

tax-farming estates, and in some cases as a result of peasant indebtedness, but also because of the westward expansion of cultivation that in many cases was in previously uncultivated areas. Equally important was the peasants' registering of title in the name of some wealthy or influential individual, and thus became "landless" in the legal sense. In all these situations, customary rights were honored, and access to land was maintained, whether a peasant had "legal" title to it or not. At the same time, any loss of land or access to it because of the rise in large-landed estates was mitigated by the westward expansion of cultivation by individuals and whole villages, and not only by large owners, as Owen points out.<sup>94</sup> Moreover, this Western movement led to the expansion of the *musha'a* system.<sup>95</sup>

As for the transition to agricultural labor that Stein points to, it too was very limited in scope during Ottoman rule. Although we lack exact figures on wage labor in general, and on agricultural wage labor specifically, we do know that the latter was primarily confined to the cash crop citrus plantations and European settlements that hired some of the original cultivators of these lands. The extent of incorporation in the world capitalist market, combined with the limited development of cash crops, the limited extent of market relations in the country, and the changes in land tenure, all point to, as described and analyzed in Chapter 2, to extremely limited changes in the existing social relations of production. Thus,

---

<sup>94</sup>Owen, *Middle East*, 267.

<sup>95</sup>Scholch, 111.