

representative of the Taffuḥ villagers in the 1895 case, registered on Dura's lands 318 dunams: a 168-dunam plot at Rifāda and a 150-dunam plot at 'Ayn Mawsib (or Mūsib).³⁶⁶

Each of these parcels was too big to be farmed by a single family, without either partners or hired laborers.

To conclude, I argue that the seeming contradictions between tapu and tax lists which this case makes apparent were not problematic in Ottoman eyes, and neither were they disharmonious for the landowners and taxpayers involved. Rather, they should be seen as a reflection of flexibility on the part of the registration commission(s) in working to register villages' properties. It indicates that the *Emlak* commission's concern, not illogically, was not with *who* owned what, per se. It bears recalling that the individual citizen was just beginning in these decades to become significant for the government. For example, traditional population counts in the Empire had, for centuries, used the household as the unit of measurement when counting the population. This remained the case until 1831, when the male individual became the unit of measurement. It would be another half century before women made it onto the population rolls. In 1881, the General Population Administration (Nüfus-u Umumi İdaresi) was created, and population counts began to record the entire population.³⁶⁷ In the Hebron district, however, it was not until 1905 that a full-

³⁶⁶ Ibid., entries #9056, 9059. Some of the Taffuḥi properties in Dura are locatable on available maps. See Abu Sitta, sheets # 474/A3 and C3, 475/A3, and 493/B1 and C1.

³⁶⁷ Gülhan Balsoy, *The Politics of Reproduction in Ottoman Society, 1838–1900* (London: Pickering and Chatto, 2013), p. 7.