

two halves likely reflected already-existing patterns of farming arrangements. By creating a corporation, villagers engendered a situation where each large bloc of land remained communal, *musha*. And since every shareholder's name was on the tapu certificate(s) as a partner, future division of the lands remained a viable option. It was facilitated by partnership clauses in the Land Code of 1858. Article 15 paved the way for arrangements like the one the Idhna villagers created. It stated that land could be divided equitably among partners if all or some of the partners requested division, provided that the division did not harm the overall yield. The yield of the sum of the divisions separately could not be less than the yield of them when joined as a whole.³⁸³

For the Salīmīs, the representative head owner appears to have been the clan elder. Bashīr al-Salīmī had been the head of the dominant family of the Salīmī *hamula*. In the family-history section of Idhna's village history, the branch of the Salīmī family descended from Bashīr forms the first Salīmī tree, and this branch (*fakhd*) of the Salīmīs is known until today by Bashīr's name.³⁸⁴ The family tree shows that Ḥamdān was the eldest of Bashīr's two sons.³⁸⁵ His status did not translate into wealth, according to the *Emlak* registers of 1876. Ḥamdān registered only a modest *hane* valued at 750 kuruş and the largest vegetable

³⁸³ Tute, 20-21.

³⁸⁴ *Idhna qaryatun*, 39. Multiple generation family trees dating back to the nineteenth century comprise large sections of many village history books and are a valuable resource for social historians.

³⁸⁵ The trees, which include only males, are constructed chronologically. Generations are represented vertically and siblings horizontally, from right to left according to age.