

History 2

Chapter 1

The Emergence of Urban Civilizations in Ancient West Asia

"It was divine nature which gave us the country, and man's skill that built the cities." ~ Marcus Terentius Varro

"Every city is two cities, a city of the many poor and a city of the few rich; and these two cities are always at war." ~Plato

The jewels lay at his feet, half-buried in the hard-packed earth. Leonard Woolley knelt down and examined the area closely. A finely worked gold headdress and a necklace of lapis lazuli lay in a tangled heap around the crushed remains of a human skull. Combs, earrings, harps and lyres of inlaid silver and gold were scattered about on the floor nearby. In the corners of the room, the remains of jars, bowls and even pieces of furniture gave the eerie impression of a just-concluded party. Woolley paused, deep in thought. Eight years of systematic digging had finally brought him to this spot: on the dusty plain of southern Iraq, at the bottom of an underground shaft, twenty-five feet underneath the floor of an ancient royal palace. He knew for certain that he had found the royal cemetery of the ancient city of Ur.

Leonard Woolley's discovery of the royal cemetery of Ur in 1927 was only one of several dramatic breakthroughs in a long search for the buried secrets of the ancient past. Adventurers, explorers and scholars had been scampering over the wind-swept hills of Egypt, Iraq, Greece, Turkey and dozens of other places since the early nineteenth century in an attempt to unlock the mysteries of early human history. Gradually, as the academic discipline of professional archeology systematized these efforts in the twentieth century, the answers began to reveal themselves. A central theme has emerged from the archeological research with startling clarity: at the heart of the ancient human experience was the city. Since the beginning of history over five thousand years ago people have come together in cities to worship, trade, raise families and develop the key inventions that have propelled history into our modern age. As Marcus Terentius Varro, a Roman writer of the first century B.C.E. put it, "It was divine nature that gave us the country, and man's skill that built the cities."¹

The first urban civilizations appeared in the region of Mesopotamia (present-day southern Iraq) in the fourth millennium B.C.E.. Cities soon sprang up in many other parts of the world, including the Indus Valley (present-day Pakistan), China and, later, in the Americas. The first cities were both the product of and the stimulus for some of the most significant technological and political achievements in human history. Writing, government, legal codes, the wheel, mathematics and engineering all developed within an urban context.

But the central role of the city in the unfolding of history also contains a fascinating paradox. While the emergence of urban civilization sparked most of the progressive developments in the human experience, it also reshaped human societies in fundamental ways. The relatively simple and egalitarian world of the neolithic village gave way to the complex, hierarchical, unequal, and contentious society of the large city. On the path of progress, humanity became less secure, less equal, and less peaceful than before.

This background essay will explore several of the most famous cities of the ancient world with this paradox in mind. After a brief review of some of the key ideas that scholars have developed in their studies of the first urban civilizations, we will examine several ancient cities in some detail. From these case studies, the salient aspects of the new urban societies of the ancient era will emerge.

1. THEORIES OF URBAN DEVELOPMENT

As the study of the earliest cities has progressed over the last several decades, scholars have been debating several basic questions posed by these ancient civilizations. What is a city? What are the essential characteristics of an urban civilization? What factors led to the emergence of the first cities in the ancient world? Why did cities act as magnets, drawing people to them out of the surrounding countryside? Was religion the motivating force? Or, did other factors play a more central role, such as long-distance trade, the development of agriculture, or increasing conflict and warfare?

Defining the basic characteristics of ancient urban civilizations has been central to understanding these early cultures. After many years of studying the ruins of ancient Mesopotamia, Australian archeologist V. Gordon Childe drew up a list of characteristics that he felt were central to a definition of an urban society. His list can be summarized as follows:

1. A large and dense population
2. Full-time specialization of labor; large-scale craft production and specialization
3. A class-structured society, including a ruling class of religious, political, and military functionaries

4. A system of taxation or tribute allowing for a centrally controlled concentration of surplus
5. A state-level organization, with a bureaucracy and military apparatus, and a defined political domain with territorial boundaries
6. Monumental public works-collective enterprises such as temples, palaces, storehouses, and irrigation systems
7. Standardized monumental artwork, reflecting a shared aesthetic and symbolic system
8. Long-distance trade
9. Writing
10. Exact, predictive scientific knowledge (basic arithmetic, geometry, and astronomy).²

Childe's list of the essential features of ancient urban civilizations has served as a touchstone for scholarly research ever since. His list has been modified to fit various local situations, but his central arguments are now widely accepted. Virtually all of the urban civilizations of the ancient world displayed these characteristics, except for writing, which seems to have been absent from the great American urban center at Teotihuacan.

But defining the characteristics of urban civilizations was only the first step for researchers. A more fundamental question involved the origins of these ancient cities. What factors led to the emergence of large-scale urban centers in the ancient world? For this question, there were no easy answers. A great deal of discussion and debate has occurred over the last several decades. Many scholars, including Childe, have emphasized economic factors in the emergence of ancient cities. Improvements in agriculture created surplus food supplies that could be offered for barter and trade. Market centers arose to accommodate these economic exchanges and towns and eventually cities emerged out of this economic matrix.³

Two variations on the economic factor in the growth of cities have been put forward by Karl Wittfogel and Robert Adams. Wittfogel argued that the large-scale irrigation systems that were necessary for the expansion of agricultural production in the ancient world were themselves factors in the growth of cities. These elaborate irrigation networks required massive amounts of human labor to construct and maintain. The members of the societies who gained the power and influence to successfully command large numbers of laborers became, in effect, a "managerial elite."⁴ These elites became the dominant strata of the hierarchical urban societies that resulted from the expansion of agriculture. Robert Adams has focused on the role of ancient cities as key "redistributive centers" which emerged at the crossroads of the expanding trade and exchange networks.⁵ The development of irrigation systems and specialization in food production led to surpluses of food available for trade and exchange. Adams argues that it was the urban elites,

particularly the priesthood associated with the main temples, who organized the storage and redistribution of the surplus.

Other scholars have placed more emphasis on the role of religion in the development of the first cities. They point out that all ancient cities first developed around a series of religious temples, staffed by a priesthood responsible for the religious rituals of the community. This religious aspect of the development of early cities has been most cogently presented by Paul Wheatley, who argued that ancient cities were essentially “ceremonial centers” which expressed the fundamentally religious outlook of ancient peoples.

Whenever...we trace back the characteristic urban form to its beginnings, we arrive not at a settlement that is dominated by commercial relations...but rather at a ceremonial complex....The predominantly religious focus...leaves no doubt that we are dealing primarily with centers of ritual and ceremonial. Naturally this does not imply that the ceremonial centers did not exercise secular functions as well, but rather that these were subsumed into an all-pervading religious context.

Beginning as little more than tribal shrines...these centers were elaborated into complexes of public ceremonial structures, usually massive and often extensive....Operationally they were instruments for the creation of political, social, economic, and sacred space, at the same time as they were symbols of cosmic, social, and moral order....Above all, they embodied the aspirations of brittle, pyramidal societies in which, typically, a [priestly] elite, controlling a corps of officials...ruled over a broad understratum of peasantry.⁶

So, the student of ancient cities must weave through a thicket of contrasting theories and interpretations in order to sort out the emergence of the first cities of the ancient world. To assist that effort, we will take a closer look at several of these ancient cities in the next section of this essay. The careful reader will see evidence of economic, redistributive and religious factors at work in the different historical situations.

2. CITIES OF ANCIENT WEST ASIA

Uruk

Deep in southern Iraq lay the ruins on one of the oldest urban civilizations of ancient Mesopotamia. The ancient city of Uruk (known as “Erech” in the Bible) first emerged in the fourth millennium B.C.E. and quickly became the dominant city in Mesopotamia until its decline after 2500 B.C.E.. The people of ancient Uruk traced their city’s founding to their patron deity, Inanna (goddess of love and war), and the city briefly dominated the region of Mesopotamia under its greatest king, the legendary Gilgamesh. Even after its decline, Uruk remained an important religious

center, and many later kings continued to build temples in the religious precincts of the city.

Uruk was far larger in size than anything that had come before. With a population estimated at over 40,000, the city stretched over an area exceeding 1,200 acres. Only a fraction of that area has been explored by archeologists since the city was unearthed in 1912, but what scholars have found here demonstrates the key role Uruk played in the development of urban civilization in the ancient world.

Uruk was at one time surrounded by massive protective walls which, according to legend, were built by Gilgamesh. However, no evidence of these walls has been uncovered by archeologists. Inside the walls, two sacred precincts dominate the center of the city. The Eanna precinct was dedicated to the city's founding deity, the goddess, Inanna, and the Kullaba district centered around the worship of the sky god, Anu. Some of the oldest structures in Uruk have been unearthed in the Kullaba district, including the famous White Temple, so-called because of its outer coating of white plaster. Archeologists have focused most of their attention on the Eanna precinct (called the "House of Heaven"), the cult center of the goddess Inanna. Here a series of temples were constructed over the centuries, with new buildings often placed directly on top of the ruins of previous structures. This was in keeping with the traditions of ancient Mesopotamia in which sacred areas were continuously built over, because the location itself was sacred, not merely the buildings themselves. Several temples occupy the Eanna sacred precinct and the entire area, measuring 985 by 655 feet, was enclosed by its own wall. Later, during the period of the king Ur-Nammu (2112-2095 B.C.E.), a huge ziggurat was constructed in the Eanna district to serve as an elevated platform for a temple to Inanna.

Amid the rubble of the temples in the Eanna precinct, archeologists have found many precious objects that reveal some of the secrets of Uruk's past. One of the most famous is the "Warka Vase," an alabaster cult vessel nearly thirty-nine inches high inscribed with a scene of a priest-king making an offering to the goddess Inanna. This indicates that early rulers of Mesopotamian cities performed both political and religious roles, acting as mediators between the people and the gods.

Also unearthed in the temple ruins were numerous clay tablets that contained an early form of pictographic writing. Over time, rudimentary pictures and symbols were simplified into shorter symbols in a writing system that came to be known as *cuneiform*. Most of these cuneiform tablets recorded quantities of wheat, barley and other products that may have been stored in the temples. This demonstrates that writing may first have developed in order to provide some form of recordkeeping. It also illustrates the key role played by the temples and their staffs, who performed functions that were both religious and secular.

Most intriguing to scholars working at Uruk is the absence of palaces or other monumental buildings that did not have a religious function. This may indicate that

the priestly staffs of the temples performed various political and managerial functions for the city, in addition to their primary religious role. Separate, secular leadership may not have emerged until later. For this reason, these early cities are often referred to as *temple communities*, due to the central place of the religious temples not only in the shape of the city, but also in its social, economic and political life.

Ur

As the ancient visitor approached the city of Ur, the gleaming temples of the central city would have been visible on the horizon for miles. After passing through farms and fields on the outskirts of the city, our traveler would eventually come to the great river and follow one of the canals branching off from the river to get to the gates of the city. Massive protective walls, twelve feet thick and over a mile in length, surrounded Ur at the peak of its power around 2100 B.C.E.. At the northern edge of the city a huge man-made harbor district linked the river and the city gates. Here ships from as far away as Lebanon, India, Egypt and Afghanistan brought valuable goods to be traded in Ur's marketplaces. A second harbor was built in the western sector of the city, linked to the main northern harbor by two canals. One of these cut through the center of the city, while the other circled around the outer walls, acting as both a transport canal and a defensive moat.

Once through the gate and into the city, the visitor would have been enveloped by the sounds and smells of the teeming streets and bazaars of the residential districts. Narrow, winding streets wove between high-walled buildings. The atmosphere was claustrophobic, but cool because the high walls shaded the streets and alleyways from the hot midday sun. Here among the maze of streets were clustered the residential neighborhoods of the city. Houses were built in one and two story buildings jumbled together in densely packed cul-de-sacs. Rooms were arranged around open inner courtyards that served as a space for domestic activities and as a refuge from the heat and noise outside. Interspersed with the residential areas were areas of craft production containing kilns for pottery making and for the smelting of various metals. Quarters for jewelers, textile workers and tanners also dotted the cityscape.

Finally, passing through open areas featuring orchards and gardens nourished by irrigation water from the canals, the visitor would approach the sacred precinct at the center of the city. Enclosed by its own separate wall, the sacred area was set apart from the rest of the city and housed the most important religious and administrative buildings. Assuming our visitor was in the city on official business and therefore had access to the sacred precinct, we follow him as he passes through the precinct walls and into the sacred enclosure. Here the hum of activity increases as scribes, bureaucrats and workers bustle between the gleaming palaces and temples. Dominating the area (and indeed the whole city) was the great

ziggurat containing the temple dedicated to Nanna, god of the moon and patron deity of the city. Built by the king Ur-Nammu (2112-2095 B.C.E.) at the height of Ur's power, the ziggurat had four levels, each sitting on top of the other, creating the form of a stepped pyramid. On the top level was placed the temple to Nanna. At the foot of the ziggurat was arrayed a vast complex of sanctuaries, including a large courtyard temple (also dedicated to Nanna) and various other cult buildings. Nearby were royal palaces that housed the royal family and other nobles. Other buildings served as residential quarters for the priests and priestesses, or as offices for various governmental officials and bureaucrats.

The ancient city of Ur was systematically excavated by the archeologist Leonard Woolley from 1922 to 1934. Woolley pioneered many new techniques in archeological exploration, including *stratigraphy*, or the dating of artifacts according to the level at which they were buried. He also developed an elaborate set of grid lines over the entire site so that the precise location of every object could be recorded on the framework of the grid. In order to preserve the exact state of objects as they were found, Woolley developed a process of pouring hot wax over them, letting it cool and then lifting out the entire mass – wax and object together. In this way the artifacts, which may have consisted of broken bits of pottery or beads from a necklace whose connecting string had long-since rotted away, could be held together in their original relationship for restoration and analysis.⁷

The most spectacular find at Ur occurred in 1927 when Woolley reached the bottom of large trenches cut into the ground under the sacred precinct and discovered the burial chambers of the kings and queens of Ur. He found two types of graves: simple rectangular shafts for ordinary commoners and vaulted chambers made out of stone or brick for the royalty and other members of the upper classes. It was here that Woolley discovered the rich cache of jewels, golden ornaments, musical instruments and furniture. But it was in a series of vertical shafts just outside the royal burial chambers that Woolley made his most startling discovery. In each shaft were up to seventy-four bodies of men and women. Their clothing and ornaments indicated that they came from many different social ranks, from simple servants to palace attendants. The skeletons showed no signs of damage or violence, leading Woolley to speculate that they had died without resistance. Beside each body was a cup. Was this a mass suicide by poison among members of the royal households that enabled the attendants to accompany their masters into the afterlife? If so, what does this evidence indicate about the nature of social hierarchy in the emerging cities of the ancient world?

From the discoveries in the Royal Cemetery and throughout the site, Leonard Woolley was able to reconstruct a timeline of the city's history. Ur had first been settled in the fifth millennium, B.C.E. and reached the peak of its power and influence in Mesopotamia during the reign of the kings of the so-called "third dynasty of Ur" from 2112 to 2004 B.C.E.. It was during this period that most of the temples and state buildings were constructed and the regional trade system

flourished. In the topsy-turvy world of competing Mesopotamian city-states, however, Ur's pre-dominance was short-lived. Around 2000 B.C.E., invaders from Iran overthrew Ur's dynasty and sacked the city. For generations afterward, inhabitants of Ur recalled the destructive end of their once-great city:

O Father Nanna, that city into ruins was made ...
Its people, not potsherds, filled its sides;
Its walls were breached; the people groan.
In its lofty gates, where they were wont to promenade, dead bodies were lying about;
In its boulevards, where the feasts were celebrated, scattered they lay....
In its palaces, where the festivities of the land took place, the people lay in heaps
Ur - it's weak and it's strong perished through hunger;
Mothers and fathers who did not leave their houses were overcome by fire;
The young, lying on their mothers' laps, like fish were carried off by the waters;
In the city the wife was abandoned, the son was abandoned, the possessions were
scattered about ...
O Nanna, Ur has been destroyed, its people have been dispersed.⁸

3. THE EVOLUTION OF URBAN SOCIETIES

All of the cities discussed in this essay – and countless others around the ancient world – represented a “Great Leap Forward” in human history. Innovations in technology, written language, law, politics and economics all flowed out of the dynamic cultures produced by these urban environments. However, it could also be argued, from another point of view, that all of these cities were based upon exploitation. Some members of these urban societies were better off than others. Some were rich, others were poor. Some were more privileged, others less so. Yet, the attractions of city life persisted in spite of these inherent inequalities. This intriguing paradox invites a closer look at the societies and cultures that developed in the cities of the ancient world.

From Kinship Societies to Tributary Societies

The first cities emerged as a result of a fundamental reorganization of food production in human societies. Before cities, ancient peoples had lived in clan groups and villages organized around extended kin, or family, relationships and sustained by hunting and gathering of food supplies. Gradually these villagers grew more knowledgeable of the various attributes of wild plants in the local area. Over time, as those plants were fully domesticated and controlled by humans, crop yields began to increase. Increasing food supplies, in turn, led to increasing populations, as more and more people could be sustained by the growing food supply. This mutually-reinforcing, cause-and-effect relationship between increasing

food production and increasing population eventually resulted in the transformation of small kin-based villages into larger towns, and eventually cities.

In an important related development, increased agricultural prosperity also led to the development of craft specialization. As more efficient farming methods led to increased crop yields, some members of a society could be released from the daily farming tasks to perform other tasks that were becoming necessary. For example, there was a growing need for containers to store and transport the growing food supplies. This led to the emergence of pottery. As some members of the community became full-time pottery makers, the skill and sophistication of the resulting pottery increased dramatically. Other crafts emerged, including metallurgy, the working of various metals into tools and implements. The combination of improved agriculture and new crafts was an explosive one. New tools and farming implements further increased agricultural productivity, enabling additional community members to be released to develop even more crafts. A larger food supply led to increased population, which in turn provided more labor available for agriculture, and so on.

Increasing food production thus led to larger and more complex human societies. This complexity, in turn, created new problems that demanded new solutions. Which members of the society would continue farming and which members would be released for craftwork? Who would collect the surplus of food production for redistribution to the non-farming members of the community? Where would this surplus be stored? Who would manage and keep track of all these arrangements?

At the center of these new arrangements was the transfer of agricultural surpluses from the producers of that surplus (the farmers) to the consumers of that surplus (the non-farming city population). In a simple, face-to-face society, this transfer could be voluntary, as villagers shared their produce with relatives or family members. But in the more complex urban societies then emerging, most people were not related to each other and, indeed, did not know each other. In this situation, it would be unlikely that a hard-working farmer would voluntarily give up a portion of his produce to non-relatives without some form of persuasion or coercion. This "persuasion" could take many forms. Most commonly, city authorities would promise protection and services (such as irrigation maintenance) in return for regular levees of "tribute" in the form of produce or labor services. Scholars have termed this type of society a "tributary society."⁹ Virtually all societies in history that advanced beyond simple village arrangements were tributary societies, until the advent of industrial capitalist economies in the modern era.

In tributary societies, the city functioned as a "redistributive center" for the flow of tribute. Farm produce and craft production was collected by urban authorities, stored in public buildings (often within the temple complexes) and then redistributed to the urban populace as needed. In the process, corps of bureaucratic scribes formed to keep track of the tribute. The first urban writing systems were a

direct outgrowth of this need for recordkeeping. Much of the tribute was redirected into the construction of large public buildings, such as temples and palaces, which were staffed by the increasingly wealthy and powerful urban elites who controlled the tribute.

As human settlements increased in size and complexity, the social networks based on kinship relations began to break down. In a village community organized around extended families, everyone knew each other and interacted with other members of their community in close face-to-face relationships. Disputes that arose could be contained and resolved by the intervention of other family members before they escalated into violence. But as population growth transformed those small kinship societies of a few hundred people into towns and cities of tens of thousands of people, the old face-to-face relationships could no longer govern social relations. Now, many encounters would take place between people who did not know each other and were not bound to each other by extended family relationships. New systems of social management were needed, leading to the emergence of law codes, police forces and governing elites to manage these new systems. The hierarchical society of the city was born.

Urban Hierarchies

In cities across the ancient world, social hierarchy emerged as the solution to problems of organizing large complex urban societies. Urban societies were stratified societies, with powerful and influential people at the top and less powerful people at the bottom. Power and influence could be political, religious, military, economic, or some combination of these roles.

At the bottom of the urban social structure were the workers who performed unskilled tasks in the urban environment. These city workers were not farmers (or at least did not farm on a full-time basis). They were completely dependent on the handout of tribute surplus for their sustenance. Craft specialists were a level above on the social scale, their ranking determined by the importance of their craft in the urban economy. Metal workers, jewelers, textile workers, pottery workers, and dozens of other craft producers worked, and often lived, in special districts of the city.

The top of the social scale was dominated by those who had access to the inner, sacred precincts of the city, i.e., members of the political and religious elite. The priestly class played a central role in all ancient cities. They were the first group to be freed from farming work to maintain the religious life of the community, including the staffing of the growing temples. They developed elaborate theologies and ritual offerings to the gods, maintained the temple buildings and kept track of important information such as flood cycles, tribute storage and disbursement. Gradually a parallel political elite emerged to carry out the more secular tasks of the city, including policing, dispensing of justice, and

maintenance of defense against outside enemies. This political-military elite often became the dominant power in the city as a result of their control of armies and weapons.

Between the top and the bottom levels of the urban society were the scribes and bureaucrats. These were the administrators and record-keepers who performed the vital function of managing the details of the increasingly complex urban systems. The key to their role was their mastery of writing. Literacy set them apart from the vast majority of their fellow city-dwellers and increased their social status accordingly. The scribal class often jealously guarded their social prestige, as can be seen in one father's advice to his son, a student in a scribal school in Egypt:

Put writing in your heart that you may protect yourself from hard labor of any kind and be a magistrate of high repute. The scribe is released from manual tasks; it is he who commands.... Do you not hold the scribe's palette? That is what makes the difference between you and the man who handles an oar.

I have seen the metal-worker at his task at the mouth of his furnace, with fingers like a crocodile's. He stank worse than fish-spawn.... The stonemason finds his work in every kind of hard stone. When he has finished his labors his arms are worn out, and he sleeps all doubled up until sunrise. His knees and spine are broken.... The barber shaves from morning till night, he never sits down except to meals. He hurries from house to house looking for business. He wears out his arms to fill his stomach, like bees eating their own honey... The farmer wears the same clothes for all times. His voice is as raucous as a crow's. His fingers are always busy, his arms are dried up by the wind. He takes his rest - when he does get any rest - in the mud. If he's in good health he shares good health with the beasts; if he is ill his bed is the bare earth in the middle of his beasts....

Apply your heart to learning. In truth there is nothing that can compare with it. If you have profited by a single day at school it is a gain for eternity.¹⁰

Here, we see one angle of vision on the myriad social classes that made up the increasingly complex urban societies of the ancient world.

The Lure of the City

In spite of the hardship of city life for all but the most privileged classes, people in the ancient era kept flocking to cities. Scholars have estimated that over eighty percent of the people of ancient Mesopotamia lived in towns or cities with populations over five thousand. What was the attraction of city life? Ancient peoples often equated city life with civilized life, in contrast to the uncultured life of the countryside. City dwellers viewed their city as the center of the world, both in a concrete material sense and in a cosmological sense. City life – when it was in harmony with the gods – meant happiness and prosperity. This theme is

prominently featured in ancient literature as, for example, in this celebration of the city of Akkade:

In those days, she (Inanna) filled Akkade's stores for emmer wheat with gold,
filled its stores for white emmer wheat with silver,
copper, tin, and blocks of lapis lazuli were regularly delivered in its granaries,
the outside of its grain silos she plastered over with mud.
Its old women were given counsel,
its old men were given eloquence,
its maidens were given playgrounds,
its young men were given the strength of weapons,
its little ones were given happiness.
Nursemaids holding the children of generals,
played the algasurru-lyre;
Inside the city was the tigi-drum, outside were reed pipes and tambourines.
Its harbour, where the ships moored, was full of joy.¹¹

NOTES

1. Quoted in Rebecca Stefoff, *Finding the Lost Cities* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1997), 11.
2. See V. Gordon Childe, "The Urban Revolution," *Town Planning Review* 21 (1950), 3-17.
3. On the role of trade and agriculture in the development of ancient cities see Jane Jacobs, *The Economy of Cities* (New York: Vintage Books, 1969) and Gordon Childe, "The Urban Revolution." James Mellaart stresses both economic and religious factors in "The Origins and Development of Cities in the Near East," in Louis Orlin, ed., *Janus: Essays in Ancient and Modern Studies* (Ann Arbor, 1975).
4. Karl Wittfogel, *Oriental Despotism* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1957).
5. Robert McC. Adams, *The Evolution of Urban Society* (Chicago, 1966).
6. Paul Wheatley, *The Pivot of the Four Quarters* (Chicago, 1971), 226-226.
7. See Leonard Woolley, *Ur of the Chaldes* (Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1929, reprint, 1982)
8. "A Sumerian Lamentation," trans. S.N. Kramer, in James B. Pritchard, ed., *Ancient Near Eastern Texts Relating to the Old Testament*, 3rd edition (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1969), 459-469.
9. Two particularly insightful discussions of the transition from kinship to tributary societies can be found in L.S. Stavrianos, *Lifelines from Our Past: A New World History* (New York: Pantheon Books, 1989), especially Chapter 2, "Tributary Societies," pp. 43-86, and Jared Daimond, *Guns, Germs and Steel: The Fates of Human Societies* (New York: W. W. Norton & Company, 1999), especially Chapter 14, "From Egalitarianism to Kleptocracy," pp. 265-292. The impact of these changes on the relationships between men and women in the ancient world is deftly analysed in Gerda Lerner, *The Creation of Patriarchy* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1986).
10. Quoted in Stavrianos, *Lifelines from Our Past*, 79.
11. Quoted in Marc Van De Mieroop, *The Ancient Mesopotamian City* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999), 42.