

However, seemingly missing from the *sancak* provincial data for grains was the data for the *qaḍas* (district) of Hebron, Jaffa, Gaza, and Bir al-Saba', as Table 3.0 shows. Further, Ruppin understood *hane* to represent a conjugal family when, based on 1905 population data, it is uncertain that this was the case. Moreover, Ruppin or the translated source he used seems to have been unaware that the introduction that accompanied the Ottoman survey of 1909 presented a caveat to its statistics. Since land size was extrapolated from the *'uṣr* tax on crops, the compilers stated that they believed that production estimates were more reliable than the data for size of cultivated areas. In their estimation, the size of cultivated areas had had been underestimated by 25 to 30 percent.²¹⁰ Ruppin, to his credit, stated that the figure of 3,000 "familien" working in agriculture in the Jerusalem mutasarrıflık (he identified all the *sancaks* as mutasarrıflıks) was far too low, and he expressed reservation about the reliability of the statistics on more than one point.²¹¹ However, a general attitude of the time (and well into the twentieth century) among westerners was that Ottoman data was unreliable. His reservations, then, have not led to investigation by subsequent authors.

Granott appears to have relied on Ruppin.²¹² He states, however, that his source is "official Turkish data of the year 1909".²¹³ Compounding the problem, Granott assumed that

²¹⁰ Güran (1997), xviii.

²¹¹ Ruppin, 86.

²¹² See the discussion in Granott (1952) on pp. 38-39.