

have shown that the composition of *hane* was socially dependent and, thus, varied between regions. Maria N. Todorova, who examines Ottoman population statistics in her research on the demography of Ottoman Bulgaria, has found that “as a general rule, the term *hane* should not be translated, but its particular connotation interpreted in each single case.”¹⁶² As one might expect, *hanes* in cosmopolitan locations where work was often procured individually were smaller than in the country, where the dictates of the agricultural economy demanded joint labor. In late-nineteenth century Istanbul, for example, more than half the households contained no more than three to four individuals.¹⁶³ The same has been found to be true for mid-nineteenth century Cairo.¹⁶⁴

The average *hane* size in the city of Hebron, per the 1905 population register, was 11.5 individuals.¹⁶⁵ My initial investigation into the question of *hane* size in the villages’

¹⁶² Maria N. Todorova, *Balkan Family Structure and the European Pattern: Demographic Developments in Ottoman Bulgaria* (Budapest and New York: Central European University Press, 2006), 100.

¹⁶³ For example, according to the census of 1885 for Istanbul, which counted the entire population, 31 percent of the *hanes* were comprised of people either living alone or in small groups with others who were not family members. Another 30 percent of the households averaged just three members, while only 27 percent of the households were extended or multiple-family households. Alen Duben, “Understanding Muslim Households and Families in Late Ottoman Istanbul”, *Journal of Family History* 15 (1990): 73-74.

¹⁶⁴ Phillippe Fargues, “Family and Household in Mid-Nineteenth-Century Cairo”, in Beshara Doumani, ed. *Family History in the Middle East: Household, Property, and Gender* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 2003), 38.

¹⁶⁵ This summation is based on my research in the registers, which will be published in a future study. Johann Büssow makes use of 1905 population registers for the district of Jerusalem in his 2011 study on politics and society in the province of Jerusalem in the Hamidian era. According to Büssow, the basis of grouping individuals in the Jerusalem registry was by *mesken*, i.e., by residence. (Büssow, 21-23.) Although the same forms Büssow reproduces in his work (Pagis’ images) were used in the Hebron district, the unit of grouping individuals in Hebron was the *hane*, not the residence. The register columns