

[landowners (hg)] applied to receive title-deeds (*senedat*), they encountered difficulties, which increased daily.³⁰²

Gerber found the passage relevant because, as he understood it, it demonstrated that *musha* was indeed registered in the *tapu*. While it is true that *musha* was registered in the *tapu*, as will be seen in Chapter 4, I do not believe that this is what was being referred to here.³⁰³ As we have seen above, *musha* was not disallowed by the *emlak* registration commission. In fact, villages had relative freedom to register *musha* as they saw fit. Shuyukh registered its *musha*-turned-waqf all on one line. Samu' chose to register *musha* line-by-line according to its location, but not to individuals but, rather to "the people". Dura and Yatta registered their *musha* to individual shareholders. As we will see in Chapter 4, *tapu* deeds were also granted under these circumstances.

I believe the difficulties pointed to in the central-government communication bring us back to one of the points discussed at the beginning of this chapter: the *en bloc* registrations. As shown in Table 3.1 at the beginning of this chapter, *en bloc* registrations appear to have been stop-gap measures taken advantage of by most of the villages. Perhaps it results from

³⁰² Gerber (1985): 214. When Gerber conducted his research, the Administrative Council files had not yet been catalogued by the ISA. He cites the document referred to here as #2515 from the year 1327.

³⁰³ Unfortunately, Gerber does not reproduce the original Turkish. It would be desirable to confirm that "basic [land] survey" was, in the original, *esas-i yoklama* and also that "in common" is indeed, not a translation of the word *mushā'*. My assumption is that Gerber would have noted the Ottoman/Arabic term if it were used, as he noted *senedati*. It is likely that a different phrase, perhaps *ıstirāken*, was used. I do not question Gerber's translation, per se. Rather, I question his interpretation of the meaning of the document.