

CONCEPTUAL MODELS OF DEVELOPING PREINDUSTRIAL CITIES: AN EXAMINATION OF THEIR APPLICABILITY TO 19TH CENTURY PALESTINE

Ruth Kark

The Hebrew University of Jerusalem, Israel

Submitted August 1982, revised October 1983

The applicability of "classic" theories or models of urban change to nineteenth century Palestine is examined in light of an empiric study of Jerusalem and Jaffa. Findings from a detailed study are compared with generalizations made by researchers of the Middle Eastern city and the preindustrial city. The characteristics of Jerusalem and Jaffa resembled the prevailing generalizations made on the traditional Middle Eastern city. Typologies of the preindustrial city, however, tended to be overly general and dichotomous, not taking into account the varying cultural background and the temporal aspects of cities. Although they contributed little to the understanding of these nineteenth century Palestine cities, the typologies provide a conceptual framework for comparative study.

The aim of this paper is to test several general models of urban change with the specific cases of preindustrial Jerusalem and Jaffa. Before dealing with these two cities, which have been studied in detail using an inductive approach and primary sources (Kark, 1976), we will present a critical view of different theories of urban change along time, theories which derive from the various disciplines of the social sciences and the humanities. An alternative approach is suggested which might prove useful in dealing with the topic. Finally, we will present some of the findings of the case study and examine their resemblance to some generalizations made by researchers of the Middle Eastern City.

Jerusalem and Jaffa are examined in light of several more general models of urban development, structure and cultural function such as the Oriental and Occidental city types described by Max Weber, the constructed type of the preindustrial versus the industrial city presented by Sjoborg, and the generalizations of Redfield and Singer concerning the cultural role of cities (orthogenetic and heterogenetic categories). This study found the typologies to be overly general and dichotomous, not taking into account the varying cultural backgrounds and temporal aspects of cities, yet at the same time they may possibly serve as useful conceptual frameworks.

A CRITICAL VIEW OF THEORIES CONCERNING URBAN CHANGE

Theories attempting to explain urban change have presented various degrees of generalization and have related to periods from ancient down to modern times. Some (Frankfort, 1951; Childe, 1950; Adams, 1966; Oppenheim, 1969) deal with the origins of cities and the processes leading to their growth. Others (Weber, 1963; Geddes, 1971; Redfield and

Singer, 1954; Weber, 1968; Mumford, 1955 and 1961; Sjoberg, 1966) concentrate on the stages of their development, i.e., rise and decline, and the character of change. The approach to the topic and its treatment has been in large measure determined by the discipline from which the scholars came. Social scientists — sociologists, anthropologists, economists and geographers, among others — have tended to adopt a deductive approach or an abstraction on various levels, while humanists — mainly historians and archeologists — an empirical or inductive approach. At times, the former presented purely theoretical models, the link between them and historical reality sometimes being irrelevant, or theories based on comparative research in an attempt to find similarity between factors and processes over time and space rather than their singularity. As expected, the discipline of the researcher directed the emphasis, so that economists and geographers exhibited an economic bias (for the most part based on the American Models — Park, Burgess and Hoyt) or an environmental prejudice (Wittfogel, 1957), while anthropologists stressed cultural and social factors and processes, and historians accentuated the historio-political processes affecting urban change (Eickelman, 1981).

Most of the theories concerning urban change presented by students of the city were general theses on the evolution of change and typologies of cities in different contexts (Lampard, 1963). When discussing the factors that brought about urban change they tended to be simplistic and deterministic. They often stressed individual variants or one or two events, such as innovations in technology, energy or writing (Childe, 1950; Sjoberg, 1966; Meadows and Mizruchi, 1969; Toynbee, 1970). This approach led to the conclusion that the process was graded rather than a continuous process along time, or a fusion of the “step” and “ramp” evolution which was suggested by Adams, Braidwood and Willy as being more fitting to historical reality (Adams, 1966). Likewise, presentations have been made of: unilinear theories of development from one type of the traditional town to a single type of modern town (Sjoberg, 1966; Redfield and Singer, 1954); multilinear evolution theories which showed parallelism in historical process but different outcomes (Steward, 1955; Harris and Ullman, 1945); theories relating to the development of different towns from the uniform point of departure (divergence theory); development from varied points of departure to one similar construct (convergence theory); or a process combining the latter two (convergence-divergence).

A central methodological problem is that these theories are based on the construction of a “model” or an “ideal type” which, on creation, becomes static and describes a certain situation at a given point, rather than a living and dynamic entity experiencing constant change in space and time. Among the generalizers there were those who dichotomized urban change or type (Wheatley, 1972). This is expressed in an extensive literature concerning the rural-urban dichotomy (Wirth, 1938) as well as the dichotomy of urban typology (“preindustrial” and industrial) (Sjoberg, 1966), traditional and modern (Wheatley, 1963), “orthogenetic” and “heterogenetic” (Redfield and Singer, 1954), oriental and western (Weber, 1968). This dichotomy has been determined mainly by cultural and social criteria. A criticism of this dichotomous approach is its rather simplistic generality. For example, the transition stages or the intermediate states were entirely neglected.

The various research categories embraced the following fields: demographic, social, behavioral, economic and regional fields (Lampard, 1963; Tunard, 1963; Schnore, 1968; Checkland, 1968; Wheatley, 1963), all in the context of time and the spatial hierarchies of urban systems. But some of the studies tended, despite their methodological sophistication, to specialize in fairly limited fields (Lampard, 1975), without attempting to understand mutual influences or make a general synthesis.

The generalizations of those siding with the historical discipline (including some social scientists) were careful and more limited in time and space, basing themselves zealously on

documentary evidence in an attempt to arrive at a synthesis (Schnore, 1975). Research workers with the historical approach limited their generalizations to themes connected with the development of towns and types of towns (process and form) in defined periods of time and limited cultural regions, and did not cut themselves asunder from the historical context. In this category, one may include such researchers as Childe, Max Weber, Mumford and others. To these have been added research more limited in territory and time, on such subjects as: "The West European City" (Dickinson, 1951), "The Medieval City in Europe" (Pirenne, 1956), "The Moslem City" (von Grunebaum, 1955; de Planhol, 1959) etc., not to speak of the numerous monographs and research on various limited aspects within the city. These empirical works were not sufficiently utilized by those among the social scientists (or even some historians) who have tended to generalize.

Some historians have regarded urban history as a branch of local history (Lampard, 1963), and concentrated either on the ecological and morphological sphere (urban form and function) or on the social sphere (urban content). Again, very little has been written about the link between the two, whether descriptively or from the methodological point of view. Attempts at generalization were made on the theme of city functions when speaking about the various types of market cities (Polanyi *et al.*, 1957), religious cities (Toynbee, 1970; von Grunebaum, 1962), capital and administrative cities, junction cities (Harris and Ullman, 1945), etc., but for the greater part these remained within the context of a limited place and time (Wagstaff, 1980).

A final major problem in the advancement of research in Middle Eastern urban change has been the lack of communication evident between the various disciplines mentioned above.

URBAN CHANGE IN JERUSALEM AND JAFFA

The examples to be examined in this paper derive from a study on the development of the cities of Jerusalem and Jaffa in the nineteenth century. This research was limited in scope when contrasted with some of the above-mentioned approaches, both from the methodological point of view as well as from the point of view of time (a period of less than 100 years), territory (two individual cities in the Ottoman Empire and Palestine) and the cultural sphere (the Moslem world over its religious and ethnical minorities). We have before us a detailed "case-study" based on an historical and geographical reconstruction from primary sources, with an inductive rather than a deductive point of departure. At the same time, an attempt was made to reconstruct the processes that acted in space and time and to create a synthesis with stress on interactions on various levels between political, demographic, social, economic and regional aspects, while at the same time regarding these two cities as part of a more general construct (Kark, 1976).

A large part of the research was devoted to a reconstruction of the process of change in content and form because there is no possibility of analyzing the causes of change without visualizing the resulting processes and forms that crystallized. This period of time was chosen, despite its short span, because it was critical to the ontogenesis and transformation of these two cities. Jerusalem and Jaffa were the core from which (apparently) the changes radiated to other parts of the country. Only after the laborious piecing together of the composite picture could the cities be viewed in the context of more general urban typologies, such as the preindustrial city and the Middle Eastern city.

During the study period Jerusalem and Jaffa were transformed from small towns (or even large villages) into cities. Major changes in both are apparent in government, infrastructure, population and economy. Yet the social structure, notwithstanding its ethnic, religious, cultural and linguistic diversity, remained relatively unchanged and traditional until the end of the

period under consideration. The changes in the various aspects were expressed in the striking expansion of the built-up area, while at the same time many traditional ecological structures were maintained (Kark and Landman, 1980).

The development of these cities was affected by both internal and external factors such as population growth (natural and immigration) and economic expansion (partly based on the importing of capital). It may not have been possible in the absence of fundamental political change which took place in the Ottoman Empire and in the Jerusalem *Mutessarifik* (Jerusalem District) during the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, which resulted in some reforms of central and local government and the judicial system. The Ottoman regime both directly affected change by limited efforts to improve urban and interurban infrastructure; and indirectly facilitated these changes by providing increased security and stability, increased religious tolerance, trading concessions to European companies in the fields of transportation, finance and industry, and allowing foreign religious and philanthropic bodies to operate (Kark, 1976).

JERUSALEM AND JAFFA IN LIGHT OF THE GENERALIZATIONS

Von Grunebaum and De Planhol

Some researchers have viewed Jerusalem and Jaffa in the nineteenth century as enclaves and regional exceptions. Our study leads to the conclusion that they were integral parts of the area (Palestine in particular, and the Ottoman Empire at large). Although having unique characteristics, they exhibited, even on somewhat superficial examination, similar trends to those of other cities in Palestine, Lebanon and Syria. Among other indicators of this similarity were the timing of outward expansion from the protective walls of small and medium sized cities and the transition from a largely subsistence economy to an import-export economy.

There is no doubt that the two traditional cities (the "old" cities) conform to a large degree to the generalizations made by Von Grunebaum, De Planhol and others relating to the traditional Moslem and Middle-Eastern city. This was expressed, for example, by the lack of municipal organization and urban solidarity; in the central role of religion and tradition in personal and social life; in the hierarchial ranking of economic functions in the city from the religious center outwards; in the heterogeneity of the population whose diversity lead among other things to ethnic and religious separation in residential areas, in similar characteristic institutions such as mosques (and churches and synagogues), bazaars, khans, hammams, and fortresses), and in the physical system which contained a wall, gates and fortifications, and streets, alleys and buildings whose descriptions and architectural styles recall many other Middle Eastern cities (Kark, 1981; 1983).

Sjoberg, Weber, and Redfield and Singer

If there indeed exists a significant relationship between the rise and fall of Empires and the development and decline of cities (Sjoberg, 1966; 1973), we will find it difficult to explain the development of different cities in the Ottoman Empire, including Jerusalem and Jaffa, and the increase in the rate of urbanization against the background of the common view concerning the decline of the Empire. One must examine anew either this "decline" or the universality of the relationship.

While accepting the premise that a large part of the processes which took place in the realm of politics, society, economy, etc., do not necessarily relate to the town but to society generally (Sjoberg, 1966; Cox, 1969), the development of Jerusalem and Jaffa was examined against the background of the changes in the Empire as a whole. In the same way, as one debates

whether the change in the Ottoman Empire was fundamental and stemmed from within or these were subsidiary changes stemming from external influences, one may pose this question at the local level in Jerusalem and Jaffa. It would appear that urban change in both cities did not originate from a fundamental local change or from industrialization. Most of its agencies were external: the Ottoman Empire, the Western Powers, the Christian Churches, Jewish associations, philanthropic institutions and societies, and the foreign immigrants. This interference brought about an increase in population and local economic and physical growth. Local society not only did not induce change, but, in most cases, even opposed it and guarded its traditional, organizational framework. Against the background of the lack of revolutionary change in the social organization of the local population on the one hand and the lack of industrial development on the other, Sjöberg's statement in regard to the preindustrial city, that "technology and social power, though not alone in stimulating urbanization, are the most crucial variables in accounting for the origin and proliferation of city life throughout the world" (Sjöberg, 1966), does not appear to be applicable to these two cities.

According to Max Weber's definitions of a city, Jerusalem and Jaffa cannot be regarded as cities until almost the end of the Ottoman period. True, they each had a wall, a moat and gates, a market and religious court, but it is difficult to regard them as enjoying political autonomy and, until the end of the nineteenth century, they lacked all concepts of citizenship and urban community (Weber, 1968). At the same time, the traditional cities of Jerusalem and Jaffa with respect to most of the cultural, social and political traits, fitted in with the generalizations presented by Weber about the Oriental city in the dichotomous typology that he created for Oriental and Western cities (Weber, 1968; Murvar, 1969). This expressed itself, *inter alia*, in a heteronomy and a lack of autocephalism, the integration of the city into the State only through functional unity, the importance attached to kinship as the basis for social organization, the sway of a monistic force also on the economy, religion and politics, the military monopoly of the ruler, and the lack of preconditions for the sprouting of a bourgeois class.

What is surprising is that despite the immense urban expansion that took place at the end of the Ottoman period, in the cultural and social spheres changes were slow and few. At this stage they stemmed more from the superficial imitation and influence of the model of the Western city and its traits rather than any fundamental process of change in this traditional Middle Eastern society. In Jerusalem and Jaffa there was perhaps at this period a differentiation, but it is certainly difficult to speak of integration as a component in their development.

For this reason, it is even difficult to view Jerusalem and Jaffa within the typology drawn up by Redfield and Singer (1954) to classify the cultural function of cities. This typology divided the cities into an orthogenetic type (i.e. characterized by a moral order and creativity based on ancient traits and traditions) and a heterogenetic type (i.e. having a technical order with norms of economic rationalism and creativity based on a destruction of the ancient culture). Jerusalem should apparently have fitted into the transformative orthogenetic model, but the difficulty is that it had the heterogeneity of population and cultural groups and a variety of "great traditions" which were guarded and jealously preserved by every population group separately. Jaffa, on the other hand, should have fitted, in accordance with its functions and economic character, with the heterogenetic model, but it is difficult to conceive of Jaffa on the eve of World War I as a city in which the technical order, heresy, rationalism and progress were dominant. During the process of urbanization in Palestine in the nineteenth century, different cultural systems existed within the towns of the country which in part were orthogenetic and in part heterogenetic (and it is perhaps preferable to conceive of a spectrum of modern, intermediate and traditional within each group in the city rather than a dichotomy). This spectrum was particularly evident in the coastal cities (Jaffa and Haifa), but is also seen in Jerusalem (Kark, 1983).

Were Jerusalem and Jaffa in the nineteenth century feudal, preindustrial cities, in the intermediate stage (described by Sjoberg as 55 centuries long) between the "folk society" and the urban, industrialized society (Sjoberg, 1965; Sjoberg, 1966; Wheatley, 1963; Cox, 1969; Morse, 1975). Do the structural characteristics laid down by Sjoberg in his "constructed type" as common to all the feudal preindustrial cities of Europe, China, India, the Middle East, etc., (which include their ecological, class, family, economic, political, religious and educational structures), also apply to Jerusalem and Jaffa? Was technology, together with the structure of the political power, the most important determinant in the spurring on of urbanization and development of Jerusalem and Jaffa?

In accordance with Sjoberg's approach, Jerusalem and Jaffa should be regarded as preindustrial cities according to their low technological level, at least until the end of the last century. Based on Sjoberg's premise of a high correlation between technology, the social structure and the distribution of the residents of city (and among all these, the physical appearance of the urban center), one might expect Jerusalem and Jaffa to be identical to one another in the social and ecological sphere (if not in the specific cultural content) and identical in form with the Greek polis, the medieval European city, etc. In addition, they should have followed an identical line of development to the cities in Europe which experienced the industrial revolution; but this is not the case. While there exists, perhaps, a number of points of external similarity with the morphology of ancient and traditional cities, one should not take the comparison too far.

The description by Saalman (1968, 11) of medieval cities in Europe as "...irregular, badly lit streets, that there were no trees or parks, that they were over-crowded and unsanitary; in short, not 'good places to live'...", or the description of Philadelphia before the year 1800: "...the practice of subdividing blocks with alleys and jamming tiny houses on vacant rear yards continued strongly..." (Warner in Goheen, 1970) remind us of the description of Jerusalem and Jaffa in the nineteenth century quoted above (Kark, 1981). But the distance between these rather superficial similarities and other spheres is great. There was no complete identity in form and nature of development even between Jerusalem and Jaffa, which expanded under often similar conditions, and at times the differences between them were considerable. The narrow streets and lanes of Toronto at the beginning of the nineteenth century were seen and conceived differently from those of Jerusalem, not to speak of the fact that Jerusalem and Jaffa reflect entirely different types of society and ecological, economic, political, religious and educational structures, that are different from those of Greece and Rome, medieval Europe, India and China. It is with difficulty that they can be included in a typical model of towns of the Middle East, not only on account of the different mixtures of environmental conditions and composition of their population, but also because one finds in them many remnants of earlier periods which influenced and continue to influence their character.

Jerusalem and Jaffa were not even feudal cities within a feudal society (Cox, 1969) since the Ottoman "feudalism" was so different from the European in that it was not hereditary, it was urban based rather than rural, and was an organ of a centralist regime, governed by the Sultan. Here feudalism served only as a system for the collection of taxes and the payment of salaries (it may be defined as lacking continuity, lacking ownership and lacking presence).

It is particularly in the case of Jerusalem and Jaffa, which were in existence almost continuously throughout the greater part of the 55 centuries about which Sjoberg draws generalizations, that there is the proof that urbanization and industrialization are not one and the same thing (Wade, 1971). The traditional cities were not static; the many metamorphoses in form and content which they underwent throughout the period of their existence is evidence for this. Even in the short period dealt with in the present study, there was tremendous

development in both cities, and this was not solely due to changes in technology and the power structure. Indeed, there was almost no industry developing in them. At the same time, it must be admitted that technological changes and developments in the political system of the Ottoman Empire (Tekely, 1971) also exerted some influence on the development of these two cities from the middle of the last century until the end of the Ottoman period. Jerusalem and Jaffa of the year 1800 and of the year 1917 were different beyond recognition. Was this change a transformation from a preindustrial to an industrial state (in response to a technological change), or did the cities still remain at the end of the period an aggregate of autonomous, religious groups as seen by Fustel in regard to the formation of the ancient city (Morse, 1975), ethnical and religious factors still occupying a very important role in the life of the individual and society? It would appear that the second description is more fitting to Jerusalem and Jaffa of the nineteenth century and in part, even to the present day.

CONCLUSION

A review of the "classic" research approaches to urban change suggests that they must be considered with caution. These were greatly influenced by the disciplinary expertise of the scholars, and thus exhibit a bias. The models and ideal types concerning the preindustrial city tended sometimes to be static, simplistic and deterministic.

A comparison of these typologies with the findings of a study of urban change in nineteenth century Jerusalem and Jaffa shows that the empiric findings suited to a large degree the generalizations made on the traditional Middle Eastern city and its first stages of transition in the nineteenth century. They are partly consistent with the concepts of Max Weber on the Oriental city.

The cultural and social complexity of Jerusalem and Jaffa together with the multivariant dynamic process of change do not fit the dichotomous classification of the cultural function of the city presented by Redfield and Singer. Sjoberg's constructed type of the preindustrial versus the industrial city, and his stress upon technology and social power as the main stimulants of urbanization appear to be similarly inappropriate in the context of nineteenth century Palestine.

It seems that theoretical deliberation, study at a macro level and use of universal categories may assist and fertilize conceptual formulation, and may be useful for comparative studies. Such theories, however, should be rigorously examined and modified in light of detailed inductive studies. These studies are necessarily limited to a definite geographic region or cultural area and a specific time, are aimed at synthesis and may be used for subsequent generalization.

REFERENCES

- Adams, Mc.R. (1966). *The Evolution of Urban Society*. Chicago:Aldine.
- Checkland, S.G. (1968). "Toward a Definition of Urban History". in: Dyos, H.J. (ed), *The Study of Urban History*. London: Edward Arnold, pp. 343-361.
- Childe, V.G. (1950). "The Urban Revolution." *Town Planning Review*, 21, 3-17.
- Cox, O.C. (1969). "The Preindustrial City Reconsidered." in: Meadows, P. and Mizruchi, E.H. (eds.). *Urbanism, Urbanization and Change: Comparative Perspective*. Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley, pp. 19-29.
- Dickinson, R.E. (1951). *The West European City*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

- Eikelman, D.F. (1981). *The Middle East, An Anthropological Approach*. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall.
- Francfort, H. (1951). *The Birth of Civilization in the Near East*. London: Williams and Norgate.
- Geddes, P. (1971 reprint of 1915). *Cities in Evolution*. New York: Harper and Row.
- Goheen, P.G. (1970). *Victorian Toronto, 1850—1900: Patterns and Processes of Growth*. Research Paper 127, University of Chicago, Chicago: Department of Geography.
- von Grunebaum, G.E. (1955). "The Structure of the Muslim Town." *American Anthropological Association*, 57, 141-158.
- von Grunebaum, G.E. (1962). "The Sacred Nature of Islamic Cities." in: A. Badawi (ed.), *Melanges Taha Hussein*. Cairo: Dar al-Maaref, pp. 25-37.
- Harris, C.D. and Ullman, E.L. (1945). "The Nature of Cities." *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 242, 7-17.
- Kark, R. (1976). *The Development of Jerusalem and Jaffa — 1840 up to the First World War*. Ph.D. Thesis, Jerusalem: The Hebrew University.
- Kark, R. and Landman, S. (1980). "The Establishment of Muslim Neighbourhoods in Jerusalem Outside the Old City During the Late Ottoman Period." *Palestine Exploration Quarterly*, 112, 113-135.
- Kark, R. (1981). "The Traditional Middle Eastern City: The Cases of Jerusalem and Jaffa." *Zeitschrift Des Deutschen Palästina Vereins*, 97, 93-108.
- Kark, R. (1983). *Jaffa — From Village to Primate City, A Study of Transition, 1799—1914*. Jerusalem: Yad Izhak Ben-Zvi Publications (in press), (Hebrew).
- Lampard, E.E. (1963). "Urbanization and Social Change." in: Handlin, O. and Burchard, J. (eds.), *The Historian and the City*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: M.I.T. Press, pp. 225-247.
- Lampard, E.E. (1975). "Two Cheers for Quantitative History: An Agnostic Forward." in: Schnore, L.F. (ed.), *The New Urban History*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 12-50.
- Meadows, P. and Mizruchi, E.H. (eds), (1969). *Urbanization and Change: Comparative Perspective*, Reading, Mass: Addison-Wesley.
- Morse, R.M. (1975). "A Framework for Latin American Urban History." in: Hardow, J.E. (ed.), *Urbanization in Latin America: Approaches and Issues*. Garden City N.Y. : Anchor Press-Doubleday, pp. 57-18.
- Mumford, L. (1955). "The Natural History of Urbanization." in: Thomas, W.L. (ed), *Man's Role in Changing the Face of the Earth*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 382-400.
- Mumford, L. (1961). *The City in History*. New York: Penguin.
- Murvar, V. (1969). "Occidental Versus Oriental City." in: Meadows, P. and Mizruchi, E.H. (eds.), *Urbanism, Urbanization and Change: Comparative Perspective*, Reading, Mass: Addison-Wesley, 51-63.

- Oppenheim, A.L. (1969). "Mesopotamia — Land of Many Cities." in: Lapidus, I.M. (ed.), *Middle Eastern Cities*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 3-18.
- Pirenne, H. (1956). *Medieval Cities*. Garden City: Doubleday.
- de Planhol, X. (1959). *The World of Islam*. Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press.
- Polanyi, K., Arensberg, C.M. and Pearson, H.W. (1957). *Trade and Market in the Early Empires*, Glencoe: The Gree Press.
- Redfield, R. and Singer, M.B. (1954). "The Cultural Role of Cities." *Economic Development and Cultural Change*, 3, 53-73.
- Saalman, H. (1968). *Medieval Cities*. New York: G. Braziller.
- Schnore, L.F. (1968). "Problems in the Quantitative Study of Urban History." in Dyos, H.J. (ed.), *The Study of Urban History*. London: E. Arnold, 189-191.
- Schnore, L.F. (1975). "Further Reflections on the 'New' Urban History: A Prefatory Note." in: Schnore, L.F. (ed.), *The New Urban History*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 3-11.
- Sjoberg, G. (1965). "Cities in Developing and Industrial Societies: A Cross Cultural Analysis." in: P.M. Houser and Schnore, L.F. (eds.), *The Study of Urbanization*. New York: Wiley, 213-263.
- Sjoberg, G. (1966). *The Preindustrial City*. New York: The Free Press.
- Sjoberg, G. (1973). "The Origin and Evolution of Cities." in: Davis, K. (ed), *Cities, Their Origin, Growth and Human Impact*. San Francisco: W.H. Freeman, 19-27.
- Steward, J.H. (1955). *Theory of Culture Change*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.
- Tekely, I. (1971). "The Evolution of Spatial Organization in the Ottoman Empire and the Turkish Republic." *Ekistics*, 31, 51-71.
- Toynbee, A. (1970). *Cities on the Move*. London: Oxford University Press.
- Tunard, C. (1963). "The Customary and the Characteristic: A Note on the Pursuit of City Planning History." in: Handlin, O. and Burchard, J. (eds.), *The Historian and the City*. Cambridge, Mass.: M.I.T. Press, 216-224.
- Wade, R.C. (1971). "An Agenda for Urban History." in: Billias, G.A. and Grob, G.N. (eds.), *American History — Retrospect and Prospect*. New York: The Free Press, 367-398.
- Wagstaff, J.M. (1980). "The Origin and Evolution of Towns: 4000 B.C. to A.D. 1900" in: Blake, G.H. and Lawless, R.I. (eds). *The Changing Middle Eastern City*. Beekenhan, Kent: Croom Helm, 11-13.
- Weber, A.F. (1963 reprint of 1899). *The Growth of Cities in the Nineteenth Century*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- Weber, M. (1968 edited by Roth, G. and Wittich, C). *The City*. New York: The Free Press.
- Wheatly, P. (1963). "What the Greatness of a City is Said to be: Reflections on Sjoberg's 'Preindustrial City'." *Pacific Viewpoint*, 14, 163-188.

- Wheatly, P. (1972). "The Concept of Urbanism." in: Ucko, P.Y., Tringham, R. and Dimbleby, G.W. (eds.), *Man, Settlement and Urbanism*, London: G. Duckworth, 601-63.
- Wirth, L. (1938). "Urbanism as a Way of Life." *American Journal of Sociology*. 44, 1-24.
- Wittfogel, K.A. (1957). *Oriental Despotism. A Comparative Study of Total Power*. New Haven:: Yale University Press.