Summary
Infogram's article, "Key Figures in the History of Data Visualization," briefly introduces a list of historical figures in data visualization history, including William Playfair, Florence Nightingale, John Snow, Charles Joseph Minard, Edmond Halley, Charles de Fourcroy, and Luigi Perozzo. Think Insight's article, "Data Visualization - History And Origins," displays a series of types of visualizations (including some from Infogram's article) in chronological order.

Takeaways
Both of these articles taught me about new ways to visualize data. I think the most notable one was the coxcomb diagram designed by Florence Nightingale, which is like a mix between a bar chart and a pie chart; each slice extends out from a central point. However, instead of the radius of each slice denoting the value of data represented, the area of each slice does.

Another interesting yet much less common-looking visualization was John Snow's map of cholera-related deaths. It starts as a basic street map, but tallies are added parallel to sides of roads where the deaths occurred, making it appear as though bar chart bars are extending from the sides of streets on the map. Each stack of tallies indicates how many cholera-related deaths occurred in that area. I think it is very clever to add quantitative data to maps this way.

Confusions / Concerns
I find it difficult to think of situations where a coxcomb diagram would outperform a bar chart. Perhaps if the size of a diagram is an issue, the coxcomb may be easier to condense than a bar chart. I think bar charts are more intuitive and efficient. Comparing shapes by a one-dimensional distance is easier at a glance than comparing the area of two very similar shapes. Without digital tools, it is harder for the one making the diagram as well, since making an accurate coxcomb diagram involves calculating the dimensions of each sector in order for the areas to be proportional to each other.