

the discrepancy in names between the *salname* and the *emlak* register in this case (and the others) has a history that more research will allow us to decipher precisely.

One who compares the other names in the Arabic script as reproduced in Table 2.1 will quickly notice that the incongruence between names in many instances is due to a small apparent misreading of letters that can look similar in handwritten scripts – confusion between a و and a ر or a د, for example, or a ف and a ن. It is most unclear, however, how other names reached Damascus, where the *salname* was drawn up. Bani N’aja, for example. This does not appear in the sources of early-Ottoman *tapu tahrir* documents. By comparison with the other village names listed in the *salname* within the subdistrict (*nahiye*) of Halilürrahman one arrives at the conclusion that this was Bani Na’im. Is it a coincidence that Khallat Na’ja is one of the land areas that belonged to Bani Na’im in the late nineteenth century? The area, today subsumed into Hebron’s municipal boundaries, was an area of vineyards (*bağ*) in the late nineteenth century. Among farmers who had plots there, each up to twenty dunams in size, were nine Hebronites, members of Bani Na’im’s leading family the Manāşrehs, and a son of the infamous Shaykh ‘Abd al-Rahman ‘Amr of Dura, who had married a woman from Bani Na’im.<sup>156</sup> The unfamiliarity with Hebron that these mis-namings and mis-reading or mis-dating of names indicates prompt us to examine the accompanying numerical data for inaccuracies as well.

---

<sup>156</sup> *Esas-ı Emlak* entries #11475, 11476, 11477, 12214, 12217, 12630, 12649, 12650, 12652, 12661, 12662, and 12666 and Bani Na’im agricultural entries #155, #202.