

emergence of big landlordism and a multiplicity of sharecropping arrangements.

The impact of partible inheritance of land in the context of dry farming generated comparable consequences in terms of parcellization, marginalization of agriculture, seasonal farming, substantial migration out of the rural sector and high incidence of wage-labour. In both regions, also capitalist domination and the introduction of capital intensive technology, where it was introduced, did not necessarily lead 'towards the establishment of wage-labour capital relations' in agriculture (Keydar, 1980:3). That is, peasant household production persisted despite increased commercialization and the introduction of scientific farming. That trend, of course, is by now a characteristic phenomenon not only of Levantine agriculture but also of West European farming as well (Djurfeldt, 1982:139). What distinguishes Turkey for the purposes of this analysis is the wider spectrum along which variations in agrarian structures was spread out, and a more accentuated response to the penetration of capitalist relations in agriculture in terms of peasant differentiation and cyclical mobility of farming households.³ Since the Turkish empirical data corresponds to and includes such a wider variety than the forms under our consideration, it is possible to elucidate hypothetical constructs which illustrate the morphology of village types, and dominant developmental tendencies among peasants, more sharply than the comparable, but incipient, forms which still prevail in the Palestinian case.

In his classification scheme, Keydar outlines three divergent types of villages that highlight developmental tendencies emerging in Turkish rural structures. The assumption adopted by Keydar as a basis for his typology is that internal differentiation within farming households and patterns of land exploitation are mediated by the social