

court records, for instance. The words' literal meanings are incongruent with the way they were applied in the *emlak* register. There were numerous, multiple-*musaqqafāt odas*, for instance, so an *oda* obviously could be more than “a room”. Likewise, there were *hanes* of one *musaqqaf*. We can deduce from assessed values of residences that a *hane* was usually bigger than an *oda*; in general, *hanes* were valued higher than *odas*. Nevertheless, one can easily observe so many exceptions to this platitude that it would be careless to attempt to deduce more than this. Did the category *musaqqafāt* have a variable meaning? Was an *oda* a one-story structure and a *hane* a two-story structure? Did *oda* cover both stand-alone buildings and, equivalent to the Arabic *bayt* (as opposed to *dār*), a room or series of rooms within an extended-family residence? These questions cannot be answered with available information.

Mundy and Saumarez-Smith have assumed that in ‘Ajlun a *hane* was a house and an *oda* a room.<sup>185</sup> Their analysis of housing values and socioeconomic stratification within and between villages in ‘Ajlun appears to indicate that there was a clear distinction between these two types of housing there, in terms of value.<sup>186</sup> In any case, it did not lead them to question the meaning of the terms. The picture in Hebron was clearly different.

Table 2.2 shows a representative sample of the range of housing values in settlements of various sizes in the different *nahiyas* of the Hebron district. Two phenomena

---

<sup>185</sup> Mundy and Saumarez-Smith, 138.

<sup>186</sup> *Ibid.*, See housing and housing-value distribution maps and the discussion following, 61-65.