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Abstract

The Image of the City, by Kevin Lynch (Cambridge: M.I.T. Press, 1960), sets forth a method for the analysis of the public conceptualization of a city and presented the images of Boston, Jersey City, and Los Angeles. Nearly ten years has passed since the publication of Lynch's pioneer work, and during this time the physical appearance of the city of Boston has been greatly altered by new construction. It was felt that a new study of the image of Boston would provide valuable information on whether a public image keeps pace with the changing physical environment and on how well the system of analysis developed by Lynch can describe such changes over time.

Accordingly, the research techniques employed by Lynch were adopted for this study. Thirty middle-class subjects, all over the age of adolescence, and all long-time residents of the Boston area, were interviewed; the sample was deliberately kept as similar as possible to Lynch's sample in order to isolate the one variable of physical change in the city. The office interview, consisting of descriptions, imaginary trips, and the drawing of a sketch map, was slightly altered but still closely approximated that used by Lynch. It was recognized from the outset that the resulting image of Boston would be that of only a small segment of the population, but this could not be avoided if the results were to be directly comparable to those obtained by Lynch.

The public image of Boston was found to have changed somewhat over the last decade. Although the city was still described as old, crowded, dirty, confusing, and predominantly built of brick, the subjects also added that Boston could now be characterized by the glass, steel, and grey concrete of its newest structures. The older elements, such as the State House, the Common and the Public Garden, and the Charles River, are still prominent parts of the Boston image; however, the new Prudential Center and the Government Center have also become very important elements for Bostonians. The path system has not changed over the years; the new Massachusetts Turnpike Extension, which cuts through central Boston, is only a minor image element. The districts of the city have retained their clarity and importance in the organization of the image. Minor shifts in the import of various image elements were found: some areas have become totally unfamiliar while others have risen in prominence, due to the new centers of activity in the city. In general, the image of Boston has not changed radically in the past ten years, but those elements which symbolize the "New Boston" have become integrated into the total conceptualization of the city.

Some problems with Lynch's methods of investigation and analysis were found, however. It was discovered that the imaginary trips through the city, along which a subject described those elements which he noticed, tended to bias the results; an element along a common trip route would have a greater probability of being mentioned than one which was not along a trip route. The sketch maps, however, gave every element an equal probability of being included. Thus the maps were a valuable check on the data obtained from the verbal portion of the interview. Although a discrepancy between the map results and
the verbal results was possible, the two sets of data were found to correlate extremely well. The major problem of analysis was in the classification of the two new major elements—the Prudential and Government Centers. Neither element fits precisely into any of Lynch’s categories: paths, districts, nodes, landmarks, and edges, although the Prudential Center was finally classified as a landmark and the Government Center as a node. It is possible that an additional category is needed to encompass such new clusters of growth. With the exception of these two centers, the image elements could still be fitted into Lynch’s category system, and the method of analysis was found to be sufficiently flexible to describe the changes in the city.
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INTRODUCTION

In 1960 Kevin Lynch introduced to the planning profession *The Image of The City*, in which he explored the ways in which people conceptualize the city and its parts. He developed a system of classification for the various elements of the physical environment: paths, nodes, edges, districts, and landmarks; and he demonstrated that the responses of his subjects could be categorized in terms of these element types. Lynch had investigated the public images of three cities in the United States—Boston, Jersey City, and Los Angeles; he found that each of these cities was conceptualized in a different way by its residents.

Since *The Image of the City* was published there have been a few other studies involving the concepts discussed by Lynch. Lynch, Appleyard, and Myer (1964) investigated what automobile passengers look at while traveling along an urban expressway. They discussed proposed routes for an inner circumferential highway for Boston in terms of the views of the city each route would afford and how such views would help or hinder the development of a coherent image of the area. Carr and Kurilko (1964) showed to a group of subjects a film that gave the impression of traveling along Boston's Northeast Expressway; they recorded the eye movements of each subject and compared them to the subject's recall and recognition of scenes from the film. Banerjee (1967) studied the effects of familiarity on image formation. His subjects were shown photographs of various scenes of Harvard Square and asked to identify them and then locate them on a map. They were also asked to draw from memory a sketch map of Harvard Square. The identifications and maps were then compared to measures of the subjects' general familiarity with the area. A positive correlation was found between identification or recognition ability and familiarity, while no correlation between the sketch maps and familiarity...
It is now nearly ten years since *The Image of the City* appeared, and during the past decade many changes have occurred in the city of Boston. Its physical appearance has been profoundly altered by new construction, yet its public image has not been brought up to date. This study is an attempt to determine the 1969 image of Boston by using the techniques employed by Lynch and to see if the category system which he devised is sufficiently flexible to account for and describe any changes in the image of the city.

Since 1956, when Lynch interviewed his sample, the following major changes have been made in Boston: Scollay Square, once a deteriorating amusement center, has been razed, and in its place has arisen the new Government Center, a complex of public and private office buildings; the Prudential Center, with its hotel, office tower, shopping plaza, and apartment buildings, now stands between the Back Bay and the South End; the old West End has disappeared, and in place of the low, ancient tenements stand the Charles River Park apartments and shopping center; and the Massachusetts Turnpike Extension now cuts through the city from Allston to South Station and the garment district.

Each of these changes, of course, has been accompanied by the elimination of structures, the changing of street patterns, and the displacement of people. In addition, the skyline of Boston has been greatly changed by the appearance of many tall buildings. Where once the major features of the skyline were the new Court House, the State House dome, the John Hancock building, and various church steeples, the outstanding structures now include the Prudential complex, the buildings of Government Center, and the Charles River Park apartments. In an unpublished study by this author (1968), in which a small sample of Boston residents was asked to draw from memory the skyline of Boston as seen from the Cambridge side of the Charles River, the new Prudential tower was
the most frequently remembered structure, and the new Government Center was often pictured; the outstanding features of the skyline of a decade ago, with the exception of the John Hancock Building, were rarely drawn. The results of this earlier study indicate that people are certainly aware of the structures which herald the "New Boston."

However, a static picture of the Boston skyline does not provide nearly enough information for one to determine the public image of the city. It must be known how people conceptualize the areas they move through on the ground level, for this is how the city is most often seen. Important in determining the image of the city are the routes people choose to travel from one point to another, the clues they use in helping them make decisions along their way, and, through long-time association with the city, what physical elements and characteristics they feel are distinctive and most representative of that city. Once this data has been collected, a composite image of the city can be drawn.
THE METHOD

The Sample

Lynch, in his original study, interviewed a small sample of thirty Boston residents, all over the age of adolescence, all long-time residents of Boston, and all with social backgrounds which he categorized as professional and managerial middle class. Lynch, in Appendix B, admits to the bias in his sample and recognizes that it cannot be said that his study produced a true public image of Boston, although his data was supported by supplementary street interviews with people of all socio-economic classes. It was decided at the outset of this study to retain the class bias of the original study by Lynch, for the following reason: if changes in the image of the city of Boston over the last ten years are to be documented, then time, with its physical changes in the city, must be the only independent variable; if a sample substantially different from the original small sample of middle-class people were interviewed, it would be impossible to attribute any changes in the city's image to the physical changes that have occurred over time; one would never know whether the differences were attributable to physical changes in Boston or to changes in the type of individual interviewed. Therefore, a sample of thirty professional and managerial residents of Boston was chosen. These individuals were interviewed during the months of February and March, 1969.

With the kind permission of Professor Lynch, I was able to read much of the original data gathered by him in 1956. From this investigation various detailed characteristics, not reported in The Image of the City, were ascertained. The original Lynch sample consisted of thirty residents of the Boston area; not all were residents of the small geographical area studied. Many subjects lived in Cambridge, some in other suburban areas such as
Wellesley, Brookline, and Milton. Also, not all those subjects who lived outside of Boston were employed in the Boston area under study. However, all of Lynch's subjects did make frequent trips into central Boston and were familiar, in varying degrees of course, with the area.

Lynch's original sample ranged in age from twenty to sixty years old. The actual ages fell into two groups--a younger group and an older group. In the younger group were seventeen subjects, ranging in age from 20 to 29; in the older group were thirteen subjects aged 40 to 60, twelve of which were 40 to 51 years of age. No subjects were in the 30 to 39 age group. The mean age for the sample was 33.8 years.

In view of these characteristics of the original sample, the sample for the present study was carefully selected to match the original as closely as possible. The subjects were chosen from Boston and suburban residents known to this author or her family. Most of those interviewed did work in the central Boston area, but, like the Lynch sample, some did not. However, as in Lynch's sample, all did have occasion to make frequent trips into central Boston, although some went to shop and some went for entertainment purposes. The age characteristics of the sample were also carefully controlled. As in the original Lynch sample there were seventeen younger subjects, ranging in age from 20 to 32, and thirteen older subjects, age range from 43 to 61. The mean age of the entire sample was 35.7. It was felt that this approximation of the original Lynch sample would be close enough to eliminate any significant differences with the possible exception of sex distribution: Lynch's sample consisted of 19 males and 11 females; the present sample consisted of 14 males and 16 females.

The Interview

The interview used was deliberately kept similar to that used by Lynch,
again to keep conditions as similar as possible in order to isolate the one variable of the physical change in Boston over time. Some alterations in the interview were made, however,

First, the interview was shortened somewhat. Lynch reports that his interviews took approximately 1½ hours each. In planning this study, however, it was felt that the interviewing time should be shortened in order to accommodate the busy schedules of most of the subjects. Accordingly, it was decided that only the essentials of the original Lynch interview would be used. Although he did not report it in The Image of the City, Lynch had included in his interview an initial definition by the subject of such terms as "residential area," "downtown," and so forth. These definitions were eliminated in this study. Also omitted were questions 7a, 7b, and 7c of Lynch's protocol (pps. 141-142): "What do you think we were trying to find out? What importance is orientation and the recognition of city elements to people? Do you feel pleasure from knowing where you are or where you are going? Or displeasure in the reverse?" The elimination of the definitions and these minor questions cut the interviewing time down to approximately one hour.

The second major change in the interview was made in the imaginary trips through Boston, in which the subject was asked to picture himself making the trip and to give explicit directions, noting the important details. The three trips which Lynch used were:

1. From Massachusetts General Hospital to South Station on foot;
2. From Boston City Hospital to the Old North Church on foot;
3. From Faneuil Hall to Symphony Hall by car.

These trips were intended to cover "the length and breadth of the city", but in actuality they ignored most of the Back Bay section of Boston. They also depended heavily on pedestrian trips, whereas most Bostonians see the
city while driving through it in an automobile. Also, the two pedestrian trips resulted in descriptions of great length, adding many minutes to the interviewing time. And finally, none of these trips could be guaranteed to take the subject past or through two areas on which this study intended to concentrate—the Government Center and the Prudential Center, two complexes, built since the original study, which supposedly symbolize the "New Boston." It was felt necessary to steer the subject's mental trips by the Prudential and Government Centers in order to obtain sufficient data for detailed analyses.

Accordingly, the following imaginary trips were selected after testing them on several pilot subjects:

1. From the Old North Church to Boston City Hospital by car.

2. From the corner of Massachusetts Avenue and Commonwealth Avenue to South Station by car.

3. From Symphony Hall to the New City Hall by foot.

A map indicating the origins and destinations of Lynch's trips, the trips used in this study, and the general directions followed, is presented on the following page.

It will be noted immediately that Trip 1 is essentially the same as one of the trips used by Lynch, except that the direction of travel is reversed. This reversal of direction was, for the most part, an arbitrary one, based primarily on the fact that it was felt undesirable to use two trips following the same general direction. Trip 3, from Symphony Hall to the New City Hall, took the subject generally in an west-east direction. Had Lynch's trip, City Hospital to the Old North Church, been used, the same west-east direction would have been followed. Therefore, the direction of the trip was reversed to east-west, Old North Church to the City Hospital.

The reason for changing both the direction and one of the terminal
Fig. 1. The imaginary trips used by Lynch compared with those used in this study.
points of Lynch's trip from Faneuil Hall to Symphony Hall, and also the method of travel, is a bit more complex. The Lynch trip by car could have easily been made via the Central Artery from the market area to the Massachusetts Avenue exit, thus by-passing the present Prudential Center area and also the present Government Center area. However, a pedestrian trip in the opposite direction would usually take the subject very close to the Prudential Center, and with the destination point changed to the New City Hall, would bring him directly to the Government Center area, which he would presumably describe.

Trip 2 was selected because it was assumed that most subjects would "drive" from Commonwealth and Massachusetts Avenues to South Station through the Back Bay area, which had been bypassed in Lynch's set of trips. This was not always the case, but the imaginary roundabout excursions taken by several subjects gave valuable information on their lack of knowledge of the relationship of the Back Bay to the South Station area when traveling by car.

These, then, are the major changes in the interview. The final interview protocol is presented below. It may seem to be somewhat different in wording from the protocol reported by Lynch (pps. 141-142), but this is only because Lynch does not report the exact wording which he used during his office interviews. He gives the reader an approximation of how he phrased his questions, and he does say that the office interviewed "covered" these questions. The interview used in this study is actually quite similar in wording to that most commonly used by Lynch in his office interviews, as determined by a reading of his transcripts. The following questions were asked:

1. What is the first thing that comes into your mind when I say the word, "Boston"? In other words, what symbolizes Boston for you?

2. What special physical characteristics do you associate with
10. Boston? I'm thinking of things like materials, colors, textures, types of buildings, street patterns, smells, noises, etc.

3. For you, is Boston at night any different than Boston during the daytime?

Is Boston during the summer any different from Boston in the winter?

4. What is your favorite view of Boston?

5. I would like you to make a quick map of central Boston, from Massachusetts Avenue downtown. Make it as if you were describing the city to a stranger, covering all the main features. It doesn't have to be an accurate drawing—just a rough sketch. Take about 10 to 15 minutes.

6. Please give me complete and explicit directions for a trip that you make frequently into central Boston, the area of the map. Picture yourself actually making the trip, and describe the things you would see, hear, or even smell along the way, including the pathmarkers which have become important to you and the clues that a stranger would need to make the same decisions you have to make. I'm interested in the physical pictures of things.

Do you have any emotional feelings about any part of the trip? How long does it usually take you? Is there any part of the trip that you feel lost or uncertain of your location?

7. Now we're going to take some imaginary trips through the city to see how you go from one point to another. I'd like you to give me the same type of explicit directions as you just did. The first trip is from the Old North Church to the City Hospital by car.

Do you have any particular emotional feelings about any part of that trip? Is there any part of the trip that you would feel lost?

(Repeat for Trips 2 and 3: Corner of Massachusetts and Commonwealth Avenues to South Station by car; Symphony Hall to the New City Hall by foot.)

8. Now I would like to know what elements of central Boston you think are the most distinctive. They can be large or small, but I want to know which ones you think are the easiest to identify and remember.

9. Would you describe _______ to me? (Insert one of the responses to Question 8) If you were taken there blindfolded and then the blindfold was removed, what clues would you use to positively identify where you were?

Do you have any particular emotional feelings about _______? Would you show me on your map where _______ is? Where are its
11.

boundaries? (if applicable)

(Repeat for two or three responses to Question 8)

10. One last question. Do you consider Boston an easy city to orient yourself in and get around in? What cities of your acquaintance do you consider easy to orient yourself in?
Before analyzing the public image of Boston as derived from this recent set of interviews, it would be wise to take a brief look at the city in objective terms. Lynch (p. 143) reports that before any interviewing was done the area of the city under study was traversed on foot by an impartial observer, who noted the various strong and weak elements and their interrelations. Accordingly, this author made her own field reconnaissance of central Boston, primarily by automobile but on foot in some areas. The images of Boston which resulted from these two field analyses, past and present, are presented on the following pages. Where this author was uncertain as to how to represent a certain area, she deferred to Lynch's analysis and adopted his representation.

There is some question as to how impartial and objective a preliminary visual field analysis of an area can be. No matter how trained the observer it is inevitable that some of his own image of the city will work its way into the data. Even if the analysis were done with a camera, the human element must still come into the picture when the photographs are analyzed. Although this author tried to be objective, it is not claimed, however, that the following image map and description is completely untainted by her own conceptualization of Boston.

In general, Boston is a city of contrasts. Its narrow, winding streets contrast with areas of open space, such as the Common and the Gardens. It is a dirty city, but the grime is often relieved by patches of green in little parks, malls, and yards. Water is extremely important in defining the shape of the city. The area under study, the central Boston peninsula on the downtown side of Massachusetts Avenue, is bounded on the south by the Fort Point Channel, on the east and north by the harbor, often obscured
Fig. 2. The visual form of Boston as seen in the field (Lynch, 1960).
Fig. 3. The visual form of Boston as seen in the field in 1969.
from view by wharves and warehouses along the waterfront, and along the north by the Charles River, which separates the city from Cambridge. Massachusetts Avenue runs between the river and the channel, forming the western boundary of the area under study. Logan Airport is across the harbor in East Boston; South Boston lies across the channel to the south; Charlestown is to the north.

The central Boston area contains many recognizable areas; as Lynch remarks, "Boston is a city of very distinctive districts" (p. 17). The major districts are Beacon Hill, the Back Bay, the West End, now the Charles River Park redevelopment area, the North End, the market area around historic Faneuil Hall, the waterfront area, the open area of the Common and the Public Garden, the South End, and the central shopping district along Washington Street.

Beacon Hill rises up from the Common and the Public Gardens and then slopes down toward the Charles River. One of the older areas in Boston, it is characterized by low brick buildings ornamented with wrought iron, interesting doorways, private courtyards, cobblestone walks, and narrow, sloping streets. Once exclusively a neighborhood of wealthy aristocrats, it is now also the home of many young students and "hippies." Charles Street, near its western edge, is lined with antique shops and specialty stores. The entire district has a very European flavor.

The Back Bay district extends inward from the Charles River to Boylston Street. Also a residential district, it is unusual for Boston in that its street pattern is quite regular. The long major streets run parallel with the River to the edge of the Public Gardens; the cross streets are somewhat narrower and have names in which the first letter corresponds to the first eight letters of the alphabet, beginning with Arlington at the Gardens and ending with Hereford just before Massachusetts Avenue. The buildings are low brick or brownstone; as on Beacon Hill, most were once townhouses of the
wealthy. Commonwealth Avenue is the major street in this district; it is marked by its width and its central mall lined by large trees.

The new West End district is now Charles River Park. It contains the Charles River Park apartments, punctuated by a large sign which reads, "If you lived here, you'd be home now." The buildings are tall and light-colored, dotted with bits of blue and yellow. Next to the apartment development is the new Charles River Plaza, with its shopping center, cinema, and parking garage. Further up on Cambridge Street is also a new motor hotel. The whole area stands in contrast to the older Massachusetts General Hospital and the Suffolk County Jail, which are adjacent to it.

The North End lies across the Central Artery near the harbor. It is, for the most part, an Italian section. The streets are very narrow and usually congested with cars and crowds. The area is both commercial and residential, with many low structures packed close together.

Nearby, on the inner side of the Central Artery, is the market area next to Faneuil Hall, a rectangular brick building nicknamed "The Cradle of Liberty." It is surrounded by an open air market where fruits, vegetables, and meats are sold. There is much noise and much congestion here, and also much litter and debris.

The waterfront area follows the curve of the peninsula behind the North End down along Commercial Street and Atlantic Avenue. These streets are wide and are lined with warehouses and wharves. The new aquarium, not yet completed, is in this district, and some of the warehouses are being converted into apartment buildings.

The Boston Common and the Public Garden lie in the center of the city, surrounded by Beacon Hill, the Back Bay, the edge of the theater district, and the central shopping area. The Garden is generally rectangular, bordered by Arlington Street, Boylston Street, Charles Street, and Beacon Street. It has
a small pond on which the swan boats glide in the warmer months, flower-lined paths, large trees, and various statues. The Common is a five-sided figure of irregular shape, bounded by Charles, Boylston, Tremont, Park, and Beacon Streets. It is generally open, but there are trees, the "Frog Pond" where children may splash during the summer, and pedestrian entrances to the parking garage which lies under the Common.

The South End lies south of Huntington Avenue and the Massachusetts Turnpike Extension. Its buildings are brick and brownstone, like the Back Bay, and many of them have the characteristic bow-front facades. Also like the Back Bay, its street pattern is surprisingly regular, with long major streets and narrower cross streets which often have little malls or planted areas in their centers. The South End is a depressed area, however, although in recent years there has been some renovation of the apartment buildings, and on some streets one can see window boxes and newly-painted doorways.

Along Washington Street where it parallels one edge of the Common and Tremont Street is an area where the activity of retail shopping is so intense that it must be singled out from the wider retail area. Here Washington Street is quite narrow and is given a dark and canyon-like appearance by the tall stores on either side. The center of activity is the node at the corner of Winter Street-Summer Street and Washington Street, where Filene's and Jordan Marsh Company, two large department stores, are located. The area is always congested with people and cars, and the general impression is one of confusion.

According to the field analysis, there are also many minor districts in the central Boston area; they are smaller in area and less well-defined as the major districts above. They include: the Boylston Street-Newbury Street shopping area, Park Square, the theater or entertainment district, the Tufts-New England Medical Center area, the wholesale district, the
retail district below and above Washington Street, and the financial office, or business district. Along Boylston and Newbury Streets are the shops which, in general, sell a higher grade of merchandise than those of the downtown retail area. The area is relatively clean for Boston, and the sidewalks are broad, giving the impression of spaciousness. The district contains such stores as Bonwit Teller, in a building which was formerly the Museum of Natural History, Shreve, Chrump, and Lowe, a well-known jewelry store, Brooks Brothers, Peck and Peck, and other establishments of this nature. The Arlington Street Church and the Ritz Carleton Hotel, both on Arlington Street near the Garden, are landmarks.

The Park Square district extends from Arlington Street downtown behind Boylston Street. It is, except for the Statler Hilton Hotel, a rather shabby area, marked by stores, restaurants, a statue of Abraham Lincoln on a grassy island, and a large bus terminal. Park Square is usually congested with automobile traffic on its short, one-way streets.

Continuing along behind Boylston Street after Park Square one reaches the theater of entertainment district; the transition is a gradual one but the center of the theater district is at the intersection of Stuart and Tremont Streets. There are several movie houses in this area, and also three legitimate theaters. However, the theater district is also the entertainment district, and a profusion of bars and nightclubs offer other forms of entertainment to patrons. This district appears to extend up Tremont Street to Boylston, and also up Washington Street to the start of the retail area; this extension is often referred to as the "Combat Zone", an area of cheap movies, "adult" bookstores, and bars, which combine to give a threatening atmosphere, especially at night.

The Tufts-New England Medical Center is a series of new buildings on Harrison Avenue. It is in sharp contrast to the surrounding area--the grey
buildings of the wholesale or garment district, the theater district, and what is left of Chinatown, which does not appear as a district on the field analysis map. Chinatown has been almost completely destroyed by the Medical Center and the Turnpike Extension; one must look hard to see it.

The financial district lies between the retail area and the market area, and is bounded on the south by the Central Artery. Its streets are narrow, its buildings tall. The financial district is the home of most of Boston's banks and insurance companies; in addition, many office buildings house lawyers and the various supportive services of such an area--stenographic services, office furniture stores, and businessmen's luncheon establishments. The district is dotted with new structures, such as the imposing New England Merchants National Bank building and the State Street Bank.

One other distinctive district in the central Boston area is the Esplanade along the Boston bank of the Charles River. This wide grassy area is the site of the Hatch Memorial Shell, where the Boston Pops Orchestra gives outdoor concerts during the summer and where many go to enjoy the view of the Charles River Basin, the sailboats, and the sunset.

The path system of central Boston is generally unsystematic, with the exceptions of the Back Bay and parts of the South End. As mentioned above, the Back Bay street pattern is a grid, with its long major streets--Beacon Street, Marlborough Street, Commonwealth Avenue, Newbury Street, and Boylston Street running parallel with Storrow Drive and the edge of the Charles River, and the cross streets named in alphabetically order. The long streets of the South End are Tremont Street, Columbus Avenue, Shawmut Avenue, Washington Street, and Harrison Avenue; the first three a quite similar in appearance, while Washington Street is distinguished by the elevated train tracks running overhead, and Harrison Avenue is marked by the Boston City Hospital and the Boston University Medical School and Hospital. The cross streets
of the South End do not run the width of the district but are blocked from Huntington Avenue, the boundary of the South End near the Prudential Center, by the tracks of the Pennsylvania Railroad. In the triangular area between Huntington Avenue and Boylston Street, in the "forgotten area" which Lynch refers to in The Image of the City (p. 20), now rises the new Prudential Center.

The paths of the rest of Boston are characterized by subtle and not-so-subtle curves, occasional abrupt endings, and general discontinuity. The narrowness of the streets is most apparent in the North End, but it is also characteristic of Beacon Hill, the central retail shopping area, and the financial district. Parking is always difficult in Boston.

There are, however, several wide major streets which are worth mentioning here. One of the most notable is Cambridge Street, which runs from the Charles Street Rotary near the River up through the Government Center to Tremont Street. Its bend is now emphasized by the curvature of the new Center Plaza office building, and in the Government Center area Cambridge Street appears to be so wide that it seems to be a plaza itself. In fact, the actual traffic lanes are narrow, but the width of the street is emphasized by the broad sidewalks, the open area around the M.B.T.A. station, and the City Hall Plaza.

Commonwealth Avenue is also a distinctive path. Its width is due to a central, tree-lined mall onto which the flanking apartment buildings and townhouses face. And Atlantic Avenue, which runs along the wharf area by the harbor edge, is another wide path, although it narrows considerably when it runs into and becomes Commercial Street.

Boston's major arteries are Storrow Drive, which runs along side the Charles River, the Massachusetts Turnpike Extension, and the Central Artery, often referred to as the Southeast Expressway, although this label is not
accurate for that portion of the roadway which runs through central Boston. The Turnpike Extension starts in the western suburbs of Boston and runs through Allston, Brighton, and the Back Bay area. It travels underneath the Prudential Center, through the edge of the South End by the new Castle Square housing development, and connects with the Central Artery at a major interchange south of the Tufts-New England Medical Center. In the central Boston area, one can enter the Turnpike Extension to travel west, out of the city, at four interchanges: near or from the Central Artery, at the foot of Arlington Street near Castle Square, behind Copley Square, and at Massachusetts Avenue. There is no point in central Boston where one can enter the turnpike to travel east; the closest interchange where this can be done is in Allston.

The Central Artery, that part of the Fitzgerald Expressway which runs through central Boston, enters the peninsula from the south across the channel and parallels Albany Street until it joins with the Turnpike Extension. It then dips into a tunnel just north of South Station and subsequently emerges as an elevated highway which runs along Atlantic Avenue and the waterfront. It curves around Dock Square and the market area just west of the North End, runs behind North Station, and then crosses the mouth of the Charles River to Charlestown, the Mystic River Bridge, and points north of Boston. Before leaving the peninsula, however, the road sends a branch down towards the river edge to connect with Storrow Drive at Leverett Circle, next to the Charles River Park development. Thus, the driver can practically circle the central Boston peninsula by traveling along the Central Artery to Storrow Drive and then heading west along the River via Storrow; or he can cut through the area by traveling on the Turnpike Extension.

Boston is generously dotted with landmarks and distinctive nodes. The newest of these are the Prudential Center and the Government Center. There
is some question as to whether the Prudential Center and the Government Center can be categorized in terms of Lynch's five types of elements. In *The View from the Road*, Lynch, Appleyard, and Myer present an image map of Boston (p. 41) which includes these two new centers. They have categorized the Prudential Center as a landmark and the Government Center as a node. However, this image map was indeed a hypothetical one, for neither of the two centers had been completed at the time of publication (1964). Government Center can be thought of as a collection of landmarks or even as a district, as well as a node; the Prudential Center covers enough area to be considered a district, and as a center of activity it might qualify as a node, instead of a landmark. It was finally decided to consider Government Center as a node and the Prudential Center as a landmark, as Lynch, Appleyard, and Myer had done. Government Center has more of the qualities of a node than of any other type of element, and the Prudential tower, the most outstanding structure of the Prudential Center, tends to make the observer think more in terms of landmarks than in terms of nodes or districts.

As a node, the Government Center is seen as the area which follows the curve of Cambridge Street from its intersection with Tremont Street and Court Street to Bowdoin Square, the intersection of Bowdoin and Chardon Streets with Cambridge Street. The name "Government Center" is precisely accurate, as in the area are office buildings for all levels of government. Traveling up Cambridge Street from the Charles River, the first building one approaches is the new state office building, recently named in honor of Senator Leverett Saltonstall. However, as the name "Saltonstall Building" has not yet become common usage, this building will henceforth be referred to as the State Office Building. It is a tall, rectangular structure, set back from the street by a plaza and broad steps. Across Cambridge Street further along its curve lies the John F. Kennedy Federal Building, actually
two connected rectangular buildings, one tall, one long. Next to the J.F.K. Building, set quite far back from the street, is the new Boston City Hall, a rather squat building surrounded by a brick plaza. Across from it is the very distinctive Center Plaza building, a private office building which follows and emphasizes the curve of Cambridge Street.

The Prudential Center covers the triangular area between Huntington Avenue and Boylston Street east of Massachusetts Avenue. Its most vivid element is its 52-story office tower, the tallest building in Boston. Beside the tower stand the Sheraton-Boston Hotel, the War Memorial Auditorium, a rectangular shopping plaza, and three new apartment buildings. There are escalators, a fountain, and an underground garage.

Another newly-constructed development which covers a large area is the Charles River Park development. Built on the land which was once the old West End of Boston, this development consists of three tall apartment buildings, a shopping plaza with cinema and garage, and a new motel on Cambridge Street. The complex stands in contrast to the old Suffolk County Jail and the large, older buildings of the Massachusetts General Hospital.

Of course, the newer structures in Boston have no monopoly on distinctiveness and vividness. Copley Square, a major node, is surrounded by landmarks—the Boston Public Library, the Sheraton-Plaza Hotel, formerly the Copley Plaza, the Old South Church, and Trinity Church. The State House with its golden dome is a landmark which can be seen for miles and marks the location of Beacon Hill and the edge of the Common. Churches, many with historic significance, are Boston landmarks; most notable are the Arlington Street Church at Arlington and Boylston Streets, the Old North Church in the North End, the Park Street Church with the Old Granary Burial Grounds beside it, and the aforementioned churches in Copley Square. Faneuil Hall, the Customs House, the John Hancock Building, Symphony Hall, the Statler Hilton
and Ritz Carlton Hotels, the Old State House at the corner of Washington and State Streets, Boston City Hospital, and Franklin Square in the South End are the other significant Boston landmarks.

There is another major part of Boston which does not appear on the visual field analysis map, and that is the subway system, which is an important path system for many Boston residents. Four transit lines run beneath the city and beyond it; they are color-keyed for traveling ease. The Red Line, a train line, runs from Harvard Square in Cambridge, through Central Boston, to Ashmont Station in Dorchester. The Blue Line train runs from Revere and East Boston in the north through Government Center, to the new Aquarium at the waterfront. The Orange line, also a train line, connects Charlestown to Roxbury and Jamaica Plain by way of central Boston and the South End. The Green line, a trolley line, runs from Lechmere Square in Cambridge, through Government Center and Park Street Station, under the Back Bay, and out to the western areas of Brookline, Brighton, and Newton. All of these lines can be reached by various transfer processes at Government Center Station, Park Street Station, or the Washington Street Station near Filene's and Jordan Marsh Company. In addition, there is a bus which runs along Massachusetts Avenue from Harvard Square in Cambridge, through the Back Bay and the South End, to Dudley Station in Roxbury, and an express bus which follows the Turnpike Extension from Brighton to the central shopping area.

With this description of the actual physical appearance of the central Boston area in mind, we can now proceed to an analysis of the thirty recent interviews and an attempt to determine an up-to-date image of the city.
In general, much of what was said by the thirty subjects interviewed in 1969 was quite similar to the responses obtained by Lynch in 1956. Yet there were some distinct differences, many of them referring to elements of the "new Boston" and its contrast with the older elements of the city.

Lynch found that Boston is "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" (p. 17). The Common and the State House were also mentioned by many subjects in this recent study as symbolic of Boston, and others mentioned the Back Bay, Beacon Hill, and the Esplanade area on the bank of the river. However, not a few interviewees said that they felt that the Prudential Center had become the symbol of Boston. A more common response, though, was that Boston is symbolized by an image of contrasts—specifically the contrast between the old and the new, between the Prudential Center and the surrounding older Back Bay area, between the new buildings of the Government Center and the townhouses of Beacon Hill.

The physical descriptions of Boston which Lynch found to be mentioned most frequently by his subjects were that "Boston is a city of very distinctive districts and of crooked, confusing paths. It is a dirty city, of red-brick buildings.... an old, historical place, full of wornout buildings, yet containing some new structures among the old" (p. 17). Others, he reports, said that Boston lacks open space, is a fairly small city, has "areas of mixed use", and is "marked by bay windows, iron fences, or brownstone fronts" (p. 18). Much of this description was found in the responses of the recent sample, who most frequently mentioned red brick or brown low buildings, plan-less narrow, winding streets, dirt, confusion, and traffic congestion. It was generally agreed that rough, weathered textures and
drab colors predominate in Boston. Other comments were that Boston is a
city of "old world charm," buildings packed closely together, and a "hodgepodge"
of structures and uses.

Yet to this description which is so similar to that uncovered by Lynch
must be added new physical characteristics which Bostonians now feel should
be included in a description of their city. Boston is also a city of tall
buildings of glass and concrete, gray rather than the red or brown of brick.
Subjects tended to be specific in their description, citing the grey concrete
of the Government Center buildings or the glass found at the Prudential Center.
It appears from the physical descriptions of the city and the elements which
now symbolize Boston that the "New Boston" has indeed made inroads in the
image of the city.

There was no agreement as to whether Boston was more appealing during
the daylight hours or at night. For many subjects, as Lynch found (p. 19),
the lights of the city at night added a sense of excitement which was
lacking during the day; in addition, it was often said that the darkness of
night hid the dirtiness of the city and made it more pleasant. However, for
others night signified the death of the city, the oppressive silence of the
usually busy shopping and financial districts; these subjects felt that
Boston was unpleasant and actually threatening and dangerous at night.

Summer in Boston was generally agreed upon to be more pleasant than
winter, although for a few subjects there was no difference. Those who
perceived a difference, however, spoke of the softer, less bleak appearance
of Boston in the summer, when the Esplanade, Commonwealth Avenue, the
Common, and the Public Gardens are green. Winter in Boston was associated
with snow, especially dirty snow; summer, in contrast, was felt to be clean.

"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." Although these words come from Lynch's report (p. 18), they are equally as applicable to this one. The identical views of the city were the favorites of these subjects. But two new favorite views must be added to the list--the sight of the Prudential Center from the Expressway heading into Boston, and the breathtaking view of the entire city from the top of the Prudential tower.

The distinctive elements of Boston according to Lynch's sample and the one interviewed in this study are presented in map form on the following pages. It can be seen that some of the elements of Boston have retained their distinctiveness for area residents; the Garden and the Common were cited by approximately the same percentage of subjects, the Washington Street shopping area and the Filene's-Jordans node dropped slightly in frequency, as did Beacon Hill, Commonwealth Avenue, and the Charles River. Copley Square and the market district near Faneuil Hall remained the same in frequency; the State House was mentioned more frequently than in Lynch's study.

More interesting than that which has remained the same, however, is that which has changed. The Prudential Center and the Government Center were both often mentioned as distinctive elements, by 18 (50-75%) and 14 subjects (25-50%), respectively; neither, of course, appear in Lynch's data. But it is significant that these new complexes are seen as distinctive by Boston area residents, most probably by virtue of their outstanding difference from the vast majority of Boston architecture. It is interesting to speculate on how a resident of a city dominated by skyscrapers and modern office buildings would view these complexes; would he be so used to the architecture that neither the Prudential Center nor the Government Center would be distinctive to him? One clue to this question is given by the responses of one subject.
Fig. 4. The distinctive elements of Boston (Lynch, 1960).
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Fig. 5. The distinctive elements of Boston in 1969.
who had spent several years living in New York. He felt that the Government Center area was indeed distinctive but that the Prudential Center was not; the Government Center, he explained, was interesting because of the curve of the Center Plaza building, the ugliness of the J.F.K. Federal Building, and especially the visible contrast of the new with the old--the Sears Crescent, the Central Artery, warehouses, and the Court Houses. For him the Prudential Building was too much like the towers of Manhattan to be distinctive; however, he did admit that the Prudential Center in its entirety was unusual because of the area covered by what appeared to be a single structure.

But let us return to the comparison of the two studies. Many of the elements which Lynch's interviewees said were distinctive do not even appear on the newer list. Storrow Drive, Cambridge Street, Atlantic Avenue and the waterfront, Louisburg Square, Back Bay, Symphony Hall, Beacon Street, the Charles Street Rotary, South Station, Union Park, and the North End were hardly cited by the more recent sample; other elements, lesser in number, took their places. Some of these absences are explainable. South Station has lost much of its importance to the Bostonian because of the general decline of passenger railroads in New England. Similarly, Atlantic Avenue and the waterfront area have lost much of their former vitality, which was decreasing even when Lynch did his research. Union Park in the South End was never mentioned by the present sample; few of the subjects in this sample said that they had any familiarity with the South End or any reason to go into its heart. As for the other missing elements and the inclusion of different ones--the Public Library, Trinity Church, the Newbury Street area, and the Old State House--there are two major possible explanations. First, the listing of distinctive elements followed the imaginary trips, one of which brought the subject through or near copley square and the areas in which the Public Library, Trinity Church, and Newbury Street are found; the
attention of the subject may have been called to these elements by this trip. Secondly, the magnetic quality of the Prudential Center may have drawn more people into the area around it and may have resulted in greater familiarity with the Back Bay over the last few years. These explanations do not account for the greater frequency with which the Old State House was mentioned by this sample, but perhaps that landmark is now more distinctive in contrast to some of the newer buildings in the surrounding business district and to the new Government Center a few blocks away.

The image of the city of Boston, other than the broad physical characteristics and the distinctive elements cited above, is difficult to describe without using Lynch's technique of discussing each of the types of image elements in turn. The image maps of both studies, derived from the maps drawn and from the verbal portions of the interviews, are presented on the following pages for brief study; a detailed analysis of the paths, edges, districts, nodes, and landmarks will follow.

In The Image of the City Professor Lynch's main emphasis seems to have been focused upon an explication of his methodology. Lynch, necessarily, was concerned with validating his research techniques, clarifying his system of analysis, and explaining his terminology. This was a necessary focus as his book was a pioneer work in image analysis. That is not to say that Lynch's study of the three cities did not provide the characteristics of the image of the city of Boston. Rather, in exemplifying his terminology Lynch concentrates in some detail upon many of these characteristics. This study, however, focuses on the city of Boston and the elements of its particular image today. Lynch's method of analysis is, for the most part, accepted and employed.

The following discussion of the elements of the image of Boston, as derived from interviews with the 1969 sample, will be concerned with
Fig. 6. The Boston image as derived from verbal interviews (Lynch, 1960).
Fig. 7. The Boston image as derived from verbal interviews, 1969.
Fig. 8. The Boston image as derived from sketch maps (Lynch, 1960).
Fig. 9. The Boston image as derived from sketch maps, 1969.
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presenting an updated description of this image; there will be particular emphasis upon the changes which have occurred since 1956, the year in which Lynch did his interviewing. Therefore, it has not been found necessary to discuss in detail some of the examples which Lynch uses in Chapter III to illustrate the variables which strengthen or weaken the image elements. Those examples cited by Lynch which are not discussed in this report are consonant with the results of this study.

There were a total of 198 elements drawn on the sketch maps or mentioned during the verbal portions of the interview. The mean number of elements included on the maps by a subject was 33.3, and the mean number of elements mentioned by a subject was 42.6. The mean number of elements per subject, including both the map and verbal data, was 52.3. Landmarks predominated in the verbal part of the interview, while paths predominated on the maps.

In the following discussion a distinction is made between major and minor elements. Major elements are those which were mentioned during the verbal portion of the interview by at least 50% of the subjects, or drawn on the sketch maps by at least 50% of the subjects. Minor elements are those that were mentioned by 12½% to 50% of the subjects during the verbal interview or drawn on the sketch maps by 12½% to 50% of the subjects. Those elements that were mentioned by less than 12½% (4 subjects) or drawn by less than 12½% of the sample are not discussed in the text but are listed in Appendix B. It will be noted that a measure of how many subjects included any given element in the total interview, either on the maps or in the verbal part or in both, is given in Appendix A. These combined measures were not used to determine whether an element was major or minor in the image. Although this method would seem to be a sensible way of determining an element's importance, it would not allow the importance of the element to be compared to its status in Lynch's study, since Lynch unfortunately did not employ such a
combined measure but kept the two measures, verbal and maps, completely separate. Consequently, when it is stated that Element X is a major element, the reader will have to refer to the preceding image maps if he wishes to know whether the status of Element X as a major element is due to its frequency of occurrence in the verbal interview or on the sketch maps. Let us now proceed with a discussion of the Boston image.

Paths

"Paths are the channels along which the observer customarily, occasionally, or potentially moves. They may be streets, walkways, transit lines, canals, railroads" (Lynch, p. 47).

The results which were obtained concerning paths are strikingly similar to those reported by Lynch, so similar in fact that the following quotation is equally applicable to both studies:

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 people who knew the city best of all to rely more upon small landmarks and less upon either regions or paths. (p. 49)

This last statement, that those with the best knowledge of Boston rely upon "small landmarks," was particularly true in the recent study. Several knowledgeable subjects would speak of, for example, passing by particular stores like Shreve, Crump, and Low or Martini Carl but would not mention that at that point they were at the intersection of Arlington and Boylston Streets. The maps, too, showed the gradation of familiarity as indicated by the path structure. Particularly obvious was the typical map of the subject who was accustomed to driving through Boston; his map was careful to show how the
various paths intersected with each other and where they went in relation to other paths. This was in contrast to the maps of those with lesser knowledge; their maps tended to show districts and landmarks with only a few paths.

As can be seen in the composite maps for this study on the preceding pages, the major paths, those mentioned by more than 50% of the interviewees, were Commonwealth Avenue, Boylston Street, Beacon Street, Huntington Avenue, Storrow Drive, the Massachusetts Turnpike Extension, and parts of Washington Street, Tremont Street, Arlington Street, Charles Street, and the Central Artery. Boylston Street and Tremont Street were often mentioned as access routes to the central shopping district and the theater district; Storrow Drive and the Central Artery were employed in the imaginary trips to reach many different points in the central Boston area. As Lynch remarks, "Customary travel will of course be one of the strongest influences, so that major access lines ... are all key image factors."

One particular major access line which was mentioned and drawn far less than one would expect was the Massachusetts Turnpike Extension. This road, which, as described above, runs through the Back Bay, beneath the Prudential Center, behind Copley Square, and terminates in the area of the wholesale district and the Tufts-New England Medical Center, is used by many commuters from the western suburbs to reach central Boston and the Central Artery. Yet because it runs below ground level it seems to be missing from the images of many people, even, occasionally, those who use it frequently. Those who included it on their maps were often unable to trace its exact route or pinpoint the major interchanges, although in their description of their trip along the Turnpike they could say that it ran under the Prudential Center and led them to the Central Artery. When asked what they saw as they drove along the Turnpike, a few subjects were able to recall passing by industrial buildings with cleverly painted facades but were unable to locate exactly
where along the route these buildings were. The Turnpike is extremely hard for most people to scale—to "sense one's position along the total length, to grasp the distance traversed yet to go." (Lynch, p. 55). This seems to be due to the lack of visible landmarks along the way, with the exception of the Prudential Tower which at one point appears to rise directly from the center of the road. Also the high speed of travel along the road and its position below ground level prevent the driver from seeing the areas he is travelling through. Similarly, the Turnpike is missing from the images of others because from the street level of Boston it cannot always be seen.

One can look down from Massachusetts Avenue to the Pike underneath, and one is mildly aware of the interchange behind Copley Square, but for the most part the road is invisible and no sense of continuity is felt.

Lynch remarks (p. 50) that "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 theaters." The image of Washington Street in the minds of the 1969 sample has changed slightly, however. It is still associated with the central shopping area; following are some of the descriptions of Washington Street that refer to its shopping function:

Old, crowded, difficult to drive in or walk around in.
A hodgepodge. A conglomeration of people, a lot of little stores, taxis, a cop on a horse.
Very busy, the sidewalks very narrow for the amount of traffic.
Stores and people packed together. The stores are short and squalid.
It's the cavern of the city.
It's still an exciting vital shopping area.
It's kind of grubby-looking for the center of a city.

But Washington Street is also associated with activities which are not shopping; they are best summed up by a term used by many subjects—the "Combat Zone." The Combat Zone does not seem to be limited in area to
Washington Street. Several subjects seemed to feel that it extends upward to Boylston Street, westward into the Theater District, and almost to Park Square. These following quotations from the verbal interviews were used to describe the lower part of Washington Street (no clear demarcation was seen between this part and the shopping section) and the area around it:

- It's the Combat Zone now—with all the nightclubs and bums.
- It's a "strip"—all very smutty, make you think of sailors just coming into town. It's very depressing.
- There are bars, cheap movie houses, and people hanging around.
- It has a threatening quality.
- It's shoddy.
- It's disconcerting; there are a lot of cheap stores.
- It's all slummy and horrible. There are so many bars.

And one subject summed it up with these words:

- You can see the degeneration and atrophication of the city.
- Parts of it are drying up, being used less and less. The people and activities are gone, probably forever.

The Combat Zone, then, now appears to mark Washington Street as clearly as its shopping function. It has many of the characteristics of the now-defunct Scollay Square, yet seemingly with a higher incidence of crime. One subject remarked casually that a city like Boston seems to need a place like Scollay Square, and that if urban renewal ever "cleans up" Washington Street, the Combat Zone will probably move on to a new location. The most likely candidate seems to be Park Square.

But Washington Street was prominent in the image of Boston only between Court Street near Government Center and Kneeland Street, like Tremont Street which was remembered mainly as one edge of the Common. As Lynch also found in reference to Washington Street (p. 50), few subjects could extend these paths into the South End.

Commonwealth Avenue, another major path, was less remembered for its extreme width, as Lynch found (p. 50), but more for the tree-lined mall which runs down its center, separating inbound and outbound traffic. It prompted
subjects to remark on the sense of tranquility which it lent to the area but also brought forth comments on the number of "old women walking their dogs" and the profusion of young people that could be seen lounging on the grassy strip in warmer weather. Several subjects expressed annoyance at the pedestrians' apparent disregard for automobile traffic along Commonwealth Avenue, especially on weekends when the area seemed thronged with students.

"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" (Lynch, p. 51). Lynch's examples of Arlington and Tremont Streets as gaining distinctiveness because of their proximity to the Public Garden and the Common was also apparent in this study; the same held true for Beacon Street, Boylston Street, and Charles Street, which was more distinctive as the path which runs between the two park areas than as an important feature of the Beacon Hill area. As mentioned above, Atlantic Avenue, which Lynch found to be important due to its relationship to the waterfront (p. 50), has lost much of its importance and its no longer a major element in the image of Boston.

One of the greatest changes in the conceptualization of a path over the years has taken place concerning Cambridge Street. Lynch found that Cambridge Street "acquired clarity from its border relationship to Beacon Hill," (p. 51), and conversely lost its sense of continuity as it narrowed after Bowdoin Square (p. 52). Neither of these two statements is applicable to Cambridge Street now. First, Cambridge Street is no longer seen to have a clear border relationship to Beacon Hill. Where the street would appear to be seen as an edge, between the Charles Street Rotary and the State Office Building, which seems to mark the entrance to Government Center, attention is called away from Beacon Hill to the new Charles River Plaza on the opposite side of the street or to the remaining shabby stores on the Hill side, which
people do not associate with the well-kept residential character of the inner part of Beacon Hill. When Cambridge Street enters the Government Center area, moreover, it almost seems to disappear as a path on one side; it is seen to widen into a plaza. This is due, apparently, to the broad spaces between the City Hall and the John F. Kennedy Building, the City Hill Plaza, and the wide area around the subway station next to the street. Yet on the opposite side of the street the continuity of the path into Tremont Street is emphasized by the Center Plaza Building, which follows and accentuates the curvature of the path. Cambridge Street has in effect become a one-sided path in the Government Center area.

The problem of path continuity in Boston is as apparent in 1969 as it was when Lynch did his research. Washington Street and Tremont Street have already been mentioned as paths which could not be easily extended into the South End, although, as Lynch also found, (p. 52) the continuity of the street name did give some assistance. Harrison Avenue is another example of path discontinuity; it was associated with Chinatown and the New England Medical Center and also with the Boston City Hospital further along. Subjects knew they could, on one of the imaginary trips, reach the City Hospital by going along Harrison Avenue from Chinatown but could picture nothing along the route.

The Central Artery was also found to be a discontinuous path for many subjects. Although a highly visible road in most areas, it seemed to fade from view beyond one particular point—the interchange with the Massachusetts Turnpike Extension. The interview question which brought this out most clearly was again the trip from the Old North Church to Boston City Hospital. The most direct route for this trip by car was to get on the Central Artery at the edge of the North End, and to proceed along this path until either the Albany Street exit or the Massachusetts Avenue exit. Almost without
exception subjects said they would drive up onto the Central Artery. But nearly half of them did not seem to know where the Southbound lane of the expressway would take them, except to the Turnpike interchange. They could not extend it beyond this point either in the verbal interview or on their maps. Accordingly, they would go in the opposite direction on the Central Artery until it intersected with Storrow Drive; they would proceed along Storrow Drive until they reached Massachusetts Avenue, and then they would go up Massachusetts Avenue until they reached the City Hospital. It appears, then, that a sense of continuity is preserved from Storrow Drive to the Central Artery until the Turnpike entrance, but then there is a sharp break in continuity. The path can be again picked up much further south as the Southeast Expressway, notorious for monumental traffic tie-ups; everyone seems to know that it goes to Milton and Quincy.

The trip from the Old North Church to the City Hospital made clear one further fact about the path system of Boston which was also mentioned by Lynch (p. 63): people often have difficulty in remembering how to go from Storrow Drive to the streets of the Back Bay, and vice versa. The interchanges are confusing and the presence of one-way paths is restrictive. As one subject put it:

I'm unsure of where I am on Storrow Drive after Mass. Ave. The signs are meaningless—I have no sense of where I'll be after I turn off.

Huntington Avenue is another path which has changed much in the last decade. It has now become less of a path and more of an edge, a boundary between the Prudential Center and the South End, between the familiar and the unfamiliar. It is seen by some as having two terminal points: one at Copley Square, a true terminus, and the other somewhere near Massachusetts Avenue, just beyond Northeastern University, a false terminus, since Huntington Avenue actually continues far out into Brookline. It was often
confused both in the verbal interview and on the maps with Boylston Street, the other major boundary of the Prudential Center.

Lynch remarks (p. 51) that "occasionally, paths were important largely for structural reasons. Massachusetts Avenue was almost pure structure for most subjects, who were unable to describe it." This was not found to be true for the members of the recent sample, who were able to describe many sections of Massachusetts Avenue. True, the section of this path which runs through the South End could not easily be recalled, but this is due to the subjects' general unfamiliarity with the South End itself. However, the Prudential Center areas has brought greater focus upon Massachusetts Avenue, and the sights of small stores, Symphony Hall, Horticultural Hall, the Christian Science Church complex, the new cinemas on Huntington Avenue near Massachusetts Avenue, and the bridge near the Auditorium subway station which arches over the Turnpike were all commonly mentioned. Indeed, there was no path in the central Boston area which could be described as "pure structure."

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....Those edges seem strongest which are not only visually prominent, but also continuous in form and impenetrable to cross movement" (Lynch, p. 62).

The Charles River, for both Lynch's sample and the recent one, was the strongest edge in Boston. It appeared on all the maps drawn and was mentioned for one reason or another by almost every subject. Everyone knows that the Charles River separates Boston from Cambridge, and for several subjects the river was the focal point of their image of the city. The activities which take place along the banks of the Charles were often cited
as extremely pleasurable: concerts at the Hatch Shell on the Esplanade, the sight of sailboats in the Charles River Basin.

The river, however strong an edge, does present some problems in conceptualizing Boston. It twists and turns in an unobvious manner for those who drive along side it. A few subjects recalled that the Prudential Tower and other Boston landmarks seem to shift from side to side as one travels inbound on Storrow Drive or the Massachusetts Turnpike Extension. Although Lynch (p. 63) reports that "everyone remembered...the curving line," few in the recent sample were able to draw the misleading curve of the Charles River at Beacon Hill, and consequently many subjects were unable to accurately place on their maps many paths and landmarks. As Lynch, too, found (p. 63), subjects had difficulty in interrelating the river and Beacon Hill; but unlike Lynch's results not even the Charles Street rotary connected them.

For both samples, the Central Artery also was felt to be a strong edge. It was seen as a barrier especially where it separates the market area from the North End; the shadowed area beneath this elevated road was felt to be a no-man's land which also generated much confusion as to where paths lead after they have passed under the Artery.

Lynch states that the railroad tracks in Boston also acted as an edge; he says (p. 64) they were a "broad gash" which "seemed to dismember the city." It is most interesting to note that not a single interviewee in the 1969 sample so much as mentioned railroad tracks running through Boston; and only one subject included the tracks on his map of the city. Not only did the tracks not function as an edge; it appears that they have completely disappeared from the image of Boston. It is a fact that South Station and North Station were occasionally included on the maps, and one subject did draw in the Back Bay station; however, these landmarks seem to be no longer associated with travel by rail. North Station is known as the building which
houses the Boston Garden, where major sports events are held, and South Station now seems only to mark the area where Summer Street appears to terminate. The decline of passenger rail travel in New England is only part of the explanation for this major discrepancy between the two sets of results; it explains the decreased importance of South and North Stations. The railroad tracks are no longer an edge because they now run along side the Turnpike Extension, which was constructed on one side of what used to be a double track bed. The Turnpike is not seen as the edge that the train tracks were, as discussed below, and since the tracks are rarely noticed when travelling along the Turnpike or looking down at it from street level, the railroad has lost most of its divisive quality.

Similarly, the waterfront with Atlantic Avenue, was not seen as a strong edge; Lynch found the same result and attributed it to both the decline in waterfront activity and the blocked view of the water by various structures (p. 62). It appears, however, that the recent sample was even less concerned with the harbor edge than the original sample, and the relationship between the Charles River and the harbor was only vaguely remembered.

Huntington Avenue has already been mentioned as an edge in the discussion of paths, above. This road sharply separates the area of the Prudential Center and the Christian Science Church from the South End; it acts as a boundary to each and not a seam joining the two. A possible explanation for Huntington Avenue as an edge may be the fact that besides Massachusetts Avenue, only one street is a continuous path from the South End to Huntington Avenue; all of the others end at the railroad tracks which parallel Huntington. If this is the correct explanation, then perhaps the railroad tracks do act indirectly as an edge although they are missing from the image. But for the sample interviewed there is a more likely explanation: the South End is an area into which few of the interviewees ever venture; it is an unknown,
and therefore Huntington Avenue marks the edge of the known. And indeed the Prudential Center is well known. It seems to have drawn attention to itself and away from whatever lies around it; as the South End is relatively unexplored territory, at least in recent years, for the 1969 sample, they seem to have wasted no attention on it. In fact, few were able to even describe the "other side" of Huntington Avenue; it seemed to be only the edge of a slum and therefore irrelevant. It is also interesting to note in contrast that Boylston Street, the other long edge of the Prudential Center, was seen rather as a seam which linked the new complex to the Back Bay, a most familiar territory.

One major path which might have been an edge had it been differently constructed was, of course, the Turnpike Extension. Its sunken position, however, kept it from being the great barrier that its width would have forced it to be had it been built at or above ground level. Boston is fortunate that the only area where the Turnpike is felt to be a barrier is just outside of Copley Square, where the interchange has made walking along Huntington Avenue difficult and where there is no bridge to cross over to Columbus Avenue in the South End. In addition, the Turnpike did tend to cause some confusion near South Station, as evidenced by those who made the imaginary trip from the corner of Massachusetts Avenue and Commonwealth Avenue to South Station by reaching the theater district and then proceeding down Kneeland Street to their destination. Many subjects voiced some bewilderment at what the Turnpike had done to the street pattern; they spoke of being unsure of how to cross over the sunken road. Yet they did not feel that the Turnpike was a barrier; all were certain they would be able to cross to South Station.

**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" (L Lynch, p. 47). The major districts identified by the subjects in the recent sample were Beacon Hill, the area of the Public Gardens and the Common, and the market area near Faneuil Hall. In addition there were fourteen other districts identified by name by varying numbers of subjects; they include Back Bay, the Financial District, the Waterfront, the North End, the Central Shopping or Retail District, Charles River Park, China Town, the Boylston Street shopping area, the Newbury Street shopping area, the Theater District, the South End, the Combat Zone, the Wholesale or Garment District, and the Esplanade by the river.

Beacon Hill has not changed much since the time of Lynch's investigations, and consequently the descriptions of this district are very similar to those reported by Lynch. Subjects agreed that the streets of Beacon Hill are narrow and steep and that the area is characterized by low, brick buildings which once were or still are townhouses. Also mentioned as characteristic were wrought iron ornamentation, amethyst glass windows along Beacon Street, glimpses of inner courtyards, cobblestone streets and sidewalks, and Louisburg Square, which seems to epitomize Beacon Hill. Today, everyone seems to recognize that Beacon Hill is no longer a purely upper-class residential area; there were frequent mentions of the hippie and student populations which have taken up residence there. Beacon Hill is seen as both a tranquil reminder of the past and an exciting lesson in present reality.

The boundaries of Beacon Hill alternate between being clear and being indistinct. It was generally agreed that Beacon Street is one definite boundary, and that the Charles River, with Storrow Drive, is another. Charles Street, however, was said to be included in the area of Beacon Hill, and the residences across Charles Street were also felt to be part of the
district. No one could say precisely where Beacon Hill ended on the Charles Street side. Similarly, subjects had great difficulty in determining the boundary on the opposite side of the hill. Lynch (p. 65) states that Cambridge Street was felt to be the edge which both separated Beacon Hill from the West End and also tied the two districts as a seam would. Lower Cambridge Street today is seen as having a vague relationship to Beacon Hill, while the upper part of Cambridge Street is now seen clearly as part of Government Center. Certainly Cambridge Street is no longer a seam tying the Hill to the West End; the West End has changed so completely that it now bears no relation to Beacon Hill.

The luxury apartment complex known as Charles River Park now stands on the site of the old West End; next to the apartment buildings there is also a new shopping plaza with garage and cinema, and a recently completed Holiday Inn motel. The new construction curves around the buildings of the Massachusetts General Hospital, and consequently the area of the Old West End is no longer seen as a district. Subjects who mentioned the hospital and the apartment buildings kept them separated in their minds, and not a few subjects mentioned either the hospital or Charles River Park but not both. In fact, few subjects saw any relation between the shopping plaza and the apartment buildings. The West End has become only several groups of structures with no common characteristics to tie them together as a district.

The Public Garden and the Boston Common together are represented as a district on the graphical representations of the Boston image, but the interview responses tend to give the impression that these two open areas in the center of Boston are seen more as an absence of structures than as the presence of definite physical characteristics. However, they are not landmarks, nodes, edges, or paths, and therefore will be classified together as a district. These two park areas are considered an oasis in the activity
of Boston; as one subject put it, a "unique preserve in the center of the city, a relief from the surrounding congestion." The Gardens, however, are closely associated with the Back Bay and the mall of Commonwealth Avenue, while the Common is tied to Beacon Hill by Beacon Street and the State House, which overlooks one corner of the Common. There is less association with the other surrounding districts—the retail area, Park Square, and the Theater District. Descriptions of the Garden and the Common refer to grass, flowers, statues, trees, and the swan boats, although the interviewing itself was done in the winter, there were no descriptions that referred to the parks during the winter. It seems that Boston residents have few associations with the Common and the Garden during the cold months; their conceptualizations of this area are only of its appearance during spring and summer.

The market district was an area that everyone could describe, but few could fix its boundaries and some could not even pinpoint it accurately on their maps. The market is known to be next to Faneuil Hall, but the location of Faneuil Hall with reference to the street pattern was seen as unclear, except that it is close to Government Center. The noise, dirt, crowds, and sight of fruits and vegetables being sold outdoors were clearly recalled, and some subjects associated the market with the nearby North End, presumably because it is known that many North End residents do their daily shopping there. The market was often called Haymarket Square, when in fact it is nearer to Dock Square; there are no longer any markets at Haymarket, but the name persists and is now associated with the Faneuil Hall market area. Perhaps the smaller area which is now devoted to market activities should now be categorized as a node, rather than as a district.

The Back Bay was another clearly defined Boston district, albeit not one that was mentioned with great frequency. Its most recognizable feature was Commonwealth Avenue, both for its mall and its width. The Back Bay was
singled out often as the only area in central Boston where the streets were laid out in a regular pattern; most subjects could easily recite all of the names of the alphabetical cross streets. Low brick and brownstone buildings, recognizable still as townhouses or converted townhouses, were said to be characteristic of the Back Bay. The presence of many young people from the various schools in the area was also mentioned often. The boundaries of the Back Bay were generally agreed to be the Charles River, the Public Garden, Kenmore Square, which is beyond Massachusetts Avenue, and a line drawn parallel to and between Commonwealth Avenue and Newbury Street, which was not included in the district.

Newbury Street as a shopping area was seen as a district in itself, separate from the Back Bay and also, surprisingly, from the shopping area along Boylston Street, which it parallels. The Newbury Street establishments were remembered as a collection of specialty stores and art galleries. One subject said of Newbury Street, "The stores are so different from the rest of the city--they're so nice!" Boylston Street, although associated with Newbury Street as being "uptown" as opposed to the central shopping district "downtown," was felt to have a different character than Newbury Street; the stores were said to be larger, less "arty," and less exclusive.

Boylston Street was also associated with business. The New England Mutual Life Insurance Building, I.B.M., and the John Hancock Building, which is not on Boylston Street but is one block south between St. James and Stuart Streets, were occasionally mentioned as being in the Boylston Street area. As one subject said:

This is really a part of the New Boston. The New England Mutual and the John Hancock were the first of the large, new architectural developments. They marked the beginning of a new era after the Depression--people were not afraid to invest money in Boston.

What is generally considered "downtown Boston" is seen as what Lynch
would call a mosaic of districts (p. 72). The Financial District, the Retail District, the Combat Zone, the Theater District, the Wholesale District—all are felt to be in one general area, grey in color, active during the day and threatening at night. None of these districts is seen to have definite boundaries; one seems to blend gradually into another. The waterfront is known to be to the south of all these areas, but it is not an important part of the image of the downtown area. Rather, it is the Central Artery which is seen as the baseline, the southern boundary of the downtown area. The mosaic of downtown districts is distinguished by its lack of landmarks; it is those buildings which have come to have personal significance for each observer which are the pathmarkers in these areas.

One district which has been decimated by the Massachusetts Turnpike Extension still remains prominent in the minds of Bostonians. Chinatown in recent years has been reduced to the area of a few blocks, but it was mentioned as a district by quite a few people. In fact, Chinatown seems to be thought of as it was once rather than as it is now.

A few subjects seemed to feel that there was a vague but undefined district in the downtown area that was not included in any of the districts mentioned above. It was referred to as "the area around the Old City Hall" or "the area around King's Chapel." One subject was very insistent on the existence of such a district; he said that it should be called the "Old Government Center," since it includes both the Old City Hall and the Old State House. This district seems to be bounded by Tremont Street, Bromfield and Franklin Streets, Devonshire Street, and Court Street. Besides the above landmarks it also has within it the Old South Meeting House, the former Old Corner Bookstore, now property of The Boston Globe, and King's Chapel and its cemetery. As this insistent subject pointed out, it is one of the few areas in the downtown area which has no new construction within it, although
new buildings are going up all around it. The vagueness and infrequency with which this district was mentioned does not warrant its inclusion in the list of Boston districts, but it does seem to be an area that is not part of any other district.

The South End has already been discussed briefly in conjunction with Huntington Avenue, one of its apparent edges. This district, it has been said, was mentioned by several subjects and included on various maps, but no one showed any familiarity with the area, except for the few blocks around the Boston City Hospital and the University Hospital. The South End was seen as a depressed area by the interviewees. Following are three typical descriptions:

- It's a very poor neighborhood. There are a lot of bars and a lot of empty-looking houses.
- It's very run-down, with lots of bars, pawn shops, run-down shops, broken windows. But it's very alive and colorful.
- The City Hospital is in the blood and guts of the city. You can see the squalor and complexity of the city around there, winter or summer.

A few subjects also mentioned that the South End has brick and brownstone buildings with bow fronts, and that there are quite a few streets with little parks in their centers. These people, however, said that they remembered these sights from years ago and that they had not been in the South End recently. The general unfamiliarity with this district is evident from all of these descriptions. No one recalled the renewal and renovation which are taking place in the South End, even in the area of the Castle Square project at the end of Arlington Street, which is close to familiar territory. For this sample, the South End was barely a part of Boston.

The North End, also relatively unfamiliar to this sample, was regarded not as a depressed and depressing district but as an historical and exciting
place to visit. Many subjects were unfamiliar with the street pattern of
the North End; in the imaginary trip from the Old North Church to the City
Hospital most subjects knew that the church was in the North End but had
little or no idea where or how to proceed from the church to the Central
Artery. Subjects felt that the district was a charming area, a bit of Italy
transplanted to Boston. Descriptions of the North End always included refer-
ences to narrow streets, crowds of people, pastry shops, and restaurants. Some
subjects remembered that Paul Revere's house was also somewhere in the North
End. The district was felt to be isolated from the rest of central Boston
by the Central Artery, which is elevated as is swings by the area. However,
the North End was tenuously associated by some people with the market dis-
trict near Faneuil Hall; perhaps this is because many North End residents do
d their daily food shopping in the open-air market and can be observed walking
to and from the area.

The districts of Boston are important elements in the organization of
the image of this city, more so for some individuals than is the path system.
It seems that most Bostonians conceptualize the city in terms of districts;
even though they may be unable to give each district a name, the mental
separation of the city into recognizable areas appears to exist.

Nodes

"Nodes are the strategic foci into which the observer can enter, typi-
cally either junctions of paths, or concentrations of some characteristic" (Lynch, p. 72). The major nodes in Boston for the 1969 sample were Govern-
ment Center and Copley Square; the most frequently mentioned minor nodes were
Post Office Square, Park Square, the area near the Central Artery where the
Summer and Callahan Tunnels emerge, Louisburg Square, and the Filene's-Jordan's corner where Washington Street intersects with Summer Street.
Louisburg Square and the Filene's-Jordan's corner are what Lynch refers to as "thematic concentrations" (p. 75) or "cores" (p. 47), epitomes of the districts in which they are located. Both were found by Lynch to be excellent examples of this type of node (p. 75). They are easily recognizable and seem to symbolize the surrounding area. Louisburg Square, in Beacon Hill, was remembered for its fenced-in park, cobblestones, well-kept townhouses, and its aura of reserve and understated elegance. In contrast, the Filene's-Jordan's corner, felt to be the heart of the retail district, was said to be characterized by noise, crowds, dirt, traffic, and intense activity. Lynch found that the exact location of Louisburg Square inside Beacon Hill was not known, while the location of the Filene's-Jordan's corner was known by all (p. 76); the same holds true for the recent sample.

Post Office Square, a large open area in the heart of the financial district, was remembered as distinctive in contrast to the dark, narrow streets of the surrounding area. Park Square was closely associated with its bus terminal. It was characterized as rather shabby and was thought of as an area one passes by on the way to the theater district.

The node between the North End and the Central Artery does not have a name but was thought of as "where the tunnels are," as this is the point of entrance to the Callahan Tunnel and the exit from the Sumner Tunnel, both of which connect the central peninsula to East Boston and Logan Airport. It was remembered as a most confusing area, with much traffic trying to go in many directions. It was at this point where, on their imaginary trip from the Old North Church to the City Hospital, subjects said they would get onto the Central Artery, and all voiced some confusion as to how to get onto the expressway going in the right direction. It is a shapeless node, marked primarily by the shadow of the Central Artery above and the mouths of the tunnels.
Lynch (p. 74) states that "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...." As has been said above, South Station today is not an important image element. It has lost its importance as a node, due to the decline in passenger railroads, and if it is remembered at all it is as a weak landmark, a large grey building. North Station, too, is now only a building, important because it holds the Boston Garden, where the Celtics and the Bruins meet their opponents and where the circus and the ice shows play to the public.

Some of the subway stations in Boston were found to be important nodes. The major ones were Park Street, Washington, and Auditorium, formerly Massachusetts. Auditorium Station was the only subway stop associated with a surface structure, the War Memorial Auditorium of the Prudential Center. All other stops were associated only with a general area where the traveler wished to go. Two stations were found to have individual character that set them apart from the other stops: Arlington, well lighted, newly painted, and attractively decorated, was remembered for its contrast to the gloom and dirt of the rest of the subway; and Charles Street, associated with the Charles River, although there is actually no view of the river when the train is stopped at the Station.

Copley Square was found to be one of the most important nodes in Boston, second only to Government Center. Lynch found it to be "less of a spatial whole than a concentration of activity and of some uniquely contrasting buildings" (p. 76). The subjects of the recent sample, however, seemed to feel that Copley Square is indeed a spatial whole and not a concentration of activity; no one mentioned the presence of any activity in Copley Square. A set of interesting buildings it certainly is; everyone who described the square mentioned the Public Library, the Sheraton Plaza Hotel (formerly the
Copley Plaza), Trinity Church, and the Old South Church. The Public Library was the symbol of Copley Square, but the two churches were also important in the image of this node. Trinity Church was often singled out as particularly distinctive; one subject referred to it as "Richardson's Romanesque Fantasy."

Copley Square appears to indicate to the subject the point where he must shift his path if he is coming from Huntington Avenue and wants to reach the retail area or Government Center. Subjects taking the imaginary trip from Symphony Hall to the New City Hall by foot who said they would walk down Huntington Avenue to Copley Square would invariably say that they would then cross in front of the library to Boylston Street and then proceed along this path. They seemed to feel that there was only one way out of the square. Perhaps this is due to the placement of the landmarks; Boylston Street with its stores on the far side is seen as the open side of the square. More likely, however, it is due to the driving habits of the sample; by car if one enters at Huntington Avenue, Boylston Street is the only way out, as St. James Street, the other path downtown, is one way into Copley Square.

The most important node in Boston, however, is also the newest one--Government Center. It is more important as a thematic concentration than as a junction of paths, although as a thematic concentration it is not the core of any particular district but rather both district and core together. It is seen as a complex of undifferentiated buildings by those subjects who are unfamiliar with the functions of each individual structure, and as a group of separate and distinct buildings by those who know in general what each building houses.

The most common physical descriptions of Government Center refer to concrete, glass, and light-colored building materials, tall, square buildings,
a sense of open space, and the curvature of the area as emphasized by the Center Plaza building. Following are some of the most typical descriptions:

new tall buildings in sharp contrast to the old area you emerge from

a group of five or six very new buildings in an open, barren area, not crowded together. Light-hued building materials.

a group of tall, ugly, government-type buildings made of glass and steel. The subway entrance looks like a small bomb shelter.

a series of various types of high-rise office buildings made a little interesting by the varied architecture.

too much of a hodgepodge of unharmonious architecture. Some buildings are like square boxes, some are multi-faceted. They look enclosed like jails. There's nothing graceful about the whole area.

The subjects of this sample who had any emotional feelings about the Government Center complex were fairly evenly divided between positive and negative feelings. Those who said they liked the area felt it was "exciting," "a pleasant surprise," and "easy to get around in." As one subject put it:

It's great. It's so much better than Scollay Square. It's a thriving complex with the accent on "complex." I like the whole idea.

Those individuals who had a negative reaction to Government Center said it was sterile and confusing. Some of their comments were:

I feel lost there, I don't know what is what is where.

I would hate to work there—all those masses of people. It's so depersonalized.

Government Center is as cold as ice—all that grey concrete.

I know they are distinct different buildings with different functions, but I'm not sure which is which.

I get depressed. It's so new. I get a feeling of nostalgia for old Scollay Square. I guess I haven't really accepted the fact that it's gone.

Surprisingly enough, this last comment was from a 24-year-old young man,
which points out an interesting fact about the reactions of this sample to
Government Center: there was no correlation between emotional feelings and
age of the interviewee.

The individual buildings in Government Center also drew descriptions
and comments. The John F. Kennedy Federal Building was described as follows:

One tall and one flat oblong building of the same size

one large, approximately 35 story building with a funny
crack in the middle and then it becomes another building.

It's all concrete and glass.

It has a broad staircase in front of it.

There were only a few emotional reactions to the J.F.K. Federal Building,
and all were negative. It was called "extraordinarily ugly," "dull," and
"drab." One subject was most vehement in his description:

The architecture is disgraceful. It doesn't even appear
to be utilitarian. It clashes with my concept of Boston
and with my concept of what an office building should be.

The New City Hall, which has received a good deal of publicity in
recent months, was called "squat," "angular," "very modern-looking," of an
"odd shape" "unusual," and "strange." Descriptions usually referred to
concrete, brick, and open space. One subject said it looked like "an upside-
down pyramid" while another called it "a modernistic fortress." Emotional
reactions were split evenly between positive and negative; those who liked
the New City Hall liked it a great deal, while those who disliked it were
equally as vehement in their objections, calling it "a monster of a build-
ing" and other unflattering terms.

The other two major buildings in the Government Center did not receive
as much comment. The State Office building was generally described as tall
and uninteresting, while the curved Center Plaza office building, like the
New City Hall, was either greatly admired or intensely disliked.
It appears that Bostonians can be divided into several groups according to their reactions to the new Government Center. First are those that love the old, warm, historic Boston and are dismayed by the new architecture, which they feel is cold and out of place. Then there are those who are captivated by anything modern and find the newness of Government Center exciting and refreshing. And thirdly there is a group which is indifferent to the newly-developed area; either they "guess it's an improvement" but are not really sure, or they simply have no emotional response at all to the area. On the whole, however, Government Center has become a focal point in the city and is its most important node.

**Landmarks**

"Landmarks, the point references considered to be external to the observer, are simple physical elements which may vary widely in scale" (Lynch, p. 78). The major Boston landmarks were the new Prudential Center, its tower, the Sheraton-Boston Hotel, the State House, the Boston Public Library in Copley Square, and Symphony Hall.

The Prudential Center is now the strongest image element in Boston. There may be some dispute over whether the Prudential Center can be correctly categorized as a landmark; since one can be within the Center, yet not be within any particular structure, the Center is not always seen as external to the observer as he travels. Neither is it a "point reference" as it extends over a large area. It is not truly a district, as it is seen as one sprawling structure, although it is subdivided. A **cluster** of landmarks is the term which best describes the Prudential Center: the tower and the Sheraton-Boston Hotel being major landmarks, the others minor. As subjects used the words "Prudential Center" to refer to the entire complex, while referring to the individual landmarks by name, the Center as a whole was
counted as a separate though all-inclusive landmark. The Prudential Center was mentioned by 28 subjects and drawn by 22; the Prudential tower or "Pru" was mentioned by 16 subjects and drawn by 6; the Sheraton-Boston Hotel was also mentioned by 16 and drawn by 6. Thus all three are major landmarks, even though the latter two are parts of the first. It cannot be said that the other component parts of the Prudential Center are also major landmarks simply because they are included by the term "Prudential Center," since when a subject used that term he did not give any indication of which or how many of the other landmarks--the Auditorium, the apartment buildings, and Lord and Taylor--he had in mind.

Descriptions of the Prudential Center usually included references to steel, glass, and concrete. The sense of open space and cleanliness is very strong there, and many subjects spoke of it as being a cold or windy place. Other descriptions referred to the use of water in the Prudential Center--for moats, fountains, and the skating rink. The outdoor and indoor escalators have made a strong impression on Bostonians, and also the rectangularity of the entire complex. The Prudential Center is considered to be the one element which is most typical of "the New Boston." Here are some general descriptions from the interviews:

There is a huge court in the middle you walk up to. There is a skating rink, fountains, lots of shops around in a square, and escalators. It's nice, very nice. I like the area because it's open and clean.

There is a statue in front of the stairs. The plaza is up the stairs, up the escalators. There are stores on either side, square pools, and a moat. I like it but I find it very windy and it can get very cold.

Tall, modern, very rectangular buildings in an area that is surrounded by old, brick buildings. There's something airy about them. It's new, clean, and uncluttered. It's a vast improvement over the area as it used to be. It's un-Bostonian, which is good.

There were attempts to create a center here, not just a group of buildings. It's shaping up.
I like the big, open spaces. It feels kind of hollow there.

I like the openness--it's a pleasant place to be. Everything around it is so different--all the little shops and eating places.

I like it because it's clean in contrast to the rest of the city. Everything moves very quickly, like the escalators. It feels open because of the large areas between buildings and the use of glass.

It is very large and varied in content. It's large but compact like a self-contained community. It's very new and very distinctive in its design. It's nice.

It will be noted that all of the emotional reactions to the Prudential Center as a whole are positive, if occasionally only mildly so. Many subjects were acutely conscious of the social and economic importance of the complex, and expressed themselves so well that they deserve to be quoted, rather than paraphrased or summarized:

It's a beautifully constructed development that gives much to our city.

It's a marvelous beginning for Boston. I'm glad to see this kind of thing coming to Boston. It implies a new side of the city, a growth of industry and commerce.

It's the only really modern complex in Boston other than Government Center, but it's more diversified. It's typical of the type of complex you can see anywhere in the world, but it's important to Boston.

I'm impressed by the structure, size, undertaking, and daring, and I'm amazed at its success.

It has livened the whole area up.

It has awakened the city.

It is not typical of the Old Boston but it is typical of the New Boston--a new confidence in the growth potential of Boston as a city.

It is the New Boston.

The individual elements of the Prudential Center were not so favorably regarded by all. The Prudential tower itself was often singled out as the
most distinctive building, but usually for its distinct lack of beauty. It was called tall and skinny, ugly, a concrete and steel slab with no character, a huge monolith with no shape, bad architecture, and an eyesore. This was not the unanimous opinion, however; there were a few subjects who considered the tower to be actually beautiful. Its height was, of course, the most commonly mentioned characteristic, and its sharp angles and lack of ornamentation were also frequently referred to. The other structures in the complex—the War Memorial Auditorium, the three apartment buildings, and the branch store of Lord and Taylor, were not often mentioned by name and were rarely described. Three subjects, however, expressed a particular dislike for the Auditorium as a center for musical events; one of these individuals strenuously objected to the name "War Memorial" and another called it "a terrible abortion." In general, though, the Prudential Center is thought of as a unified complex of new buildings with a variety of functions; undoubtedly the name "Prudential Center" encourages the conceptualization of these structures as a unit.

The other major Boston landmarks, the State House, the Boston Public Library, and Symphony Hall, are all older structures. Lynch too found the library and the State House to be major landmarks (Figs. 35 and 36, p. 146). It is unclear from the responses of the recent sample whether Copley Square strengthens the Public Library as a landmark, or whether the library strengthens Copley Square as a node; in either case the two elements cannot be separated in the image. The golden dome of the State House, however, is very important by itself in the image of Boston, although it is often associated with both Beacon Hill and the Boston Common. It can be seen from both Cambridge and Storrow Drive and has not been diminished in importance by the newer structures in the city.

The last major landmark, Symphony Hall, was included on the sketch
maps of 50-75% of the subjects of the recent sample; however, it was mentioned during the verbal interviews by less than 25%. Why this should be so is rather puzzling. Lynch's image maps (p. 146) show more consistent data from his sample: Symphony Hall was drawn by less than 25% and mentioned by less than 12%. If the maps drawn by the recent sample were disregarded, Symphony Hall would be relegated to its former position as a minor landmark; yet the maps do indicate something about the way a person conceptualizes the city and should not be ignored. There are three possible explanations for the discrepancy in results. First, the instructions to use Massachusetts Avenue as a boundary of the area drawn may have called attention to the landmarks situated along this path, as is Symphony Hall. Secondly, the distinctiveness of the Prudential Center and its importance as a landmark may have brought the focus of the subject to the area around the "Pru" and caused him to recall Symphony Hall as an important element. The third explanation, however, seems to best explain the results, although there may be elements of the first two that are correct. It is that Symphony Hall is indeed a major landmark, that the frequency with which it is included on the sketch maps is more indicative of its status than the frequency with which it was mentioned during the verbal portion of the interview. Of the three imaginary trips, one started at Symphony Hall and any mention of this landmark in the trip was not counted. The other two trips, from the Old North Church to the City Hospital, and from the corner of Massachusetts Avenue and Commonwealth Avenue to South Station, did not take the subject anywhere near Symphony Hall unless he went the roundabout way to the City Hospital from Storrow Drive and up Massachusetts Avenue. Unless the subject went by Symphony Hall on his description of his trip to work, he had no occasion to mention noticing this structure as a landmark; and it was rarely included in the list of distinctive elements, for it is simply not physically
distinctive. Therefore, Symphony Hall was mentioned as a landmark as many times as it could possibly be within the limits of the verbal interview. The map-drawing, however, did not limit the area over which the subject's mind could range, and therefore in this case should be regarded as more valid than the results of the verbal data. The general problem of limitations of the method will be discussed further in the next section of this report.

There were a great many minor landmarks agreed upon by the 1969 sample, many more than are indicated by Lynch's maps. Some of these minor landmarks have already been discussed as elements of the new Government Center (the New City Hall, the Kennedy Federal Building, the State Office Building, the Center Plaza office building) and as parts of the Prudential Center Complex (the Sheraton-Boston Hotel, War Memorial Auditorium, Prudential apartment buildings, Lord and Taylor). It is obvious that these new structures are one reason for the increased length of the list of minor landmarks between 1956 and 1969. No landmarks existed in the areas cleared for this new construction, and therefore there was no substitution of elements, only addition.

The older landmarks in the city fall into several categories, each with different reasons for their importance. One of the most important types of Boston landmarks is the historical landmark; Boston is an old city and many of its buildings date back to Revolutionary times. Bostonians are keenly aware of this fact, and although the historical landmarks are distinctive for their architecture, for the subjects in the sample, historical associations seemed to be equally as important in determining the strength of these landmarks. The Old State House, on Washington Street just outside the retail district, King's Chapel, one of the oldest churches in Boston, and Faneuil Hall, the "Cradle of Liberty," are the historical landmarks of the city.
Then there are a set of minor landmarks which are used to indicate to the subject in what direction along a given path he is travelling. These directional landmarks did not often appear on the sketch maps but were most evident in the trips through the city. The tower of the Customs House was used to indicate whether the subject was proceeding north or south along the Central Artery; if it could be seen from the expressway after one entered near the mouths of the harbor tunnels, one knew he was travelling south. South Station was an important directional landmark for travelling along Atlantic Avenue by the waterfront; it also marked the foot of Summer Street and the edge of the retail district. More than a few subjects said they would look for the Beacon Hill movie theater to be on the left side of Tremont Street to point the way to Government Center. And Bonwit Teller, a women's clothing store housed in the former Museum of Natural History, an unusual structure, gave focus to the Newbury and Boylston Street shopping areas and told the subject he was nearing Arlington Street and the Public Garden.

Many minor landmarks were remembered for their particular associations with specific functions. The two Boston hospitals mentioned or drawn frequently enough to be regarded as landmarks, Boston City Hospital and Massachusetts General Hospital, are good examples. Other landmarks associated with specific activities were Horticultural Hall, the Museum of Science, the Hatch shell, where summer concerts are held, the Suffolk County Jail, known to most people as the Charles Street Jail, the bus terminal at Park Square, North Station, the old and new Court Houses behind the Center Plaza office building, and the Old City Hall.

Three of the above directional landmarks, Massachusetts General Hospital, The Charles Street Jail, and the Park Square bus terminal, are also examples of another type of landmark—that which is given importance by its position at a node. Subjects at nodes look for almost any recognizable structure to
orient themselves by, and consequently many buildings which are not particularly distinctive were included in the list of minor landmarks. Copley Square gives special emphasis to the Sheraton Plaza Hotel, the Old South Church, and Trinity Church, as well as the Public Library. The Hotel Statler and Paine Furniture Company are seen to mark Arlington Street at Park Square, while Shreve, Crump, and Low, a well-known but nondescript jewelry store, is almost as important a landmark as the Arlington Street Church in indicating the intersection of Arlington and Boylston Streets. The Park Street Church and the Old Granary Burial Ground are remembered as being near the Common at the corner of Park and Tremont Streets. The intersection of Newbury Street with Arlington Street is marked by the Ritz Carleton Hotel. The building which was formerly the Hotel Touraine and is now being converted to an apartment building was often "looked for" where Boylston Street crosses Tremont Street. Filene's and Jordan Marsh, the two large department stores in the retail area, are not only emphasized by that Washington Street node but have actually created it by drawing crowds of shoppers.

Only one minor landmark does not seem to fall into any of the above categories--the John Hancock building. A truly "bottomless tower," its precise location is known by very few people. However, its prominence on the skyline was remembered and it was often included in the sketch maps.

The list of Boston landmarks, with the exception of the structures built since 1956, is similar to Lynch's. It is longer, but in general the same landmarks were named by both samples. The strength of some Boston landmarks has diminished over the years; Faneuil Hall has been overshadowed by the new Government Center, as the John Hancock Building has certainly been replaced in the minds of Bostonians by the Prudential tower as the most prominent structure in the skyline.

The importance of the Prudential Center and the Government Center in the
image of Boston cannot be overestimated. These symbols of the New Boston have indeed become integrated into the city's image and have added a sense of excitement to a charming but formerly staid area. Because of these two new complexes, Boston is now seen as a growing, lively city. It is still considered a most difficult city to orient oneself in, but the Prudential Center and the Government Center are drawing people into the city and making them more familiar with formerly infrequented areas. In the words of one subject:

Visualizing where you are in Boston is hard, but it has become easier since they built the Government Center and the Prudential Center. I can now see them as definite points of reference at opposite ends of the city.

The Prudential and Government Centers are the key symbols in the image of the New Boston.
EVALUATION OF THE METHOD

After the thirty interviews had been completed and the data collected, it was discovered that there are some serious problems with the research technique that were not apparent at the outset of this study. These problems do not invalidate the results but do cast some doubt upon their significance. It must be said that had these difficulties been recognized earlier, the study would still not have been charged to eradicate them, as it was necessary to adhere to the method employed by Lynch in his original study in order to compare the two sets of results. For these problems were not recognized by Lynch, or at least not explicitly stated in The Image of the City.

The first major difficulty comes in determining the worth of the sketch maps drawn by the interviewees. Does such a map provide valid and valuable information about the individual's image of the city? There are several objections to the use of the sketch map as a research technique. First, many subjects had a great deal of difficulty in switching their perspective of the city from ground level to the aerial view necessary to draw the requested map. One subject found it impossible to do so at all; several attempts produced only a continuous jagged line to indicate a walking tour of a small area. Yet the verbal portion of the interview made clear that she had an excellent knowledge of the city of Boston, although one would never know it from her map.

Secondly, the objection may be raised that the drawing of the map depends heavily on a certain amount of artistic ability. This argument holds that if a subject is unable to draw an area accurately he will omit many elements which he actually considers to be important. A lack of artistic ability may so hamper the subject that he will draw a map quite inconsistent with his knowledge of an area. A study by Banerjee (1967) on persons'
knowledge of Harvard Square in Cambridge demonstrated that the quality of the maps drawn of the area had little correlation with recognition ability and familiarity with Harvard Square. However, with the one exception described above, the maps produced by the subjects of this study were clear and fairly accurate, although not always to scale or free of distortion; indeed, most subjects seemed to feel that the map they had drawn was a good indication of their knowledge of central Boston.

If the sketch maps are conceded to be valid data, are they then necessary in an interview which is attempting to tap an individual's conceptualization of an area? Perhaps the information which they provide is obtained by the other questions in the interview, and perhaps the maps are actually superfluous. Before the answer to this query can be determined, we must look carefully at the other parts of the interview which present major problems to the researcher—the real and imaginary trips.

There were a total of four trips "taken" in the course of the interview. One was the trip to work or other frequently-made trip into the central Boston area. The other three trips were imaginary ones, standardized for all subjects; their origin and destination points were selected by the interviewer, but the actual path to be followed was left up to the subject. These trips were intended to cover as much as possible of the area under study. However, the habitual trip of the subject could not be depended upon to cover any particular areas. Therefore, the three imaginary trips became very important as a source of data about the subject's knowledge of Boston and his image of the city.

The three imaginary trips used in this study, as the reader may recall, were: from the Old North Church to Boston City Hospital by car, from the corner of Massachusetts and Commonwealth Avenues to South Station by car, and from Symphony Hall to the New City Hall in Government Center on foot.
It was found that the routes taken by subjects on these tree trips varied little. Two or three common routes were used for each trip; they are as follows:

1. Old North Church to City Hospital: Central Artery to Albany Street to Massachusetts Avenue; or Central Artery to Massachusetts Avenue; or Central Artery to Storrow Drive to Massachusetts Avenue.

2. Commonwealth and Massachusetts Avenues to South Station: Commonwealth Avenue to Arlington Street to Boylston Street, then either Tremont Street to Kneeland Street, or Washington Street to Essex Street; or Storrow Drive to Central Artery to Atlantic Avenue.

3. Symphony Hall to New City Hall: Huntington Avenue to Copley Square to Boylston Street, across Garden and Common to Beacon Street to Tremont Street to Government Center; or Huntington Avenue to Copley Square to Boylston Street directly to Tremont Street, etc.; or Massachusetts Avenue to Boylston Street, etc.

There were few subjects whose trips did not conform to these routes.

In order for the trips to be valuable, they should cover all the major sections of the area under study. It can be seen that the following areas were avoided by the above routes: the South End, the wharf area, Beacon Hill, Newbury Street, North Station, and the hearts of the financial and retail districts. This would have been a serious drawback in the collection of data on the entire area of central Boston had not the maps been included in the interviews, as every area and every element has an equal chance of appearing on the map. In sketching his map the subject is restricted only by his own image of the city and not by the structuring of questions.

The trips which the subject describes give a good indication of how well a subject knows the path system of Boston but may not give a valid indication of what the subject considers to be important landmarks. As has been stated
above, bottomless towers like the John Hancock Building are meaningless from a ground-level viewpoint. They seem to be only ordinary structures; no conception of their height is possible unless they are seen from a distance. Thus they are often excluded from a description of a trip but are usually included in the sketch maps because the subject remembers how they appear on the skyline or from a distant ground-level vantage point.

There is also a serious origin and destination problem with the trips. If a landmark is used as the origin or destination point of a trip it cannot be counted as having been freely mentioned by the subject. However, if no other trip takes the subject past that landmark, its chances of being mentioned at all are considerably decreased. It will probably not appear in the subject's responses unless he considers it a distinctive element, and surely not all important landmarks are thought of as being the distinctive elements of a city. The example of Symphony Hall has already been discussed in the preceding section, and the Old North Church is another example of this problem.

Besides slighting certain elements the trips also give special emphasis to paths and landmarks that may not be as important as the data would indicate. It is now all too obvious to this researcher that once the origin and destination points of a trip are chosen, the routes that the majority of subjects will use to connect these two points can be determined in advance by common sense. There will be some surprises, but in general the usual path system can be guessed at quite accurately. This situation can be put to good use if the researcher wishes to study certain areas in some detail; the subject's mental wanderings can be guided near or through these chosen areas. But it must be kept in mind that there will also be some distortion of the data. If the usual routes are known in advance, then the paths and even the landmarks that will probably be most commonly mentioned can be
predicted with accuracy. For example, the trip from Symphony Hall to the New City Hall was purposely chosen to guide the subject's visualizations to the Prudential Center and the Government Center; this was acknowledged from the beginning and was reported above. But common sense could have predicted that most subjects would direct their route through Copley Square, either via Huntington Avenue or Boylston Street, and that therefore the Boston Public Library, the Sheraton Plaza Hotel, Trinity Church, and the Old South Church would have higher probabilities of being mentioned by the subjects. Similarly, if the destination of this trip had been the Massachusetts General Hospital instead of the New City Hall, one would or should know in advance that Government Center would not be mentioned during the description of that trip; the common route would be to go via Charles Street from the Common to the Charles Street Rotary, where the hospital is, thus avoiding Cambridge Street completely. The frequency with which Government Center is mentioned will have been reduced, and only by virtue of its being a distinctive element in Boston will it be mentioned. However, Government Center and Copley Square will still have equal chances of being included on the sketch maps, regardless of their inclusion in or exclusion from the usual routes of trips.

It must therefore be concluded that the sketch map is indeed a valuable part of the interview. It acts as a check on the data obtained by the imaginary trips with their built-in distortions. It was most fortunate in this study that the composite sketch maps and the image of Boston as derived from the verbal portions of the interview, including the trips as the main source of data, agreed so well, for it was both possible and likely for great disparities to have occurred. In Appendix A there is a list of all the elements which were 1) included on the maps, 2) mentioned during the interview, and 3) either drawn or mentioned by at least 12½% of the sample (4 subjects). The elements were assigned three different ranks, depending
on the frequency with which they occurred on the maps, in the verbal inter-
view, and either one or the other. To compare the similarity between the
maps and verbal part of the interview, a coefficient of correlation between
ranks, Kendall's tau, was determined. The value of tau was found to be .634,
with a standard deviation of .063. The resulting critical ratio, 10.1,
is very highly significant, indicating a similarity of great magnitude between
the results of the maps and of the verbal portion of the interview.

Another serious problem arose not in the design of the interview but in
the analysis of the data. The intent was to use exactly the same method as
Lynch has used in determining the importance of the various paths, districts,
edges, nodes, and landmarks, but unfortunately Lynch never explicitly stated
in *The Image of the City* what his method of analysis was. He did not say
what types of responses he counted in tallying the frequency with which a
given element was mentioned. It was assumed that he did not make the obvious
error of counting the mention of an element if it was the origin or destina-
tion point of a trip, but this is only an assumption. Lynch did not state
whether he counted the mention of an element if it was not referred to by
name but only described accurately enough so that he could identify it.
Also, on page 145 he gives a legend for the image maps which classify ele-
ments as "over 75\%", "50-75\%", and so forth. Yet he does not say 50-75\% of
what. One is not sure whether these percentages refer to the total number
of subjects or to the total number of responses.

In this study, the percentages indicate the number of subjects out of
the total thirty who mentioned a given element; an element was counted only
once per subject no matter how many times it was mentioned during the inter-
view. Thus the Prudential Center is a major landmark because it was men-
tioned by more than 75\% of the subjects in the sample. An element was not
counted unless it was specifically referred to by name. "That church at the
corner of the Common" was regarded as insufficient, although it was obvious from the context that the subject was referring to the Park Street Church. The rationale for this distinction is as follows: if a person does not know the name of a landmark or a path it is not important in his image of the city. It must be admitted that these decisions were arbitrary and that arguments against them can be made. However, in view of the lack of guidelines from Lynch's report on his method, some independent decisions had to be made as to how the data would be handled. The results may not be directly comparable to Lynch's, but, on the other hand, they may be. In any event they are internally consistent.

In sum, then, how valid are the results of this study, with all of the above problems in data collection and uncertainties in analysis? The results can be said to be an approximation of the Boston image of a segment of the population, the middle-class, post-adolescent resident of the metropolitan Boston region. It is only approximate because of possible distortions of the data due to the research techniques. It is not known how well this image would correlate with that obtained by a larger sample that would include a greater cross-section of Bostonians. Lynch had a check for his office interview data; his street interviews reached people of all socio-economic levels and presumably of all areas of the city. There was no such check included in this study; it was assumed that if such a check were used it would corroborate the results of the interviews, as was found by Lynch. It must be remembered, however, that this was only an assumption, and for this sample that assumption is of questionable validity. The strange blank area in the images of the subjects of this sample, the South End, would no doubt take on some substance for people who live in or near that area; similarly, the North End would be more familiar to a group of North End residents, of which there were none in this sample. But for purposes of determining the
image of the average middle-class Bostonian the data can be considered to be accurate.

The comparability of these results to those obtained by Lynch is quite good if one assumes that the data were indeed analyzed identically. This assumption seems to be a valid one; the method of analysis used in this study is logical and appears to be the one employed by Lynch. The samples are very similar, and the interviews are as similar as possible. It is thus fairly certain that the differences between the past and present images of Boston are attributable to changes in the city and not to variations in the research technique. Lynch's system of analysis and classification appears to be sufficiently flexible to describe these environmental changes, so that it can now be said that the middle-class image of the city of Boston has been brought up to date.
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APPENDIX A

The Elements Drawn, Mentioned, and Either Drawn and/or Mentioned by the 1969 Sample (by 12½% or more)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element</th>
<th>Frequency of Appearance</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Maps</td>
<td>Verbal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commonwealth Avenue</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts Avenue</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boylston Street</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles River</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beacon Street</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prudential Center</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Garden</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government Center</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State House</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles Street</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Artery</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tremont Street</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huntington Avenue</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Storrow Drive</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arlington Street</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Library</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington Street</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copley Square</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beacon Hill</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North End</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Symphony Hall</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harbor/Waterfront</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mass. Turnpike</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newbury Street</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheraton-Boston Hotel</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prudential Tower</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mass. General Hospital</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dartmouth Street</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filene's</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>War Mem. Auditorium</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christian Science Ch.</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jordan March</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park Street Church</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berkeley Street</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambridge Street</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New City Hall</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheraton-Plaza Hotel</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial District</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marlborough Street</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

78.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element</th>
<th>Frequency of Appearance</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Maps</td>
<td>Verbal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atlantic Ave.</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faneuil Hall</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old Granary Burial Gr.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ritz-Carlton Hotel</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail District</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Center Plaza Bldg.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exeter Street</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairfield Street</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harrison Ave.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J.F.K. Building</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Hancock Bldg.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park Square</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park St. M.B.T.A. Sta.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prudential Apartments</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stuart Street</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Station</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Street</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer Street</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Back Bay</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Esplanade</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinatown</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarendon Street</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essex Street</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gloucester Street</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King's Chapel</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kneeland Street</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statler Hotel</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trinity Church</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arlington St. Church</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles River Park</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customs House</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science Museum</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Court House</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Station</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old City Hall</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old State House</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theater District</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franklin Street</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lord and Taylor</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park Street</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albany Street</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bonwit Teller</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boston City Hospital</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles Street Jail</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbus Avenue</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Element</td>
<td>Frequency of Appearance</td>
<td>Rank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Maps</td>
<td>Verbal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hatch Music Shell</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisburg Square</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winter Street</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hanover Street</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hereford Street</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old South Church</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paine Furniture Co.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park Sq. Bus Terminal</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post Office Square</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Street</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beacon Hill Theater</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combat Zone</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greyhound Terminal</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herald-Traveler Bldg.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horticultural Hall</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N.E. Medical Center</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parker House</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South End</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wholesale District</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arlington M.B.T.A. Sta.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atheneum</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bromfield Street</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles Cinema and Plaza</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles M.B.T.A. Sta.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Devonshire Street</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gilchrist's</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Street</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotel Elliot</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milk Street</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raymond's</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schubert Theater</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shreve, Crump, and Low</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old South Meeting House</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total frequencies of elements drawn and/or mentioned by less than 4 subjects: 42 112 140

Totals: 910 1279 1569

Mean number of elements per subject: 33.3 42.6 52.3
APPENDIX B.

Elements Drawn or Mentioned by Less Than $12\frac{1}{2}\%$ of the Sample

Aquarium
Arch Street
Armory
Astor Theater
Back Bay Station
Batterymarch Street
Best and Company
Boston City Club
Boston Five Cent Savings Bank
Boylston Street M.B.T.A. Station
Bowdoin Street
Broad Street
Broadway
Brooks Brothers, Inc.
Causeway Street
Casual Corner
Chauncy Street
Cheri Theaters
Colonial Theater
Congress Street
Cornhill
Dock Square
Dover Street
Emerson College
Exeter Street Theater
Federal Street
Fleet Street
Gary Theater
Government Center M.B.T.A. Station
Harvard Club
Hollis Street
Hotel Lenox
Hotel Vendome
I.B.M.
Joy Street
Ken's
Little Building
Lincoln Street
Louis
Martini Carl
Masonic Temple
Mt. Vernon Street
Midtown Motor Inn
Music Hall Theater
Myrtle Street
New England Merchants Bank
New England Mutual Insurance Co.
New York Streets
Northern Avenue

81.
Old Court House
Pappagallo
Paris Cinema
Paul Revere House
Phillips Drug Store
Pinckney Street
Playboy Club
Post Office
Providence Street
Railway Express
Registry of Motor Vehicles
Rogers Peet
Salem Street
Saxon Theater
Sears Crescent
Shawmut Avenue
Sheraton Building
South Street
State Street Bank
Symphony Cinema
Telephone Building
Traynor Flowers
Union Square
Union Street
University Hospital
University of Massachusetts--Boston
Uptown Theater
Washington Street Elevated
West Street
Wilbur Theater
Y.W.C.A.