

manifested in changes in the relations of production. This phenomenon also symbolized the beginning of a wide process of socio-economic differentiation within the village/Hamula. The village land which was once distributed among all the families in the village began to be concentrated in fewer hands. And the village structure which was family oriented began to gradually lose its character, giving birth to a new structure, whose main features were the intensification of relations of exploitation among family members of the same Hamula as well as in the increasing dependence of many families on the head of the Hamula.

In addition to their economic dependence on the landlord, peasants in the share-cropping system were also personally dependent on the landlords. This was particularly evident in villages under the control of the heads of Hamulas. Unlike the Sursuks or the Sultan who were absentee landlords, heads of Hamulas, until at least the early 20th century, resided on the land. The share-cropper, known in the Marxist literature as metayer, became economically, socially and personally dependent on the landowner.

Commenting on this phenomenon, Smilianskaya observed:

There is clear indication that the metayer was personally dependent on the Feudal lord: the former did not have the right to marry without the landlord's permission; upon his marriage the metayer paid a fee., and according to some sources, the metayer could not leave his feudal lord at will, whereas the latter could forcibly transfer a metayer to another estate. (Smilianskaya, 1966: 236)

The contention that share-cropping forms of production are necessarily backward or present obstacles to capitalist development in agriculture is simplistic. The previous discussion shows that this