

Monkhouse, F.J. *A Dictionary of Geography*. Chicago, Aldine Publishing Company, 1965. 344 pages, maps, diagrams, analytical list of entries.

John M. Crowley

Volume 11, Number 22, 1967

URI: <https://id.erudit.org/iderudit/020705ar>

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.7202/020705ar>

[See table of contents](#)

Publisher(s)

Département de géographie de l'Université Laval

ISSN

0007-9766 (print)

1708-8968 (digital)

[Explore this journal](#)

Cite this review

Crowley, J. M. (1967). Review of [Monkhouse, F.J. *A Dictionary of Geography*. Chicago, Aldine Publishing Company, 1965. 344 pages, maps, diagrams, analytical list of entries.] *Cahiers de géographie du Québec*, 11(22), 144–145.
<https://doi.org/10.7202/020705ar>

local populations in the area, by creating new job opportunities. Burnet estimates that some 500,000 people have stayed during one century of tourism development along the coasts. Furthermore, in spite of considerable depopulation during the war years the local tourist economies have revived which demonstrates their tenacity.

3. Coastal tourism in France was discovered by the English, and though the foreigners today only count for a minor share among the visitors it is still a large group, in some areas more than 60% of a considerable foreign minority. The second largest foreign group comes from the Benelux states and they mostly frequent the *zone nord* down to the Brittany stations, where they form approximately 20-25% of the foreign clientele. The North Americans have become one of the most important foreign tourist groups in France, in general, although they have never replaced the English as the largest group in numbers.

Some comments on the negative side should conclude this presentation. The difficulties to compare the regions could have been avoided by tabulating more data or having more maps. Now one has to look through the volume in order to find comparable information for different sections. An index would have improved this considerably.

The regional treatment is understandable but can be discussed. Why this regionalization? Why not a historical regionalization which would have given a different pattern altogether? The initiation of tourism in the Côte d'Azur region is the oldest one, whereas the western part of the Mediterranean shoreline was initiated later and has started to expand at a much later date; the regionalization that has been used is traditional and well known to most geographers. Is it a meaningful regionalization? The author mentions the role of transportation but never follows it up. Cannot a large part of the different coastal development be explained in terms of accessibility? Could not that aspect have been included in the description in a thematic way? The impact tourism has had locally could have been related to statistical documentation on employment at various years, by which it could have been established when places really became tourist places. Now one is left in the air when it comes to the relative importance of tourism in the different localities and regional sectors.

The author has approached a topic which is very large and consequently limitations have had to be made. Working myself on tourism geography, I found Mr. Burnet's work interesting to read. However, I would have preferred to have a more systematic and comparative treatment. Otherwise the risk to lengthy regional monography becomes tempting.

Jan LUNDGREN,
McGill University.

DICTIONNAIRE DE GÉOGRAPHIE

MONKHOUSE, F. J. **A Dictionary of Geography.** Chicago, Aldine Publishing Company, 1965. 344 pages, maps, diagrams, analytical list of entries.

Many English-speaking geographers and those of other tongues who work in English will be interested to learn of the publication of this dictionary of geographical terms. Since the book is unilingual, it will be of less value to French-speaking geographers who merely consult the English-language literature; for in such a case one usually desires the French equivalent of an English technical term instead of, or in addition to, its definition in English. The author and the publisher hope that the book will also be of interest to the general public.

The volume under review is one of a number of books in geography put out in the last few years by the Aldine Publishing Company of Chicago, a name which was virtually unknown in the field of geography publications until rather recently. To judge from the predominance of British authors and the somewhat confusing information on the back of the title page, this company appears to be a U.S. outlet for the London firm Edward Arnold (Publishers) Ltd.

As the title implies, *A Dictionary of Geography* consists of concise definitions of terms commonly used in geography and allied fields. The definitions are frequently supplemented, as we are told in the blurb sheet inside the dust jack, by specific examples, pertinent statistics, and other information. Place names, political units, and other gazetteer information are not included.

In its effort to be acceptable to everyone, this dictionary is bound to please no one. Definitions which are designed to please most and to be understandable to the uninitiated are certain to be unsatisfactory to the specialist. Exception can be taken to virtually every definition by an informed person in the field in question, at least the present writer could certainly find fault with the definition of every term he looked up. The most vulnerable definitions are of course those of general but controversial terms, such as «region,» «geography,» and the various branches of geography. However, definitions are a particularly thorny problem in geography, and in this review it would serve no useful purpose to find fault with individual entries.

One of the most unfortunate aspects of the book is the lack of equilibrium or, more precisely, the overemphasis on geomorphology at the expense of the other branches of physical geography as well as human and economic geography. This bias no doubt reflects the personal interest and competence of the author, who admits in the preface the greater weight given to geomorphology, with the rather weak excuse that it is necessitated by «the modern development of Geomorphology» (p. iii). We have become accustomed to the priority status accorded to geomorphology in most manuals of geography, but there is no reason that we should not deplore it. Naïve indeed is the geomorphologist who fancies that «industrial complex» or «site» (biogeographical sense), neither of which are listed, are less worthy geographical terms than «mud-pot» (p. 210) or «misfit river» (p. 205).

So far as biogeography is concerned, the listing of terms is fairly complete, but the entries are usually either extremely abbreviated or given a position of inferiority with respect to geomorphological definitions. The word «biogeography» itself receives 3 lines, less space than is accorded «berm» and «bioherm,» while «bird's foot delta» receives 3 inches of column space including an illustration (pp. 38-39). «Ecosystem» is accorded only 9 lines while «kame» and associated features occupy $\frac{3}{4}$ page; yet the ecosystem is much more fundamental to biogeography than are kames to geomorphology. The geological definition of «succession» comes before the botanical definition, and animal succession is not mentioned at all. The soils definition of «horizon» is the last one given; and, as noted, the biogeographical definition of «site» is not given.

The interested reader will never grasp the distinction between hydrology and hydrography by means of this dictionary. Hydrology is said to be a science mainly concerned with inland waters while hydrography is concerned with the oceans «mainly and essentially from the point of view of navigation» (p. 161).

Even climatology, which usually receives considerable attention in general works of geography, fares badly.

One of the best points of the volume is the maps and diagrams. That one picture is worth a thousand words is certainly borne out by the illustrations in this book. Skillful block diagrams and tiny but very legible maps show us everything from barchan dunes to Mercator's projection. The clarity and ingenuity of the minuscule maps and diagrams are almost unbelievable, and the author and his assistants are to be complimented upon them. Unfortunately there are no photographs.

In conclusion, this geographical dictionary will be a handy reference for some and a source of constant frustration for others. In the opinion of the present writer the greatest fault of the book is the overemphasis on geomorphological terms. In short, what might have been a rather good dictionary of *geomorphology* has turned out to be a distinctly incomplete and unbalanced dictionary of *geography*.

John M. CROWLEY

LE NORD DU CANADA

«Nord Canadien». Collection Louis-Edmond Hamelin, coédition Centre de psychologie et de pédagogie et Colin-Véronèse, Montréal et Paris, 1966, 2 livrets (I – Moyen-Nord. 24 diapositives.) (II – Grand-Nord. 24 diapositives.)

L'enseignement de la géographie au Québec échappe enfin à sa dépendance traditionnelle du matériel pédagogique étranger qui, malgré sa qualité, n'a jamais été adapté aux exigences de l'étude de notre milieu.