

more progressive than many of its counterparts on the other side of the Atlantic, Amsterdam is no longer the radically progressive city that it seemed in the 1970s. In fact, several other European cities now have as much progressive potential as Amsterdam. Nonetheless, Amsterdam remains significant as both an “ordinary city” and a “progressive city.” Within Europe, Amsterdam is also a forerunner in becoming a minority–majority city with all its dynamics, opportunities, and tensions that brings about.

Manuel B. Aalbers

See also Gay Space; Gentrification; Historic Cities; Multicultural Cities; Red-Light District; Sex Industry; Social Housing; Squatter Movements; Tourism

Further Readings

- Aalbers, M. B. 2005. “Big Sister Is Watching You! Gender Interaction and the Unwritten Rules of the Amsterdam Red-light District.” *Journal of Sex Research* 42(1):54–62.
- Aalbers, M. B. and M. C. Deurloo. 2003. “Concentrated and Condemned? Residential Patterns of Immigrants from Industrial and Non-industrial Countries in Amsterdam.” *Housing Theory and Society* 20(4): 197–208.
- Brants, C. 1998. “The Fine Art of Regulated Tolerance: Prostitution in Amsterdam.” *Journal of Law and Society* 25(4):621–635.
- Deben, L., W. Heinemeijer, and D. van der Vaart, eds. 2000. *Understanding Amsterdam. Essays on Economic Vitality, City Life and Urban Form*. 2nd ed. Amsterdam: Het Spinhuis.
- Girouard, Mark. 1985. *Cities and People: A Social and Architectural History*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Mak, G. 1999. *Amsterdam. A Brief Life of the City*. London: Harvill Press.
- Mamadouh, V. D. 1992. *De stad in eigen hand: Provos, kabouters en krakers as Stedelijke Sociale Bewegingen* (The State in Its Own Hands: Provos, Kabouters and Squatters as Urban Social Movements). Amsterdam: SUA.
- Musterd, S. and W. Salet, eds. 2003. *Amsterdam Human Capital*. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press.
- Terhorst, P. J. F. and J. C. K. Van de Ven. 1997. *Fragmented Brussels and Consolidated Amsterdam: A Comparative Study of the Spatial Organisation of Property Rights*. Amsterdam: Netherlands Geographical Society.

ANCIENT CITIES

The earliest cities developed within a broad transformation of human society called the “urban revolution.” Simpler agricultural societies grew into complex, urban states independently in at least six parts of the world. The first large-scale complex societies, often referred to as “pristine states,” developed in Mesopotamia, Egypt, the Indus Valley, North China, the Andes, and Mesoamerica. This entry covers ancient cities starting with the pristine states and ending prior to the Classical period in the Mediterranean and prior to European conquest in other parts of the world.

Early Urban Traditions

Cities within major world regions typically shared key principles of form and function, allowing them to be grouped into urban traditions. The following sections describe eight of the best documented early urban traditions.

Mesopotamia

The earliest large urban settlement was Tell Brak in the dry farming zone of northern Mesopotamia. During the Uruk period (3800–3100 BC) this city consisted of a central zone of public architecture surrounded by sprawling suburban settlement over 1 square kilometer in extent. At the end of this period, the site declined and the focus of urban development shifted to southern Mesopotamia. At the start of the Early Dynastic period (2900–2300 BC), the southern Mesopotamian site of Uruk grew explosively from a small town to a compact walled city of some 400 hectares (4 square kilometers). At the same time, nearby rural villages were abandoned, suggesting that people were moved forcibly into the city. This urban growth was part of a cultural explosion that saw the spread of cities and city-states across the Euphrates plain, the development of cuneiform writing, and a series of economic, religious, and cultural innovations.

Over the following millennia, the Near East witnessed several cycles in which periods of city-state organization (such as the Early Dynastic period) with numerous small interacting cities alternated with periods of political centralization

dominated by large imperial capitals. Some of the most impressive cities of the ancient world were imperial capitals in the first and second millennia BC, such as Babylon, Nineveh, and Persepolis.

Egypt

Because archaeologists have failed to find large cities in Egypt prior to Akhenaten's capital at Amarna in the New Kingdom period (1350 BC), Egypt has sometimes been contrasted to Mesopotamia as a "civilization without cities." This label masks a distinctive form of urbanism, however. While it is possible that flooding by the Nile River destroyed earlier large capitals, it appears more likely that the Egyptians forged a form of dispersed urbanism characterized by smaller, more specialized urban settlements. Walled towns served as local administrative centers, large temples were built in religious compounds, and the temples were maintained by special settlements of workers and priests. Laborers for major construction projects were housed in walled villages. This pattern originated during the Old Kingdom period (2700–2100 BC) when the Egyptian state and associated institutions, such as kingship and hieroglyphic writing, were first consolidated. Egypt did not lack cities; rather its urban systems were structured differently from the more familiar form of Mesopotamian cities.

Indus Valley

A distinctive tradition of cities developed around 2300 BC in the valley of the Indus River in Pakistan and western India. The best known cities are Mohenjo-daro and Harappa. Each was composed of two parts: a large raised platform with public architecture on the west and dense residential zones on the east. Houses were serviced by a sophisticated system of drains, pipes, and ditches; this level of sanitary engineering was not matched until the Roman period two millennia later. Public architecture at these sites is enigmatic. The citadels support likely storage structures, but there are no obvious temples or royal palaces. A large open tank at Mohenjo-daro, known as the "Great Bath," was probably used for some kind of ritual bathing or purification rites. The basic patterns of urban architecture and layout are duplicated at a series of smaller sites, including walled towns and a port facility with a dock and warehouses. The

undeciphered script of the Indus Valley civilization may hold clues to this fascinating and enigmatic urban society.

North China

China was the home to the longest-lasting non-Western urban tradition. Urban settlements were first founded in the Erlitou period (2100–1800 BC) and expanded greatly in the following Shang period (1800–1100 BC). Many early cities were walled, but Anyang, the most extensively excavated city, lacked a wall. In spectacular royal tombs at Anyang, kings were accompanied by sacrificed retainers, whole chariots with oxen, and rich offerings. A tradition of bronze ritual vessels exhibits impressive technological and aesthetic sophistication. Unlike cities in most early urban traditions, Anyang presents no surviving large stone buildings; public buildings were constructed of timber on low earth platforms. Chinese writing was perfected in the Shang period, and numerous ritual texts survive on bronze vessels and on carved bones. Principles established in these early urban centers, such as city walls and orientation to the cardinal directions, were later incorporated into the long-lasting tradition of imperial capitals, an especially well documented form of non-Western urbanism.

The Andes

The Andean culture area included a variety of localized urban subtraditions. Impressive planned ceremonial complexes first appeared on the coast of Peru in the second millennium BC. These sites share key architectural features (e.g., a U-shaped form and sunken circular courtyards), but their residential areas have not been well studied. Specialists debate both their urban status and whether their builders were the rulers of states, or chiefs of smaller-scale societies. Politics based in the large and impressive highland cities of Wari and Tiwanaku dominated the Andes between AD 500 and 900. The most powerful polity to develop in the Andes was the Inka empire (AD 1400–1530). Inka kings used city-building as an imperial strategy, and cities with distinctive Inka masonry and urban forms were built across large parts of the Andes to administer the empire.

Mesoamerica

Like the Andes, Mesoamerica (central Mexico to Honduras) was the setting for a number of regional subtraditions of urbanism, starting around the time of Christ. Most spectacular are the Classic period (AD 200–900) Maya cities of the tropical lowland jungle; the best studied cities are Tikal, Copán, Palenque, and Caracol. These consisted of planned civic centers with impressive stone pyramids, palaces, and ballcourts, surrounded by sprawling, unplanned residential zones. Newly deciphered hieroglyphic texts on public stone monuments tell the stories of petty kings and their military and ceremonial deeds. Around AD 900, Maya civilization collapsed and the cities were overgrown by jungle vegetation. Other well studied Mesoamerican urban cultures include the Olmec, Zapotec, and Aztec, all of which built small cities that followed the Maya pattern of planned civic zones coupled with unplanned residential areas. The largest Mesoamerican cities were in central Mexico: Teotihuacan (AD 100–600) and the Aztec imperial capital Tenochtitlan (AD 1300–1519); each had over 100,000 inhabitants.

Southeast Asia

The largest city ever built—in areal extent—was the great Khmer imperial capital of Angkor (AD 800–1300), whose maximal extent was larger than 1,000 square kilometers. The temple compound of Angkor Wat (82 hectares in area) was only one of many monumental complexes, along with palaces and reservoirs, all carefully built and arranged following cosmological and mythological principles. Like the Maya cities, the ceremonial core was surrounded by low-density informal housing, and much of the city was devoted to intensive agricultural cultivation. The Khmer urban tradition began much earlier than Angkor, however, and over the centuries, kings and architects worked out distinctive canons of urban planning and architectural style that drew on both the Hindu and Buddhist religions. Southeast Asia was also home to a tradition of commerce-based coastal port cities.

Sub-Saharan Africa

Several urban subtraditions flourished in sub-Saharan Africa prior to European conquest. In West Africa, the city of Jenné-Jeno (AD 450–1100)

combined extensive craft production and exchange systems with modest public architecture. The Yoruba cities (AD 1400–1900) were also busy commercial centers without large public buildings; warfare was rampant and these cities were surrounded by defensive walls. In eastern Africa, Great Zimbabwe was an impressive inland city (AD 1100–1400) with a large elliptical walled compound; its expansion resulted from an active system of inland–coastal commerce. At the coastal end of that relationship, Swahili settlements grew into busy port cities that maintained their independence until Portuguese conquest in AD 1500.

Conceptual Approaches

Two contrasting definitions of the terms *city* and *urban* are used by archaeologists. The demographic definition, based on the concepts of Louis Wirth, identifies cities as large, dense settlements with social heterogeneity. Many ancient cities had only modest populations, however (often under 5,000 persons), and thus are too small to qualify as “urban” from this perspective. The alternative functional approach defines a city as a settlement that contains activities and institutions that affect a wider hinterland. The most common of these “urban functions” existed in the realm of politics or administration, economics, and religion. The functional definition allows for different types of cities, both within and between urban traditions.

The concept of the “urban revolution,” first identified by V. Gordon Childe (1892–1957), describes a series of social changes that brought about the development of the earliest cities and states in each of the six regions of pristine urbanism. These changes (such as the origin of social classes and the production of an agricultural surplus) provided the social context for the earliest cities. Once class-structured state societies took hold in a region, individual cities rose and fell in response to a variety of forces.

Patterns of Variation

Archaeologists in the eighteenth century began their programs of fieldwork in the Near East at urban sites because that was where they found the biggest monuments and the richest offerings. Today this approach continues in some areas, but most archaeologists take a more analytical approach to

ancient urban sites. In this newer perspective, conceptual models are applied to the archaeological remains of early cities in order to learn about them as human settlements. The most common conceptual approach derives from political economy. Archaeologists look to agricultural production and demography as important factors in urban dynamics. Craft production and long-distance exchange are major topics of urban research today. Ancient state-level economies varied enormously, and economic processes and institutions affected urban form and dynamics. For example, cities under state-controlled noncommercial redistributive economies (e.g., Inka and Egypt) had more standardized plans and state storage facilities, whereas cities in areas with commercialized economies (e.g., Sumerian and Swahili) were typically smaller with less standardization in layout.

Political form and the dynamics of power are also major topics of archaeological research on ancient cities. Rulers used urban architecture to communicate messages about power, wealth, legitimacy, and other ideological themes. Accordingly, the capitals of city-states (e.g., Sumerian and Aztec) were small cities with relatively modest public architecture, whereas imperial capitals were larger in size and far more “monumental” in their cityscapes. The civic centers of ancient capitals were almost always carefully planned, following local rules and canons. Residential zones, on the other hand, were most commonly shaped by generative, bottom-up processes instead of central planning.

In the past two decades, the focus on economics and politics has been supplemented by a newer focus on the social characteristics of the urban population. Excavations of houses, workshops, and residential zones are now common, and urban households, neighborhoods, and social variation have become major topics of research. Archaeologists borrow models from urban geography to investigate the social dynamics of cities, including topics such as wealth and inequality, power and control, urban social identities, and spatial practices. Another tradition of research emphasizes the religious dimensions of early cities, including cosmological models of city layout and the symbolism of temples. It is known from historical documents that in some ancient traditions cities were highly sacred places and rulers deliberately aligned their capitals with the cosmos (e.g., China, India, and

Southeast Asia), whereas cities in other traditions (e.g., Sumerian, Swahili) show far less evidence of such sacralization.

In comparison with modern cities, ancient cities were more strongly constrained by their environmental setting. Limitations in transport technology and organizational capacity required that food and other bulky resources come from close to the city. As a result, agricultural productivity and resource distribution played large roles in determining the locations and population levels of most ancient cities. Imperial Rome, with its seagoing fleets and advanced imperial and commercial grain procurement systems, was one of the first cities to outgrow the constraints of its local environmental context by importing food from North Africa.

Although most ancient cities had much smaller ecological footprints than Rome, many or perhaps most of them were responsible for serious environmental degradation. Archaeologists have documented agricultural overintensification and its ensuing negative effects on soils in the vicinity of many ancient cities. Nearly all ancient urban societies engaged in deforestation, often with disastrous consequences for soils and the water table. In temperate latitudes forests were cut down for firewood and construction materials. The most wood-hungry pyrotechnology-based industries were metallurgy and the production of cement and plaster from limestone. In tropical forest settings, forests were cleared for agricultural production.

Most ancient cities were ultimately destroyed or abandoned. Some, like Teotihuacan or Uruk, flourished for many centuries, whereas others, such as Akhenaten’s capital Amarna and most Inka cities, were abandoned shortly after they were founded. These differences in longevity, which might be considered reflections of ancient urban sustainability, remain poorly understood. Because the dynamics of urban change typically require razing old buildings to construct new ones, cities with long lives are much more difficult for archaeologists to study. The most difficult ancient cities to excavate are those that have continued to thrive into modern times, such as Damascus, Beijing, Rome, London, and Mexico City. Although their archaeological resources present numerous problems for modern heritage conservation and planning, these cities do provide settings where large numbers of people can learn about ancient cities and urban lifeways.

In summary, the most striking result of archaeological fieldwork on ancient urban sites around the world is the recognition of a high level of variation among ancient cities. Each urban tradition exhibited its own distinctive forms and styles of architecture and layout, and cities in each tradition bore the marks of regional patterns of economy, politics, religion, and social organization. High levels of variation often existed within urban traditions as well. The two best documented ancient urban traditions—Mesopotamia and Mesoamerica—each included small city-state capitals, huge imperial capitals, port cities, industrial towns, and cultural centers. As archaeologists continue to excavate and analyze ancient cities, these patterns of variation are becoming clearer. It is increasingly possible to compare ancient, historical, and modern cities in order to uncover the broad patterning of similarities and differences in urban settlements across space and time.

Michael E. Smith

See also Acropolis; Agora; Athens, Greece; Childe, V. Gordon; Rome, Italy; Urban Archaeology

Further Readings

- Chew, Sing C. 2000. *World Ecological Degradation: Accumulation, Urbanization, and Deforestation, 3000 BC–AD 2000*. Walnut Creek, CA: AltaMira.
- Childe, V. Gordon. 1950. "The Urban Revolution." *Town Planning Review* 21:3–17.
- Gates, Charles. 2003. *Ancient Cities: The Archaeology of Urban Life in the Ancient Near East and Egypt, Greece, and Rome*. New York: Routledge.
- Hull, Richard. 1976. *African Cities and Towns before the European Conquest*. New York: Norton.
- Marcus, Joyce and Jeremy Sabloff, eds. 2008. *The Ancient City: New Perspectives on Urbanism in the Old and New World*. Santa Fe, NM: SAR Press.
- Smith, Michael E. 2008. *Aztec City-state Capitals*. Gainesville: University Press of Florida.
- Steinhardt, Nancy S. 1990. *Chinese Imperial City Planning*. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.
- Trigger, Bruce G. 2003. *Understanding Early Civilizations: A Comparative Study*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Van De Mieroop, Marc. 1999. *The Ancient Mesopotamian City*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

ANNEXATION

Annexation is a procedure that enables a city to grow by expanding its boundaries to include neighboring territory. It is closely related to the idea of consolidation, a process that enables two or more cities to merge into one larger government. Virtually every major American city has grown either through annexation or consolidation.

Annexation has had a long history in the United States. In the nineteenth century, annexation and consolidation produced America's largest cities. New York, Chicago, Boston, and Philadelphia—along with many others—grew enormously. New York City expanded from approximately 44 to 300 square miles, and Chicago from 10 to 185 square miles. Boston grew to almost 30 times its original size. Philadelphia increased even more dramatically: from 2 to 130 square miles. Although suburbanization greatly enlarged the geographic reach of their metropolitan regions, annexation in major Eastern and Midwestern cities ended in the nineteenth century. But annexation continues elsewhere in the United States. Between 1950 and 1990, David Rusk reports, more than 80 percent of the nation's central cities grew by 10 percent or more. Important examples include Houston, Memphis, Oklahoma City, Jacksonville, Phoenix, and San Jose. And there are many others. The major cities of the twentieth century in the South and West, like the major Eastern and Midwestern cities of the nineteenth century, have thus grown by annexation.

There are two ways to understand why some cities in the United States continue to annex adjacent territory and others do not. One is that the arguments for and against annexation have a different impact in different parts of the country. The other is that the legal structure that empowers cities to annex neighboring territory differs from place to place.

Consider first the arguments for and against annexation. Many annexations have been fueled by the idea that size matters. Civic pride and boosterism have fostered expansion as cities have competed with each other to be one of America's largest cities. Often, this expansion has been supported by the business community. Land speculation and the desire to create an efficient geographic area for the delivery of city services have played a