

physical indication of this is *menzûls*, or guesthouses. As shown in this study, eighteen of the Hebron villages registered a structure for hosting guests in the village in 1876. Another indication is out-of-district land ownership. As Appendix IV illustrates, the majority of property owners registered in Hebron's *Esas-ı Emlak* whose residence was outside the district, lived not in one of Palestine's cities but, rather, in another of its villages.

Secondly, as this dissertation has shown, Hebron's villagers were not, as the conventional narrative would have them, unaware of the society in which they lived and of which they were a part, nay, the majority. Whether bargaining for a lower tax rate based on historical and religious privilege, as did the Shuyukh villagers; registering land ownership in the names of a representative few, as was seen in Nahālīn and Idhna; converting village agricultural properties into waqf, as did the Shuyukhis with their musha and as did the Idhna villagers, apparently, with their vineyards; registering village lands *en bloc* as most villages did with at least part of their lands or trees; or registering all properties to individuals, as did Bani Na'im, Sa'ir, Nahālīn, Wadi Fukīn, 'Arṭūf, and Ja'ba – Hebron villagers strategized to comply with reform but to comply in such a way that reform worked *in* their interest and not against it.

This study has begun to unravel the historiographical web of information upon which the narrative of land tenure in post-1858 Ottoman Palestine has been built. Doing so, it has revealed the debility of its evidence. Not only has this study shown that property-tenure reforms were carried out thoroughly in at least one part of Palestine, its evidence has put