Reading the text, walking the terrain, following the map: Do we see the same landscape?
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1 Document vs. landscape

2 Map document vs. textual document

3 Indications and suggestions
Document or landscape?

• Viewing documents representing landscape
  – *Moving the eyes*

• Seeing the landscape
  – *Moving the eye-head-body system*
Document vs. practice

- Distinction muddled by expressions such as “conceptual map”
- Embodied creatures finding our way
But ...no mapless societies?

- No maps before 1500 (Wood 2010)
- Wayfinding: words, body, brain, senses, landscape, fellow creatures, ...and recently some maps

The “History of Cartography” is not discussing maps. They are discussing things we think look like maps.
Case study: text vs. map

Schnitler: Scandinavia, 1740’s
• From overlapping tax areas to borders between states
• Information gathering
• Common people seen as a source to information based on their knowledge, not on their status
Modelling and stepwise formalisation

Thus, model at two levels:
1. the map is a model of the text
2. each formalisation step is a model of the previous

Modelling necessarily removes and adds information.
Remediation?

Change 8te Miile to <spaceDistanceMileMountain>8</>
Change <spaceDistanceMileMountain>8</> to 64 kilometres
Change 64 kilometres to (0,0), (64000,0).
Fall-off, yes, but also add-ons.
Too little and too much

- Too little: What do a map need in order to be made
- Too much: What do a text have to offer

This is what used to be the typology.
Too little: underspecification

“A verbal text describing a spatial phenomenon in a way that can be understood as two or more significantly different phenomena by a competent reader, thus, an ambiguity stemming from a lack of information.”

Definition of under-specification.

Choices must be made.
Underspecification means that we have to make choices.
Too much

“ [...] in North of there, there are no peasant farm.”

“There are no More Finns Close to the Borders [...]”

\[ \text{length}(A, B) \neq \text{length}(B, A) \]
This is most central for “too little”; too little is said, thus, it is not specified enough.

Even when things are put onto pre-existing maps the same choices are made, but in that case they are usually hidden. But deciding that this map can be used to represent the contents of that text is a choice from which all the smaller choices follows by necessity, except when we say “this do not fit! The map is wrong!”
Media restrictions:
How to make maps anyway

- Dynamic
- Completeness definition
- Choices
- Text

Not only how things are said, also what can be said.
There are workarounds
...but full specification is not used in natural language.
Different media, different experiences

• How things are said
• What is said

``Every medium has the capacity of mediating only certain aspects of the total reality'' (Elleström 2010)

...so it is no surprise that wayfinding is different from both maps and texts
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If there is a media difference, is that an argument for there being a practice difference?
Thank you!
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