

register signified ownership and, most significantly, it could be used to help prove ownership in cases of dispute or application for a tapu deed.

Appendix I to this study reproduces an image of two register pages and a translation of the form headlines on the pages of Hebron's *Esas-ı Emlak* register. The heading on the column for names, *esām-ı ashāb-ı emlak*, indicates that the tax obligation was to be registered in the "name of the owner(s) of the property". However, as will be discussed in Chapter 4, there did not necessarily need to be congruency between the *tapu* and tax lists, although this was undoubtedly the long-term Ottoman goal.²³⁰ It was possible to register a property in the *emlak* without registering it in the *tapu*. In the absence of a *tapu* register for Hebron with which we can compare, it is impossible to estimate the degree to which one was divergent from the other in Hebron. It can be reasonably assumed, though, that at this juncture the tax register was the more thorough record, at least in the early decades of reform.²³¹

***Emlak* registration as a strategy**

One who wishes to discuss *average* or *typical* patterns of rural land ownership in Hebron quickly runs into difficulties. While we can divide claimed ownership into two typologies, individual/partner and communal, an examination of patterns of registration from village to village reveals that there was flexibility allowed in registration. Individuals, family groupings

²³⁰ Mundy and Saumarez-Smith, 108-109, 135, 204.

²³¹ Gerber (1985),