

men registered in the *Emlak* register were quite possibly family heads, but their status within their extended families cannot be ascertained from information available. Their reported landed wealth, and lack thereof, has been discussed above. The size of the seven Jamrūra plots recorded in the tax register, five plots of 105 dunams and two plots of 70 dunams, implies that the ownership was in shares. Given the size of the plots and the number of tapu certificates, it is reasonable to assume that a number of people did indeed stand behind the registered owners, working the land. We can understand that this was distinct from a partnership, since there was no notation in the *Emlak* register that a partnership existed. In the following section, the case from Idhna to be discussed will clarify how this arrangement was treated in the tapu register.

It may also be mentioned that in Dura a number of Taffuḥ villagers registered in their names in the *Emlak* register large parcels of field-crop land. These plots were widely variant in size but most were large, some comparable in size to the whole of Taffuḥ's 665 dunams in Jamrūra. For example, Ṣāliḥ b. Jādallah claimed a single, 735-dunam plot in Far'a, as well as an additional 25-dunam plot in another part of Dura's lands.³⁶⁴ One Sālim b. Muslim registered a 285-dunam plot on Khallat 'Ayn Fāris.³⁶⁵ And Ismā'īl b. Badawī al-Khmeise, the

variations of a name also can be found, at times within one document, more often between different documents. Also, it must be added, unfamiliar, scripted names can be the hardest for a researcher to decipher. That is to say, I may unwittingly be responsible for transcription errors regarding the Hebron sharia-court records, of which any form of reproduction other than hand-copying was forbidden to me.

³⁶⁴ The smaller plot was in Qīr'as(?). *Esas-ı Emlak*, entries # 9060, 9064.

³⁶⁵ *Ibid.*, entry # 9063.