

Introduction¹

MOGENS HERMAN HANSEN

The present volume is a supplement to *A Comparative Study of Thirty City-State Cultures. An Investigation Conducted by the Copenhagen Polis Centre* (Copenhagen 2000). The investigation mentioned in the title goes back to a Research Programme submitted to the Danish National Research Foundation in 1991 in which I coined the concept of city-state culture and suggested a preliminary description.² The programme listed a dozen examples of city-state cultures plus half a dozen civilisations which ought to be further studied before one could determine whether they were city-state cultures in the sense suggested in the research programme. The investigation culminated in a large international symposium on city-state cultures in world history, held in Copenhagen in January 1999, and in the publication of its acts in 2000, entitled *A Comparative Study of Thirty City-State Cultures*, hereafter abbreviated *30 CSC*.³ In that volume a much refined description of the concepts of city-state and city-state culture (*30 CSC* 16-19) is based on thirty-four case studies of individual civilisations, of which thirty seem to have had a system of political organisation and a degree of urbanisation that meet a sufficient number of the criteria used to describe the concepts of city-state and city-state culture (*30 CSC* 22).

In the introduction to the volume I admit that “it is most unlikely that I have succeeded in finding all examples of this peculiar form of state formation. I have to confess ignorance of how many more examples I could have found by reading deeper into the historical literature. And I am equally ignorant of how many more can be found by historians, archaeologists and anthropologists who happen to be persuaded by the present volume and become convinced that its key concepts can reasonably be applied to other civilisations not yet studied from this particular point of view” (*30 CSC* 25).

As is apparent from this quote and from the publication of the present volume, it is the aim of the Polis Centre to spot and describe all identifiable city-state cultures in world history. We do not know how many city-state cultures there have been, and we have to admit that there must have been a number of city-state

cultures which can no longer be identified. If, in a region, we have ancient remains of a number of urban centres, but no decipherable written record and no other symbolic source material testifying to political organisation, we are unable to make any inference about the political structure. The region may have been a macro-state with multiple urban centres, or each city may have been the urban centre of a city-state. In such cases we shall never know. One example is Middle Bronze Age Crete. There is no longer any doubt that each of the palaces was the centre of an urban settlement;⁴ but it is still a moot point whether Crete during the New Palace Period was one state with, probably, five major urban centres, or was carved up into five micro-states, each composed of a town centred on a palace and its immediate hinterland.⁵ The decipherment of the Linear A script may solve the problem, but the number of preserved tablets is so small that the script may defy decipherment. A number of identical clay sealings found all over central and eastern Crete may favour the view that there was one Cretan state governed from Knossos,⁶ but not necessarily;⁷ and there are no other symbolic sources which allow us to make a choice between the two scenarios outlined above.⁸

In other cases new excavations and the ongoing decipherment of recently found documents may provide us with solid evidence of yet another city-state culture, although it is too early to be certain. One such example is the Early Bronze Age settlements found in northern Syria. In upper Mesopotamia, in the eastern part of modern Syria, there is a plethora of fairly large circular tells, each surrounded by the remains of an even larger circular fortification wall. In recent years some of them have been excavated and von Oppenheim, who excavated one and surveyed several others, coined the term *Kranzhügel* to describe such a tell and the term *Kranzhügelkultur* to describe the civilisation responsible for the settlements. It flourished in the first half of the 3rd millennium B.C. but all the settlements suffered a decline ca. 2300 B.C. and several seem to have been abandoned. Three of the best known sites are Tell Beydar (ancient Nagada),

Tell Brak (ancient Nagar) and Tell Chuera (Bretschneider [2000]). The sites can reasonably be described as fortified towns centred on a palace, but were they city-states or towns of a larger territorial state? In 1994-95 the excavation of Nagada brought to light 170 tablets inscribed with a Sumerian cuneiform script but in a Semitic language. They are not yet fully deciphered, but one text mentions the king of Nagar who apparently ruled Nagada ca. 2350 B.C. (Bretschneider [2000] 66-67). This piece of evidence points to a macro-state with several urban centres all ruled by the same king. But we cannot preclude the possibility that Nagada was a former city-state now conquered by Nagar, or that it was still a dependent city-state dominated by Nagar.⁹ Only future discoveries can shed light on the issue.

A third scenario emerges when the little written evidence we have seems to be contradicted by the archaeological evidence. One example is the history of the Medes in the 7th century B.C. According to Herodotus there was a large Median state ruled by a dynasty of kings, and the names of two of the kings appear in Babylonian chronicles. But the three major excavated sites of the 7th century seem to have been urban centres each ruled by a local dynast.¹⁰ The Medes may have been organised into city-states before they were unified into a large state centred on Ekbatana (modern Hamadan).

The Six City-State Cultures Described in this Volume

In addition to unidentifiable city-state cultures and city-state cultures that may be properly identified in future, there are some which were not included in *30 CSC* although the available sources suffice for at least a preliminary description. Since the publication of *30 CSC* in 2000 I have become aware of four such civilisations: (a) one in northern Syria in the Neo-Hittite period (ca. 1200-700 B.C.), (b) one in Lykia in southwest Asia Minor in the Dynastic period (ca. 540-360 B.C.), (c) one in the Bènizàa region in Mesoamerica in the Post-Classic period (ca. 800-1500), and (d) one in Nepal in the years 1480-1768. For reasons explained below I decided to add to these four contributions two contributions about civilisations already treated in *30 CSC*, viz. (e) one about the Sumerian city-states, and (f) one about the German city-states. Let me start with a presentation of each of the six chapters and the scholars who kindly accepted my invitation to write them for this publication.

(a) All scholars seem to agree that the Hittite state

developed into an empire ruled from Hattusa. But the Hittite kings were not absolute monarchs in full control of the government of all the provinces. There is a great number of surviving vassal-treaties, each defining the relations between the Great King in Hattusa and a vassal king ruling one of the subject provinces. The treaties show that many provinces were allowed a considerable amount of self-government.¹¹ They were, in a sense, member states rather than just provinces. In modern accounts of the Hittite state these vassal states are never described as being city-states. It may be suggested that some of them, e.g. Ugarit and Karkamis, were dependent city-states, but it would be grossly misleading to describe the Hittite state as a city-state empire, like that of the Romans or that of the Aztecs, i.e. an overarching power structure centred on a capital and ruling a large number of dependent city-states.

Historians agree on the absence of city-states during the Hittite period, but many scholars are also in agreement about the view that Anatolia and northern Syria were carved up into city-states in the Old Assyrian period before the Hittites (ca. 2000-1800 B.C.)¹² and again in the period that followed the break-up of the Hittite empire (ca. 1200-700 B.C.).¹³ As explained in *30 CSC* I have doubts about the justification of applying the concepts of city-state and city-state culture to Anatolia around 2000 B.C. (*30 CSC* 23), but I find it attractive to describe northern Syria in the Neo-Hittite period as a city-state culture. The obvious person to ask to write that chapter was Ingolf Thuesen, the author of the chapter about the Syrian city-states in *30 CSC*.¹⁴ In the opening of his new chapter Thuesen suggests that, like western Syria, northern Syria may have passed through a consecutive series of city-state cultures of which the Neo-Hittite phase is the only one sufficiently attested to allow of a proper description. A corollary of this view is that the *Kranzhügelkultur* (mentioned *supra* 7) may have been one of the earlier phases and I shall not be surprised if a future supplement volume will include a description of the *Kranzhügelkultur*.

(b) In 1998 Professor F. Kolb of Tübingen University visited the University of Copenhagen. His team has conducted an impressive survey in central Lykia of the town of Kyaneai and its territory. His lecture was a fascinating account of many of the indigenous aspects of Lykian culture, and in the discussion I suggested that it might be a good idea to distinguish an earlier Lykian indigenous city-state culture from a later city-state culture in the Hellenistic period when the Lykian towns had developed into Greek *poleis*.

This volume is the place for such an investigation. Through Jan Zahle, the Danish specialist on Ancient Lykia, I established contact with the Austrian archaeologist Thomas Marksteiner. He accepted my challenge and wrote the present chapter about the indigenous Lykian city-state culture. His contribution is a magisterial survey of the archaeological evidence of urbanisation during the Dynastic period (ca. 540-360 B.C.). Furthermore, he argues persuasively that it would be a mistake to analyse the early Lykian towns as Hellenic *poleis*. However, describing himself as an archaeologist specialising in *Bauforschung*, he desisted from an analysis of the political aspects of the Lykian city-state culture and left that to me. My introduction to his contribution is therefore going to be much longer than my short presentation of the other five city-state cultures.

Lykia is the coastal region of south-western Anatolia lying between Karia to the west and Pamphylia to the east.¹⁵ The Lykian people are known especially from their characteristic sepulchral monuments, from their coins, and from inscriptions in the Lykian language, an Anatolian Indo-European language, attested in some 200 inscriptions written in an alphabet related to the Greek and presumably derived from it.¹⁶

If we omit the pre-Persian period, the history of Lykia is conveniently subdivided into three periods: (a) the Dynastic period from the conquest of Lykia by the Persians in the 540s to ca. 360 when Lykian dynasts disappear from the sources; (b) the Hekatomnid period ca. 360-334 when Lykia was under Karian domination exercised by the Hekatomnids, the family of Karian rulers who in their capacity of Persian satraps ruled all of Karia and Lykia; and (c) the Hellenistic period from Alexander's conquest of Asia Minor in 334 onwards.

In the course of the Hellenistic period the Lykians became completely Hellenised; the urban centres developed into Greek *poleis*, and in the 2nd and 1st centuries B.C. twenty-three Lykian *poleis* formed a federation, mentioned by Montesquieu in *De l'esprit des lois* alongside the Dutch cities as the prototype of a federal state composed of urbanised micro-states.¹⁷

Hellenistic Lykia became an integral part of the Hellenic city-state culture, but what about Lykia in the Dynastic period? was the region urbanised? and if so, were the towns just central places in the social and economic sense, or were they political centres as well? and if so, were they organised like a Greek *polis*?

Some of the urban centres in Lykia can be traced back to the Archaic period, but then the settlements

were much too small to be proper towns. A not insignificant urbanisation seems to have taken place in the course of the Classical period, starting in the first half of the 5th century.¹⁸ The main centres, principally known from excavations and surveys, are: Xanthos, Limyra, Telmessos, Myra(?) and the site of Avşar Tepesi (probably to be identified with Lykian Zagaba). All these settlements were fortified; their walls enclosed an area of between 10 and 25 ha. All seem to have been inhabited by some 1,000-1,500 persons, and in Xanthos perhaps as many as 2,500. There may have been more urban settlements of the same type and size. Tlos, Pinara, Phellos and Apollonia were important dynastic centres too, but the sites have not yet been surveyed or excavated.¹⁹ The differentiated nature of the remains found in the five known settlements indicates that, in spite of their small size, they can all be regarded as proper towns or cities in the historical sense of these terms. On the other hand, there is no evidence that the Lykian towns of the Dynastic period were copies of Greek towns. The German excavations of Avşar Tepesi, for example, show that it was an indigenous Lykian town that was deserted in the mid 4th century; the population was probably moved to Kyaneai, the nearby dynastic centre which in the Hellenistic period became a proper Greek *polis*.²⁰ The conclusion seems to be that Lykia was urbanised before it was Hellenised. In addition to the towns, the Lykian landscape was dotted with small fortified hill-top settlements.²¹

The political organisation of Lykia is still enigmatic and the following account is little more than a sketch. After the Persian conquest in the 540s Lykia was part of a satrapy and under the suzerainty of the Achaimenid kings (Herodotos 3.90.1). But like many other subjects of the Persian empire the Lykians seem to have enjoyed a considerable degree of autonomy.²² The oldest coins, struck on the so-called middle standard, point to some regional political co-operation;²³ but Lykia was not a unified political entity settled with towns which were only economic and administrative centres. The region was presumably split up into a number of small polities, each ruled by a "dynast", a term not attested in any source dealing with Lykia, but conventionally used by modern historians to describe the Lykian rulers. In Lykian inscriptions the only equivalent term found is *khñtawata*, a noun which probably means "authority" or "rule".²⁴ The centre of a polity was either a fortified hill-top settlement or a town, and the towns of Xanthos, Limyra, Telmessos, Myra and Avşar Tepesi are known to have been residences of local dynasts.

Our sources for the Lykian dynasts are (a) literary sources, (b) inscriptions, (c) tombs, and (d) coins. (a) There are a few scattered references to Lykian rulers in classical Greek authors;²⁵ (b) the Lykian inscriptions provide us with the names of half a score of dynasts.²⁶ (c) Dynasts seem to have been buried in pillar tombs or heroa, of which altogether some 40 are known today.²⁷ (d) The coins are by far the most important source for the simultaneous existence of a plurality of polities. The names of some 50 dynasts are attested on coins struck by some 12 different mints.²⁸ Given that these coins span a period of ca. 120 years, the numismatic evidence supports the view that the dynasts were actually rulers and not just members of an aristocracy,²⁹ and this view is corroborated by the small number of tombs of dynasts. All the towns mentioned above seem to have had a mint, and the names of the towns are often found on the coins, usually alongside the name of the dynast who issued the coin and, obviously, ruled the town.³⁰

We have no precise information about the powers of the dynast. From some sources we can infer that he was commander-in-chief of the armed forces,³¹ and from this information combined with the coins it is a qualified guess that a dynast had legislative and judicial powers as well. The coins also show that a dynast of a major town could strike coins in several different towns. Thus, Kuprilli of Xanthos had coins with his name struck in all the major Lykian mints in the period ca. 470-430, and he must have been the ruler of Lykia for several decades.³² In the period ca. 380-360 Perikles of Limyra set himself up as the ruler of eastern Lykia and struck coins in several places on the east Lykian heavy standard.³³ But the coins show also that the plurality of mints and dynasts persisted to the end of the Dynastic period.³⁴

The Lykian towns seem to have been political centres of micro-states, sometimes independent, sometimes hierarchically organised and ruled by a leading dynast. These micro-states have been interpreted by some scholars as *poleis*, and the process of Hellenisation has been retrojected from the Hekatomnid and Hellenistic periods back into the Dynastic period.³⁵ However, recent research has demonstrated that there is no support in the sources for such an interpretation.³⁶ There is no evidence that any of the towns was a citizen community or had magistrates or a council as virtually any *polis* had. There is no trace of a *prytaneion* or a *bouleuterion*, or a theatre or a stoa,³⁷ all characteristic of the Greek *polis*, whereas remains have been found of what was probably the residence of the local dynast;³⁸ again by contrast with

the *polis* where no remains of a “palace” can be found before the Hellenistic period, not even in *poleis* governed by a tyrant.³⁹ Nor were there any monumental temples, another characteristic of the *polis*. Admittedly, the style of the coins betrays some Greek influence, but all legends are in the Lykian language and alphabet.⁴⁰ There are very few inscriptions in Greek from the Dynastic period, and most of those found are bilingual (with similar texts in Lykian and in Greek) or even trilingual (with Aramaic as the third language).⁴¹

It is undoubtedly true that the Lykian cities of the Dynastic period were not *poleis*. But Lykia may still have been a city-state culture, i.e. a network of micro-states, most of them with a (small) town as the economic, religious, social and political centre. The name of the town seems to be the same as the name of the state. Thus, Ar̄na (Greek: Xanthos) and Z̄muri (Greek: Limyra) were the names of urban centres and of polities ruled by dynasts.⁴² Whenever that happens it is an indication that the region is organised into city-states.⁴³ In world history the majority of the attested city-states have been ruled by dynasts and kings.⁴⁴ To have city-states organised as citizen communities is a prominent feature of some city-state cultures, but it is far from ubiquitous.⁴⁵ Another feature characteristic of city-state cultures is the oscillation between periods in which all of Lykia or part of Lykia was under one dynast, typically the dynast of Xanthos perhaps representing the King of Persia,⁴⁶ and periods in which Lykia was divided among many dynasts. In most city state cultures “none of the city-states is so powerful that it can conquer all the others and transform the region into one political unit”.⁴⁷

Instead of asking the question: were the Lykian polities of the Dynastic period *poleis* testifying to an early Greek influence in Lykia? one should ask the question: were they city-states? The important studies in recent years by i.a. Kolb, Domingo-Gygax, Marksteiner and several others indicate that, in the Dynastic period, there may well have been an indigenous Lykian city-state culture based on local Anatolian traditions, and Karian and Achaimenid influence may have been as important or even more important than the Hellenic impact on Lykian civilisation.⁴⁸ Hellenisation gathered momentum in the Hekatomnid period, and in the Hellenistic period the indigenous city-states were transformed into *poleis* which eventually formed a federation like that of the Achaian or Aitolian *poleis*.

(c) Whereas – so far – no city-states have been found in North America and South America, Meso-

america seems for long periods to have been a patchwork of city-state cultures. The three best known are described in *30 CSC*, viz. the Maya (by Nikolai Grube), the Mixtec (by Michael Lind) and the Aztec (by Michael Smith). But, as already pointed out by Lind (578) and Smith (592-93), there were probably several others. Only, they are fairly unknown and have attracted so little attention that a proper account must await future research. There is, however, one exception: the Bènizàa who in the Post-Classic period lived in what can reasonably be described as city-states. In 2000 Michel Oudijk, one of the leading specialists on the Bènizàa region, was appointed lecturer in religious studies at Copenhagen University, and only a fortnight after his arrival in Copenhagen he accepted my invitation to join the team and write an account of the Zapotec city-state culture. He prefers to call it the Bènizàa city-state culture and I shall hereafter adopt his terminology.

(d) From ca. A.D. 1200 the Kathmandu valley in Nepal was ruled by the so-called Malla dynasty. The history of the dynasty is conveniently subdivided into two periods: from ca. 1200 to 1482 all of the valley was ruled by a succession of kings, but when Yakṣa Malla died in 1482, his kingdom was divided among his three sons, and for the next three centuries the valley was split up into three minute kingdoms, each centred on a fortified city: Lalitpur, Kathmandu and Bhaktapur. In 1768-69 the Malla dynasty was overthrown by the Gurkhas under Prithvi Narayan Shah and the three small kingdoms became part of Nepal. The Kathmandu valley covers some 550 km², and the three Malla kingdoms constitute the smallest city-state culture so far attested, but there seems to be no doubt that it was, essentially, a city-state culture and thus deserves a full description in this context, written by Professor Gérard Toffin who works in the leading centre in Europe for the study of the history of Nepal: the Centre André-Georges Haudricourt, Centre d'études himalayennes, CNRS.

The two remaining contributions are about city-state cultures which have already had a full chapter in *30 CSC*: viz. the Sumerian and the German city-states.

(e) Planning the 1999 symposium about city-state cultures, I entrusted the chapter about the Sumerian city-states to the eminent professor Jean-Jacques Glassner. At the symposium it turned out that, in opposition to the great majority of his colleagues, he denied that the concept of city-state was of any value at all in an analysis of the Sumerian micro-states. Like Fineman and Marcus, he argued that "city-state" was just the modern historians' synonym for the ancient

Greek *polis*.⁴⁹ He refused to acknowledge any difference between the modern heuristic concept of city-state and the ancient Greek concept of *polis*; and he suggested that the concept of city-state be restricted to an analysis of the *polis* and, accordingly, avoided in a study of the Mesopotamian polities, which he preferred to call micro-states (*petits états*).

It is always a refreshing challenge to have the Devil's advocate in a team of scholars; and it is not at all bad in the *Comparative Study of Thirty City-State Cultures* to have one chapter which openly contests the value of the methodology and the model on which the volume is based. But in this case the result has also been that the readers of the book are left with a highly personal account of the Sumerian civilisation, and without any information about the prevailing interpretation of the political structure of Babylonia in the late fourth and third millennia B.C. In almost all other accounts of the Sumerians their polities are described as city-states (*30 CSC* 31 n. 93); and several anthropologists have even preferred the Sumerian polities to the Greek *poleis* or the Italian *città* as the best model for what a city-state is.⁵⁰ Furthermore, in the chapters of *30 CSC* about the city-state of Assur and the Syrian city-states, the existence of Sumerian city-states is taken for granted and not even problematised.⁵¹

Therefore, to balance Glassner's chapter in *30 CSC* I invited Aage Westenholz of the Carsten Niebuhr Institute to submit for this volume an alternative interpretation based on the assumption that the Sumerian polities were city-states, i.e. self-governing micro-states, each composed of one major urban centre with its immediate hinterland, often dotted with sanctuaries and second-order settlements, so that all of Babylonia constituted a city-state culture composed of a network of some 25-50 such city-states. Westenholz is as eminent an expert as Glassner; as in the previous volume I believe that the city-state model does fit the Sumerian civilisation (*30 CSC* 20); but with two opposed interpretations it is up to the readers to study both and make up their minds for themselves.

(f) The reason for having a new chapter about the German city-states is different. The author of the chapter in *30 CSC* is Professor Peter Johanek, the head of the *Institut für vergleichende Städtegeschichte* in Münster.⁵² He argues judiciously that no clear line can be drawn between, on the one hand, the imperial and free towns and, on the other hand, the territorial towns. The former were presumably city-states, by contrast with the latter who recognised a prince or a bishop as their lord. Nevertheless, some of the territorial towns enjoyed more autonomy than some of the

imperial towns. So Johaneck finds it problematic to apply the concept of city-state to the mediaeval and Early Modern German towns, especially since the imperial towns lay scattered between bishoprics and principalities and did not form a network that can reasonably be described as a “city-state culture”. The largest network of towns in Germany was the Hanseatic League, which was dominated by territorial towns and had only a few large Imperial towns among its members. Only in Switzerland, the southernmost part of mediaeval Germany, did a proper city-state culture emerge in the course of the Middle Ages, as described by Martina Stercken in *30 CSC*.

Much of Johaneck’s chapter is about northern Germany, but by far the majority of the imperial and free towns were to be found in southern Germany.⁵³ In Swabia, Franconia and Thuringia there were in fact clusters of imperial cities, and, for shorter or longer periods, they did form leagues (briefly mentioned in *30 CSC* 23). So, moving the focus from North to South Germany one might perhaps find evidence of what can be described as a city-state culture, comparable to those in Switzerland and northern Italy. The scholar who undertook to write this chapter was the Finnish historian Björn Forsén. He has been affiliated with the Polis Centre in connection with the Centre’s study of the Greek *polis* and my endeavour to find someone who could write about the south German city-states matched his plan to conduct comparative investigations of ancient and Mediaeval city-states.

The Concept of City-State Culture

I believe that each of the six civilisations described in this volume meets a sufficient number of the criteria set out in *30 CSC* 16-17 as characteristics of a city-state culture. As explained in the final chapter of that volume, the method we use in our study of the concept of city-state culture and the civilisations described as city-state cultures involves a constant oscillation between the intension and extension of this concept, or, to put it differently: between the concept itself and its denotata (*30 CSC* 597, 600-01). One can therefore turn the investigation upside down and examine to what extent the descriptions of these six civilisations can shed more light on the concept of city-state culture.

Emergence. “City-state cultures emerge in one of the three following ways: (a) In a period of demographic and economic upsurge, urbanisation and state formation take place simultaneously or in close sequence. The city-state period is preceded by a pre-

state period. The formation of city-states is gradual and often imperceptible. (b) Colonisation of a region takes the form of the foundation of a number of city-states. (c) In a period of decline, an urbanised macro-state disintegrates in such a way that each of its major urban centres becomes a city-state” (*30 CSC* 16-17). The six civilisations studied in this volume induce me to treat the three possibilities in the reverse order. Four of the city-state cultures owe their origin to the collapse of a macro-state, colonisation is an additional factor in one of these civilisations, and in one case the city-states arose gradually after a pre-state period.

It is still a moot point how and when the Sumerian city-state culture emerged but, as pointed out by Westenholz, “it is possible that, around 3200 to 3000 B.C., there was an integrated territorial state in Babylonia, with Uruk as its capital, and that the later Sumerian city-state culture was but the decayed remains of that state” (*infra* 23).

There is no doubt that the emergence of the Neo-Hittite city-state culture in north Syria was a direct result of the collapse of the Hittite empire ca. 1200 B.C. (*infra* 44-45).

In Mesoamerica the Bènzàa city-state culture grew up in the 9th century A.D. following the fall in ca. 800 of Monte Albán, the urban centre and seat of the rulers of the Bèngolazàa state (*infra* 75, 87).

The city-state culture in the Kathmandu valley emerged by King Yakṣa Malla’s decision in A.D. 1482 to divide his small kingdom among his three sons so that each became the ruler of a micro-state centred on a town (*infra* 108).

The Bènzàa city-state culture emerged in the 9th century A.D. in the Valley of Oaxaca after the fall of Monte Albán. But in the second half of the 15th century there were large-scale migrations from the Valley of Oaxaca to the Sierra Zapoteca and the Isthmus of Tehuantepec. The colonisation of the Isthmus of Tehuantepec and to a lesser degree of the Sierra Zapoteca took the form of the foundation of city-states (*infra* 79-80).

The Lykian cities and, consequently, the Lykian city-state culture developed gradually in the course of the Dynastic period and there is no evidence of any important state formation in Lykia antedating the 6th century B.C. (*infra* 69).

The south German city-state culture seems to be a case apart, and it would be unwise to force it into one of the categories: “There was no single way in which the city-states of central Europe acquired their free status: indeed almost every one did so in a slightly different manner.”⁵⁴

To the four new examples of city-state cultures emerging by devolution rather than evolution must be added the six examples recorded in *30 CSC*;⁵⁵ it can be argued that the north Italian city-states constitute a seventh example.⁵⁶ These eleven attestations are sufficient, I think, to disprove a common evolutionist model which still has many adherents. It is held that early cities were all city-states and that the territorial state dotted with cities is a later phase of a universal development. The fact that urbanisation and state formation were usually co-eval (*30 CSC* 15) has led to the theory that a pre-state phase is commonly followed by a city-state phase which again leads to the formation of a territorial state.⁵⁷ I believe that the civilisations studied in *30 CSC* and in this supplement disprove the model: there are many states which emerged as macro-states without passing through a city-state phase, and there are many city-state cultures which emerged in consequence of the disintegration of an earlier macro-state.

Disappearance. “A city-state culture ceases to exist either (a) by the (temporary) disappearance of the urban centres which, of course, is associated with the disappearance of the political structure of the cities as well; or (b), the city-state culture disappears by being conquered by a neighbouring Great Power: the city-states are transformed into cities, sometimes abruptly, but sometimes the city-states are allowed to persist for some time, and the transformation from city-states to cities is slow and almost imperceptible” (*30 CSC* 17). Five of the six city-state cultures examined here disappeared by being conquered by neighbours:

The Sumerian city-states of the early Dynastic period were conquered by Sargon of Akkade ca. 2330 and turned into municipalities of the macro-state he created (*infra* 38).

The Neo-Hittite city-states were conquered by Sargon II (721-705) and incorporated into the Assyrian empire (*infra* 54).

The Lykian dynasts disappeared ca. 360 B.C. when Lykia came under Karian rule (*supra* 9).

The Bènzàa city-states were subjected by the Spaniards in 1521; they were allowed to persist as dependent city-states for some generations, but by ca. 1600 they had become units of the Spanish colonial administration (*infra* 75-76).

The three small kingdoms in the Kathmandu valley were overrun by the Gurkhas in 1768-69 and incorporated into Nepal (*infra* 107-08).

Again, the south German city-states are a case apart: in form they persisted until the dissolution of

the Holy Roman Empire in 1806 but in fact they had lost most of their self-government long before (*infra* 98, 101).

Clusters of city-state cultures. The civilisations studied in *30 CSC* show that city-state cultures tend to appear in clusters: the most conspicuous are found (a) in the Fertile Crescent in the Near East, (b) in Mediterranean and Central Europe, (c) in Mesoamerica, and (d) in West Africa (*30 CSC* 17). The city-state cultures studied in this volume fit into the picture. The Sumerian, north Syrian and Lykian city-state cultures belong with the west Syrian, Palestinian, Assyrian, Phoenician, Neo-Babylonian and Philistine city-state cultures (*30 CSC* 35-139). The south German city-states lie next to the Swiss and the north Italian (*30 CSC* 30 n. 74; 277-342), and the Bènzàa city-states constitute the fourth attested city-state culture in Mesoamerica alongside the Maya, the Mixtec and the Aztec city-states (*30 CSC* 547-95). Nepal is different, but perhaps just a harbinger indicating that other city-state cultures may be found in this part of Asia. In *30 CSC* Dilip Chakrabarti rejected the Indus civilisation (ca. 2600-1900 B.C.) and the Mahajanapadas (ca. 600-300 B.C.) as proper examples of city-state cultures.⁵⁸ He added, however, that India has had a long tradition of political fragmentation. Scores of the fortified urban settlements found in the Indus valley may have been city-states and not just second-order settlements in the territories of four large states: Harappa, Mohenjodaro, Ganweriwala and Rakhigarhi (*30 CSC* 375-76). If so, the Indus civilisation may after all have been a city-state culture composed of scores of city-states, and there may have been other city-state cultures not yet discovered and described.

Cycles of city-states. “In some cases a region is split up into city-states only once in history, but there are examples of regions which at least twice and sometimes three or four times in world history have been a city-state culture” (*30 CSC* 17).⁵⁹

Westenholz’ paper is focused the Sumerian city-states in the Early Dynastic period, but there is evidence of no less than three later phases of city-state organisation: (1) in the fairly short period between the breakdown of Sargon’s and Naramsin’s empire and the emergence of the Third Dynasty of Ur (ca. 2150-2100), (2) during the Isin-Larsa period after the fall of Ur (ca. 2000-1800), (3) during the Early Neo-Babylonian period after the Kassite dynasty in Babylon had been deposed by Elamite tribes and until the Assyrian conquest of Babylonia in the mid 8th century (ca. 1100-750).⁶⁰

Future studies may show that the Neo-Hittite city-

state culture of the Iron Age was preceded by a city-state culture in the early Bronze Age, viz., the *Kranzhügelkultur* dating from ca. 2800-2300 B.C. (*supra* 7-8).

The indigenous Lykian city-state culture of the Dynastic period (ca. 540-360) was followed by the Hellenic city-state culture of the Hellenistic period inaugurated by Alexander's conquest in 334. In this case the transition from one city-state phase to the next one was gradual, and one can speak of an overlap in the Hekatomnid period (ca. 360-334) with its much more intensive process of Hellenisation (*infra* 69-70).

Germany and Nepal belong with the civilisations which only once in history were organised into city-states. Ignorance of the early history of the Bènzàa region forces us to suspend judgement (*infra* 73).

Names of city-states. In a city-state culture the name of the state is almost invariably identical with the name of its urban centre, whereas in macro-states the name of the state is different from the name of its capital and usually denotes the territory, i.e. the whole country dotted with a number of urban centres (30 CSC 18 with n. 80).

In Sumerian sources toponyms such as Uruk, Umma, Nippur, and Shuruppak sometimes denote a polity and sometimes its main urban centre.⁶¹ Karkamis and Hamath are names of Neo-Hittite states as well as of cities (*infra* 46, 51). The names of Lykian towns, e.g. Arñna (Greek: Xanthos) and Zêmuri (Greek: Limyra), are found on coins where they seem to denote the community rather than just its urban centre (*supra* 10). Zaachila and Tehuatepec are the designations of Bènzàa towns as well as of the city-states ruled from these urban centres (*infra* 80). Rothenburg and Dinkelsbühl were walled towns but also imperial cities which had joined the Swabian League (*infra* 95). The three petty kingdoms in the Kathmandu valley were named after their capitals: Lalitpur, Bhaktapur and Kathmandu (*infra* 108).

Dependent city-states. The city-states of a city-state culture are not necessarily independent peer polities, but can be hierarchically organised systems of polities, of which some are hegemonic, some independent, and some dependencies. Dependent city-states are self-governing communities which usually have to pay tribute and provide troops to a neighbouring overlord, or a hegemonic city-state within the region, or a central government in regions in which the city-states were united in a federation (30 CSC 17). Five of the six city-state cultures described in this volume testify to the existence of dependent city-states.

Wars between the Sumerian city-states are attested throughout the Early Dynastic period, and for shorter periods Lagash, Umma, Ur and Uruk succeeded in dominating some of the neighbouring city-states (*infra* 33, 36). However, the Sumerian city-states seem not normally to have attempted a full incorporation of the city-states they conquered but allowed them to persist as dependent city-states; sometimes they regained their independence when the city-state to which they belonged lost its hegemonic position.

During the 9th and 8th centuries the Neo-Hittite city-states often had to pay tribute to the Assyrians and can therefore in this final phase be seen as dependent city-states (*infra* 49, 54).

The Lykian city-states of the Dynastic period were under the suzerainty of the Persian King and formed part of the satrapy of Lydia (*supra* 9).

In the Bènzàa region in Mesoamerica each of the major city-states seems to have ruled a number of dependent city-states. In the mid 13th century Zaachila was the hegemonic city-state in the Valley of Oaxaca; and two centuries later the isthmus of Tehuatepec was dominated by the city-state of Tehuatepec. It controlled a number of dependent city-states in the Isthmus itself and even succeeded in turning six of city-states in the Valley of Oaxaca into tributary dependencies (*infra* 83).

The south German Reichsstädte were self-governing polities but still part of the Holy Roman Empire and ruled by the emperor (*infra* 98).

Leagues and federations. Related to the existence of dependent city-states is the inclination to form leagues and federations. A city-state is by nature a micro-state, and a city-state culture consisting of disconnected city-states has always been an easy prey to larger neighbours. At the same time the wish to remain city-states seems to have prevailed in all city-state cultures, and the obvious compromise was to form alliances which sometimes took the form of a league, but often developed into a confederation or even into a federal state in the full sense (30 CSC 17, 612-13). The importance of leagues and federations is attested in four of the six city-state cultures described in this volume.

The so-called Sumerian kinglist of ca. 2000 B.C. testifies to some kind of council in which most of the Sumerian city-states were represented. It was headed by the leader of one of the city-states, and the hegemonic position passed from city-state to city-state (*infra* 32). Furthermore, each city-state had its own patron divinity, but the Sumerian gods formed a Pantheon with Enlil of Nippur as the principal god

(*infra* 35). Thus, the oldest of all city-state cultures is also the first to provide us with information about formalised co-operation between the city-states.

The oldest Lykian coins were issued by different dynasts but all were struck on the so-called middle standard, and almost all had the triskeles on the reverse. It is tempting to assume some co-operation between all or most of the dynasts;⁶² but we do not know whether it took the form of a league or a federation.⁶³ That it did not last is indicated by the later coins, which were struck on either the light west Lykian or the heavy east Lykian standard and with a plurality of reverse types.

In the second half of the 14th century the ruler of Zaachila formed a federation of Bènizàa city-states, but two Mixtec city-states became members as well. The members paid tribute and provided contingents to the federal army but continued to be politically and administratively autonomous (*infra* 85-86).

In the course of the 14th century the south German cities formed a number of successive leagues which, by contrast with the Hanseatic League in the north, consisted of imperial and free cities only. The largest was the Swabian League, which in 1485 had 40 members and in the same years it concluded an alliance with a league of imperial and free cities along the Rhine and with the major Swiss cities. Together the three leagues constituted a network of 59 free and imperial cities (*infra* 95). The apogee of the leagues was reached in the early 15th century. Soon after, the two German ones lost their importance whereas the Swiss developed into a fully fledged city-state culture.

Urbanisation. While Max Weber's functional description of "the city" (*die Stadt*) is still largely valid,⁶⁴ the restriction of this *Idealtypus* to the western world has been one of the main obstacles to the recognition that city-states and city-state cultures have existed outside Europe and the Near East.⁶⁵ If the city-state is a micro-state centred on a city, and if there have been no cities outside the western cultural sphere, the early micro-states attested in other continents cannot have been city-states. According to Weber a true city had to be a *Stadtgemeinde*, and *die Stadt des Okzidents* was in his opinion the only *Stadtgemeinde* in the true sense. In Weber the counterpart of the true western city was the Asian or oriental city.⁶⁶ As in Burckhardt's work⁶⁷ the opposition between western freedom and oriental despotism can be discerned behind the two types of city.⁶⁸ But the opposition between the western and the oriental city has been made obsolete by modern archaeological, anthropological and historical research and "nobody

should need any longer a type or model of the 'Oriental' city as opposed to the western city, since this type was the product of a Euro-centric view and a colonialist attitude."⁶⁹ Thus, there is no longer any reason to question the application of the terms town and/or city⁷⁰ to the Sumerian, Neo-Hittite, Lykian, or Kathmandu valley urban centres. They all fit Weber's ideal type, which he constructed from a study of the mediaeval cities north of the Alps, i.e. the towns of the Holy Roman Empire, cf. n. 66 *supra*.

The problematical civilisation in this context is the Mesoamerican, i.e. the Bènizàa city-state culture in the Post-Classic period. There is no discussion in Weber of indigenous African or American urban settlements.⁷¹ Excavations, historical studies and fieldwork have provided us with a rich literature about African urbanism,⁷² and no less than seven African city-state cultures are included in *30 CSC*.⁷³ Again, during the last two generations the numerous studies of urbanism in pre-Columbian America have revolutionised our understanding of American society before the Spanish colonisation, and it is especially the Mesoamerican city which has been in focus.⁷⁴ Recognition of the nucleated settlements as proper cities rather than ceremonial centres was long obscured by the contrast between the monumental stone architecture and the ephemeral character of habitations built of perishable materials.⁷⁵ Furthermore, the open texture of the centres raised doubt about whether they were nucleated settlements at all. The Maya cities had, on average, 6-10 inhabitants per ha and that is very different from the towns of ancient and mediaeval Europe where a density of 150-250 inhabitants per ha is frequently attested.⁷⁶ On the other hand, even in Mesoamerica there is a marked difference between nucleated and dispersed settlement, and the nucleated settlements seem to have been towns in the functional sense: they were centres of trade, they gave rise to a considerable division of labour and specialisation of function, and they were genuine *Zentralorte* not only in the economic but also in the social and political sense.

A different set of problems concerns the relation between centre and hinterland, and between the urban and the political aspects of the town or city. In a valuable discussion of the nature of the Mesoamerican city, Joyce Marcus points out some essential differences between the western and the Indian view of the city. The western city is defined "on the basis of such variables as population size, percentage of population not engaged in extractive subsistence activities, or presence of public institutions ..." In Mesoamerican

civilisations “the term clearly referred not only to a nucleated settlement (in our terms a town or city), but also to its ruler, its inhabitants, and the territory ruled, including outlying dependencies and landholdings” (Marcus [2000] 54-55). Marcus shows that this view of the city was held by the Aztecs, the Maya, the Mixtec and the Zapotec⁷⁷ and adds that it was shared by the Yoruba in west Africa as well. The last observation is crucial. The Yoruba was one of the west African city-state cultures.⁷⁸ The similarity between the Yoruba and the Mesoamerican concept of the city indicates that the difference is not between the western and the Mesoamerican concept of a city, but between the city in a modern macro-state and in a city-state culture. In ancient Hellas the term *polis* clearly referred not only to a nucleated settlement (in our terms a town or city), but also to its rulers (or political institutions), its inhabitants, and the territory ruled, including outlying dependencies and landholdings.⁷⁹ In mediaeval Italy *civitas* signified not only the city, but also the territory, and again the citizens united in a community, the body politic, the state.⁸⁰ In China in the Spring-and-Autumn period the most common term for state – *guo* – referred both to the state and to the capital city, and the written graph for *guo* also insisted on its urban status, for it was composed of elements representing a city wall and a weapon, later supplemented by an element indicating inhabitants.⁸¹ Thus, what Marcus identified as the Mesoamerican view of the city re-appears in city-state cultures all over the world, in west Africa, in Europe and in Asia.⁸² The difference is rather between a macro-state and a city-state view of the city.

Summing up, the six studies printed in this volume corroborate most of the features singled out in *30 CSC* as essential characteristics of a city-state culture. For further comparisons, see the general index *infra* 140.

The Weberian ideal types I have constructed and called “city-state” and “city-state culture” are modern heuristic concepts to be used by historians, archaeologists and anthropologists in their descriptions of historic civilisations. Of course, none of the peoples described called their polities “city-states” and their civilisation a “city-state culture”. Each people had their own individual perception of their own social organisation, and used their own terms. The term and the concept behind it varied from civilisation to civilisation. And in most cases the people of one civilisation were ignorant of the existence of other similar civilisations in other periods and/or in other parts of the world.⁸³ No two individual concepts were iden-

tical, nor were the polities to which the concepts referred; but they betray, I hold, a number of striking similarities, and the concepts of city-state and city-state culture are constructed by detecting and putting together these similarities. In doing this we have moved from each civilisation’s self-perception to a modern detached artificial perception of a *type of civilisation*. Our *city-state* is the generic term for what the Greeks called *polis*, the Romans *civitas*, the Chinese *guo*, the Malay *negeri*, the Yoruba *llu*, the Maya *ahawlel*, the Mixtec *yuhuitaya*, the Aztecs *altepetl*, the Zapotec *queche*, etc. – In some cases we do not know the term any longer, in other cases there may not have been a specific term. – By creating the generic concept and the equivalent term, we have moved from what today is often called the *emic* view of a civilisation to the *etic* view: while each of the individual city-state cultures is probably best described in accordance with the *emic* view, the comparison between city-state cultures necessitates the *etic* approach and, being purely heuristic concepts, city-state and city-state culture are constructed and analysed in accordance with an *etic* view. As in any other comparative study, the combination of the two approaches at different levels is inevitable.

Why City-States Existed

In the preface to *30 CSC* I invited those participants in the 1999 symposium who wanted to continue the theoretical debate about the concepts of city-state and city-state culture to submit their contributions to a forthcoming volume. So far, none of the participants has taken up the invitation, but Professor Azar Gat of Tel Aviv University has volunteered and submitted a paper in which he argues that the principal motive behind the formation of city-states was defence. His paper is a valuable contribution to the debate over the origin of city-state cultures, and I can agree with much of what he says. I note, however, that some of his examples concern cities which, in my opinion, were not city-states but urban centres of macro-states.⁸⁴ If this is so, defence was a principal motive behind urbanisation as such, not just the formation of city-states. Is there, then, some factor which in regions that eventually became city-state cultures made defence purposes a stronger incentive than in regions organised into macro-states? It seems reasonable to assume that the large number of city-states in a city-state culture results in a higher number of wars than those which occur in macro-states with many towns. Macro-states fight one another, but internally they

enjoy peace. A city-state culture suffers from war with neighbouring macro-states, but, in addition to that, it suffers from numerous wars between the city-states themselves. That is probably why nucleated settlement and defence circuits become even more important here than in macro-states.

Appendix. The Origin of the North Italian City-States

The universally accepted view is that the north Italian city-states emerged ca. 1100 and disappeared again in the course of the 14th century. What marked the beginning of the city-states was the election of consuls and the self-conscious description of cities as communes.⁸⁵ The demise of the city-state is commonly dated to ca. 1400 when princes had come to power once again and the commune was replaced by the *signoria*.⁸⁶ Thus, with the exception of some city-republics that still existed in the age of Machiavelli and even later, the city-state period in northern Italy covered the three centuries from ca. 1100 to ca. 1400.⁸⁷

According to this view the city-state is defined by its constitution: ca. 1100, in the rapidly growing urban centres, republican rule replaced the rule of a bishop or a count, but ca. 1400 republican institutions had been suppressed by a monarchical form of rule exercised by princes and tyrants. Two of the most influential general accounts in English of the Italian city-states are Daniel Waley's *The Italian City-Republics* (2nd edn 1978) and Philip Jones' *The Italian City-State from Commune to Signoria* (1997). Both titles reveal that the central aspect of the city-state is the *form* of state rather than the *type* of state. One gets the impression that only city-republics counted as city-states. But such a view has to be modified by a study of city-states in which the emphasis is on the *type* of state.

Throughout world history until the second half of the 18th century all macro-states were monarchies, but the majority of city-states were monarchies too; due to the small size of the city-state, however, quite a few became republics, i.e. states ruled by councils, and/or assemblies in which decisions were made by vote after a debate. Again, of the republican city-states the majority were aristocracies (or oligarchies), and the democratically governed city-state, though attested in a number of city-state cultures, is undoubtedly less common than the monarchical or aristocratic city-state. Thus, most city-states were monarchies, many were oligarchies, some were democracies and

the specific form of government is not an essential aspect of the concept of the city-state as such.⁸⁸ The city-state is a micro-state composed of one town with its immediate hinterland, and a city-state culture is a civilisation which, politically, is organised as a system of city-states.⁸⁹ The counterpart of a city-state is a macro-state which usually has a number of cities within its borders; they are administrative units, and one of them may be a capital; but none is in possession of self-government to such a degree that it counts as a "polity" or a "state".⁹⁰

If this model of the city-state is adopted, the history of the Italian city-states appears in a new perspective. The crucial question is not: when did the Italian commune emerge? but rather: when was northern Italy split into a large number of small political units, each consisting of a town with its immediate hinterland? This question can be split up into two: (a) when had urbanisation reached a point that would allow a town with its immediate hinterland to function as a polity? and (b) when did the ruler(s) of an Italian city acquire the powers that constitute a state, i.e. legislative and judicial powers, the right to levy taxes, strike coins, have its own army and enter into relations with other similar cities?

Re (a). There is no agreement about the re-appearance of cities in mediaeval Italy, and a long scholarly battle has been fought between two opposing groups of scholars called, respectively, "optimists" and "pessimists". The optimists emphasise continuity and believe that the ancient cities undoubtedly dwindled in the Early Middle Ages but never disappeared completely.⁹¹ The archaeological evidence, however, points to discontinuity and the available data marshalled by the pessimists are now, I think, so overwhelming that the optimists are well advised to accept what can be learned from the physical remains. The Italian towns survived during Late Antiquity until the early 7th century, but thereafter "in the hundreds of trenches excavated in towns throughout Italy the commonest, if most prosaic discovery, is not the remains of buildings but 'dark earth'... However, the era of 'dark earth' ended in the ninth century".⁹² No matter whether one follows the "optimists" or the "pessimists", there is no doubt that northern Italy became urbanised once again in the course of the 9th century, and that, alongside Spain, Italy was the most urbanised country in Europe at the beginning of the second millennium.⁹³ The question is: how were the cities governed? From the late 8th to the late 9th century northern Italy was part of the Carolingian empire; but with the death of Louis II in 875, cen-

tralised government disappeared. “nowhere, however, did state authority simply collapse into anarchy; it merely became more localised and more focused on individual cities”.⁹⁴

Re (b). Between the 9th and 11th centuries many north Italian cities were ruled by bishops. They resided in palaces in the urban centre and ruled the city assisted by an advisory *consilium*; the bishop presided over meetings of the general assembly; he was sometimes commander-in-chief of the town’s armed forces; he had judicial and legislative powers, he levied taxes and he struck coins.⁹⁵ Each episcopal city controlled the immediate hinterland of the town.⁹⁶ The bishops had acquired these powers with the support of the Carolingian rulers, and during much of the 9th century the north Italian towns were probably urban centres of the Carolingian empire rather than polities. But with the power vacuum from the late 9th century onwards, the north and central Italian bishoprics and counties became polities rather than municipalities. Furthermore, in the course of the 10th century the bishops, some 120 altogether, had the advantage of the counts, many of whom left the cities and settled in the countryside.⁹⁷ This is when the Italian city-states emerged – what happened around 1100 was not the emergence of the city-state but the emergence of the city-republic: elected consuls took over the judicial powers previously held by bishops. The Italian cities were under the suzerainty of the German king or, since 962, the emperor; but that was a matter of form both before and after 1100, and in this respect there is no difference between the 11th and the 12th centuries. Thus, the emergence of the Italian city-state should probably be pushed back some 200 years and, on this interpretation, mediaeval north Italy is yet another example of a city-state culture which emerged by the fragmentation of an urbanised macro-state into a large number of micro-states, each consisting of a town with its hinterland.⁹⁸

Again, if the type of state is in focus rather than the form of state, the demise of the Italian city-state was not caused by the transition from commune to *signoria*. It was caused by small city-states being swallowed up by the larger ones, whereby the large city-states became “territorial” states, each with a plurality of towns inside a territory that covered a five-digit number of square kilometres.⁹⁹ The two phenomena were, of course, interconnected, but the change of emphasis results in a change of analysis. The difference between the two interpretations is most apparent in the case of Venice. If one takes the opposition between republic and *signoria* to be the crucial

criterion, Venice remained a city-state until 1797.¹⁰⁰ If one prefers to emphasise the conquest of small city-states by the larger ones and the ensuing formation of territorial states, then Venice was transformed from a city-state into a territorial macro-state in the years 1404-28 when it conquered all the cities in the Veneto and acquired an urbanised territory of some 30,000 km².¹⁰¹

Notes

1. I would like to thank Prof. Michael Wörrle and Dr. Jan Zahle for reading and commenting on the section about Lykia (*infra* 8-10).
2. The Programme was published in Hansen (1994) 10-13.
3. For the symposium, see *30 CSC* 4, 9-10.
4. van Effenterre (1985) 103-13; Knappett (1999) 621-24.
5. Cherry (1986); Knappett (1999); *30 CSC* 22. According to Cherry (1986) 21, the five Cretan states were centred on Khania, Phaistos, Knossos, Mallia and Kato Zakros.
6. Hallager and Hallager (1995); Hallager (1996).
7. Cherry (1986) 26.
8. One of Cherry’s principal arguments is the analogy with the Mycenaean palaces in Greece, each of which was indisputably the centre of a polity ([1986] 24-25).
9. Bretschneider seems to believe that they were city-states (64). He may be right, but he does not provide any evidence in support of this classification.
10. Herodotos 1.95-106; the three sites are Godin Tepe, Tepe Nush-i Jan, Baba Jan. For a brief account, see Kuhrt (1995) II: 652-56.
11. Kuhrt (1995) 266-70; Macqueen (1986) 77-78.
12. Kuhrt (1995) 225-29; Macqueen (1986) 18, 75-6.
13. Kühne (1994) 59. When I wrote the introduction to *30 CSC* I listed Karkamis as an isolated city-state (19) because I had not yet realised that it belonged to a whole Neo-Hittite city-state culture.
14. I. Thuesen, “The City-State in Ancient Western Syria”, in *30 CSC* 55-65.
15. Ps.-Skylax 100; Zahle (1980) 37-49 shows that the Lykian people inhabited the region from Telmessos in the west to Gagai in the east.
16. Tombs: Zahle (1983). Coins: Mørkholm and Neumann (1978); Vismara (1989-96); Kolb and Tietz (2001). Language: Bryce (1986) 42-98.
17. Strabo 14.3.3; Larsen (1968) 240-63; Behrwald (2000).
18. See Marksteiner *infra* 63-68.
19. Wurster (1976). The ongoing Turkish excavations of Tlos and Patara have not yet been published.
20. Thomsen (2001).
21. Marksteiner, *infra* 63-64.
22. Marksteiner, *infra* 57.
23. Zahle (1989) 170-71.
24. Domingo Gygas (2001) 76. In Lykian inscriptions this term is applied to, e.g., the fourth-century dynast Perikles (Domingo Gygas [2001] 74), who in Greek sources is called “king” (*Basileus*), *SEG* 41 1282; Wörrle (1991) 206.
25. See note 31 *infra*.
26. Bryce (1986) 133-34; Keen (1998) 46-48.
27. Zahle (1983) 108; (1991) 151.

28. Kolb and Tietz (2001) 373.
29. Kolb and Tietz (2001) 373.
30. Domingo Gyax (2001) 83; Kolb and Tietz (2001) 348, 377.
31. *TAM* 1.104.b.2-3; Herodotos 7.98; Theopompos (*FGrHist* 115) fr. 103.17; *SEG* 39 1414. Keen (1998) 87-90.
32. Keen (1998) 112-24; Kolb and Tietz (2001) 369-71.
33. Keen (1998) 148-74; Kolb and Tietz (2001) 398-401.
34. Kolb and Tietz (2001) 377.
35. In his monograph about the Athenian fifth-century empire, Meiggs (1972) 208 takes it for granted that the Lycian cities were a kind of Greek *poleis*: "In parts of Caria and Lycia tyrants could be expected and accepted long after they were an anachronism elsewhere".
36. Marksteiner, *infra* 68, 70-71; Domingo Gyax (2001) 83, 85, 87, 89, 91-92.
37. A *prytaneion* is known from Tlos (*TAM* II 582) and Telmessos (*TAM* I 5), probably to be dated to the 1st century B.C. and the remains of a late Hellenistic *bouleuterion* have been found in Antiphellos (Gneisz [1990] 304-5). Hellenistic theatres are found in no less than thirteen Lykian cities (Frederiksen [2002] 111-20).
38. Marksteiner *infra* 59 (Xanthos).
39. Hansen and Fischer-Hansen (1994) 25-30.
40. Mørkholm and Neumann (1978).
41. Of the bilingual inscriptions (Lykian and Greek), the most important from a political point of view is an edict concerning exemption from commercial taxes, granted to four communities which in this context are described as *poleis*, *viz.*, Xanthos, Tlos, Pinará and Kadyanda (Bosquet [1986] 101-06). It was found in Xanthos and shows that there must have been both a Lykian and a Greek-speaking population in Xanthos. The queen of early Lykian inscriptions is a trilingual decree from Xanthos (Lykian, Greek and Aramaic) concerning the foundation of a cult (Neumann [1979] 320).
42. Arřina on coins: Keen (1998) 57, cf. Melchert (1993) 6; *SNG Suppl.* 496 (Arřinahe); Domingo Gyax (2001) 83-84.
43. Hansen (2000) 18 with note 80.
44. Hansen (2000) 611.
45. Hansen (2000) 612 with note 81.
46. Bryce (1986) 103; Zahle (1991).
47. Hansen (2000) 17.
48. Zahle (1991)
49. Glassner (2000) 35-36; Marcus and Fineman (1998) 8-9, cf. Marcus (1998) 80, 90, 91-94. For a reply to this view, see Hansen in *30 CSC* 598-601.
50. Maisels (1990) 131-98, 269-74, 310-12; Trigger (1993) 8-14.
51. Thuesen (2000) 59; Larsen (2000) 117.
52. P. Johanek, "Imperial and Free Towns of the Holy Roman Empire – City-States in Pre-Modern Germany?" in *30 CSC* 295-319.
53. Emphasised by Johanek in *30 CSC* 296-97.
54. Friedrichs (1981) 113.
55. Cf. *30 CSC* 611. The Sumerian city-states in the Isin-Larsa period (ca. 2000-1800 B.C.) emerging by disintegration after the breakdown of the Ur III dynasty (Postgate [1992] 43-45; Kuhrt [1995] 74; Baines & Yoffee [1998] 208). The Syrian city-states after ca. 1000 B.C. (*30 CSC* 62); the Neo-Babylonian city-states in the 9th and 8th centuries B.C. (*30 CSC* 117-18); the Swiss city-states emerging after the extinction of the Dukes of Zähringen in 1218 (*30 CSC* 322-23); the Chinese city-states of the Spring-and-Autumn period (*30 CSC* 359, 361); the Maya city-states of the Post-Mayapan period (*30 CSC* 561); the Mixtec city-states of the Post-Classic period (*30 CSC* 578).
56. Cf. *30 CSC* 30 n. 65 and the appendix *infra* 17-18.
57. Wheatley (1971) 398; Hammond (1972) 2; Southall (1998) 4. Cf. *30 CSC* 605.
58. D. Chakrabarti, "Mahajanapada States of Early Historic India", in *30 CSC* 375-91.
59. Sumerian/Neo-Babylonian; Syrian (2600-2300, 2000-1800, 1000-720 B.C.); Palestinian (2900-2300, 2000-1200 B.C.); Phoenician homeland (Middle Bronze Age and Iron Age); Etruscan/Italian; Taklamakan; Sriwijaya/Malay; Maya (250-900, A.D. 1450-1600).
60. For repeated cycles of Sumerian city-states, see Postgate (1992) 43-45; Kuhrt (1995) 74; Baines and Yoffee (1998) 208. Cf. *30 CSC* 20, 22, 117-27, 611. For the Neo-Babylonian city-states, see Larsen in *30 CSC* 77-87.
61. *Infra* 26. The exception is the city-state of Lagash which in the 3rd millennium had its main urban centre at Girsu (Glassner [2000] 39). But Lagash – which in historical times was a ceremonial centre only – may once have been the capital, see *infra* 40 note 10.
62. Zahle (1989) 170-71; (1991) 146.
63. See the cautious remarks in Domingo Gyax (2001) 81-82.
64. Weber (1999) 59-62, cf. *30 CSC* 11-12.
65. *30 CSC* 602-3.
66. Weber (1999) 100: "Im auffallendsten Gegensatz namentlich zu den asiatischen Zuständen stand nun die Stadt des mittelalterlichen Okzidents, und zwar ganz speziell die Stadt des Gebiets nördlich der Alpen da, wo sie in idealtypischer Reinheit entwickelt war." Cf. also 84, 88, 108, 121. Cf. Nippel (1999) 1, 16, 18-19.
67. Liverani (1997) 86-88.
68. Nippel (1999) 6.
69. Liverani (1997) 107.
70. For the synonymous use of these two terms in most historical studies, see *30 CSC* 25.
71. Note, however, that Weber once refers to the Fante cities on the Gold Coast (Weber [1999] 108).
72. Shaw *et al.* (1993); Coquery-Vidrovitch (1993).
73. The Mzâb in Sahara; the Hausa, the Yoruba, the Fante, the Kotoko and the Ijo in west Africa; the Swahili in east Africa, *30 CSC* 445-545. For a recent discussion of African city-states, see Holder (2001) 24-37.
74. Marcus (2000); *30 CSC* 553-56, 603-04 (Maya cities), 572-73 (Mixtec cities); 585-87 (Aztec cities).
75. Adams (1960) 273.
76. An average of 6-10 inhabitants per ha in Maya cities (*30 CSC* 553-56, 604); an average of 150-250 inhabitants per ha in Greek *poleis* of the Classical period (Hansen [1997] 28, 74 n. 153); an average of 175-190 inhabitants per ha in early modern European cities (Bairoch [1988] 21-24).
77. The Zapotec is commonly used as a designation of the inhabitants of the Bënizâa region, see 73 *infra*.
78. Peel (2000) 506-17. For the meaning of *Ilú* ("city" or "state" or both at the same time), see 508.
79. Hansen (1998) 17-34, 31-54 in the French edition.
80. For *civitas* in the sense of city, see the examples in Niermeyer (1984) 184; for the sense of territory, see the statutes of the Florentine republic quoted in Brown (2000) 34-35; for the sense of community, people, state, see Bartolus *ad D.* 4.4.3 n.1: *quia ipsamet civitas sibi princeps est*.

81. Lewis (2000) 367-68.
82. See 30 CSC 625: General Index s.v. *term used for city and city-state*, with references to all the relevant chapters.
83. In some city-state cultures belonging to the same cluster of city-state cultures, there is explicit evidence of knowledge of earlier city-state cultures and, possibly, an acculturation: the Neo-Babylonian city-states evidently copied some of the Sumerian institutions (Larsen [2000] 122). The Philistine city-states seem to have been modelled on the Palestinian and Phoenician city-states to the north (Strange [2000] 132). It has been argued that the Greeks acquired not only the alphabet but also the *polis* from the Phoenicians (Niemeyer [2000] 109). Again, the Etruscan and Latin city-states may to some extent have been modelled on the Greek city-states in Sicily and southern Italy; and there is no doubt that the medieval Italian city-states were conscious about their heritage from the Roman *civitas* and the Greek *polis*.
84. In Europe: the Celtic *oppida*. In Asia: the cities of the Indus civilisation, Hattusa in Anatolia, and the cities in Japan. In Mesoamerica: Teotihuacan, Monte Albán, Mirador, and Mayapan. In Africa: the Zulu kraal.
85. Waley (1978) 27-28; Jones (1997) 134; Epstein (2000) 279-80.
86. Waley (1978) 133-40; Epstein (2000) 288;
87. Waley (1978) 5-8, 133-40; Epstein (2000) 277, 279; Chittolini (1994) 28-29. According to Jones (1997) 618-50, the transition from city-state to *signoria* took place somewhat earlier, viz., in the period ca. 1250-1300.
88. Hansen in 30 CSC 599, 611.
89. Hansen in 30 CSC 16-18.
90. Hansen in 30 CSC 16, 608.
91. La Rocca (1992) 161, 172-73; Ward-Perkins (1996), (1997).
92. Hodges (2000) 61.
93. Bairoch (1988) 158-59; Dilcher (1967) 67-71.
94. Epstein (2000) 279.
95. During the 10th and 11th centuries minting rights were granted to bishops of, e.g., Milano, Padua, Trento and Ravenna (Cavichchi [1991] 29-47).
96. Goetz (1944) 10-27; Dilcher (1967) 44-66, cf. 63: "Unter der Herrschaft des Bischofs hat sich die Stadt, zum ersten male seit der Antike, als gebiet eignen Verfassungsrechtes vom umliegenden Lande deutlich abgesetzt, sie bildet einen Rechtskörper eigener und unverwechselbarer Art."
97. Theseider (1964) 76, 93.
98. Hansen in 30 CSC 17 with note 65.
99. Chittolini (1994) 35; Epstein (2000) 287; Hansen (2000) 602.
100. Burke (1986) 142.
101. Chittolini (1994) 44; Hansen in 30 CSC 602.
- Bairoch, P. 1988. *Cities and Economic Development from the Dawn of History to the Present* (Chicago).
- Behrwald, R. 2000. *Der lykische Bund* (Bonn).
- Bosquet, J. 1986. "Une nouvelle inscription trilingue à Xanthos?", *Revue archéologique* 101-6.
- Bretschneider, J. 2000. "Nabada: The Buried City", *Scientific American* October: 62-69.
- Brown, A. 2000. "The Language of Empire", in W.J. Connell and A. Zorzi (eds.), *Florentine Tuscany* (Cambridge) 32-47.
- Bryce, T.R. 1986. *The Lycians: A Study of Lycian History and Civilisation to the Conquest of Alexander the Great I: The Lycians in Literary and Epigraphic Sources* (Copenhagen).
- Burke, P. 1986. "City-States", in J.A. Hall (ed.), *States in History* (Oxford) 137-53.
- Cavichchi, A. 1991. *La moneta medievale in Italia da Carlo Magno al Rinascimento (Rome)*.
- Cherry, J.F. 1986. "Politics and Palaces: Some Problems in Minoan State Formation," in C. Renfrew and J.F. Cherry (eds.) 1986. *Peer Polity Interaction and Socio-Political Change* (Cambridge) 19-45.
- Chittolini, G. 1994. "Cities, 'City-States', and Regional States in North-Central Italy", in Ch. Tilly and W.P. Blockmans (eds.), *Cities and the Rise of States in Europe A.D. 1000 to 1800* (Boulder) 28-43.
- Coquery-Vidrovitch, C. 1993. *Histoire des villes d'Afrique noire* (Paris).
- Dilcher, G. 1967. *Die Entstehung der lombardischen Stadtkommune* (Aalen).
- Domingo Gyax, M. 2001. *Untersuchungen zu den lykischen Gemeinwesen in klassischer und hellenistischer Zeit* (Bonn).
- Effenterre, H. van 1985. *La cité grecque des origines à la défaite de Marathon* (Paris).
- Epstein, S.R. 2000. "The Rise and Fall of Italian City-States", in 30 CSC 277-93.
- Fineman, G.M. and Marcus, J. (eds.) 1998. *Archaic States* (Santa Fe).
- Fredriksen, R. 2002. "The Greek Theatre. A Typical Building in the Urban Centre of the *Polis*?" in T. Heine Nielsen, *Even More Studies in the Ancient Greek Polis* (Stuttgart) 65-124.
- Friedrichs, Chr. 1981. "The Swiss and German City-States", in R. Griffith and C.G. Thomas (eds.), *The City-State in Five Cultures* (Santa Barbara) 109-42.
- Glassner, J.-J. 2000. "Les petits Etats mésopotamiens à la fin du 4^e et au cours du 3^e millénaire", in 30 CSC 35-53.
- Gneisz, D. 1990. *Das antike Rathaus* (Vienna).
- Goetz, W. 1944. *Die Entstehung der italienischen Kommunen im frühen Mittelalter*. Sitzungsberichte der Bayrischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, philosophische-historische Abteilung, Jahrgang 1944, Heft 1.
- Grube, N. 2000. "The City-States of the Maya", in 30 CSC 547-65.
- Hallager, B.P. and Hallager, E. 1995. "The Knossian Bull. Political Propaganda in Neopalatial Crete?", in R. Laffineur and W.-D. Niemeier (eds.), *Politeia* (Liège) 547-56.
- Hallager, E. 1996. "The Minoan Roundel – and Other Sealed Documents in the Neopalatial Linear A Administration" I-II (Liège).
- Hammond, M. 1972. *The City in the Ancient World* (Cambridge, Mass.).
- Hansen, M.H. 1994. "Poleis and City-States, 600-323 B.C. A Comprehensive Research Programme", in Whitehead (ed.) 9-17.
- Hansen, M.H. 1997. "The Polis as an Urban Centre. The Literary and Epigraphical Evidence", in M.H. Hansen (ed.), *The Polis as an Urban Centre and as a Political Community*. Acts of the Copenhagen Polis Centre 4 (Copenhagen) 9-86.

Bibliography

- 30 CSC = M.H. Hansen (ed.), *A Comparative Study of Thirty City-State Cultures. An Investigation Conducted by the Copenhagen Polis Centre*. Historisk-filosofiske Skrifter. Det Kongelige Danske Videnskaberne selskab (Copenhagen 2000).
- Adams, R.M. 1960. "The development of Culture in the Great Empires", in C.H. Kraeling and R.M. Adams (eds.), *City Invincible* (Chicago).
- Baines, J. and Yoffee, N. 1998. "Order, Legitimacy, and Wealth in Ancient Egypt and Mesopotamia", in Fineman and Marcus (eds.) 199-260.

- Hansen, M.H. 1998. *Polis and City-State. An Ancient Concept and its modern Equivalent*. Acts of the Copenhagen Polis Centre 5 (Copenhagen). French edition 2001 entitled *Polis et Cité-État* (Paris).
- Hansen, M.H. and Fischer-Hansen, T. 1994. "Monumental Political Architecture in Archaic and Classical Greek *Poleis*", in Whitehead (ed.) 23-90.
- Hodges, R. 2000. *Towns and Trade in the Age of Charlemagne* (London).
- Holder, G. 2001. *Poussière, Ô Poussière! La Cité-État sama du pays dogon (Mali)* (Nanterre).
- Johanek, p. 2000. "Imperial and Free Towns of the Holy Roman Empire – City-States in Pre-Modern Germany?", in *30 CSC* 295-319.
- Jones, P. 1997. *The Italian City-State from Commune to Signoria* (Oxford).
- Keen, A.G. 1998. *Dynastic Lycia: A Political History of the Lycians and their Relations with Foreign Powers, c. 545-362 B.C.* (Leiden).
- Knappett, C. 1999. "Assessing a Polity in Protopalatial Crete," *American Journal of Archaeology* 103: 615-39.
- Kolb, F. and Tietz, W. 2001. "Zagaba: Münzprägung und politische Geographie in Zentrallykien", *Chiron* 31: 347-416.
- Kühne, H. 1994. "The Urbanization of the Assyrian Provinces", in S. Mazzone (ed.), *Nuove fondazioni nel vicino oriente antico: realtà e ideologia* (Pisa) 55-84.
- Kuhr, A. 1995. *The Ancient Near East I-II* (London).
- La Rocca, C. 1992. "Public Buildings and Urban Change in Northern Italy in the Early Mediaeval Period", in J. Rich (ed.), *The City in Late Antiquity* (London) 161-80.
- Larsen, J.A.O. 1968. *Greek Federal States* (Oxford).
- Larsen, M.T. 2000. "The City-States of the Early Babylonian Period", in *30 CSC* 117-27.
- Lewis, M.E. 2000. "The City-State in Spring-and-Autumn China", in *30 CSC* 359-73.
- Lind, M.D. 2000. "Mixtec City-States and Mixtec City-State Culture", in *30 CSC* 567-80.
- Liverani, M. 1997. "The Ancient Near Eastern City and Modern Ideologies", in Wilhelm (ed.) 85-107.
- Macqueen, J.G. 1986. *The Hittites and their Contemporaries in Asia Minor* (2nd edn. London).
- Maisels, Ch.K. 1990. *The Emergence of Civilization. From Hunting and Gathering to Agriculture, Cities and the State in the Near East* (London).
- Marcus, J. 2000. "On the Nature of the Mesoamerican City", in M.E. Smith and M.A. Masson (eds.), *The Ancient Civilizations of Mesoamerica* (Oxford) 49-82 (reprint of an article first published in 1983).
- Marcus, J. 1998. "The Peaks and Valleys of Ancient States. An Extension of the Dynamic Model", in Fineman and Marcus (eds.) 59-94.
- Marcus, J. and Fineman, G.M. 1998. "Introduction", in Fineman and Marcus (eds.) 3-13.
- Marksteiner, T. 1997. *Die befestigte Siedlung von Limyra. Studien zur vorrömischen Wehrarchitektur und Siedlungsentwicklung in Lykien unter besonderer Berücksichtigung der klassischen Periode* (Vienna).
- Meiggs, R. 1972. *The Athenian Empire* (Oxford).
- Melchert, H.C. 1993. *Lycian Lexicon, Lexica Anatolica 1* (Chapel Hill).
- Mørholm, O. and Neumann, G. 1978. *Die lykische Münzlegenden* (Göttingen).
- Neumann, G. 1979. *Neufunde lykischer Inschriften seit 1901* (Wien).
- Niermeyer, J.F. 1984. *Mediae Latinitatis Lexicon Minus* (Leiden).
- Nippel, W. 1999. "Introduction" to Weber's *Die Stadt* (= Weber 1999).
- Peel, J.D.Y. 2000. "Yoruba as a City-State Culture", in *30 CSC* 507-17.
- Postgate, J.N. 1992. *Ancient Mesopotamia* (London).
- Shaw, T. et al. (eds.) 1993. *The Archaeology of Africa. Food, Metals and Towns* (London).
- Smith, M.E. 2000. "Aztec City-States", in *30 CSC* 581-95.
- Southall, A. 1998. *The City in Time and Space* (Cambridge).
- Tabacco, G. 1979. *Egemonie sociali e strutture del potere nel medioevo italiano* (Torino).
- Theseider, E.D. 1964. "Vescovi e città nell'Italia precomunale", *Italia Sacra* 5: 55-109.
- Thuesen, I. 2000. "The City-State in Ancient Western Syria", in *30 CSC* 55-65.
- Trigger, B. 1993. *Early Civilizations: Ancient Egypt in Context* (Cairo).
- Vismara, N. 1989-96. *Monetazione arcaica della Lycia I-III* (Milano).
- Waley, D. 1978. *The Italian City-Republics* (2nd edn. London).
- Ward-Perkins, B. 1996. "Urban Survival and Urban Transformation in the Eastern Mediterranean", in R. Hodges and B. Hobley (eds.), *The Rebirth of Towns in the West AD 700-1050* (London) 16-27.
- Ward-Perkins, B. 1997. "Continuists, Catastrophists, and the Towns of Post-Roman Northern Italy", *Papers of the British School at Rome* 65: 157-76.
- Weber, M. 1999. *Wirtschaft und Gesellschaft* 5: *Die Stadt*, ed. W. Nippel, in *Max Weber Gesamtausgabe* I:22:5 (Tübingen).
- Wheatley, P. 1971. *The Pivot of the Four Quarters* (Edinburgh).
- Whitehead, D. (ed.). 1994. *From Political Architecture to Stephanus Byzantius*. Papers from the Copenhagen Polis Centre 1 (Stuttgart).
- Wilhelm, G. (ed.) 1997. *Die Orientalische Stadt* (Saarbrücken).
- Wörrle, M. 1978. "Epigraphische Forschungen zur Geschichte Lykiens II", *Chiron* 8: 201-46.
- Wurster, W.W. 1976. "Antike Siedlungen in Lykien. Vorbericht über ein Survey-Unternehmen im Sommer 1974", *Archäologischer Anzeiger* 23-49.
- Wurster, W.W. 1978. "Wohnbereiche antiker Siedlungen in Lykien," in *Bericht über die 29. Tagung für Ausgrabungswissenschaft und Bauforschung der Koldewey Gesellschaft* 21ff.
- Zahle, J. 1980. "Lykian Tombs and Lycian Cities", in H. Metzger (ed.), *Actes du colloque sur la Lycie antique* (Paris) 37-49.
- Zahle, J. 1983. *Arkæologiske studier i lykiske klippegrave og deres relieffer* (Copenhagen).
- Zahle, J. 1989. "Politics and Economy in Lykia during the Persian Period", *Revue des Études Anciennes* 91:171-82.
- Zahle, J. 1991. "Achaemenid Influences in Lycia (Coinage, Sculpture, Architecture). Evidence for Political Changes during the 5th Century B.C.", in *Achaemenid History* 6: 145-60.

