

studies, the mesh of smaller roads is overlaid to support arguments relating to segmental changes and an often parasitic relation to older infrastructural configurations.

The overall impact is of a restrained yet carefully marshalled visual argument. Maps are drawn to convey and support the rhetoric of each part of the narrative; they are carefully related to each textual component, but are also visually coherent. I was constantly reminded of Edward Tufte's work on design. Like Tufte's books, this atlas makes a proper *visual* use of the medium. It achieves so much more than a more conventional historical atlas precisely because of its ability to merge detail into a bigger picture, to offer something striking, different, and clear but also argued, evidenced, and rigorous.

Wow! What a stunning atlas.

Chris Perkins / University of Manchester / UK

CLASSICS IN CARTOGRAPHY: REFLECTIONS ON INFLUENTIAL ARTICLES FROM *CARTOGRAPHICA* / ed. Martin Dodge. Chichester, UK: Wiley-Blackwell, 2011. Pp. 430. ISBN-13 978-0-470-68174-9 (cloth), US\$114.95; ISBN-13 978-1-1199-5737-90 (ebook), US\$94.99.

In some ways, writing a review about a collection of newly republished "classic" papers on cartography is a little like asking a chef to comment on his signature dish. The reason the book exists at all is precisely to celebrate a range of work that has already been deemed to be of significant value to cartography. Certainly, the 10 papers selected from the annals of *Cartographica* and republished here as a reinterpretation of touchstone articles are unquestionably of a high quality. This review will not attempt to explore the papers themselves; to do so would be futile. Rather, I will ask, what can we gain from the collection as a publication in its own right?

Almost at once, the reader will be interested in what was selected for inclusion. Perhaps, too, they will look to see if their own particular "classics" make the cut. The foreword by Jeremy Crampton (editor of *Cartographica*, 2008–2010) and the introductory chapter by editor Martin Dodge (also of the *Cartographica* editorial board) go to great lengths to explain the process by which papers were selected. Actually, they become almost apologetic, for it is impossible to prepare a book of this type and be wholly objective. Any metrics that might be used (e.g., citations) are flawed and are not at all good proxies for the potential real impact of a paper. Are older papers more classic than newer ones? Are those cited more often better by virtue of this metric or that metric? Should several papers by the same prolific or highly regarded author be included in such a small selection? The dilemmas that faced Dodge are almost endless. For every paper that was selected there

will most likely be an equally deserving one that didn't make the cut, given the many hundreds of papers published since the journal's first issue in 1964. So the book represents a celebration of the publication, and the papers are a potpourri of highlights – a dip into the varied work that attempts to touch on the practical (e.g., David Douglas and Thomas Peucker's 1973 paper "Algorithms for the Reduction of the Number of Points Required to Represent a Digitized Line or Its Caricature"), the theoretical (e.g., Denis Wood and John Fels' 1986 paper "Designs on Signs/Myth and Meaning in Maps"), and the controversial (e.g., J.B. Harley's 1989 paper "Deconstructing the Map"). Ultimately, papers were selected based on what Dodge explains as a "subjective fudge." Raw citation counts were part of the equation for selection, but in their own way they mask a slew of potential pitfalls. So papers were incorporated that were perhaps less visible initially but are nevertheless intellectually significant, and the selection also aimed to provide a collection that represents a wide range of cartographic interests. There can be little complaint about the papers selected, though, of course, there are those that fail to make the cut, such as Gail Langran and Nicholas Chrisman's 1988 paper "A Framework for Temporal Geographic Information." Papers are grouped into three main sections: "Epistemological Practice," "Ontological Understanding," and "Politics and Society." This division seems to make sense, and it allows the reader to place a particular paper in a wider context regardless of publication date or chronology.

I found myself skimming through the reprinted original papers, having read them all at various points (though it is worth pointing out that they are presented in a consistent format here, and many of the illustrations have been redrawn). I imagine most readers will be familiar with the original papers, but perhaps new students and early-career scholars will find this collection a valuable place to easily locate important papers at once. I did pause on some papers and reread them with fond recollections . . . papers that perhaps I haven't read for many years or I recall reading at a particular stage of my career. Both Harley's "Deconstructing the Map" and David Mark and Ferenc Csillag's "The Nature of Boundaries on 'Area Class' Maps" were published the year I started my BSc in cartography and geography (1989). I knew very little about academic literature at that time, and even less about the various authors and experts that I should perhaps have paid more attention to in those fledgling academic years. I confess to never having read Harley's paper until a few years after I graduated. I should also confess to not recalling whether my university library (Oxford Polytechnic) even took *Cartographica*. If it did, I rarely consulted it, and, again, probably should have done, in the same way that I have urged cartography students of my own to do so

for the past 20 years. Many will already have the original papers, or have easy access to them through the *Cartographica* archive, so having them again is much like downloading a Pink Floyd album from iTunes when you have both the vinyl and the CD knocking around somewhere: you know what the album sounds like, it resonated when you first heard it, and you're simply getting it in a new format for convenience. That said, how many of us routinely revisit older papers? There's much to be learned from rereading these works. Journal papers are often overlooked because there are so many and they are published so frequently in a crowded journal market. I encourage those who take the time to read this book to reacquaint themselves with old friends and perhaps find something new that was overlooked on first reading – much like finding new sounds and colours in *Shine on You Crazy Diamond* despite having listened to it 50 times or more. The original papers are certainly classics; of that there is no doubt. They have all helped to shape cartography in some way, whether by offering a programmed solution or by encouraging us to consider the nature of the map as an intellectual object.

Classics in Cartography offers the original authors (or expert commentators where, perhaps, the original author is deceased or was unable to contribute) the opportunity to write a reflection essay. In many ways, this is where the book's quality and interest lie, and it is here that the volume becomes something quite unexpected. After each of the original papers appears a reflective essay. If you are expecting a dry, academic exploration of the original work, you'll be disappointed: instead we are treated to a look behind the scenes, a "making of," and, in most essays, a personal account of the circumstances of the work. Here we see authors struggling with their own thoughts, admitting to issues that they wrestled with at the time (and perhaps still do), and providing fascinating insights into their approach to thinking and writing at a particular stage of their own career. There are some touching moments, such as Mark Monmonier's explanation of the origins of his "Strategies for the Visualization of Geographic Time-Series Data" paper coinciding with the death of his mother and a stout performance by one of his graduate students, who read the paper at an Association of American Geographers meeting in his absence. Similarly, Crampton gives a moving account of his meetings with Brian Harley before his passing in commenting on "Deconstructing the Map" and how it transformed his own graduate career. Here, then, we have more than just reflections on 10 papers: we have an insight into the lives of the authors and a contextualization of their work. We get a glimpse of what worried them and what inspired them. We learn that Wood and Fels would probably not have written their paper had they not met when Fels and his wife were looking for a place to spend his sabbatical,

or even that they wouldn't have discovered a mutual interest in semiotics had they not shared lunch one day. Academic serendipity, then, is the real story: thoughts and chance meetings that came together at a perfect moment to result in a piece of work that has come to be regarded as a classic. This is the story behind 10 pieces of high-quality academic work and an insight into the many other stories that lie behind published academic papers. Why we tackle and publish a paper and who we end up collaborating with are as much a function of serendipity as of planning. There is a reality that lies behind the academic, and that reality is often a fascinating story that gives us a context for their published work. Again, this is no different from music: we feel a greater connection to the work of a composer or a band when we know a little of their life and the context for their work. It becomes more real, and that enables us to develop empathy for the work that we perhaps couldn't gain from simply listening to it. It breathes life into the work and helps us contextualize it.

Classics in Cartography is more than just a book containing 10 reprinted papers accompanied by modern reflections. We can debate the list of papers included, but really it matters very little. The papers selected are fine examples of the body of work published in *Cartographica* to date; there is a good spread of cartographic interests and of authors. The reflective essays are absorbing and bring colour to the originals. I am left wondering whether adding a short reflective piece shouldn't be a publishing requirement, because the context reveals so much more than the original paper alone.

I have only one criticism. On page 6, Dodge notes that "it would be fair to say none of the other cartography journals has the same *international* reputation for publishing innovative research and for intellectual leadership" (original emphasis). Given that he was at pains to explain the procedure for selecting the papers and the problem of empirical measures of a paper's worth, this claim seems insufficiently substantiated, particularly as there are two other cartography journals that can claim Thomson Reuters citation listings and impact factors reflecting their relative importance. *Cartographica* does not currently enjoy this status – but then again, as editor of *The Cartographic Journal* maybe I'm duty bound to pick up on this (as well as being a little playful!).

Classics in Cartography is not only a supremely constructed book in its own right but does a fine job of representing the high calibre of papers published in *Cartographica* over the past 48 years. It provides an insightful read and should also be a staple for students of cartography and GIS. Given the wealth of classics that didn't make the cut, maybe there is opportunity for a second volume? As Pink Floyd did: The Final Cut?

Kenneth Field / ESRI Inc. / Editor, *The Cartographic Journal*