

The village-to-village registration-pattern variations are seemingly slight, yet they are, nonetheless, important to note. In Sa'ir, for example, the list of properties is organized by families. In other villages, like Tel al-Şāfī and Yaţţa, the village's list was arranged and recorded according to crops – all the fig trees, followed by the vegetable gardens, followed by fields and olive-tree plots. In other villages, such as in Shuyukh, the list of properties was ordered according to locations, first all the plots (olive trees, vineyards, and fields) in Sh'ib al-Fāris, followed by those in Wadi al-Ĥrĥa<sup>360</sup> (fields, vineyards, figs, and olives), Kan'ān (olives, figs, fields, vegetable gardens, and vineyards), and etc. These variations suggest that the Ottoman surveyors heading the *Emlak* survey committee were flexible in their survey methodology in order to win the much-needed cooperation of the populace so that the most complete registration of properties and equitable evaluation of property values could be conducted.

But how far were they willing to bend? Or was this bending at all? Was it generally permitted in the district, and elsewhere, to issue tapu certificates to property shareholders who were not registered or otherwise noted as taxpayers? An examination of the case of co-partnerships indicates that the answer is “yes”. Throughout the Hebron district one finds in the *Emlak* survey evidence of joint partnerships of property, from houses to olive presses to farmlands. This is not surprising; Islamic laws of inheritance facilitated the creation of intra-

---

<sup>360</sup> واد الحرحة: Ĥirĥa? Ĥarĥa? Ĥurĥa? I could not locate this wadi.