sight of the New York City skyline

Figure 10

Figures 37 and 41,
pages 147 and 149

Figure 11, page 28

Figure 12, page 28




FIG. 9. Jersey City from the south

FIG. 10. The visual form of Jersey City as seen in the field






FIG. 11. *Journal Square*

FIG. 12. *The New Jersey Medical Center*



in the distance. The other diagrams fill out the image of the city, adding in particular those practical necessities, the major paths, primarily the well-trafficked ones which by their continuity are the exceptions to the majority of Jersey City streets. There is a paucity of recognizable districts and landmarks, and a lack of commonly known centers or nodal points. The city is, however, marked by the presence of several strong edges or isolating boundaries: the overhead lines of railroads and highways, the Palisades, and the two waterfronts.

In studying the individual sketches and interviews, it became apparent that none of the respondents had anything like a comprehensive view of the city in which they had lived for many years. The maps were often fragmented, with large blank areas, concentrating most often on small home territories. The river bluff seemed to be a strong isolating element, and usually a map showed either the top as strong and the lowland as weak or, vice versa, the two being connected by one or two purely conceptual paths. The lower area, in particular, seemed difficult to structure.

When asked for a general characterization of the city, one of the most common remarks was that it was not a whole, that it had no center, but was rather a collection of many hamlets. The question: "What first comes to mind with the words 'Jersey City'?", so easy to answer for Bostonians, proved to be a difficult one. Again and again, subjects repeated that "nothing special" came to mind, that the city was hard to symbolize, that it had no distinctive sections. One woman put it:

This is really one of the most pitiful things about Jersey City. There isn't anything that if someone came here from a far place, that I could say, "Oh, I want you to see this, this is so beautiful."

The most common response to the question of symbolism was nothing in the city at all, but rather the sight of the New York City skyline across the river. Much of the characteristic feeling for Jersey City seemed to be that it was a place on the edge of something else. One person put it that his two symbols were the skyline of New York, on the one side, and the Pulaski Skyway, standing for Newark, on the other. Another emphasized the sense of enclosing barriers: that to get out of Jersey City one must

either go under the Hudson, or through the confusing Tonelle traffic circle.

One could hardly ask for a more dramatic, more imageable; basic location and piece of topography than Jersey City, if one were able to build completely anew. But the general environment was persistently referred to with the words "old," "dirty," "drab." The streets were repeatedly described as "cut up." The interviews were notable for their paucity of information about the environment, and for the conceptual, rather than perceptually concrete, quality of the city image. Most striking was the strong tendency to describe, not by visual images, but by street names and the types of use. Take the following part of a trip description in a familiar area, as an example:

After you cross the highway, there's a going-up bridge; and after you come under the bridge, the first street you get to, there's a tannery packing company; the second corner after going on the avenue, you see banks on each side; and you come to the next corner, there's a radio store and a hardware store right close together on your right. On your left, before you cross the street, is a grocery store and a cleaner. You come on up to 7th Street, and on 7th Street is a saloon facing you on the lefthand corner, a vegetable market on the righthand—a liquor store on the right side of the road, on the left is a grocery store. The next street is 6th Street; there's no landmark except that you come under the railroad again. When you go under the railroad, the next street is 5th. On your right is a saloon; there's a new filling station across the street on your right; there is a saloon on the left. 4th Street—when you come to 4th on the righthand corner, there's a vacant lot; next to that vacant lot is a saloon; on the righthand side facing you is a meat wholesale place; and on your left across from the meat place, is a glass store. The next is 3rd—you come up to 3rd and see a drugstore on your right, whiskey store across from you on the right; on the left is a grocery store and a saloon on your left across from the grocery store. The next is 2nd, and there's a grocery store on the left and a saloon on the left across from it. On your right, before you cross the street, there's a place where they sell household appliances, and then 1st Street, there's a butcher shop, meat market on the left and across from it is a vacant lot that's used for a parking lot, on your right is a clothing store and a candy store on the right. . . .

Figure 13

and so on. In all this description we have only one or two visual images: a "going-up" bridge, and perhaps the railroad underpass. This subject first seems to see her environment when she reaches Hamilton Park, and then through her eyes one suddenly catches a glimpse of the fenced, open square, with its round, central bandstand, and the surrounding benches.

Many remarks came out about the indistinguishability of the physical scene:

It's much the same all over . . . it's more or less just common-ness to me. I mean, when I go up and down the streets, it's more or less the same thing—Newark Avenue, Jackson Avenue, Bergen Avenue. I mean, sometimes you can't decide which avenue you want to go on, because they're more or less just the same; there's nothing to differentiate them.

How would I recognize Fairview Avenue when I come to it?

FIG. 13. A street in Jersey City



By the street sign. It's the only way you can recognize any street in this city. There's nothing distinctive, just another apartment house, that's all, on the corner.

I think we usually find our way around. Where there's a will there's a way. It's confusing at times, you may lose some minutes in trying to find a place, but I think eventually you get where you want to go to.

In this relatively undifferentiated environment there is a reliance not only on use-locations, but frequently on gradients of use, or of the relative state of repair of structures. The street signs, the big advertising signs of Journal Square, and the factories are the landmarks. Any landscaped open spaces, such as Hamilton or Van Vorst Parks, or especially the large West Side Park, are cherished. On two occasions, people used tiny grass triangles at certain street intersections as landmarks. Another woman spoke of driving over to a small park on a Sunday, so that she could sit in the car and look at it. The fact that the Medical Center has a small landscaped plot in front of it seems to be as important an identifying characteristic as its great bulk and skyline silhouette.

The evident low imageability of this environment was reflected in the image held even by its long-time residents, and was manifested in dissatisfaction, poor orientation, and an inability to describe or differentiate its parts. Yet even such a seemingly chaotic set of surroundings does in fact have some pattern, and people seize upon and elaborate this pattern by concentration on minor clues, as well as by shifting their attention from physical appearance to other aspects.

Los Angeles

The Los Angeles area, the heart of a great metropolitan region, presents a different picture, and one quite different from Boston as well. The area, while comparable in size to the Boston and Jersey City zones, includes little more than the central business district and its fringes. The subjects were familiar with the area, not through residence, but by reasons of work place in one of the central offices or stores. Figure 14 presents the field reconnaissance in the usual manner.

As the core of a metropolis, central Los Angeles is heavily charged with meaning and activity, with large and presumably distinctive buildings, and with a basic pattern: its almost regular grid of streets. Yet a number of factors operate to result in a different, and less sharp, image than that of Boston. First is the decentralization of the metropolitan region, whereby the central area is still by courtesy "downtown," but there are several other basic cores to which people are oriented. The central area has intensive shopping, but it is no longer the best shopping, and great numbers of citizens never enter the downtown area from one year to the next. Second, the grid pattern itself is an undifferentiated matrix, within which elements cannot always be located with confidence. Third, the central activities are spatially extended and shifting, a fact which dilutes their impact. Fre-

FIG. 14. *The visual form of Los Angeles as seen in the field*




Figure 14



FIG. 15. *Los Angeles from the west*

quent rebuilding prevents the identification that builds up by historical process. The elements themselves, despite (and sometimes because of) frequent attempts at flamboyance, are often visually faceless. Nevertheless, we are not now looking at another chaotic Jersey City, but rather at the active and ecologically ordered center of a great metropolis.

Figure 15

The accompanying aerial photograph gives an impression of this scene. Except by minute attention to plant types, or to the distant background, it would be hard to distinguish this from the center of many U. S. cities. There is the same piling-up of blank office structures, the same ubiquity of traffic ways and parking lots. The image maps, however, are much more dense than those of Jersey City.

The essential structure of this image is the nodal point of Pershing Square, which lies in the crook of the L formed by two shopping streets, Broadway and 7th Street. All this is in the general matrix of a grid of paths. At the far end of Broadway is the Civic Center area, and beyond that the sentimentally important node of the Plaza-Olvera Street. Alongside Broadway is the

Spring Street financial district, and next over is Skid Row (Main Street). The Hollywood and Harbor Freeways may be recognized as bounding the two open sides of the L. The general image is remarkable for its emptiness east of Main or Los Angeles Streets, and south of 7th Street, except for the extension of the repeating grid. The central area is set in a vacuum. This L-shaped center is liberally sprinkled with remembered landmarks, chief of them being the Statler and Biltmore Hotels, and then, among others, the Richfield Building, the Public Library, Robinsons and Bullocks department stores, the Federal Savings Building, the Philharmonic auditorium, City Hall, and the Union Depot. But only two landmarks were described in any concrete detail: the ugly, black and gold Richfield Building and the pyramided top of the City Hall.

Figure 43, page 150

FIG. 16. *The Civic Center*






FIG. 17. *Pershing Square*

Other than the Civic Center area, recognizable districts are either small and linear, confined to the borders of paths (such as the 7th Street shopping, the Broadway shopping, Transportation Row on 6th Street, the Spring Street financial district, and Skid Row on Main Street), or relatively weak: Bunker Hill, Little Tokyo. The Civic Center is strongest, because of its obvious function, size, spatial openness, new buildings, and definite edges. Few fail to remark it. Bunker Hill is not as strong an image, despite its historical connotations, and quite a few felt that it was "not in the downtown area." Indeed, it is surprising how the core, in bending around this major topographic feature, has succeeded in visually burying it.

Pershing Square is consistently the strongest element of all: an exotically landscaped open space in the heart of downtown, reinforced by its use as an outdoor political forum, camp meeting,

Figure 16, page 35

and old people's rest. Along with the Plaza-Olvera Street node (involving another open space), Pershing Square was the most sharply described element, with its immaculate central lawn, fringed first by banana trees, then by a ring of old people sitting in solid ranks on the stone walls, then by busy streets, and finally by the close files of downtown buildings. Although remarkable, it was not always felt to be pleasant. Sometimes subjects showed fear of the old and eccentric people who use it; more often the response was one of pathos, heightened by the way in which these people are confined to the fringing walls, and kept off the central grass. Unfavorable comparisons were drawn with the earlier, if dowdier, aspect of the Square: a grove of trees, with scattered benches and walks. The central grass was resented not only because of its denial to the park loungers, but because it makes it impossible to cut across the space, as a pedestrian would normally do. Nevertheless, this is a highly identifiable image, strengthened by the presence of a dominant landmark, the red-brown mass of the Biltmore Hotel, which efficiently orients the direction of the Square.

For all its importance in the city image, Pershing Square seems to float a little. It is one block away from the two key streets, 7th and Broadway, and many were uncertain of its precise location, although sure of its general one. Subjects on their trips tended in their minds to peer sideways for it, as they passed each minor street. This seems bound up with its off-center location, and also with the subjects' tendency to confound various streets, as noted below.

Broadway was perhaps the only path which was unmistakable for all. As the original main street and still the largest shopping concentration in the downtown area, it is marked by the crowds on its sidewalks, by the length and continuity of its shopping, by the marquee of its movie houses, and by the street cars (where other streets carry only busses). Although conceded to be the core, if anything is, yet Broadway was not a shopping area for most of these middle-class persons. Its walks are crowded with the ethnic minorities and lower-income groups whose living quarters ring the central section. The subjects interviewed regarded this linear core as an alien one, looking at it with vary-

Figure 17

Figure 18, page 38

ing degrees of avoidance, curiosity, or fear. They were quick to describe the status differences between the Broadway crowds, and those to be seen on 7th Street, which, if not elite, is at least a middle-class shopping street.

In general, it is difficult to differentiate the numbered cross streets one from another, except for 6th, 7th, and 1st Streets. This confusion of paths was apparent in the interviews. To a lesser extent, the named longitudinal streets were also interchangeable. Several of these "north-south" streets, particularly Flower, Hope, Grand, and Olive, all of which run into Bunker Hill, tended at times, like the numbered streets, to be confused one for another.

Although one downtown street may be confounded for another, few subjects had difficulty in maintaining direction on the paths. End vistas, such as the Statler Hotel on 7th Street, the Library on Hope Street, Bunker Hill on Grand Street; and

FIG. 18. *Broadway*



side-to-side differences in use or pedestrian intensity, such as along Broadway, seem frequent enough to provide directional differentiation. In fact all streets are visually closed, despite the regular grid at the center, whether by topography, the freeways, or an irregularity in the grid itself.

Across the Hollywood Freeway is one of the strongest elements of all, the nodal center of the Plaza-Olvera Street. This was very sharply described: its shape, trees, benches, people; the tiles, the "cobbled" (actually brick-paved) street, the tight space, the goods for sale, unfailingly the smells of candles and candy. Not only is this small spot visually very distinct, but it is the only true historical anchor-point in the city and seems to generate a fierce attachment.

Through this same general area, however, between the Union Depot and the Civic Center, subjects had great difficulty in picking their way. They felt that the grid had deserted them, and

Figure 19

FIG. 19. *The Plaza and the entrance to Olvera Street*




Figure 20

they were unsure where the known streets struck into this amorphous zone. Alameda Street leads treacherously away to the left, instead of paralleling the north-south streets. The large-scale clearance of the civic area seems to have erased the original grid and substituted little new. The freeway is a sunken barrier. In their task of walking from Union Depot to the Statler, the relief with which most subjects greeted the appearance of 1st Street was almost audible.

When asked to describe or symbolize the city as a whole, the subjects used certain standard words: "spread-out," "spacious," "formless," "without centers." Los Angeles seemed to be hard to envision or conceptualize as a whole. An endless spread, which may carry pleasant connotations of space around the dwellings, or overtones of weariness and disorientation, was the common image. Said one subject:

FIG. 20. *The Hollywood Freeway*



It's as if you were going somewhere for a long time, and when you got there you discovered there was nothing there, after all.

But there was some evidence that orientation at the regional scale was not too difficult. The apparatus of regional orientation included the ocean, the mountains and hills for the older residents, the valley regions such as San Fernando and the large development districts such as Beverly Hills, the major freeway and boulevard system, and, finally, a central gradient of age over the whole metropolis, evidenced in the condition, style, and type of structures appropriate to each era in the successive rings of growth.

Below this grand scale, however, structure and identity seemed to be quite difficult. There were no medium-sized districts, and paths were confused. People spoke of being lost when off habitual routes, of depending heavily on street signs. At the smallest scale, there were occasional pockets of high identity and meaning: mountain cabins, beach houses, or areas planted with highly differentiated vegetation. But this was not universal, and an essential middle link in the structure, the imageability of districts at the medium scale, tended to be weak.

In almost all the interviews, where subjects were describing the trip they took from home to work, there was a progressive decrease in the vividness of impressions as they approached downtown. Near the home there was much detail about the slopes and turns, the vegetation and the people; there was evidence of daily interest and pleasure in the scene. Nearing the center, this image gradually became grayer, more abstract and conceptual. The downtown area, as in Jersey City, was basically a collection of named uses and store fronts. Undoubtedly this was in part due to the increasing strain of driving on the major radials, but it seemed to persist even after leaving the car. Evidently the visual material is itself of poorer stuff. Perhaps the increasing smog also has its effect.

Smog and haze, incidentally, were frequently mentioned as the torment of the city dweller. They seemed to dull environmental colors, so that the over-all tone was reported to be whitish, yellowish, or gray. Several drivers into the city center reported that they regularly checked on smog conditions each morning, by

noting the visibility of such distant tower beacons as the Richfield Building, or City Hall.

Automobile traffic and the highway system were dominant themes in the interviews. This was the daily experience, the daily battle—sometimes exciting, usually tense and exhausting. Trip details were full of references to signal lights and signs, intersections and turning problems. On the freeways, decisions had to be made far ahead of time; there were constant lane maneuvers. It was like shooting rapids in a boat, with the same excitement and tension, the same constant effort to "keep one's head." Many subjects noted their fears on driving a new route for the first time. There were frequent references to the overpasses, the fun of the big interchanges, the kinesthetic sensations of dropping, turning, climbing. For some persons, driving was a challenging, high-speed game.

On these fast roads, one can have some sense of the major topography. One subject felt that coming over a great hill each morning marked the midpoint of her journey and gave shape to it. Another noted the extension of the city's scale due to the new roads, which have changed her whole conception of the relations of elements. There were references to the pleasure of momentary extensive views from elevated portions of the freeway, versus the contained monotonous sensation of the embankment in a cut. On the other hand, as in Boston, these drivers seemed to have difficulty in locating the freeway, in tying it to the rest of the city structure. There was a common experience of a momentary loss of orientation when coming off a freeway ramp.

Another frequent theme was that of relative age. Perhaps because so much of the environment is new or changing, there was evidence of widespread, almost pathological, attachment to anything that had survived the upheaval. Thus the tiny Plaza-Olvera Street node, or even the decayed hotels of Bunker Hill, claimed the attention of many subjects. There was an impression from these few interviews that there is an even greater sentimental attachment to what is old than exists in conservative Boston.

In Los Angeles as well as in Jersey City, people took great delight in flowers and vegetation, which indeed are the glory of

many of the residential sections of the city. The early portions of home-to-work trips were full of vivid pictures of the flowers and trees. Even car drivers moving at high speed seemed to note and enjoy such urban detail.

But these remarks did not apply to the area directly under study. Central Los Angeles is far from the visual chaos of Jersey City, and it has a rather liberal number of single building landmarks. Yet, except for a conceptual and rather undifferentiated grid, it was difficult to organize or comprehend as a whole. It had no strong general symbols. The strongest images, Broadway and Pershing Square, were, to this middle class group of subjects at least, rather alien or even menacing. Not one described them as pleasant or beautiful. The little, neglected Plaza, and certain of the shopping or entertainment functions symbolized by the landmarks in the upper 7th Street area were the only elements on which any affection was bestowed. One subject put this by saying that the old Plaza, on one end, and the new Wilshire Boulevard, on the other, were the only things with character, and that they summed up Los Angeles. The image seemed to lack much of the recognizable character, stability, and pleasant meaning of central Boston.

Common Themes

We find, in comparing these three cities (if we can find anything in such small samplings) that, as might be expected, people adjust to their surroundings and extract structure and identity out of the material at hand. The types of elements used in the city image, and the qualities that make them strong or weak, seem quite comparable between the three, although the proportion of element types may vary with the actual form. Yet at the same time, there are marked differences between the levels of orientation and satisfaction in these different physical environments.

Among other things, the tests made clear the significance of space and breadth of view. The dominance of Boston's Charles River edge is based on the wide visual sweep it affords on entering the city from this side. A large number of city elements can be seen at once in their relations; one's position relative to the whole is abundantly clear. Los Angeles' Civic Center was noted for its spatial openness; Jersey City subjects responded to

Figure 4, page 20

the view before them as they descended the Palisades toward the Manhattan skyline.

There was an emotional delight arising from a broad view, which was referred to many times. Would it be possible, in our cities, to make this panoramic experience a more common one, for the thousands who pass every day? A broad view will sometimes expose chaos, or express characterless loneliness, but a well-managed panorama seems to be a staple of urban enjoyment.

Even raw or shapeless space seems to be remarkable, although perhaps not pleasant. Many people refer to the clearance and excavation at Dewey Square in Boston as a striking sight. Undoubtedly this is by contrast to the otherwise tight urban spaces. But when the space has some form, as it does along the Charles River or on Commonwealth Avenue, in Pershing Square or Louisburg Square or to some extent in Copley Square, the impact is much stronger: the feature becomes memorable. If Boston's Scollay Square or Jersey City's Journal Square had spatial character commensurate with their functional importance, they would truly be key features in their cities.

The landscape features of the city: the vegetation or the water, were often noted with care and with pleasure. The Jersey City subjects were sharply aware of the few green oases in their surroundings; those of Los Angeles often stopped to describe the exotic variety of local vegetation. Several of them reported daily detours which lengthened their trip to work but allowed them to pass by some particular planting, park, or body of water. Here is a not unusual excerpt from a Los Angeles trip:

You cross over Sunset, past a little park — I don't know what the name of it is. It's very nice, and — oh — the jacarandas are coming into bloom. One house about a block above has them. On down Canyon and all kinds of palm trees there: the high palms and the low palms; and then on down to the park.

Los Angeles, geared to the motor car, also furnishes the most vivid examples of the response to the path system: to the way it is itself organized, to its relation with other city elements, to its own internal character of space, view, and motion. But the visual dominance of the paths and their key influence as the net-

work from which most people experience their surroundings are also amply attested to in the Boston and Jersey City material.

Quite as apparent is the constant reference to socio-economic class: the avoidance of "lower class" Broadway in Los Angeles, the recognition of the "upper class" Bergen Section in Jersey City, or the unmistakable division of Boston's Beacon Hill into two distinct sides.

The interviews brought out another general response: to the way in which the physical scene symbolizes the passage of time. The Boston interviews were full of references to age contrast: the "new" Artery cutting through the "old" market district; the new Catholic chapel among the ancient buildings on Arch Street; the old (dark, ornamented, low) Trinity Church silhouetted against the new (bright, stark, tall) John Hancock Building, and so on. Indeed, descriptions were often made as if they were a response to contrast in the urban scene: spatial contrast, status contrast, use contrast, relative age, or comparisons of cleanliness or of landscaping. Elements and attributes became remarkable in terms of their setting in the whole.

In Los Angeles there is an impression that the fluidity of the environment and the absence of physical elements which anchor to the past are exciting and disturbing. Many descriptions of the scene by established residents, young or old, were accompanied by the ghosts of what used to be there. Changes, such as those wrought by the freeway system, have left scars on the mental image. The interviewer remarked:

There seems to be a bitterness or nostalgia among natives which could be resentment at the many changes, or just inability to re-orient fast enough to keep up with them.

General comments such as these quickly become apparent on reading the interview material. It is possible, however, to study both interviews and field studies more systematically, and to learn much more about the character and structure of the urban image. This will be the burden of the following chapter.

III.

THE CITY IMAGE AND ITS ELEMENTS

There seems to be a public image of any given city which is the overlap of many individual images. Or perhaps there is a series of public images, each held by some significant number of citizens. Such group images are necessary if an individual is to operate successfully within his environment and to cooperate with his fellows. Each individual picture is unique, with some content that is rarely or never communicated, yet it approximates the public image, which, in different environments, is more or less compelling, more or less embracing.

This analysis limits itself to the effects of physical, perceptible objects. There are other influences on imageability, such as the social meaning of an area, its function, its history, or even its name. These will be glossed over, since the objective here is to uncover the role of form itself. It is taken for granted that in actual design form should be used to reinforce meaning, and not to negate it.

The contents of the city images so far studied, which are referable to physical forms, can conveniently be classified into five types of elements: paths, edges, districts, nodes, and landmarks.

Indeed, these elements may be of more general application, since they seem to reappear in many types of environmental images, as may be seen by reference to Appendix A. These elements may be defined as follows:

1. *Paths.* Paths are the channels along which the observer customarily, occasionally, or potentially moves. They may be streets, walkways, transit lines, canals, railroads. For many people, these are the predominant elements in their image. People observe the city while moving through it, and along these paths the other environmental elements are arranged and related.

2. *Edges.* Edges are the linear elements not used or considered as paths by the observer. They are the boundaries between two phases, linear breaks in continuity: shores, railroad cuts, edges of development, walls. They are lateral references rather than coordinate axes. Such edges may be barriers, more or less penetrable, which close one region off from another; or they may be seams, lines along which two regions are related and joined together. These edge elements, although probably not as dominant as paths, are for many people important organizing features, particularly in the role of holding together generalized areas, as in the outline of a city by water or wall.

3. *Districts.* Districts are the medium-to-large sections of the city, conceived of as having two-dimensional extent, which the observer mentally enters "inside of," and which are recognizable as having some common, identifying character. Always identifiable from the inside, they are also used for exterior reference if visible from the outside. Most people structure their city to some extent in this way, with individual differences as to whether paths or districts are the dominant elements. It seems to depend not only upon the individual but also upon the given city.

4. *Nodes.* Nodes are points, the strategic spots in a city into which an observer can enter, and which are the intensive foci to and from which he is traveling. They may be primarily junctions, places of a break in transportation, a crossing or convergence of paths, moments of shift from one structure to another. Or the nodes may be simply concentrations, which gain their importance from being the condensation of some use or physical character, as a street-corner hangout or an enclosed square. Some




of these concentration nodes are the focus and epitome of a district, over which their influence radiates and of which they stand as a symbol. They may be called cores. Many nodes, of course, partake of the nature of both junctions and concentrations. The concept of node is related to the concept of path, since junctions are typically the convergence of paths, events on the journey. It is similarly related to the concept of district, since cores are typically the intensive foci of districts, their polarizing center. In any event, some nodal points are to be found in almost every image, and in certain cases they may be the dominant feature.

5. *Landmarks.* Landmarks are another type of point-reference, but in this case the observer does not enter within them, they are external. They are usually a rather simply defined physical object: building, sign, store, or mountain. Their use involves the singling out of one element from a host of possibilities. Some landmarks are distant ones, typically seen from many angles and distances, over the tops of smaller elements, and used as radial references. They may be within the city or at such a distance that for all practical purposes they symbolize a constant direction. Such are isolated towers, golden domes, great hills. Even a mobile point, like the sun, whose motion is sufficiently slow and regular, may be employed. Other landmarks are primarily local, being visible only in restricted localities and from certain approaches. These are the innumerable signs, store fronts, trees, doorknobs, and other urban detail, which fill in the image of most observers. They are frequently used clues of identity and even of structure, and seem to be increasingly relied upon as a journey becomes more and more familiar.

The image of a given physical reality may occasionally shift its type with different circumstances of viewing. Thus an expressway may be a path for the driver, and edge for the pedestrian. Or a central area may be a district when a city is organized on a medium scale, and a node when the entire metropolitan area is considered. But the categories seem to have stability for a given observer when he is operating at a given level.

None of the element types isolated above exist in isolation in the real case. Districts are structured with nodes, defined by



edges, penetrated by paths, and sprinkled with landmarks. Elements regularly overlap and pierce one another. If this analysis begins with the differentiation of the data into categories, it must end with their reintegration into the whole image. Our studies have furnished much information about the visual character of the element types. This will be discussed below. Only to a lesser extent, unfortunately, did the work make revelations about the interrelations between elements, or about image levels, image qualities, or the development of the image. These latter topics will be treated at the end of this chapter.

Paths

For most people interviewed, paths were the predominant city elements, although their importance varied according to the degree of familiarity with the city. People with least knowledge of Boston tended to think of the city in terms of topography, large regions, generalized characteristics, and broad directional relationships. Subjects who knew the city better had usually mastered part of the path structure; these people thought more in terms of specific paths and their interrelationships. A tendency also appeared for the people who knew the city best of all to rely more upon small landmarks and less upon either regions or paths.

The potential drama and identification in the highway system should not be underestimated. One Jersey City subject, who can find little worth describing in her surroundings, suddenly lit up when she described the Holland Tunnel. Another recounted her pleasure:

You cross Baldwin Avenue, you see all of New York in front of you, you see the terrific drop of land (the Palisades) . . . and here's this open panorama of lower Jersey City in front of you and you're going down hill, and there you know: there's the tunnel, there's the Hudson River and everything. . . . I always look to the right to see if I can see the . . . Statue of Liberty. . . . Then I always look up to see the Empire State Building, see how the weather is. . . . I have a real feeling of happiness because I'm going someplace, and I love to go places.

Particular paths may become important features in a number of ways. Customary travel will of course be one of the strongest

influences, so that major access lines, such as Boylston Street, Storrow Drive, or Tremont Street in Boston, Hudson Boulevard in Jersey City, or the freeways in Los Angeles, are all key image features. Obstacles to traffic, which often complicate the structure, may in other cases clarify it by concentrating cross flow into fewer channels, which thus become conceptually dominant. Beacon Hill, acting as a giant rotary, raises the importance of Cambridge and Charles Streets; the Public Garden strengthens Beacon Street. The Charles River, by confining traffic to a few highly visible bridges, all of individual shape, undoubtedly clarifies the path structure. Quite similarly, the Palisades in Jersey City focus attention on the three streets that successfully surmount it.

Concentration of special use or activity along a street may give it prominence in the minds of observers. Washington Street is the outstanding Boston example: subjects consistently associated it with shopping and theatres. Some people extended these characteristics to parts of Washington Street that are quite different (e.g., near State Street); many people seemed not to know that Washington extends beyond the entertainment segment, and thought it ended near Essex or Stuart Streets. Los Angeles has many examples—Broadway, Spring Street, Skid Row, 7th Street—where the use concentrations are prominent enough to make linear districts. People seemed to be sensitive to variations in the amount of activity they encountered, and sometimes guided themselves largely by following the main stream of traffic. Los Angeles' Broadway was recognized by its crowds and its street cars; Washington Street in Boston was marked by a torrent of pedestrians. Other kinds of activity at ground level also seemed to make places memorable, such as construction work near South Station, or the bustle of the food markets.

Characteristic spatial qualities were able to strengthen the image of particular paths. In the simplest sense, streets that suggest extremes of either width or narrowness attracted attention. Cambridge Street, Commonwealth Avenue, and Atlantic Avenue are all well known in Boston, and all were singled out for their great width. Spatial qualities of width and narrowness derived part of their importance from the common association of main streets with width and side streets with narrowness. Looking

for, and trusting to the "main" (i.e., wide) street becomes automatic, and in Boston the real pattern usually supports this assumption. Narrow Washington Street is the exception to this rule, and here the contrast is so strong in the other direction, as narrowness is reinforced by tall buildings and large crowds, that the very reversal became the identifying mark. Some of the orientation difficulties in Boston's financial district, or the anonymity of the Los Angeles grid, may be due to this lack of spatial dominance.

Special façade characteristics were also important for path identity. Beacon Street and Commonwealth Avenue were distinctive partly because of the building façades that line them. Pavement texture seemed to be less important, except in special cases such as Olvera Street in Los Angeles. Details of planting seemed also to be relatively unimportant, but a great deal of planting, like that on Commonwealth Avenue, could reinforce a path image very effectively.

Proximity to special features of the city could also endow a path with increased importance. In this case the path would be acting secondarily as an edge. Atlantic Avenue derived much importance from its relation to the wharves and the harbor, Storrow Drive from its location along the Charles River. Arlington and Tremont Streets were distinctive because one side runs along a park, and Cambridge Street acquired clarity from its border relationship to Beacon Hill. Other qualities that gave importance to single paths were the visual exposure of the path itself or the visual exposure from the path of other parts of the city. The Central Artery was notable partly for its visual prominence as it sweeps through the city on an elevated course. The bridges over the Charles were also apparent for long distances. But the Los Angeles freeways at the edges of the downtown area are visually concealed by cuts or planted embankments. A number of car-oriented subjects spoke as if those freeways were not there. On the other hand, drivers indicated that their attention sharpened as a freeway came out of a cut and attained a wide view.

Occasionally, paths were important largely for structural reasons. Massachusetts Avenue was almost pure structure for most subjects, who were unable to describe it. Yet its relationship as

Figure 30, page 77

Figure 18, page 38

Figure 21, page 53

Figure 7, page 24

Figure 20, page 40

an intersector of many confusing streets made it a major Boston element. Most of the Jersey City paths seemed to have this purely structural character.

Where major paths lacked identity, or were easily confused one for the other, the entire city image was in difficulty. Thus Tremont Street and Shawmut Avenue might be interchangeable in Boston, or Olive, Hope, and Hill Streets in Los Angeles. Boston's Longfellow Bridge was not infrequently confused with the Charles River Dam, probably since both carry transit lines and terminate in traffic circles. This made for real difficulties in the city, both in the road and subway systems. Many of the paths in Jersey City were difficult to find, both in reality and in memory.

That the paths, once identifiable, have continuity as well, is an obvious functional necessity. People regularly depended upon this quality. The fundamental requirement is that the actual track, or bed of the pavement, go through; the continuity of other characteristics is less important. Paths which simply have a satisfactory degree of track continuity were selected as the dependable ones in an environment like Jersey City. They can be followed by the stranger, even if with difficulty. People often generalized that other kinds of characteristics along a continuous track were also continuous, despite actual changes.

But other factors of continuity had importance as well. When the channel width changed, as Cambridge Street does at Bowdoin Square, or when the spatial continuity was interrupted, as it is at Washington Street at Dock Square, people had difficulty in sensing a continuation of the same path. At the other end of Washington Street, a sudden change in the use of buildings may partly explain why people failed to extend Washington Street beyond Kneeland Street into the South End.

Examples of characteristics giving continuity to a path are the planting and façades along Commonwealth Avenue, or the building type and setback along Hudson Boulevard. Names in themselves played a role. Beacon Street is primarily in the Back Bay but relates to Beacon Hill by its name. The continuity of the name of Washington Street gave people a clue as to how to proceed through the South End, even if they were ignorant of this area. There is a pleasant feeling of relationship to be gained



FIG. 21. *Commonwealth Avenue*

simply from standing on a street which by name continues to the heart of the city, however far. A reverse example is the attention given to the nondescript beginnings of Wilshire and Sunset Boulevards in the central area of Los Angeles, because of their special character farther out. The path bordering the Boston harbor, on the other hand, was at times fragmented simply because of the changing names it bears: Causeway Street, Commercial Street, and Atlantic Avenue.





Paths may not only be identifiable and continuous, but have directional quality as well: one direction along the line can easily be distinguished from the reverse. This can be done by a gradient, a regular change in some quality which is cumulative in one direction. Most frequently sensed were the topographic gradients: in Boston, particularly on Cambridge Street, Beacon Street, and Beacon Hill. A gradient of use intensity, such as on the approach to Washington Street, was also noted, or, on a regional scale, the gradient of increasing age on approaching the center of Los Angeles on a freeway. In the relatively gray environment of Jersey City, there were two examples of gradients based on the relative state of repair of tenements.

A prolonged curve is also a gradient, a steady change in direction of movement. This was not often sensed kinesthetically: the only citations of a bodily sense of curving motion were in the Boston subway, or on portions of the Los Angeles freeways. When street curves are mentioned in the interviews, they seem to relate primarily to visual clues. The turning in Charles Street at Beacon Hill was sensed, for example, because the close building walls heightened the visual perception of curvature.

People tended to think of path destinations and origin points: they liked to know where paths came from and where they led. Paths with clear and well-known origins and destinations had stronger identities, helped tie the city together, and gave the observer a sense of his bearings whenever he crossed them. Some subjects thought of general destinations for paths, to a section of the city, for example, while others thought of specific places. One person, who made rather high demands for intelligibility upon the city environment, was troubled because he saw a set of railroad tracks, and did not know the destination of trains using them.

Cambridge Street in Boston has clear, strategic terminal points: the Charles Street rotary and Scollay Square. Other streets may have only one sharp terminal: Commonwealth Avenue at the Public Garden, or Federal Street at Post Office Square. On the other hand, the indefinite finale of Washington Street—variously thought of as going to State Street, to Dock Square, to Haymarket Square, or even to North Station (actually it formally runs to

the Charlestown bridge)—prevented it from becoming as strong a feature as it might otherwise have been. In Jersey City, the never-accomplished convergence of the three main streets crossing the Palisades, and their final nondescript subsidence, was highly confusing.

This same kind of end-from-end differentiation, which is conferred by termini, can be created by other elements which may be visible near the end, or apparent end, of a path. The Common near one end of Charles Street acted this way, as did the State House for Beacon Street. The apparent visual closure of 7th Street in Los Angeles by the Hotel Statler, and of Boston's Washington Street by the Old South Meeting House, had the same effect. Both are accomplished by a slight shift of the path direction, putting an important building on the visual axis. Elements known to be on a particular side of a path also conferred a sense of direction: Symphony Hall on Massachusetts Avenue and the Boston Common along Tremont Street were both employed in this way. In Los Angeles, even the relatively heavier concentration of pedestrians on the western side of Broadway was used to judge in which direction one was facing.

Once a path has directional quality, it may have the further attribute of being scaled: one may be able to sense one's position along the total length, to grasp the distance traversed or yet to go. Features which facilitate scaling, of course, usually confer a sense of direction as well, except for the simple technique of counting blocks, which is directionless but can be used to compute distances. Many subjects referred to this latter clue, but by no means all. It was most commonly used in the regular pattern of Los Angeles.

Most often, perhaps, scaling was accomplished by a sequence of known landmarks or nodes along the path. The marking of identifiable regions as a path enters and leaves them also constituted a powerful means of giving direction and scaling to a path. Charles Street entering Beacon Hill from the Common, and Summer Street entering the shoe and leather district on the way to South Station, are examples of this effect.


Given a directional quality in a path, we may next inquire if it is aligned, that is, if its direction is referable to some larger



Figure 32, page 80

Figure 18, page 38





system. In Boston, there were many examples of unaligned paths. One common cause was the subtle, misleading curve. Most people missed the curve in Massachusetts Avenue at Fal-mouth Street, and confused their total map of Boston as a result. They considered Massachusetts Avenue to be straight, sensed its right-angle intersections with a large number of streets, and assumed these streets to be parallel. Boylston and Tremont Streets were difficult because, by a number of small changes, they pass over from almost parallel to almost perpendicular. Atlantic Avenue was elusive because it is a compound of two long curves and a substantial straight tangent, a path which completely reverses its direction but is straight in its most characteristic section.

At the same time more abrupt directional shifts may enhance visual clarity by limiting the spatial corridor, and by providing prominent sites for distinctive structures. Thus the Washington Street core was defined; Hanover Street was crowned by an old church at the apparent end; and the South End cross streets gained intimacy as they shifted course to cross the major radials. Quite similarly, one was prevented from sensing the vacuum in which central Los Angeles is placed by the grid shifts which close off the outward view.

The second common cause of misalignment to the rest of the city was the sharp separation of a path from surrounding elements. Paths in the Boston Common, for example, caused much confusion: people were uncertain which walkways to use in order to arrive at particular destinations outside the Common. Their view of these outside destinations was blocked, and the paths of the Common failed to tie to outside paths. The Central Artery was a still better example, for it is more detached from its surroundings. It is elevated and does not allow a clear view of adjacent streets, but permits a kind of fast and undisturbed movement totally missing in the city. It is a special kind of automobile-land rather than a normal city street. Many subjects had great difficulty aligning the Artery to surrounding elements, although it was known to connect North and South Stations. In Los Angeles as well, the freeways were not felt to be "in" the rest of the city, and coming off an exit ramp was typically a moment of severe disorientation.

Figure 7, page 24

Recent research on the problems of erecting directional signs on the new freeways has shown that this disassociation from the surroundings causes each turning decision to be made under pressure and without adequate preparation. Even familiar drivers showed a surprising lack of knowledge of the freeway system and its connections. General orientation to the total landscape was the greatest need of these motorists.²

The railroad lines and the subway are other examples of detachment. The buried paths of the Boston subway could not be related to the rest of the environment except where they come up for air, as in crossing the river. The surface entrances of the stations may be strategic nodes in the city, but they are related along invisible conceptual linkages. The subway is a disconnected nether world, and it is intriguing to speculate what means might be used to mesh it into the structure of the whole.

The water surrounding the Boston peninsula is a basic element to which parts may be aligned. The Back Bay grid was related to the Charles River; Atlantic Avenue was linked to the harbor; Cambridge Street led clearly to the river from Scollay Square. Hudson Boulevard in Jersey City, despite its frequent twists, was aligned with the long peninsula between the Hackensack and the Hudson. The Los Angeles grid, of course, provided automatic alignment between downtown streets. It was easy to put down as a basic pattern in a sketch map, even if the individual streets were not distinguishable. Two-thirds of the subjects drew this first, before adding any other elements. However, the fact that this grid is turned through some angular distance, both from the ocean coast line and the cardinal directions, gave a number of subjects some uneasiness.

When we consider more than one path, then the path intersection becomes vital, since it is the point of decision. The simple perpendicular relationship seemed easiest to handle, especially if the shape of the intersection was reinforced by other features. The best-known intersection in Boston, according to our interviews, was that of Commonwealth Avenue and Arlington Street. It is a visually obvious tee, supported by the space, the planting, the traffic, and the importance of the elements joined. The crossing of Charles and Beacon Streets was also well known: the outlines are made visible and reinforced by the



Figure 29, page 75

borders of the Common and the Public Garden. Intersections of a number of streets with Massachusetts Avenue were easily understood, probably because the right-angle relationships stood out in contrast to the remainder of the central city.

Indeed, for several subjects, confused intersections with streets entering from many angles were one of their typical Boston characteristics. Crossings of more than four points almost always gave trouble. An experienced taxi dispatcher, with a near-perfect grasp of the city path structure, confessed that the five-pointed crossing at Church Green on Summer Street was one of the two things in the city that troubled him. Equally unnerving was a traffic circle with many entering paths occurring at rapid intervals around an undifferentiated curve.

But the number of entrances is not the whole story. Even a non-perpendicular, five-pointed crossing may be made clear, as has been done in Boston's Copley Square. The controlled space and the heightened character of the node serve to bring out the angled relationship between Huntington Avenue and Boylston Street. Park Square, on the other hand, is a simple perpendicular joint that in its shapelessness fails to communicate its structure. At many Boston crossings not only are the number of paths multiplied, but the continuity of the spatial corridor is completely lost when it strikes the chaotic emptiness of a square.

Nor are such chaotic crossings simply the product of past historical accident. The contemporary highway interchange is even more confusing, particularly since it must be negotiated at higher speeds. Several Jersey City subjects, for example, spoke with fear of the shape of the Tonnelle Avenue Circle.

A perceptual problem on a larger scale is raised where a path branches slightly to make alternate paths, both of relative importance. A case is the branching of Storrow Drive (after a name confusion with Charles Street) into two paths: the older Nashua Street, leading to Causeway-Commercial-Atlantic, and the recent Central Artery. These two paths were not infrequently confused with one another, producing major convulsions in the image. All subjects seemed unable to conceive both at once; maps showed either one or the other as an extension of Storrow Drive. Quite similarly, in the subway system, the successive

branching of main lines was a problem, since it was hard to keep distinct the images of two slightly divergent branches and hard to remember where the branch occurred.

A few important paths may be imaged together as a simple structure, despite any minor irregularities, as long as they have a consistent general relationship to one another. The Boston street system is not conducive to this kind of image, except perhaps for the basic parallelism of Washington and Tremont Streets. But the Boston subway system, whatever its involutions in true scale, seemed fairly easy to visualize as two parallel lines cut at the center by the Cambridge-Dorchester line, although the parallel lines might be confused one with the other, particularly since both go to North Station. The freeway system in Los




Figure 22





FIG. 22. *The Tonnelle Avenue Circle*



Angeles seemed to be imaged as a complete structure, as did the Jersey City system of Hudson Boulevard intersected by three paths which go down over the Palisades, or the triad of West Side, Hudson, and Bergen Boulevards, with the regular cross streets between.

Where a subject was accustomed to travel by automobile, one-way restrictions were difficult complications in the image of a path structure. The taxi dispatcher's second mental block was due to just such an irreversibility in the system. For others, Washington Street was not traceable across Dock Square because it is one-way entering on both sides.

A large number of paths may be seen as a total network, when repeating relationships are sufficiently regular and predictable.

FIG. 23. *The Back Bay*




The Los Angeles grid is a good example. Almost every subject could easily put down some twenty major paths in correct relation to each other. At the same time, this very regularity made it difficult for them to distinguish one path from another.

Boston's Back Bay is an interesting path network. Its regularity is remarkable in contrast to the rest of the central city, an effect that would not occur in most American cities. But this is not a featureless regularity. The longitudinal streets were sharply differentiated from the cross streets in everyone's mind, much as they are in Manhattan. The long streets all have individual character—Beacon Street, Marlboro Street, Commonwealth Avenue, Newbury Street, each one is different—while the cross streets act as measuring devices. The relative width of the streets, the block lengths, the building frontages, the naming system, the relative length and number of the two kinds of streets, their functional importance, all tend to reinforce this differentiation. Thus a regular pattern is given form and character. The alphabet formula for naming the cross streets was frequently used as a location device, much as the numbers are used in Los Angeles.

The South End, on the other hand, while having the same topological form of long parallel major streets interconnected by short minor streets, and while often mentally considered as a regular grid, is much less successful in its pattern. Major and minor streets are also differentiated by width and use, and many of the minor streets have more character than those of the Back Bay. But there is a lack of differentiated character in the major streets: Columbus Avenue is hard to distinguish from Tremont Street, or from Shawmut Avenue. This interchangeability was frequent in the interviews.

The frequent reduction of the South End to a geometrical system was typical of the constant tendency of the subjects to impose regularity on their surroundings. Unless obvious evidence refuted it, they tried to organize paths into geometrical networks, disregarding curves and non-perpendicular intersections. The lower area of Jersey City was frequently drawn as a grid, even though it is one only in part. Subjects absorbed all of central Los Angeles into a repeating network, without being disturbed by the distortion at the eastern edge. Several subjects



even insisted on reducing the street maze of Boston's financial district to a checkerboard! The sudden, and particularly the rather indiscernible, shift of one grid system to another grid system, or to a non-grid, was very confusing. Subjects in Los Angeles were often quite disoriented in the area north of First Street or east of San Pedro.

Edges

Edges are the linear elements not considered as paths: they are usually, but not quite always, the boundaries between two kinds of areas. They act as lateral references. They are strong in Boston and Jersey City but weaker in Los Angeles. Those edges seem strongest which are not only visually prominent, but also continuous in form and impenetrable to cross movement. The Charles River in Boston is the best example and has all of these qualities.

The importance of the peninsular definition of Boston has already been mentioned. It must have been much more important in the 18th century, when the city was a true and very striking peninsula. Since then the shore lines have been erased or changed, but the picture persists. One change, at least, has strengthened the image: the Charles River edge, once a swampy backwater, is now well defined and developed. It was frequently described, and sometimes drawn in great detail. Everyone remembered the wide open space, the curving line, the bordering highways, the boats, the Esplanade, the Shell.

The water edge on the other side, the harborfront, was also generally known, and remembered for its special activity. But the sense of water was less clear, since it was obscured by many structures, and since the life has gone out of the old harbor activities. Most subjects were unable to interconnect the Charles River and Boston Harbor in any concrete way. Partly this must be due to the screening of the water at the tip of the peninsula by railroad yards and buildings, partly to the chaotic aspect of the water, with its myriad bridges and docks, at the meeting of the Charles River, the Mystic River, and the sea. The lack of frequented waterside paths, as well as the drop in water level at the Dam, also breaks the continuity. Farther west, few were aware of any




Figure 4, page 20

water in the South Bay, nor could they imagine any stop to development in this direction. This lack of peninsular closure deprived the citizen of a satisfying sense of completion and rationality in his city.

The Central Artery is inaccessible to pedestrians, at some points impassable, and is spatially prominent. But it is only occasionally exposed to view. It was a case of what might be called a fragmentary edge: in the abstract continuous, but only visualized at discrete points. The railroad lines were another example. The Artery, in particular, was like a snake lying over the city image. Held down at the ends and at one or two internal points, it elsewhere writhed and twisted from one position to the next. The lack of relation felt while driving the Artery was mirrored in its ambiguous location for the pedestrian.

Storrow Drive, on the other hand, while also felt to be "outside" by the driver, was clearly located on the map, because of its alignment to the Charles River. It was the Charles River, despite its role as the basic edge in the Boston image, which was curiously isolated from the detailed structure of the adjoining Back Bay. People were at a loss as to how to move from one to the other. We can speculate that this was not true before Storrow Drive cut off pedestrian access at the foot of each cross street.

Similarly, the interrelation of the Charles River and Beacon Hill was hard to grasp. Although the position of the hill is potentially explanatory of the puzzling bend in the river, and although the hill thereby gains a commanding enfilade view of the river edge, the Charles Street rotary seemed for most people to be the only firm connection between the two. If the hill rose sharply and immediately out of the water, instead of behind a masking foreshore covered by uses which are only doubtfully associated with Beacon Hill, and if it were more closely tied to the path system along the river, then the relation would have been much clearer.

In Jersey City, the waterfront was also a strong edge, but a rather forbidding one. It was a no-man's land, a region beyond the barbed wire. Edges, whether of railroads, topography, throughways, or district boundaries, are a very typical feature of this environment and tend to fragment it. Some of the most

Figure 7, page 24



FIG. 24. *The lake front of Chicago*

unpleasant edges, such as the bank of the Hackensack River with its burning dump areas, seemed to be mentally erased.

The disruptive power of an edge must be reckoned with. The isolation of the North End in Boston by the Central Artery was glaring, in the eyes of residents and non-residents alike. Had it been possible, for example, to preserve the connection of Hanover Street into Scollay Square, this effect might have been minimized. The widening of Cambridge Street, in its day, must have done the same to the West End-Beacon Hill continuum. The broad gash of Boston's railroad tracks seemed to dismember the city, and to isolate the "forgotten triangle" between the Back Bay and the South End.

While continuity and visibility are crucial, strong edges are not necessarily impenetrable. Many edges are uniting seams, rather than isolating barriers, and it is interesting to see the differences in effect. Boston's Central Artery seems to divide absolutely, to isolate. Wide Cambridge Street divides two regions sharply but keeps them in some visual relation. Beacon Street, the visible boundary of Beacon Hill along the Common, acts not as a barrier but as a seam along which the two major areas are clearly joined together. Charles Street at the foot of Beacon Hill both divides and unites, leaving the lower area in uncertain relation to the hill above. Charles Street carries heavy traffic but also contains the local service stores and special activities associated with the Hill. It pulls the residents together by attracting them to itself. It acts ambiguously either as linear node, edge, or path for various people at various times.

Edges are often paths as well. Where this was so, and where the ordinary observer was not shut off from moving on the path (as he is on the Central Artery, for example), then the circulation image seemed to be the dominant one. The element was usually pictured as a path, reinforced by boundary characteristics.

Figueroa and Sunset Streets, and to a lesser extent Los Angeles and Olympic Streets, were usually thought of as the edges of the Los Angeles central business district. Interestingly enough, they were stronger in this respect than the Hollywood and Harbor Freeways, which also can be thought of as major boundaries, and are both much more important as paths and physically more imposing. The fact that Figueroa and the other surface streets are conceptually part of the general grid, and have been familiar for some time, as well as the relative invisibility of the depressed or landscaped freeways, all conspired to erase these freeways from the image. Many subjects had difficulty in making a mental connection between the fast highway and the remainder of the city structure, just as in the Boston case. They would, in imagination, even walk across the Hollywood Freeway as if it did not exist. A high-speed artery may not necessarily be the best way of visually delimiting a central district.

The elevated railways of Jersey City and Boston are examples of what might be called overhead edges. The elevated along

Figure 57, page 169




Figure 24, page 64

Washington Street in Boston, seen from below, identifies the path and fixes the direction to downtown. Where it leaves the street, at Broadway, the path loses direction and force. When several such edges are curving and intersecting overhead, as they do near North Station, the result may be quite confusing. Yet high overhead edges, which would not be barriers at the ground level, might in the future be very effective orientation elements in a city.

Edges may also, like paths, have directional qualities. The Charles River edge, for example, has the obvious side-from-side differentiation of water and city, and the end-from-end distinction provided by Beacon Hill. Most edges had little of this quality, however.

It is difficult to think of Chicago without picturing Lake Michigan. It would be interesting to see how many Chicagoans would begin to draw a map of their city by putting down something other than the line of the lake shore. Here is a magnificent example of a visible edge, gigantic in scale, that exposes an entire metropolis to view. Great buildings, parks, and tiny private beaches all come down to the water's edge, which throughout most of its length is accessible and visible to all. The contrast, the differentiation of events along the line, and the lateral breadth are all very strong. The effect is reinforced by the concentration of paths and activities along its extent. The scale is perhaps unrelievedly large and coarse, and too much open space is at times interposed between city and water, as at the Loop. Yet the façade of Chicago on the Lake is an unforgettable sight.

Districts

Districts are the relatively large city areas which the observer can mentally go inside of, and which have some common character. They can be recognized internally, and occasionally can be used as external reference as a person goes by or toward them. Many persons interviewed took care to point out that Boston, while confusing in its path pattern even to the experienced inhabitant, has, in the number and vividness of its differentiated districts, a quality that quite makes up for it. As one person put it:

Each part of Boston is different from the other. You can tell pretty much what area you're in.

Jersey City has its districts too, but they are primarily ethnic or class districts with little physical distinction. Los Angeles is markedly lacking in strong regions, except for the Civic Center area. The best that can be found are the linear, street-front districts of Skid Row or the financial area. Many Los Angeles subjects referred with some regret to the pleasure of living in a place that has strongly characteristic areas. Said one:

I like Transportation Row, because it's all there together. That's the main thing; all these other things are spotty . . . There's transportation right there. And all the people have the same thing in common working there. It's very nice.

Subjects, when asked which city they felt to be a well-oriented one, mentioned several, but New York (meaning Manhattan) was unanimously cited. And this city was cited not so much for its grid, which Los Angeles has as well, but because it has a number of well-defined characteristic districts, set in an ordered frame of rivers and streets. Two Los Angeles subjects even referred to Manhattan as being "small" in comparison to their central area! Concepts of size may depend in part on how well a structure can be grasped.

In some Boston interviews, the districts were the basic elements of the city image. One subject, for example, when asked to go from Faneuil Hall to Symphony Hall, replied at once by labeling the trip as going from North End to Back Bay. But even where they were not actively used for orientation, districts were still an important and satisfying part of the experience of living in the city. Recognition of distinct districts in Boston seemed to vary somewhat as acquaintance with the city increased. People most familiar with Boston tended to recognize regions but to rely more heavily for organization and orientation on smaller elements. A few people extremely familiar with Boston were unable to generalize detailed perceptions into districts: conscious of minor differences in all parts of the city, they did not form regional groups of elements.

The physical characteristics that determine districts are thematic continuities which may consist of an endless variety of components: texture, space, form, detail, symbol, building type, use, activity, inhabitants, degree of maintenance, topography. In a closely built city such as Boston, homogeneities of façade—

material, modeling, ornament, color, skyline, especially fenestration—were all basic clues in identifying major districts. Beacon Hill and Commonwealth Avenue are both examples. The clues were not only visual ones: noise was important as well. At times, indeed, confusion itself might be a clue, as it was for the woman who remarked that she knows she is in the North End as soon as she feels she is getting lost.

Usually, the typical features were imaged and recognized in a characteristic cluster, the thematic unit. The Beacon Hill image, for example, included steep narrow streets; old brick row houses of intimate scale; inset, highly maintained, white doorways; black trim; cobblestones and brick walks; quiet; and upper-class pedestrians. The resulting thematic unit was distinctive by contrast to the rest of the city and could be recognized immediately. In other parts of central Boston, there was some thematic confusion. It was not uncommon to group the Back Bay with the South End, despite their very different use, status, and pattern. This was probably the result of a certain architectural homogeneity plus some similarity of historical background. Such likenesses tend to blur the city image.

A certain reinforcement of clues is needed to produce a strong image. All too often, there are a few distinctive signs, but not enough for a full thematic unit. Then the region may be recognizable to someone familiar with the city, but it lacks any visual strength or impact. Such, for example, is Little Tokyo in Los Angeles, recognizable by its population and the lettering on its signs but otherwise indistinguishable from the general matrix. Although it is a strong ethnic concentration, probably known to many people, it appeared as only a subsidiary portion of the city image.

Yet social connotations are quite significant in building regional images. A series of street interviews indicated the class overtones that many people associate with different districts. Most of the Jersey City regions were class or ethnic areas, discernible only with difficulty for the outsider. Both Jersey City and Boston have shown the exaggerated attention paid to upper-class districts, and the resulting magnification of the importance of elements in those areas. District names also help to give identity to districts even

when the thematic unit does not establish a striking contrast with other parts of the city, and traditional associations can play a similar role.


When the main requirement has been satisfied, and a thematic unit that contrasts with the rest of the city has been constituted, the degree of internal homogeneity is less significant, especially if discordant elements occur in a predictable pattern. Small stores on street corners establish a rhythm on Beacon Hill that one subject perceived as part of her image. These stores in no way weakened her non-commercial image of Beacon Hill but merely added to it. Subjects could pass over a surprising amount of local disagreement with the characteristic features of a region.

Districts have various kinds of boundaries. Some are hard, definite, precise. Such is the boundary of the Back Bay at the Charles River or at the Public Garden. All agreed on this exact location. Other boundaries may be soft or uncertain, such as the limit between downtown shopping and the office district, to whose existence and approximate location most people would testify. Still other regions have no boundaries at all, as did the South End for many of our subjects. Figure 25 illustrates these

Figure 57, page 169

Figure 55, page 167

FIG. 25. Variable boundaries of Boston districts



differences of boundary character, in the case of Boston, by outlining both the maximum extent assigned to any district, and the hard core of common agreement.

These edges seem to play a secondary role: they may set limits to a district, and may reinforce its identity, but they apparently have less to do with constituting it. Edges may augment the tendency of districts to fragment the city in a disorganizing way. A few people sensed disorganization as one result of the large number of identifiable districts in Boston: strong edges, by hindering transitions from one district to another, may add to the impression of disorganization.

That type of district which has a strong core, surrounded by a thematic gradient which gradually dwindles away, is not uncommon. Sometimes, indeed, a strong node may create a sort of district in a broader homogeneous zone, simply by "radiation," that is, by the sense of proximity to the nodal point. These are primarily reference areas, with little perceptual content, but they are useful organizing concepts, nevertheless.




FIG. 26. *The market area*



Some well-known Boston districts were unstructured in the public image. The West End and North End were internally undifferentiated for many people who recognized these regions. Even more often, thematically vivid districts such as the market area seemed confusingly shapeless, both externally and internally. The physical sensations of the market activity are unforgettable. Faneuil Hall and its associations reinforce them. Yet the area is shapeless and sprawling, divided by the Central Artery, and hampered by the two activity centers which vie for dominance: Faneuil Hall and Haymarket Square. Dock Square is spatially chaotic. The connections to other areas are either obscure or disrupted by the Artery. Thus the market district simply floated in most images. Instead of fulfilling its potential role as a mosaic link at the head of the Boston peninsula, as does the Common farther down, the district, while distinctive, acted only as a chaotic barrier zone. Beacon Hill, on the other hand, was very highly structured, with internal sub-regions, a node at Louisburg Square, various landmarks, and a configuration of paths.

Again, some regions are introvert, turned in upon themselves with little reference to the city outside them, such as Boston's North End or Chinatown. Others may be extrovert, turned outward and connected to surrounding elements. The Common visibly touches neighboring regions, despite its inner path confusions. Bunker Hill in Los Angeles is an interesting example of a district of fairly strong character and historical association, on a very sharp topographical feature lying even closer to the city's heart than does Beacon Hill. Yet the city flows around this element, buries its topographic edges in office buildings, breaks off its path connections, and effectively causes it to fade or even disappear from the city image. Here is a striking opportunity for change in the urban landscape.

Some districts are single ones, standing alone in their zone. The Jersey City and Los Angeles regions are practically all of this kind, and the South End is a Boston example. Others may be linked together, such as Little Tokyo and the Civic Center in Los Angeles, or West End-Beacon Hill in Boston. In one part of central Boston, inclusive of the Back Bay, the Common, Beacon Hill, the downtown shopping district, and the financial and mar-

Figure 26

See Appendix C for a detailed discussion of Beacon Hill

Figure 27, page 72



FIG. 27. *Bunker Hill*



ket areas, the regions are close enough together and sufficiently well joined to make a continuous mosaic of distinctive districts. Wherever one proceeds within these limits, one is in a recognizable area. The contrast and proximity of each area, moreover, heightens the thematic strength of each. The quality of Beacon Hill, for example, is sharpened by its nearness to Scollay Square, and to the downtown shopping district.

Nodes

Nodes are the strategic foci into which the observer can enter, typically either junctions of paths, or concentrations of some characteristic. But although conceptually they are small points in the city image, they may in reality be large squares, or somewhat extended linear shapes, or even entire central districts when the city is being considered at a large enough level. Indeed, when conceiving the environment at a national or international level, then the whole city itself may become a node.

The junction, or place of a break in transportation, has compelling importance for the city observer. Because decisions must be made at junctions, people heighten their attention at such

places and perceive nearby elements with more than normal clarity. This tendency was confirmed so repeatedly that elements located at junctions may automatically be assumed to derive special prominence from their location. The perceptual importance of such locations shows in another way as well. When subjects were asked where on a habitual trip they first felt a sense of arrival in downtown Boston, a large number of people singled out break-points of transportation as the key places. In a number of cases, the point was at the transition from a highway (Storrow Drive or the Central Artery) to a city street; in another case, the point was at the first railroad stop in Boston (Back Bay Station) even though the subject did not get off there. Inhabitants of Jersey City felt they had left their city when they had passed through the Tonnelle Avenue Circle. The

FIG. 28. *The Charles Street rotary*



transition from one transportation channel to another seems to mark the transition between major structural units.

Such points as Scollay Square, the Charles Street rotary, and South Station, are examples of strong junction nodes in Boston. The Charles Street rotary and Scollay Square are both important junction nodes, since both are the switch points at which one flanks the obstacle of Beacon Hill. The rotary itself is not a handsome place, but it clearly expresses the transfer between river, bridge, Storrow Drive, Charles Street, and Cambridge Street. Moreover, the open river space, the elevated station, the trains popping in and out of the hillside, the heavy traffic, all can be clearly visualized. The nodes can be important even when the physical form is shapeless and slippery, as it is in Journal Square in Jersey City.

The subway stations, strung along their invisible path systems, are strategic junction nodes. Some, like Park Street, Charles Street, Copley, and South Station, were quite important in the Boston map, and a few subjects would organize the rest of the city around them. Most of these key stations were associated with some key surface feature. Others, such as Massachusetts, were not prominent. This may be because this particular transfer was rarely used by these particular subjects, or because of unfavorable physical circumstances: the lack of visual interest, and the disassociation of the subway node from the street crossing. The stations themselves have many individual characteristics: some are easy to recognize, like Charles Street, others difficult, like Mechanics. Most of them are hard to relate structurally to the ground above them, but some are particularly confusing, such as the utter directionlessness of the upper-level station at Washington Street. A detailed analysis of the imageability of subway systems, or of transit systems in general, would be both useful and fascinating.

Major railroad stations are almost always important city nodes, although their importance may be declining. Boston's South Station was one of the strongest in the city, since it is functionally vital for commuter, subway rider, and intercity traveler, and is visually impressive for its bulk fronting on the open space of Dewey Square. The same might have been said for airports, had

our study areas included them. In theory, even ordinary street intersections are nodes, but generally they are not of sufficient prominence to be imaged as more than the incidental crossing of paths. The image cannot carry too many nodal centers.

The other type of node, the thematic concentration, also appeared frequently. Pershing Square in Los Angeles was a strong example, being perhaps the sharpest point of the city image, characterized by highly typical space, planting, and activity. Olvera Street and its associated plaza was another case. Boston had quite a number of examples, among them the Jordan-Filene corner and Louisburg Square. The Jordan-Filene corner acts secondarily as a junction between Washington Street and Summer Street, and it is associated with a subway stop, but primarily it was recognized as being the very center of the center

FIG. 29. *The nether world of the subway*



Figure 28, page 73

Figure 11, page 28

Figure 29

Figure 17, page 36

Figure 30, page 77

of the city. It is the "100 per cent" commercial corner, epitomized to a degree rarely seen in a large American city, but culturally very familiar to Americans. It is a core: the focus and symbol of an important region.

Louisburg Square is another thematic concentration, a well-known quiet residential open space, redolent of the upper-class themes of the Hill, with a highly recognizable fenced park. It is a purer example of a concentration than is the Jordan-Filene corner, since it is no transfer point at all, and was only remembered as being "somewhere inside" Beacon Hill. Its importance as a node was out of all proportion to its function.

Nodes may be both junctions and concentrations, as is Jersey City's Journal Square, which is an important bus and automobile transfer and is also a concentration of shopping. Thematic concentrations may be the focus of a region, as is the Jordan-Filene corner, and perhaps Louisburg Square. Others are not foci but are isolated special concentrations, such as Olvera Street in Los Angeles.

A strong physical form is not absolutely essential to the recognition of a node: witness Journal Square and Scollay Square. But where the space has some form, the impact is much stronger. The node becomes memorable. If Scollay Square has a spatial shape commensurate with its functional importance, it would undoubtedly be one of the key features of Boston. In its present form, it could not be remembered in any concrete way. It got such epithets as run-down, or disreputable. Seven out of thirty subjects remembered that it had a subway station; nothing else could be agreed upon. Evidently it made no visual impression, and the connections of various paths to it, which is the basis of its functional importance, were very poorly understood.

A node like Copley Square, on the contrary, which is of less functional importance and has to handle the angled intersection of Huntington Avenue, was very sharply imaged, and the connections of various paths were eminently clear. It was easily identified, principally in terms of its unique individual buildings: the Public Library, Trinity Church, the Copley Plaza Hotel, the sight of the John Hancock Building. It was less of a spatial whole than a concentration of activity and of some uniquely contrasting buildings.

Figure 59, page 171

Figures 60 and 61,
pages 175 and 177




FIG. 30. *Washington and Summer Streets*

Nodes such as Copley Square, Louisburg Square, or Olvera Street, had sharp boundaries, identifiable within a few feet. Others, such as the Jordan-Filene corner, were only the highest peak of some characteristic that had no sharp beginning. In any event, the most successful node seemed both to be unique in some way and at the same time to intensify some surrounding characteristic.

Nodes, like districts, may be introvert or extrovert. Scollay Square is introverted, it gives little directional sense when one

is in it or its environs. The principal direction in its surroundings is toward or away from it; the principal locational sensation on arrival is simply "here I am." Boston's Dewey Square, on the other hand, is extroverted. General directions are explained, and connections are clear to the office district, the shopping district, and the waterfront. For one person, South Station in Dewey Square was a huge arrow pointing to the heart of downtown. Approach to such a node seems to come from a particular side. Pershing Square has a similar directional quality, primarily because of the presence of the Biltmore Hotel. In this case, however, exact location in the path grid was uncertain.

Many of these qualities may be summed up by the example of a famous Italian node: the Piazza San Marco in Venice. Highly differentiated, rich and intricate, it stands in sharp contrast to the general character of the city and to the narrow, twisting spaces of its immediate approaches. Yet it ties firmly to the major feature of the city, the Grand Canal, and has an oriented shape that clarifies the direction from which one enters. It is within itself highly differentiated and structured: into two spaces (Piazza and Piazzetta) and with many distinctive landmarks (Duomo, Palazzo Ducale, Campanile, Libreria). Inside, one feels always in clear relation to it, precisely micro-located, as it were. So distinctive is this space that many people who have never been to Venice will recognize its photograph immediately.

Figure 31

Landmarks

Landmarks, the point references considered to be external to the observer, are simple physical elements which may vary widely in scale. There seemed to be a tendency for those more familiar with a city to rely increasingly on systems of landmarks for their guides—to enjoy uniqueness and specialization, in place of the continuities used earlier.

Since the use of landmarks involves the singling out of one element from a host of possibilities, the key physical characteristic of this class is singularity, some aspect that is unique or memorable in the context. Landmarks become more easily identifiable, more likely to be chosen as significant, if they have a clear form; if they contrast with their background; and if there is some




FIG. 31. *The Piazza San Marco, Venice*

prominence of spatial location. Figure-background contrast seems to be the principal factor. The background against which an element stands out need not be limited to immediate surroundings: the grasshopper weathervane of Faneuil Hall, the gold dome of the State House, or the peak of the Los Angeles City Hall are landmarks that are unique against the background of the entire city.


In another sense, subjects might single out landmarks for their cleanliness in a dirty city (the Christian Science buildings in Boston) or for their newness in an old city (the chapel on Arch Street). The Jersey City Medical Center was as well known for its little lawn and flowers as for its great size. The old Hall of Records in the Los Angeles Civic Center is a narrow, dirty struc-



ture, set at an angle to the orientation of all the other civic buildings, and with an entirely different scale of fenestration and detail. Despite its minor functional or symbolic importance, this contrast of siting, age, and scale makes it a relatively well-identified image, sometimes pleasant, sometimes irritating. It was several times reported to be "pie-shaped," although it is perfectly rectangular. This is evidently an illusion of the angled siting.

Spatial prominence can establish elements as landmarks in either of two ways: by making the element visible from many locations (the John Hancock Building in Boston, the Richfield Oil Building in Los Angeles), or by setting up a local contrast with nearby elements, i.e., a variation in setback and height. In Los Angeles, on 7th Street at the corner of Flower Street, is an

FIG. 32. *The "little gray lady" on Seventh Street*



old, two-story gray wooden building, set back some ten feet from the building line, containing a few minor shops. This took the attention and fancy of a surprising number of people. One even anthropomorphized it as the "little gray lady." The spatial setback and the intimate scale is a very noticeable and delightful event, in contrast to the great masses that occupy the rest of the frontage.

Location at a junction involving path decisions strengthens a landmark. The Telephone Building at Boston's Bowdoin Square was used, for example, to help people to stay on Cambridge Street. The activity associated with an element may also make it a landmark: an unusual case of this was the Symphony Hall in Los Angeles. This auditorium is the very antithesis of visual imageability: housed in rented quarters in a nondescript building, whose sign simply says "Baptist Temple," it is completely unrecognizable to the stranger. Its strength as a landmark seemed to derive from the contrast and irritation felt between its cultural status and its physical invisibility. Historical associations, or other meanings, are powerful reinforcements, as they are for Faneuil Hall or the State House in Boston. Once a history, a sign, or a meaning attaches to an object, its value as a landmark rises.

Distant landmarks, prominent points visible from many positions, were often well known, but only people unfamiliar with Boston seemed to use them to any great extent in organizing the city and selecting routes for trips. It is the novice who guides himself by reference to the John Hancock Building and the Custom House.

Few people had an accurate sense of where these distant landmarks were and how to make one's way to the base of either building. Most of Boston's distant landmarks, in fact, were "bottomless"; they had a peculiar floating quality. The John Hancock Building, the Custom House, and the Court House are all dominant on the general skyline, but the location and identity of their base is by no means as significant as that of their top.

The gold dome of Boston's State House seems to be one of the few exceptions to this elusiveness. Its unique shape and function, its location at the hill crest and its exposure to the Com-

Figure 32

Figure 58, page 170

mon, the visibility from long distances of its bright gold dome, all make it a key sign for central Boston. It has the satisfying qualities of recognizability at many levels of reference, and of coincidence of symbolic with visual importance.

People who used distant landmarks did so only for very general directional orientation, or, more frequently, in symbolic ways. For one person, the Custom House lent unity to Atlantic Avenue because it can be seen from almost any place on that street. For another, the Custom House set up a rhythm in the financial district, for it can be seen intermittently at many places in that area.

The Duomo of Florence is a prime example of a distant landmark: visible from near and far, by day or night; unmistakable; dominant by size and contour; closely related to the city's traditions; coincident with the religious and transit center; paired with its campanile in such a way that the direction of view can be gauged from a distance. It is difficult to conceive of the city without having this great edifice come to mind.

But local landmarks, visible only in restricted localities, were much more frequently employed in the three cities studied. They

ran the full range of objects available. The number of local elements that become landmarks appears to depend as much upon how familiar the observer is with his surroundings as upon the elements themselves. Unfamiliar subjects usually mentioned only a few landmarks in office interviews, although they managed to find many more when they went on field trips. Sounds and smells sometimes reinforced visual landmarks, although they did not seem to constitute landmarks by themselves.

Landmarks may be isolated, single events without reinforcement. Except for large or very singular marks, these are weak references, since they are easy to miss and require sustained searching. The single traffic light or street name demands concentration to find. More often, local points were remembered as clusters, in which they reinforced each other by repetition, and were recognizable partly by context.

A sequential series of landmarks, in which one detail calls up anticipation of the next and key details trigger specific moves of the observer, appeared to be a standard way in which these people traveled through the city. In such sequences, there were trigger cues whenever turning decisions must be made and reassuring cues that confirmed the observer in decisions gone by. Additional details often helped to give a sense of nearness to the final destination or to intermediate goals. For emotional security as well as functional efficiency, it is important that such sequences be fairly continuous, with no long gaps, although there may be a thickening of detail at nodes. The sequence facilitates recognition and memorization. Familiar observers can store up a vast quantity of point images in familiar sequences, although recognition may break down when the sequence is reversed or scrambled.


Element Interrelations

These elements are simply the raw material of the environmental image at the city scale. They must be patterned together to provide a satisfying form. The preceding discussions have gone as far as groups of similar elements (nets of paths, clusters of landmarks, mosaics of regions). The next logical step is to consider the interaction of pairs of unlike elements.

Such pairs may reinforce one another, resonate so that they enhance each other's power; or they may conflict and destroy

Figure 33

FIG. 33. *The Duomo, Florence*



themselves. A great landmark may dwarf and throw out of scale a small region at its base. Properly located, another landmark may fix and strengthen a core; placed off center, it may only mislead, as does the John Hancock Building in relation to Boston's Copley Square. A large street, with its ambiguous character of both edge and path, may penetrate and thus expose a region to view, while at the same time disrupting it. A landmark feature may be so alien to the character of a district as to dissolve the regional continuity, or it may, on the other hand, stand in just the contrast that intensifies that continuity.

Districts in particular, which tend to be of larger size than the other elements, contain within themselves, and are thus related to, various paths, nodes, and landmarks. These other elements not only structure the region internally, they also intensify the identity of the whole by enriching and deepening its character. Beacon Hill in Boston is one example of this effect. In fact, the components of structure and identity (which are the parts of the image in which we are interested) seem to leapfrog as the observer moves up from level to level. The identity of a window may be structured into a pattern of windows, which is the cue for the identification of a building. The buildings themselves are interrelated so as to form an identifiable space, and so on.

Paths, which are dominant in many individual images, and which may be a principal resource in organization at the metropolitan scale, have intimate interrelations with other element types. Junction nodes occur automatically at major intersections and termini, and by their form should reinforce those critical moments in a journey. These nodes, in turn, are not only strengthened by the presence of landmarks (as is Copley Square) but provide a setting which almost guarantees attention for any such mark. The paths, again, are given identity and tempo not only by their own form, or by their nodal junctions, but by the regions they pass through, the edges they move along, and the landmarks distributed along their length.

All these elements operate together, in a context. It would be interesting to study the characteristics of various pairings: landmark-region, node-path, etc. Eventually, one should try to go beyond such pairings to consider total patterns.

Most observers seem to group their elements into intermediate organizations, which might be called complexes. The observer senses the complex as a whole whose parts are interdependent and are relatively fixed in relation to each other. Thus many Bostonians would be able to fit most of the major elements of the Back Bay, the Common, Beacon Hill, and the central shopping, into a single complex. This whole area, in the terms used by Brown⁸ in his experiments referred to in Chapter 1, has become one locality. For others, the size of their locality may be much smaller: the central shopping and the near edge of the Common alone, for example. Outside of this complex there are gaps of identity; the observer must run blind to the next whole, even if only momentarily. Although they are close together in physical reality, most people seem to feel only a vague link between Boston's office and financial district and the central shopping district on Washington Street. This peculiar remoteness was also exemplified in the puzzling gap between Scollay Square and Dock Square which are only a block apart. The psychological distance between two localities may be much greater, or more difficult to surmount, than mere physical separation seems to warrant.

Our preoccupation here with parts rather than wholes is a necessary feature of an investigation in a primitive stage. After successful differentiation and understanding of parts, a study can move on to consideration of a total system. There were indications that the image may be a continuous field, the disturbance of one element in some way affecting all others. Even the recognition of an object is as much dependent on context as on the form of the object itself. One major distortion, such as a twisting of the shape of the Common, seemed to be reflected throughout the image of Boston. The disturbance of large-scale construction affected more than its immediate environs. But such field effects have hardly been studied here.

The Shifting Image

Rather than a single comprehensive image for the entire environment, there seemed to be sets of images, which more or less overlapped and interrelated. They were typically arranged in a



series of levels, roughly by the scale of area involved, so that the observer moved as necessary from an image at street level to levels of a neighborhood, a city, or a metropolitan region.

This arrangement by levels is a necessity in a large and complex environment. Yet it imposes an extra burden of organization on the observer, especially if there is little relation between levels. If a tall building is unmistakable in the city-wide panorama yet unrecognizable from its base, then a chance has been lost to pin together the images at two different levels of organization. The State House on Beacon Hill, on the other hand, seems to pierce through several image levels. It holds a strategic place in the organization of the center.

Images may differ not only by the scale of area involved, but by viewpoint, time of day, or season. The image of Faneuil Hall as seen from the markets should be related to its image from a car on the Artery. Washington-Street-by-night should have some continuity, some element of invariance, with Washington-Street-by-day. In order to accomplish this continuity in the face of sensuous confusion, many observers drained their images of visual content, using abstractions such as "restaurant" or "second street." These will operate both day and night, driving or walking, rain or shine, albeit with some effort and loss.

The observer must also adjust his image to secular shifts in the physical reality around him. Los Angeles illustrated the practical and emotional strains induced as the image is confronted with constant physical changes. It would be important to know how to maintain continuity through these changes. Just as ties are needed between level and level of organization, so are continuities required which persist through a major change. This might be facilitated by the retention of an old tree, a path trace or some regional character.

The sequence in which sketch maps were drawn seemed to indicate that the image develops, or grows, in different ways. This may perhaps have some relation to the way in which it first develops as an individual becomes familiar with his environment. Several types were apparent:

a. Quite frequently, images were developed along, and then outward from, familiar lines of movement. Thus a map might

be drawn as branching out from a point of entrance, or beginning from some base line such as Massachusetts Avenue.

b. Other maps were begun by the construction of an enclosing outline, such as the Boston peninsula, which was then filled in toward the center.

c. Still others, particularly in Los Angeles, began by laying down a basic repeating pattern (the path gridiron) and then adding detail.

d. Somewhat fewer maps started as a set of adjacent regions, which were then detailed as to connections and interiors.

e. A few Boston examples developed from a familiar kernel, a dense familiar element on which everything was ultimately hung.

The image itself was not a precise, miniaturized model of reality, reduced in scale and consistently abstracted. As a purposive simplification, it was made by reducing, eliminating, or even adding elements to reality, by fusion and distortion, by relating and structuring the parts. It was sufficient, perhaps better, for its purpose if rearranged, distorted, "illogical." It resembled that famous cartoon of the New Yorker's view of the United States.

However distorted, there was a strong element of topological invariance with respect to reality. It was as if the map were drawn on an infinitely flexible rubber sheet; directions were twisted, distances stretched or compressed, large forms so changed from their accurate scale projection as to be at first unrecognizable. But the sequence was usually correct, the map was rarely torn and sewn back together in another order. This continuity is necessary if the image is to be of any value.

Study of various individual images among the Bostonians revealed certain other distinctions between them. For example, images of an element differed between observers in terms of their relative density, i.e., the extent to which they were packed with detail. They might be relatively dense, as a picture of Newbury Street which identifies each building along its length, or relatively








Image Quality

thin, when Newbury Street is characterized simply as a street bordered by old houses of mixed use.

Another distinction could be made between concrete, sensuously vivid images, and those which were highly abstract, generalized, and void of sensuous content. Thus the mental picture of a building might be vivid, involving its shape, color, texture, and detail, or be relatively abstract, the structure being identified as "a restaurant" or the "third building from the corner."


Vivid does not necessarily equate with dense, nor thin with abstract. An image might be both dense and abstract, as in the case of the taxicab dispatcher's knowledge of a city street, which related house numbers to uses along block after block, yet could not describe those buildings in any concrete sense.

Images could be further distinguished according to their structural quality: the manner in which their parts were arranged and interrelated. There were four stages along a continuum of increasing structural precision:

a. The various elements were free; there was no structure or interrelation between parts. We found no pure cases of this type but several images were definitely disjointed, with vast gaps and many unrelated elements. Here rational movement was impossible without outside help, unless a systematic coverage of the entire area were to be resorted to (which meant the building up of a new structure on the spot).

b. In others, the structure became positional; the parts were roughly related in terms of their general direction and perhaps even relative distance from each other, while still remaining disconnected. One subject in particular always related herself to a few elements, without knowing definite connections between them. Movement was accomplished by searching, by moving out in the correct general direction, while weaving back and forth to cover a band and having an estimate of distance to correct overshooting.

c. Most often, perhaps, the structure was flexible; parts were connected one to the other, but in a loose and flexible manner, as if by limp or elastic ties. The sequence of events was known but the mental map might be quite distorted, and its distortions might shift at different moments. To quote one subject: "I like





to think of a few focal points and how to get from one to another, and the rest I don't bother to learn." With a flexible structure, movement was easier, since it proceeded along known paths, through known sequences. Motion between pairs of elements not habitually connected, or along other than habitual paths, might still be very confusing, however.

d. As connections multiplied, the structure tended to become rigid; parts were firmly interconnected in all dimensions; and any distortions became built in. The possessor of such a map can move much more freely, and can interconnect new points at will. As the density of the image builds up, it begins to take on the characteristics of a total field, in which interaction is possible in any direction and at any distance.

These characteristics of structure might apply in different ways at different levels. For example, two city regions may each possess rigid internal structures, and both connect at some seam or node. But this connection may fail to interlock with the internal structures, so that the connection itself is simply flexible. This effect seemed to occur for many Bostonians at Scollay Square, for example.

Total structure may also be distinguished in a still different way. For some, their images were organized rather instantaneously, as a series of wholes and parts descending from the general to the particular. This organization had the quality of a static map. Connection was made by moving up to the necessary bridging generality, and back down to the desired particular. To go from City Hospital to the Old North Church, for example, one might first consider that the hospital was in the South End and that the South End was in central Boston, then locate the North End in Boston and the church within the North End. This type of image might be called hierarchical.

For others, the image was put together in a more dynamic way, parts being interconnected by a sequence over time (even if the time was quite brief), and pictured as though seen by a motion picture camera. It was more closely related to the actual experience of moving through the city. This might be called a continuous organization, employing unrolling interconnections instead of static hierarchies.



One might infer from this that the images of greatest value are those which most closely approach a strong total field: dense, rigid, and vivid; which make use of all element types and form characteristics without narrow concentration; and which can be put together either hierarchically or continuously, as occasion demands. We may find, of course, that such an image is rare or impossible, that there are strong individual or cultural types which cannot transcend their basic abilities. In this case, an environment should be geared to the appropriate cultural type, or shaped in many ways so as to satisfy the varying demands of the individuals who inhabit it.

We are continuously engaged in the attempt to organize our surroundings, to structure and identify them. Various environments are more or less amenable to such treatment. When reshaping cities it should be possible to give them a form which facilitates these organizing efforts rather than frustrates them.

IV.

CITY FORM

We have the opportunity of forming our new city world into an imageable landscape: visible, coherent, and clear. It will require a new attitude on the part of the city dweller, and a physical reshaping of his domain into forms which entrance the eye, which organize themselves from level to level in time and space, which can stand as symbols for urban life. The present study yields some clues in this respect.

Most objects which we are accustomed to call beautiful, such as a painting or a tree, are single-purpose things, in which, through long development or the impress of one will, there is an intimate, visible linkage from fine detail to total structure. A city is a multi-purpose, shifting organization, a tent for many functions, raised by many hands and with relative speed. Complete specialization, final meshing, is improbable and undesirable. The form must be somewhat noncommittal, plastic to the purposes and perceptions of its citizens.

Yet there are fundamental functions of which the city forms may be expressive: circulation, major land-uses, key focal points.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Angyal, A., "Über die Raumlage vorgestellter Oerter," *Archiv für die Gesamte Psychologie*, Vol. 78, 1930, pp. 47-94.
2. Automotive Safety Foundation, *Driver Needs in Freeway Signing*, Washington, Dec. 1958.
3. Bell, Sir Charles, *The People of Tibet*, Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1928.
4. Best, Elsdon, *The Maori*, Wellington, H. H. Tombs, 1924.
5. Binet, M. A., "Reverse Illusions of Orientation," *Psychological Review*, Vol. I, No. 4, July 1894, pp. 337-350.
6. Bogoraz-Tan, Vladimir Germanovich, "The Chukchee," *Memoirs of the American Museum of Natural History*, Vol. XI, Leiden, E. J. Brill; and New York, G. E. Stechert, 1904, 1907, 1909.
7. Boulding, Kenneth E., *The Image*, Ann Arbor, University of Michigan Press, 1956.
8. Brown, Warner, "Spatial Integrations in a Human Maze," *University of California Publications in Psychology*, Vol. V, No. 5, 1932, pp. 123-134.
9. Carpenter, Edmund, "Space Concepts of the Aivilik Eskimos," *Explorations*, Vol. V, p. 134.
10. Casamajor, Jean, "Le Mystérieux Sens de l'Espace," *Revue Scientifique*, Vol. 65, No. 18, 1927, pp. 554-565.
11. Casamorata, Cesare, "I Canti di Firenze," *L'Universo*, Marzo-Aprile, 1944, Anno XXV, Number 3.
12. Claparède, Edouard, "L'Orientation Lointaine," *Nouveau Traité de Psychologie*, Tome VIII, Fasc. 3, Paris, Presses Universitaires de France, 1943.
13. Cornetz, V., "Le Cas Élémentaire du Sens de la Direction chez l'Homme," *Bulletin de la Société de Géographie d'Alger*, 18e Année, 1913, p. 742.
14. Cornetz, V., "Observation sur le Sens de la Direction chez l'Homme," *Revue des Idées*, 15 Juillet, 1909.
15. Colucci, Cesare, "Sui disturbi dell'orientamento topografico," *Annali di Neurologia*, Vol. XX, Anno X, 1902, pp. 555-596.
16. Donaldson, Bess Allen, *The Wild Rue: A Study of Muhammadan Magic and Folklore in Iran*, London, Lirzac, 1938.
17. Elliott, Henry Wood, *Our Arctic Province*, New York, Scribners, 1886.
18. Finsch, Otto, "Ethnologische erfahrungen und belegstücke aus der Südsee," Vienna, Naturhistorisches Hofmuseum, *Annalen*. Vol. 3, 1888, pp. 83-160, 293-364. Vol. 6, 1891, pp. 13-36, 37-130. Vol. 8, 1893, pp. 1-106, 119-275, 295-437.
19. Firth, Raymond, *We, the Tikopia*, London, Allen and Unwin Ltd., 1936.
20. Fischer, M. H., "Die Orientierung im Raume bei Wirbeltieren und beim Menschen," in *Handbuch der Normalen und Pathologischen Physiologie*, Berlin, J. Springer, 1931, pp. 909-1022.
21. Flanagan, Thomas, "Amid the Wild Lights and Shadows," Columbia University Forum, Winter 1957.
22. Forster, E. M., *A Passage to India*, New York, Harcourt, 1949.
23. Gatty, Harold, *Nature Is Your Guide*, New York, E. P. Dutton, 1958.
24. Gautier, Emile Félix, *Missions au Sahara*, Paris, Librairie A. Colin, 1908.
25. Gay, John, *Trivia, or, The Art of Walking the Streets of London*, Introd. and notes by W. H. Williams, London, D. O'Connor, 1922.
26. Geoghegan, Richard Henry, *The Aleut Language*, Washington, U. S. Department of Interior, 1944.
27. Gemelli, Agostino, Tessier, G., and Galli, A., "La Percezione della Posizione del nostro corpo e dei suoi spostamenti," *Archivio Italiano di Psicologia*, I, 1920, pp. 104-182.
28. Gemelli, Agostino, "L'Orientazione Lontana nel Volo in Aeroplano," *Rivista Di Psicologia*, Anno 29, No. 4, Oct.-Dec. 1933, p. 297.
29. Genep, A. Van, "Du Sens d'Orientation chez l'Homme," *Réligions, Moeurs, et Légendes*, 3e Série, Paris, 1911, p. 47.
30. Granpré-Molière, M. J., "Landscape of the N. E. Polder," translated from *Forum*, Vol. 10:1-2, 1955.

31. Griffin, Donald R., "Sensory Physiology and the Orientation of Animals," *American Scientist*, April 1953, pp. 209-244.
32. de Groot, J. J. M., *Religion in China*, New York, G. P. Putnam's, 1912.
33. Gill, Eric, *Autobiography*, New York City, Devin-Adair, 1941.
34. Halbwachs, Maurice, *La Mémoire Collective*, Paris, Presses Universitaires de France, 1950.
35. Homo, Leon, *Rome Impériale et l'Urbanisme dans l'Antiquité*, Paris, Michel, 1951.
36. Jaccard, Pierre, "Une Enquête sur la Désorientation en Montagne," *Bulletin de la Société Vaudoise des Sciences Naturelles*, Vol. 56, No. 217, August 1926, pp. 151-159.
37. Jaccard, Pierre, *Le Sens de la Direction et L'Orientation Lointaine chez l'Homme*, Paris, Payot, 1932.
38. Jackson, J. B., "Other-Directed Houses," *Landscape*, Winter, 1956-57, Vol. 6, No. 2.
39. Kawaguchi, Ekai, *Three Years in Tibet*, Adyar, Madras, The Theosophist Office, 1909.
40. Kepes, Gyorgy, *The New Landscape*, Chicago, P. Theobald, 1956.
41. Kilpatrick, Franklin P., "Recent Experiments in Perception," *New York Academy of Sciences, Transactions*, No. 8, Vol. 16, June 1954, pp. 420-425.
42. Langer, Suzanne, *Feeling and Form: A Theory of Art*, New York, Scribner, 1953.
43. Lewis, C. S., "The Shoddy Lands," in *The Best from Fantasy and Science Fiction*, New York, Doubleday, 1957.
44. Lyons, Henry, "The Sailing Charts of the Marshall Islanders," *Geographical Journal*, Vol. LXXII, No. 4, October 1928, pp. 325-328.
45. Macgraith, Brian G., "The Astronomy of the Aranda and Luritja Tribes," Adelaide University Field Anthropology, Central Australia no. 10, taken from *Transactions of the Royal Society of South Australia*, Vol. LVI, 1932.
46. Malinowski, Bronislaw, *Argonauts of the Western Pacific*, London, Routledge, 1922.
47. Marie, Pierre, et Behague, P., "Syndrome de Désorientation dans l'Espace" *Revue Neurologique*, Vol. 26, No. 1, 1919, pp. 1-14.
48. Morris, Charles W., *Foundations of the Theory of Signs*, Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1938.
49. *New York Times*, April 30, 1957, article on the "Directomat."
50. Nice, M., "Territory in Bird Life," *American Midland Naturalist*, Vol. 26, pp. 441-487.
51. Paterson, Andrew and Zangwill, O. L., "A Case of Topographic Disorientation," *Brain*, Vol. LXVIII, Part 3, September 1945, pp. 188-212.
52. Peterson, Joseph, "Illusions of Direction Orientation," *Journal of Philosophy, Psychology and Scientific Methods*, Vol. XIII, No. 9, April 27, 1916, pp. 225-236.
53. Pink, Olive M., "The Landowners in the Northern Division of the Aranda Tribe, Central Australia," *Oceania*, Vol. VI, No. 3, March 1936, pp. 275-305.
54. Pink, Olive M., "Spirit Ancestors in a Northern Aranda Horde Country," *Oceania*, Vol. IV, No. 2, December 1933, pp. 176-186.
55. Porteus, S. D., *The Psychology of a Primitive People*, New York City, Longmans, Green, 1931.
56. Pratolini, Vasco, *Il Quartiere*, Firenze, Valleschi, 1947.
57. Proust, Marcel, *Du Côté de chez Swann*, Paris, Gallimand, 1954.
58. Proust, Marcel, *Albertine Disparue*, Paris, Nouvelle Revue Française, 1925.
59. Rabaud, Etienne, *L'Orientation Lointaine et la Reconnaissance des Lieux*, Paris, Alcan, 1927.
60. Rasmussen, Knud Johan Victor, *The Netsilik Eskimos* (Report of the Fifth Thule Expedition, 1921-24, Vol. 8, No. 1-2) Copenhagen, Gyldendal, 1931.
61. Rattray, R. S., *Religion and Art in Ashanti*, Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1927.
62. Reichard, Gladys Amanda, *Navaho Religion, a Study of Symbolism*, New York, Pantheon, 1950.
63. Ryan, T. A. and M. S., "Geographical Orientation," *American Journal of Psychology*, Vol. 53, 1940, pp. 204-215.
64. Sachs, Curt, *Rhythm and Tempo*, New York, Norton, 1953.
65. Sandström, Carl Ivan, *Orientation in the Present Space*, Stockholm, Almqvist and Wiksell, 1951.
66. Sapir, Edward, "Language and Environment," *American Anthropologist*, Vol. 14, 1912.
67. Sauer, Martin, *An Account of a Geographical and Astronomical Expedition to the Northern Parts of Russia*, London, T. Cadell, 1802.
68. Shen, Tsung-lien and Liu-Shen-chi, *Tibet and the Tibetans*, Stanford, Stanford University Press, 1953.
69. Shepard, P., "Dead Cities in the American West," *Landscape*, Winter, Vol. 6, No. 2, 1956-57.
70. Shipton, Eric Earle, *The Mount Everest Reconnaissance Expedition*, London, Hodder and Stoughton, 1952.
71. deSilva, H. R., "A Case of a Boy Possessing an Automatic Directional Orientation," *Science*, Vol. 73, No. 1893, April 10, 1931, pp. 393-394.
72. Spencer, Baldwin and Gillen, F. J., *The Native Tribes of Central Australia*, London, Macmillan, 1899.

73. Stefánsson, Vihljalmar, "The Stefánsson-Anderson Arctic Expedition of the American Museum: Preliminary Ethnological Report," *Anthropological Papers of the American Museum of Natural History*, Vol. XIV, Part 1, New York City, 1914.
74. Stern, Paul, "On the Problem of Artistic Form," *Logos*, Vol. V, 1914-15, pp. 165-172.
75. Strehlow, Carl, *Die Aranda und Loritza-stämme in Zentral Australien*, Frankfurt am Main, J. Baer, 1907-20.
76. Trowbridge, C. C., "On Fundamental Methods of Orientation and Imaginary Maps," *Science*, Vol. 38, No. 990, Dec. 9, 1913, pp. 888-897.
77. Twain, Mark, *Life on the Mississippi*, New York, Harper, 1917.
78. Waddell, L. Austine, *The Buddhism of Tibet or Lamaism*, London, W. H. Allen, 1895.
79. Whitehead, Alfred North, *Symbolism and Its Meaning and Effect*, New York, Macmillan, 1958.
80. Winfield, Gerald F., *China: The Land and the People*, New York, Wm. Sloane Association, 1948.
81. Witkin, H. A., "Orientation in Space," *Research Reviews*, Office of Naval Research, December 1949.
82. Wohl, R. Richard and Strauss, Anselm L., "Symbolic Representation and the Urban Milieu," *American Journal of Sociology*, Vol. LXIII, No. 5, March 1958, pp. 523-532.
83. Yung, Emile, "Le Sens de la Direction," *Echo des Alpes*, No. 4, 1918, p. 110.

INDEX*

- Acropolis, 124
- Age contrasts, 45 (*see also* Contrast)
- Airports, 74
- Air travel, 113
- Albany, 136
- Aleuts, 132, 138
- Alps, 132
- Apparency, 10
- Arctic, 132
- Arunta, 126, 127, 129, 130, 132, 134, 138, 139
- Ashanti, 126, 134
- Assam, 134

- Barriers, 47, 100
- Beacon Hill, 17, 19, 50, 54, 63, 68, 69, 71, 72, 74, 145, 160-173
 - as traffic obstacle, 172
 - back side, 162, 167
 - commercial uses, 169
 - connection to city structure, 172
 - differentiated characteristics, 172
 - external visibility, 172
 - front side, 162, 167
 - governmental area, 168
 - interview descriptions, 162
 - landmarks, 169, 171
 - location, 161
 - lower side, 168
 - map, 161
 - paths, 168
 - spatial form, 164, 164
 - street interviews, 163
 - sub-areas, 167, 169
 - thematic elements, 165, 166
 - thematic unit, 167
 - topography, 163, 164
- Beacon Hill, transition zone, 168
 - views out, 168
 - West End, continuum with, 64
- Beverly Hills, 41
- Binet, M. A., 125
- Birds, nesting territories of, 135
- Boston, 10, 14, 16-25
 - ambiguity of shape, 22
 - blank areas, 20
 - character, 17
 - distinctive elements, 147
 - districts (*see* Boston districts)
 - edges (*see* Boston edges)
 - field analysis, 19, 147
 - image difficulties, 15, 24
 - image from interviews, 146
 - image from sketch maps, 146
 - image from street interviews, 153
 - intersections, 58
 - nodes (*see* Boston nodes)
 - outline map, 18
 - paths (*see* Boston paths)
 - peninsula, 17, 20, 57, 62
 - structure, 19, 21
 - views, 18
 - vivid elements, 17
- Boston districts, 22, 69
 - Back Bay, 19, 22, 57, 60, 61, 63, 68, 69
 - Beacon Hill, 17, 19, 50, 54, 63, 68, 69, 71, 72, 74, 145, 160-173 (*see also* Beacon Hill)
 - Chinatown, 71
 - Common, 17, 19, 21, 23, 55, 56, 71, 145, 171
 - Copps Hill, 172
 - financial district, 51, 62, 85
 - "forgotten triangle," 20, 64

* Italicized page numbers refer to illustrations.