

residences #11 and #16, valued at 750 and 500 kuruş. And Ḥamdān's daughter and son, Sabḥa and Mustafa, each registered a residence. Hers, structure #18, was valued at 500 kuruş. Her brother's, structure #21, was assessed at 750 kuruş.

Conclusion

Information culled from the *Esas-ı Emlak* has permitted us in this chapter to sketch a picture of late-Ottoman village structure in the southern Palestinian hills that is immeasurably more concrete than has been possible to date. Yet, as pure indicators of relative wealth and economic stratification we must treat these numbers with caution. Firstly, and most obviously, housing values are only one possible indicator of wealth. For example, one not infrequently finds in the Hebron villages that people bearing the title "shaykh" are not those with the highest-valued residences. Of course, shaykhly status is also not necessarily an indicator of wealth, even though the conventional narrative explained in the Introduction to this study would have it so, particularly in the wake of land-tenure reform.

Secondly, and more importantly, as the example of Wadi Fukin has demonstrated, the *Esas-ı Emlak* register was not a statistical register. In the sample image from the register shown in Appendix 1 of this study, you, the reader, will likely focus primarily on the columns of numbers. The frontispiece image to this study is cropped in such a way that, hopefully, your eye was drawn to the most important data in the register: the names of the individuals. The social scientist's instinct is to crunch numbers, abstract percentages, and to identify