

holdings there. What concerns us is the discrepancy brought to light between the tapu registers of 1875 and the property-value and land tax (*vergi*) register of 1876.

In 1876, only seven residents of Taffūḥ were named as land owners of Jamrūra lands in the *Emlak* register (See Table 4.3, above). The dissonance appears baffling. How can it be explained? How should it be understood? It is plausible that the circumstances of representative claims seen in previous chapters and likewise to be seen below in the Idhna case were in part replicated here, in the *Emlak* register. The proportion of divisions of the land – five plots of 105 dunams each, and two plots of 70 dunams each – suggests a representative division of tax liability, if not ownership. If this was the case, then conceivably one name in the *Emlak* register represented a number of tapu holders. It is not clear from available evidence, however, why these seven would have been chosen. The other property holdings they registered in their names do not set them apart from other villagers in terms of status based on property wealth. Muhammad b. ‘Isa Ṭubās, for example, registered assets valued at a total of 3,250 kuruş: a one-room hane, two vineyard plots together totaling 2.5 dunams, and two vegetable-garden plots, together totaling 1.25 dunams.³⁴⁶ Ibrāhīm b. Jādallah Zawātneh registered only a 9-dunam vineyard plot and a quarter-dunam vegetable garden, together valued at 5,250 kuruş.³⁴⁷ Jabr b. Sulīmān and Muhammad b. Naşrallah Zreiqāt each registered just one small property, the former a quarter-dunam vegetable

³⁴⁶ *Esas-l Emlak*, Taffuh entries #52 (residences), and #51, 114, 366, and 388 (agricultural properties).

³⁴⁷ *Ibid.*, entries #202, 386 (agricultural properties).