theme and will give researchers important data on urbanism from the pre-Classical period. The book is written in layman's terms, with few citations, but has extensive bibliographies at the end of each chapter.

After a brief discussion of the origins of urbanism and of the Uruk expansion, Van De Mieroop concentrates on the later periods, stressing the continuity of Mesopotamian civilization, rather than focusing on political changes. He ends his study in the Hellenistic period, most likely because the conquest of Alexander gives an arbitrary occasion by which to close a major chapter in the history of Mesopotamian urbanism, even though, as he concedes, the Mesopotamian city did not fade after the loss of political independence (see Susan Sherwin-White and Amélie Kuhrt, *From Samarkand to Sardis* [Berkeley and Los Angeles: Univ. of California Press, 1993]).

Van De Mieroop has not written an exhaustive study of urbanism, but has distilled information on topics such as the origins of the city, city and countryside, urban landscape, social organization, urban government, feeding the citizens, crafts and commerce, credit and management, and religion and learning. He dismisses the theories of urban origins put forth by Paul Wheatley (as ceremonial centers: *The Pivot of the Four Quarters* [Chicago: Aldine, 1971]) and by Jane Jacobs (urbanism precedes agriculture: *The Economy of Cities*, 2nd ed. [Harmondsworth: Pelican, 1972]), and favors those of Robert M. Adams (slow evolutionary change: *The Evolution of Urban Society* [Chicago: Aldine, 1966]).

Van De Mieroop argues that only a handful of Mesopotamian kings are known to have founded new cities, that Dur-Sharrukin was the only city in pre-Greek Mesopotamia truly founded on virgin soil, and that Mesopotamian kings were reluctant to boast about building cities because it was considered an act of hubris. These are contestable statements, as there were a number of new settlements in the Old Babylonian period (e.g., Haradum and Mashkan-Shapir) and kings such as Yaḥdun-Lim boasted of creating cities on virgin soil. Furthermore, he cites a late tradition about Sargon of Akkad that criticizes his building a replica of Babylon next to Agade. However, Marduk's anger against Sargon is not because he built a new city, but because he desecrated Babylon (for the founding of new cities, see Stephania Mazzoni, ed., *Nuove fondazioni nel vicino oriente antico* [Pisa: Giardini, 1994]). Van De Mieroop discusses the difficulty of understanding the layout of the Mesopotamian suburbs and the deployment of city defenses (add the evidence for a moat at Terqa: Giorgio Buccellati et al., *Terqa Preliminary Reports*, no. 11 [Malibu: Undena, 1979], 42–83).

Van De Mieroop sees a higher degree of autonomy for the ancient Mesopotamian city and citizenry than did previous scholars. Thus, with the progressive expansion of political units in Mesopotamia, cities and their representatives gained increasing political autonomy and influence, a reversal of the idea that Mesopotamia evolved from “primitive democracy” toward a totalitarian state (as promoted by Thorkild Jacobsen, “Primitive Democracy in Ancient Mesopotamia,” *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 2 [1943]: 159–72). Mesopotamian cities were also self-supporting; import of food from long distances was exceptional. Craftsmen often worked independently and in institutional workshops, while merchants were often private citizens, rather than royal agents. Van De Mieroop also argues for sophisticated credit operations in Mesopotamia that are usually associated with capitalist economies (see now, Daniel Snell, *Life in the Ancient Near East* [New Haven: Yale Univ. Press, 1997]). The only significant deficiency in this work is the lack of integrated studies on urbanization in northwest Mesopotamia and Syria. The development of urban civilization in this region is only briefly handled.

In the interval since the publication of the book under review, a number of studies have appeared, among which is Michel Fortin’s “Urbanisation et redistribution des surplus agricoles en Mésopotamie septentrionale [3000–2500 av. J.-C.],” in *Aspects of Urbanism in Antiquity: From Mesopotamia to Crete*, ed. Walter Aufrecht et al. (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997), 50–81. Recent studies on the settlement of the Khabur valley have included debates on whether urbanization in the early third millennium B.C. was due to indigenous designs or to contact with the south (see Frank Hole, “Middle Habur Settlement and Agriculture in the Ninevite 5 Period,” *Bulletin of the Canadian Society for Mesopotamian Studies* 21 [1991]: 17–29; Glenn Schwartz, “Rural Economic Specialization and Early Urbanization in the Khabur Valley, Syria,” in *Archaeological Views from the Countryside: Village Communities in Early Complex Societies*, ed. Schwartz and Steven Falconer [Washington: The Smithsonian Institution, 1994], 19–36, and Fortin, “Economie et société dans la moyenne vallée du Khabour durant la période de Ninive 5,” in *La Djazira et L’Esphrate syriens*, ed. Olivier Rouault and Markus Wülfler [Paris: Éditions Recherches sur les Civilisations, in press]).

Apart from the minor criticisms, Van De Mieroop has produced an excellent work that offers many stimulating ideas concerning Mesopotamian cities, while providing a framework for a profitable comparative analysis in the history of urbanism.

MARK W. CHAVALAS

UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN, LA CROSSE


This volume contains the last remaining Hittite texts from the collection of the Vorderasiatisches Museum in Berlin. It
appears under the above title and not as the expected volume 61 of Keilschrifturkunden aus Boghazkoi. The text fragments belong to all genres, but festivals and rituals predominate. The autographs are by the experienced Liane Jakob-Rost and are of her usual high quality. The volume is provided with the now standard lists of personal, divine, and geographic names.

It will be inconvenient for citation purposes that this final volume of Berlin texts is not part of the established KUB series, but we should be grateful for its appearance. Most of the fragments are predictably small and of limited interest, aside from the occasional unusual vocabulary or orthography. There are several significant exceptions, however, on which I will focus my remarks. No. 7 is an unusual ritual text for the king, who is designated as armentalitya (i 15', iv 15'). This epiphany, unique to my knowledge, confirms the unity of the text, despite the author's remarks (p. 7). More remarkably, the prayer-like direct speech in column iv is apparently introduced by manašši kiššan [. . . hu-wa-ar-ta-ar-zī “they curse him for him as follows.”]
The lines following name Suppilluliuma and Mursili. Are we to infer a ritual employed against a specific enemy of some subsequent Neo-Hittite king? In no. 11 pár-du-uš-ša-aš ta-př-ša-nu-an “a pitcher of p.” (iii 15') can hardly be separated from [nu DUGAL] pár-aš-tu-uš-ša-aš hărzi (to be restored thus!) in KBo 19.138 obr. 13, with the matching nu DUGAL GIR₄ hărzi “he holds a cup of fired clay” in the duplicate KBo 24.98, 7. The word partišnušša is thus equivalent to GIR₄ and designates the material “fired clay,” in some instances perhaps also a “kiln.” For the meanings of GIR₄, see Christel Rüster and Erich Neu, Hethitisches Zeichenlexikon (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1989), 226. On partišnušša—compare the remarks of H. G. Gütberbock and H. A. Hoffner, The Hittite Dictionary of the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago, vol. P (Chicago: Oriental Institute, 1995), 191. The missing s in partušša may be an error (omitted sign aš) or reflect a real reduction of a cluster [-rst-] to [-rt-].

Nos. 19–21 are fragments of a ritual for the Palaic god Zidar, with very interesting syntax, including two instances of clause-internal “local” particles attached to locatives (-šan 19 i 19’ and -kan 19 iv 8). No. 30, along with no. 29, is an invaluable addition to the “invocation of the mountains” portion of the monthly festival (CTh 591). See the references given by the author (p. 9). The obverse of no. 57 is noteworthy for the phrase hašduer tepu hašhaššan (i 4') that helps delimit the meanings of both the noun hašduer and the verb hašašš and for informing us about the extensive collection of “dust” or “ashes” (haššaššAŠAHR.A-aš) from various objects in an empty city (i. 14’–17').