Self-Applied Orientation Test for Central Boston

1. Identification & assoc. with test area:
   Present home add. – 38 Dana St., Cambridge, Mass, -2 mos.
   Former "       "        in receding order –
   - Travelling in Italy – 8 months
   - Central Manhattan, NYC, NY – 30 months
   - Graduate Center, Harvard University, Cambridge – 24 mos.
   - Georgia Tech campus, Atlanta, Ga. – 48 mos.
   - Davidson College " ,     Davidson, N.C. (small town)- 12 mos.
   - U.S. Navy, U.S. and Overseas (no city living)- 24 mos.
   - Davidson College Campus – 18 mos.
   - Tuscaloosa, Alabama (pop. 35,000) – 24 mos.
   - Davidson, N.C. – 12 mos.
   - APCM Mutsto, Belgian Congo (white compound
     of 10 families, 2 miles from African settlement of
     50,000 pop.) – from birth to age of 14.
   Vital statistics – age 28, married, occupation-architect.

   Assoc. with test area: infrequent visits in 1950-52
   to Symphony Hall, Opera House, legit. theatre,
   and restaurant dining (in evenings and Sunday lunch);
   perhaps 5 visits in all (1950- present) for
   shopping or related (Wash. St. area); infrequent visits in 1950-52
   to Back Bay for social purposes and dentist;
   2 days this year of apt.- hunting in Back Bay and

Beacon Hill; and occasional through – auto trips
via Mass. Ave. to Huntington & Rte. 9 and
along drive (can't name) south bank of
Charles, going west from Beacon Hill area.
Also, in 1950-52, habitually passed through
the area by subway going from Harvard
to So. Station. Used to use bus to go
to dentist on Commonwealth. Otherwise, all
travel by auto and subway. Have seen
Boston in day and night, rain and shine,
about equally.

2. Associations with the word "Boston":

The first thought is to remember with satis-
faction the 2 years as a student here. This period
represented the first time in which I felt my personal
intellectual & creative capacities were challenged in
full; I think of Boston, but mostly of Cambridge,
as a center of culture and learning.

An inseparable aspect of this attitude is its
reinforcement by physical evidences of age, tradition,
the weathering of time and crises. I like to
think of Boston as a city with a personality,
forced on its contemporary citizens, that is all-
knowing and sagacious. Whereas other American cities, en-
joying greater economic prosperity at present,
are brash, "moderne", and "tinny", Boston
has had these phases and has outlived them.
Boston's physical environment conveys the idea
that there are deep-seated values which outlive
materialism (as displayed by gaudiness, the
screams of false-prophet-advertizing, etc.). Some
of these physical clues are :a) age of buildings and
fidelity to the more sincere architectural styles
(Richardson bldgs., North Church, but not John
Hancock!) ;b) an imposed order and communal
feeling as evidenced in homogeneity of facade
color, texture, material; building mass-height; continuity

of street facade-planes; repetition of contrast and
detail-types (e.g., white fenestration trim against
red-brick walls;) ~~a forest of chimneys. (at~~ a
pervading sense of form repetition, but having
variety in color, size, etc. (e.g., chimneys _
these are also a clue to age). I do not
regard Boston as a homogeneous city; but I
think of it as a city with a discipline which
emphasizes that human individuality is achieved
more by the fruits of mind and heart than
by display of material acquisitions. (Note the
stylistic homogeneity in men's clothes in Cambridge,
a center of individual & creative thought).
      Boston, to me, also means a sense
of home and warmth. In part this is due
to its people (residents), whom I regard as being natural
and spontaneous (as against neurotic New Yorkers).
In part it is due to physical clues such
as: tree-lined streets, with children seen and heard;
chimneys and ~~glowln~~ glowing lights in windows;
ability to recognize faces in a crowd at several
widely-spaced points; the sight of pumpkins on
most doorsteps and front porches (in outlying
areas) ; the identity of my own apt. (with a
private entrance and front porch) and the
ability to identify people I know with individual buildings

(~~oasi~~ in which they live (easier for smaller-
sizes, even if they don't occupy the whole
building); the coincidence in area of home
and workplace (I can walk home for lunch);
etc.

      I am aware that the my mental image
derived from the word "Boston" does not fit
the facts of the metropolitan area. Through
student planning problems, I have learned that
Boston is not compact and that at its fringes
there is a sprawl. The ~~city~~ metropolitan
area, for me, will always be a pattern
of nuclei settlements, some weak, some strong,
arranged about a center concentrically. I cannot
{see drawing in PDF of original}
relate many of the actual nuclei to means of
transportation between them. But my conception
of a <u>pattern</u> is stronger for the metropolitan

area as a whole than for any of its parts.
Cambridge and central Boston, for instance,
are more amorphous in overall shape and
interrelation of parts. When I try to relate
the parts of Cambridge and Boston, I have
a mind cluttered with detail, much of it con-
flicting. But for the metropolitan area as
a whole, I can easily find a conceptual
principle of organization. This concept would
at least furnish enough information so
that I can search <u>radially</u> and <u>circum-
ferentially</u> for ~~the~~ any given part.

     As for the character of outlying Boston,
I know that, in most cases, it is far
from the picture of discipline, age, home, etc.
above. Some areas (Concord, Lexington) reinforce
my immediate picture of "Boston". Most,
though, represent a squalid, drab destruction
of the picture. Unlike other American cities,
Boston fringes seem to bespeak already- spent
efforts to break with the discipline of the core.
I don't remember too much new subdivision;
but I have a vivid picture of endless rows of
dilapidated frame houses, covered with the pall of
factory smoke. The one strongest unifying

element for the metropolitan area, is the
continuity of trees, grass and the feeling of
nature. Major roads seem to have this
one common sensation.

3. Area sterotypes:
       a.) Central business district – for small towns,
       a "main street"; with one major point
       of activity on it; lots of auto traffic (but
       no public transit and few taxis); people
       walking leisurely & speaking; stores arranged
       in a linear hierarchy of types; office
       buildings indistinguishable as such; familiar
       loafers; dead at night. For larger towns,
       a complex organization of centers of activity
       ~~b.)~~ with a radio concentric hierarchy of activity;
       wedge-like structure of definable districts
       other than retail shopping (e.g. offices,
       warehousing, wholesale, etc.); noise of vehicles
       drowning out humans; people hurried and
       impersonal (perhaps cruel, impolite, etc.);
       frustration when driving; soot, dirt and refuse;
       dark in day, buildings reaching beyond
       my comprehension of height; endless
       perspectives of cold, inanimate street-channels;
       occasional islands of relief (a park, Fifth Ave.,

or a small, ~~soculu~~ secluded space). It is
at night that American ~~cities~~ city cores
have charm for me. Darkness confines
and limits my view to selected points
of light and activity. I am not usually
in those areas without life; the sub-areas
I do frequent at night are usually those
I do not see in the day. This change is a relieving note.

b.) Slums _ are at the centers or edges of
a city, representing natural obsolescence or
someone's recent mistake. Slums mean
dirt and filth and lack of care. They also
mean too many people, the chief index
of which is squawling, untended babies.
Many areas which have these characteristics
but which are inherently ~~inho~~ interesting,
architecturally or in area structure, I
do not think of as slums. Others, where
obsolescence is obvious but where care and
attachment by people ~~is~~ are evident, are also
not slums. A slum is also where one is
apt to find immigrants, Negroes, and people
~~c.)~~ of Catholic faith – though this association
is extremely unpleasant to me.

c.) <u>Retail shopping</u> – is an area of non-descript
arch. styles; extreme variety in plastic qualities ~~elements~~;
profusion of confusing signs; building hlights
between 2 and 4 stories; continuous street
planes; nervous roof and cornice profiles;
glass fronts which cannot be seen through;
cheap and stereotyped shop-front materials
(carrara glass, glass block, etc.); conventional
forms and combinations (a 5 & 10 store, a
drugstore, etc.); tremendous activity of people
and vehicles; and dead at night.

d.) <u>Office districts</u> – are areas of relative
homogeneity in a faceless, neo-modern arch.
{margin: ~~apt suburban RR yards Civic center~~}
style; tall buildings; grey in color;
no trees or vegetation – cold, untextured surfaces
everywhere; endless vistas of glistening pavement
and deep street-channels; ~~windows that are
not windows and are not~~ absolutely dead
at night; all women seen are young.

e.) <u>Wholesale and warehouse districts</u> – are similar
in feeling to office districts, except: that
buildings are lower and all too bulky
and massive in the relation of height to
surface coverage; that the bawl and

curses of truckers, and the extreme congestion
of unloading give a feeling of life and
animation; that the street patterns are not
as simple and consistent as in office dis-
tricts; and that, at night, these districts
are not just dead – they are terrifying.

f.) Entertainment districts – are subareas
of retail shopping which are dead in day
and blossom at night. These don't
stand out as distinct areas except for
Manhattan. In many cases, I think of individual
facilities, as against an area grouping.
g.)
g.) Hotel ~~and restaurant~~ districts – these
areas are not distinct in character but
are distinct locationally – they are either
near railroad & bus terminals or they
are bordering the busiest part of retail.
Hotels as buildings are a distinct impression,
however.

h.) Apartment districts – until I went to Italy,
these were always close to the city center.
They are distinct from "projects". Buildings
have a non-descript arch. style; mostly

very tall (but st.-channels are not dark and
deep); materials are grey, untextured, and
lacking in name. Lobbies and attendants
are in evidence and bldgs. ~~apts.~~ are always of
a "restricted look" _ no low-income tenants,
no Negroes, etc. Street facades are continuous,
at least at eye-level, but there is space
in front of bldgs. for occasional trees and
bushes, few of which ever give a sense of
personal care. There is not enough greenery
to sense as a continuity and outstanding
feature – nothing really stands out – but there
is enough to distinguish the area from
retail and other areas. An apt. district has
enough pavement to reinforce the pleasant sensation
of a woman's high heels clicking as she walks.
It feels like a city should in this sense.

i.) <u>Housing projects</u> – are areas where consciously -
designed homogeneity has not enough detail
to give interest. Greenery is the unifying
force; man-made homogeneity has not been
used to unify or provide a background
against which variety can be sensed. Space
is non-existent or dissipated; individual
buildings are set out spatially in the false

notion that each is in itself interesting. There
isn't enough vertical plane continuity and pavement
to give a city feeling. Projects are a false pre-
tense of giving the amenities ~~of~~ leading to a sense of individuality. In
most cases, any given building is of an undis-
tinguised architectural treatment.

j.) <u>Suburban areas</u> – mean pretentious, single-
family houses, with all the lush accompaniments
of land, trees, and sophisticated retail-services
facilities. They are distinguished from "<u>developments</u>".
These ~~are~~ "developments", to me, are the
worst manifestation of misinterpretation, on
the part of the public, of ~~what~~ "freedom",
"individuality", "private interests – public interests",
etc. Developments are infinites areas of
small houses, closely spaced, each different
from its neighbors in a literal sense,
but all sinking into an amorphous, faceless
mass. Streets are curved and winding
arbitrarily; land is all flat; and there are
no objects visible over roof-tops in the
immediate vicinity. There is no sense of
spatial contrast in ~~drvi~~ driving through.

k.) <u>Railroad yards</u> – are infinite in length,

difficult to cross. They coincide ~~or~~ with or
are accompanied by wholesale warehouse
areas; they ~~have~~ give some of the same feelings.
They are dark grey, overhung with smoke,
and they make the surrounding area black
(and, therefore, cold). Men, walking on the
tracks, look inhumanly small – like ants or
worker bees. The engines, their movement, noise,
and intermittent smoke-puffs, are fun and
make the yards seem ~~larger~~ smaller.

l.) <u>Civic centre</u> – has no distinct correspondence
for me, except that, if they existed, they
might seem like Rockefeller Centre in some
ways. I think of individual public bldgs. –
not of an area. It is still an interesting
architectural concept for me – not a reality that
I have seen. On second thought, the Worth
St. City Hall area of New York is one –
its chief characteristic is ~~tall~~ that of having
tall blgs. arranged around a park. At
lunch time, in the spring, ~~and~~ summer, and
fall, ~~people~~ workers are in evidence – eating,
making love, sleeping, etc.

4. Map drawing – miscellaneous comments as I draw
      a.) Have to start with Cambridge & the approaches
      to cen. Boston I know.
      b.) Started my map badly – can see things
      as I go along and have no vivid mental
      map which flows out immediately – in
      architectural sketching this is common
      and is adjusted by making a series of
      increasingly-refined overlays – why not here?
      E.g., I know there is more area northeast
      of Beacon Hill than I have shown; there
      is a greater distance between Copley and
      Beacon than I have shown.
      c.) There are additional pieces of information
      I know which are difficult to represents:
          {number circled} 1. General locations of pts. or bldgs.
             which, if shown in the area of a
             grid or near some other definite thing,
             would give an inaccurate sense of
             specific location – e.g., Hotel Vendome,
             somewhere near and to right of Commonwealth, west
             of Copley; John Hancock, not far from
             Commonwealth, between the Public Garden
             and Mass. Ave.; the State House, on
             Beacon, but don't know whether east or
             west of the projected line of Boylston St.
{margin: over ↓}

{number circled} 2. Distinction between developed- amorphous
    areas and other white spaces on my
    map. I know the area north & south of
    Tremont & Washington is patterned, though I
    assume amorphously – but how can I represent
    it – I have only a vague idea or
    attitude about its character. China Town
    is equally amorphous, but I think
    of it with more ease of classification
    because of its name, the restaurants
    I have been to, and ~~an awareness~~ certainty that
    it is a jumble.
{number in circle} 3. Pts. and bldgs. ~~whic~~ whose locations
    I know only in a general way in
    areas which I can't structure at
    all. These are so many as to be
    almost impossible to show in a short
    time, even more impossible to prove
    how I could find them on demand.

5. <u>Characterization of Subareas</u> – subareas which have distinct and nameable qualities and/or an overall relation to other areas are:

 <u>a.) "Back Bay" and "Back Bay X"</u>: these two differ from each other in popular name (I think "Back Bay" refers to area east of Mass. Ave.) and in distinctness of their extent. Qualities I name are true, in general, of areas on both sides of Mass. Avenue. "Back Bay" is a rectangle, bounded by Beacon; the Pub. Garden; one or another street south of and parallel to Commonwealth; ~~and~~ the west boundary would extend about 4 or 5 blocks west of Mass. Avenue. It is true that I think of "Back Bay X" as having less feeling of high social status, somewhat more run-down, and a little less homogeneity of plastic qualities than "Back Bay". "Back Bay" ~~he~~ is first of all a high-status residential area; its status seems to be lower than it might once have been – all of its styles are reminiscent of other times; residents of the area include many young, single people as against stable, prosperous families; there are a number of converted uses (doctor's offices, etc.) That it is

high quality residential is the prime classi-
fication, but I seldom think of the above
qualifying considerations. Back Bay has also
a strong ~~visual~~ image, best described in
unconnected phrases: red-brick; a forest of chimneys and
flues; Mansard roofs and dormer windows;
clean-swept walks & street surfaces; carefully-
tended planting in front of many bldgs.;
wide, shallow street channels; gridiron street
pattern, with emphasis and detail on east-
west streets; uniformity of 4-5-floor bldg.
heights; white wood or stone window trim;
rectangular window openings, spaced evenly
about 5-10 ft. on centers on each floor;
continuous facade planes; continuous tree
and bush strips along east-west streets;
well-dressed people walking, but no crowds;
expensive cars at curbs; moderate auto
and taxi circulation, no transit; a small-
interval, slow-paced experience in time –
there are no major centers and contrasts
within the area, but many small and
personal details on individual buildings; stone steps;
ornate wrought-iron lamp posts (which I vaguely
wish still produced a flickering light at night).
There are generalities for "Back Bay" – I know there

are many exceptions, such as the cut stone, with
struck joints, on facades of part of Commonwealth.

b.) "Beacon Hill North" and "Beacon Hill South" –
These 2 are combined because they are both on
the hill and have essentially the same form
qualities. Beacon Hill North is almost a slum,
but its outstanding characteristics are interesting
and pleasant. The slum status is indicated by
filthy streets, grimy building entrances; poorly-
dressed and unshaven people; hordes of people
leaning and bawling from windows (in Italy
this would seem normal for higher-class areas);
and less planting (again, normal for
Italy). The areas have in common the
narrow, steeply-sloping streets which seem to
give a small-scale feeling – the end is not
infinite, and the steps & doors stacked up seem
to make it easier to count the houses &
est. the distance. Buildings are uniformly of
same height as Back Bay but seem to
have more variety because of the step-down of
the slopes. There is a strong overall homo-
geneity of red-brick (redder, & more uniform than
Back Bay); severe rectilinearity in facade shapes
& pattern; ~~white wood or stone to~~ dark wood trim;

peculiar and extremely personalized entrances, fences
and gates, private courts, wrought-iron lamps
& accessories at entrances, and an occasional
"doll-house" built in left-over alleys. Building
fronts are more ~~very~~ narrow and openings are smaller
(though proportionately spaces) than in Back Bay.
The architectural ~~is~~ style is obviously older
and gives a suggestion of very early colonial
days – it is sincere and straight-forward.
There is very little vehicle movement, and
the sounds are of people. In ~~Back Bay~~
Beacon Hill South this activity of people is
a clue to prosperity, along with its cleanliness,
carefully-tended planting, polished brass on
doors, and the greater pretension of its buildings.
Louisburg Square is a wonderful space, but
is a "center" to me only in a visual sense,
because its activity is limited. As a
visual relief or focus, it is important in
the higher feeling of status that one has of B.H.
South.

c.) Boston Common and Public Garden – This area
is a distinct and striking entity because it
has an obvious homogeneity of color, texture, and
material. It is also an "island" of relief in

a sea of activity. It may also have its own
dynamic activity (Father Fenney et. al.) but I
have not often seen it. In any case, the area
is big enough to absorb this and still provide
a place for quiet meditation, etc. Its' boundaries
are the surrounding streets, but the exact
shape is hard to define.

d. <u>Back Bay, Beacon Hill, and the Common-
Garden</u> seem to belong together as a
distinct and definable area – perhaps
only because I am unable to organize
any other part of central Boston. Two
of the parts are residential; the third
a buffer between them and the commercial
core. The arrangement, if I knew the core,
might be made in other ways:
{see drawing in PDF of original}

6. <u>Characterization of centers</u>: centers which are
distinct and important as foci to me are those
where I have a distinct impression of contrast
in activity and a visual sense. These are:

a. <u>Copley Square</u>- this square is fixed for
me in location because I can find it at the
intersection of 2 known streets. The chief im-
pressions I have of it are: monumental, neo-classic architectural
style; white-grey limestone, moderately textured;
the lush hotel (Sheraton Plaza or Statler?);
tremendous volume of vehicular traffic, particu-
larly the disturbing diagonal movement on Hunting-
ton; fancy people on sidewalks; moderate-to-
high-style stores; tall buildings, but well-
proportional to the rectangular space. I don't think of
this center as belonging visually or functionally
to Back Bay. To me it is an international
element, with moderate deference to Boston
character and tradition. I don't like to
walk in the square because of the traffic.

b. <u>Park and Tremont</u>- this point is a center
to me because of its strong activity of movement
against a visual tension of park green vs.
city. It is at this point that the high
relief of the park in contrast to ~~strong~~ heavily-
developed commercial area seems greatest. With
this as an ~~backdrop~~ overtone, the movement
on the sidewalk (which seems 50 yds. wide) of
people – rushing to and from subways, strolling, chatting in

groups; whistling at girls, etc. – is an intense
sensation. Vehicles are there but don't
seem as important.

c.) <u>Jordan-Filene area</u> – somewhere on Washington
Street, not far from Park and Tremont, is
a point where buildings seem to get higher,
streets more narrow, and crowds impossible.
The ridiculous situation of cars and people
rivals anything I have seen in Italy, except
that here there is mutual fear between
pedestrians and auto drivers.

d.) <u>South Station</u> – which I could find only
by getting on a subway from Harvard or
Park, is a ghastly desert of pavement with
cars and pedestrians crossing at all angles.
It is not a space nor an intersection –
it is like turning 100,000 cars loose
at an airport standby apron, to go in
any desired direction, and an equal number
of pedestrians to rival the best of All-American
~~back~~ broken-field running. Buildings seen
on the horizon give the stereotype impressions
I have for wholesale-warehouse districts.

22

7. Blindfold-Recognition Places. For me, these are
divided into degrees and qualifications as noted
on the overlap. Brief descriptions of these places
follow.

    a. Mass. Ave. Bridge over the Charles. broad,
    undivided roadway; low stone balustrades;
    progression of lamp-posts; MIT at one end;
    fun-profile of Back Bay at the other (with
    the rise of Beacon Hill at the left as I face it).
    b. Mass. Ave. Commonwealth. Commonwealth is
    certain because of its width; the treelined
    median; the limestone rows of apt. houses.
    I am less certain that Mass. Ave. is the
    only very broad and very heavily-travelled
    street intersecting Commonwealth. However,
    my uncertainty would be dispelled if I also
    saw the sign for the Eliot Lounge at this
    point.
    c. Mass. Ave.- Huntington – This is certain because
    Symphony Hall on the NW corner is unmistakable (though hard
    to describe other than weather-beaten, neo-classical,
    limestone, monumental). I also assume that
    the Huntington St. underpass, fenced off with
    wrought iron, is ~~unmist~~ has no counterpart
    elsewhere.
    d. Beacon St. – This is the epitome of my

{margin: In the east end the State Hse, slope of Beacon, and the Common would reinforce.→}

concept of Back Bay. But the view of the
river at block ends is the identifying clue.
e. Commonwealth – see 7 b. above
f. Copley Square – see 6 a. above. The only
clue I would have to getting out of Copley
to another desired point would be the diagonal
of Huntington & its relation to Commonwealth.
Without it, & binding Commonwealth alone,
I could move east-west or north-south, but
could not distinguish north from south or
east from west without difficulty (sun; the
uncertain feeling that the hotel is on the
north side & Public Library on the south)
g. The bridge between Broadway St. and Boston.
arched, divided, metal-grill ~~pavem~~ roadway;
iron balustrades; the view of Beacon Hill
and traffic interchange at one end, lower
bldgs. on the Cambridge side.
h. Traffic interchange at this bridge (g above).
a combination of overhead NW-SE movement
and complex, center-vision-blocked rotary below.
I'm too busy to see Beacon Hill and the
river on either side, but I assume this
is the only such interchange in Boston.
i. North Slope of Beacon Hill. that it is Beacon
Hill seems certain. If I am in a position

to see the direction of slope the <u>indices of</u>
<u>slum</u> mentioned in 5 b. above would furnish
fairly rapid recognition. Without the
slope, I would be uncertain because I might
be at some of the slummy parts on the hills'
crest.
<u>j. West slope of Beacon Hill</u>. ditto, except qualities
reversed.
k<u>. Louisburg Square</u> – trees; {see drawing in PDF of original} 2-way
street boundaries; houses as                              de-
scribed in 5 b. above; a                              sculpture
in the middle; and a slope in one direction.
l. <u>Boston Common- Public Garden</u> – see 5 c above.
m. <u>Jordan-Filene on Washington</u> – see 6 c above.
I would know how to get out of this point
by the fact that Filene's is NE of Jordan's.
n. <u>Old North Church </u>– this would be uncertainly
based on the assumption that no other early
Colonial, frame church exists in Boston.
o. South Station – see 6 d. above.
p<u>. Tea Wharf</u> – this would be uncertainly based
on the assumption that no other ship bay
in Boston {see drawing in PDF of original} has delapidated, frame,
2-3 story houses, closely-spaced or continuously-
joined, with small row boats alongside – instead
of warehouses & boat yards.

8. Walks and rides.

    a. From Mass. Ave. Bridge to Park St. Station.

Leaving MIT on my left, I head into the
bridge (crossing Chas. R. Drive) and, with
Beacon Hill (stacked-up facade planes) and

{margin: P.S. I think I would see John Hancock Tower to my left, but am not sure how far left.}

Back Bay (crazy profile) on my left on
the far bank, I come to the ~~all~~ far
bank; crossing overhead of the parkway (which
runs along the bank), I make my first
left turn (Beacon St.). I follow Beacon
as straight as I can, passing through Back
Bay (a residential area of red-brick, 3-4-
story buildings), and come to a green park
on my right. This is the Public Garden.
I keep the Garden on my right for one
block and turn right on Boylston St. On
Boylston I go all the way to the lower
end of the park, the Common green on my
left, the Garden on my right. At the lower
end of the Park I may be no more than
20-30 feet from the subway entrance. But, I
really think I have to turn left, keeping the
Common on my left, and go one block to the
intersection of the st. I'm on with Tremont.
Following Tremont to the left, still with the
Common on my left, I go one block to Park St.
On the Common corner of this intersection, I should find the subway
station.

<u>b. From Symphony Hall to Jordan-Marsh</u>. Leaving
Symphony Hall, I would cross Mass. Ave., with
the Ave. on my left, travelling on Huntington.
I would continue on Huntington until I came
to Copley Square – a big rectangular space
surrounded by a hotel, a church, the Public
Library, and shops – on Huntington I would
be crossing the square on a diagonal. At
the far corner of the diagonal I would turn
half-right onto Commonwealth Avenue –
After leaving the square, Commonwealth becomes
a broad, tree-lined avenue. I would follow
this until I saw a park – the Public Garden –
dead-ending Commonwealth. At the dead end,
I turn right and then make the next
left turn. ~~once or twice until I was on~~
~~Tremont Street. In making these left turns,~~
~~the Besotn Com~~ Crossing one street on my
left. I would probably take the second
left, keeping the Boston Common green on my
left. After this last left, I should be
on Tremont. ~~At~~ On this street I go until I
can turn right. I go one block after turning
right and then turn left on Washington Street.
After turning left, I keep going until I find
Jordan Marsh on my right.

c. By subway, after leaving Cambridge to Symphony
Hall. In the subway, I come up to the surface
over the Charles River. I have a wonderful im-
pression of Boston ahead. In daytime, I can
see the crazy, cubistic pile-up of red-brick
houses on Beacon Hill ahead of me; the flatter, "lacier"
profile of Back Bay on the right background
(with a strong red-brick river-front wall);
somewhere behind, the silly John Hancock tower,
trying unsuccessfully to be ~~both~~ modern, ~~and~~
Cape Cod and big, all at the same time;
and, in the foreground, a blue expanse of
water with patches of white sail – always
a delight to me. During this experience, the
subway clatter, crowdedness, and mechanistic
bridge elements seem incongrous. I am bothered
by the Chas. St. Station shed which blocks
my view of Boston as we stop. When we
start again, the city view is snatched too
rapidly from me – I wish it could be more
gradual – as we go below surface. The
next stop is Park St., where I change
for the "Huntington" or some other ~~unknow~~
unidentified car. Park St. Station is un-
mistakable – it is like a barn – high,
long, ~~drafty~~ draughty, uneven floor, unlike

any subway station I ever saw. People are
milling about everywhere: they add to my
uncertainty and confusion concerning the location
of my car. I have to climb some steps and
walk under some tracks overhead, relayed from
one to another of about 3-4 signs. Finally
I find the right car, under one of 2 or 3
possible waiting stations, identified to me only
by reading many markers. After boarding,
I stay aboard for 5-6 stops, but after
the $3^{\underline{d}}$ or $4^{th}$ I have to crane around to
read the station names. I know the Symphony
Hall station only by its sign, and this is
where I get out. I have no idea when I emerge
from the station stairs which direction to take
to Symphony. Looking around in all directions,
I see the Hall.