

misunderstanding in the literature that *musha* was incompatible with and outlawed by land-tenure reform laws. This idea, together with *musha*'s continued existence, has been a pillar of the argument that land-tenure reform failed. This chapter demonstrates that *musha* was permitted after land-tenure reforms, and it begins to examine the ways in which villagers simultaneously conformed with Ottoman goals of individualizing deeds to title and tax obligations while preserving land-management techniques like this that were beneficial to them. This discussion will continue in Chapter 4, as well. We begin this chapter with a historiographical intervention regarding the traditional understanding of individual/household agricultural wealth in the province of Jerusalem in the early twentieth century. The following section presents an overview of agricultural property in the district of Hebron. The chapter then considers patterns of registration in the *emlak* register.

### **Misreadings: Ruppin and Granott on farmholdings and sharecroppers**

In 1907, 1909, 1913, and 1914, the Ottomans compiled statistical data on the size of agricultural lands, agricultural plot-sizes, and production in various parts of the empire. These surveys administered by the Ministry of Forests, Mines, and Agriculture (*Orman ve Meadin ve Ziraat Nezareti*) were conducted by means of questionnaires sent to the *qaza* (subdistrict) governments to be completed in part by chambers of commerce (*ticaret odalari*) and city councils (*belediye meclisleri*), and in part by commissions comprised of treasury, tapu and population-registry (*nufüs*) officials. *Vergi* records like the *emlak* register