

There appear to be three errors in the *salname* numbers, as noted in the Table above with the notation “(sic?)”. I believe an extra zero was inadvertently added to the *hane* numbers for Ras Abu ‘Amār, ‘Artūf, and Suflā, and that likely these figures should be 33, 14, and 80 *hanes* respectively. According to the figures as recorded, there were 3,566 *hanes* in the district in 1871. If we assume we can correct for extra zeroes, this reduces the overall *hane* count to 3,071. In 1876, when the unit of counting was not *hanes* but, rather, residences, 3,646 homes were counted in the district. This is the total of the figures in the first column of Table 2.1.

It is expected that there would be more residences than *hanes*, since my research into Hebron’s population registers shows that the *hane* often comprised more than one conjugal family. And as expected, a comparison between the numbers of households in 1871 and the number of residences in 1876 yields these results in all but twelve cases, or 20 percent of the entries. Residences (*oda, hane*) in the rural Hebron district appear to have been primarily single-family units. This corresponds with the situation Kenneth Cuno found in rural Egypt in the mid-nineteenth century.<sup>157</sup>

---

<sup>157</sup> The 1848 census in Egypt was enumerated in the villages not by household (*ma’isha* in Arabic) but, rather, by house (*manzil*). In the three villages he sampled, he found that nuclear families – a husband and wife and their children) were predominant in the *manzils*. Kenneth Cuno, “Demography, Household Formation, and Marriage in Three Egyptian Villages during the Mid-Nineteenth Century”, in Mohammad Afifi, Rachida Chih, Brigitte Marino, Nicolas Michel and Işık Tamdoğan, eds., *Sociétés rurales ottomanes / Ottoman Rural Societies* (Cairo: Institute français d’archéologie orientale), 110.