

deduced from this evidence that significant permanent settlement by the ancestors of today's main families in these villages occurred at some point between the sixteenth and nineteenth centuries. Needless to say, the sites of these villages have a much longer history of settlement.³¹³ Regarding Jamrūra, the early-sixteenth century tapu register lists two villages in the Hebron district which may have referred to Jamrūra, but neither possibility can be concluded with any certainty.³¹⁴ Ehud Toledano, who has also examined these early-Ottoman registers, reads these two locales as “Jamrūra or: Jamrūn” and Jamrīn villages.³¹⁵

between the *ḥa* (h) and the *jiim* (j) is only a dot: ح ج, and a middle-*jiim* can be hard to decipher from a middle-*miim* (m) in some handwritten scripts. However, the *khirbe* cannot be located in the register itself.

³¹³ Archaeological findings attest to the fact that both settlements are ancient. (Dabbagh, p. 204)

³¹⁴ There is similarity in the names. The register was organized by timar-holders and their properties, which were not always confined to contiguous areas, so proximity of locales on the register pages cannot be taken as a certain indicator of topographical closeness. For example, Taffūḥ and Bayt Kāḥil are found next to each other in the register, but geographically close Tarqumiyya is listed elsewhere.

Jamrūra is written **جمرورة**, however the *siyakāt* script employed omits the dots which are so crucial to distinguishing letters in Arabic and Ottoman Turkish. One may consider village (entry #347) Jamrīn or Jimrīn (**جمرين**), for which the authors also suggest the possibility of reading the entry as Jamīra (i.e., **جميرة**). They identify this as being a mezra “close to Ḥalḥul [village]”, which conceivably could be our Jamrūra: It is four kilometers west of Ḥalḥul. Bakhit and Sawariyyah, pp. 225, 228. Additionally, the authors suggest the following possible readings for the name of Hebron-area village (entry #358) in Tapu Defter 131: **جمرويه**, **جمرويه**, **جمرويه**, **جمروت**. Jamrūra does not appear to be a possible reading of the record (a facsimile of the original is included with the authors’ transliteration and annotations), however the authors frequently note locations in the register which, when compared with their known names today, appear to us as variations or perhaps copying errors: for example, Bayt Kāḥil and Bayt Kāmil; Dīr Šāfit and Dīr Šāmit; Jibrān and Bayt Jibrīn (whose name in nineteenth-century Hebron court records often appears as Bayt Jibrīl), and Baṭṭa (found often in nineteenth-century, central-government Turkish documents) instead of Yaṭṭa. Thus, it is worthwhile to mention (in a footnote) these possibilities regarding Jamrūra, even though definitive conclusions cannot be reached.

³¹⁵ Ehud Toledano, “*Sancak Yerushalaim ba-meah Ha-tet*”zany – *Hityashvut Kfarit ve Magamot Demografiot* (The Jerusalem Sancak in the Sixteenth Century—Village Settlement and Demographic Trends) in Amnon Cohen, ed., *Prakim ba-Toldot Yerushalaim ba-Rishit HaTqufa HaOthmanit* (Chapters in the History of Jerusalem in the Early Ottoman Period), 75 Hebrew. Toledano mapped these locations, but I have not yet