indeed been registered in the tapu register (which employed dunams, not feddans), *even though* their kushans were not presented or mentioned in court.

Secondly, the choice of the term *sahm* (share) is also noteworthy. We infrequently find this term employed in the Hebron sharia court, except in a minority of inheritance cases, for example, a number of siblings inheriting shares in a store, a house, a field, or an olive grove. The term *qīrāṭ* (pl. *qarārīṭ*) was more often used in cases of inheritance, as well as in mortgage cases. *Qīrāṭ*s signify twenty-fourths. The distinction between the two is that the latter term was employed when the property in question was left physically undivided, and was shared. Thus, one who sold his or her *qīrāṭ*s sold his or her partnership rights to the whole, not a particular portion of the property itself. Additionally, while *qirāṭ*s were shares of twenty-four, there was no limit on the number of *sahm*s.

More frequently than the employment of either of these two terms, however, one finds that sharia-court cases involving shares of an entity were enumerated in (*shari'*) fractions in accordance with rules of inheritance according to relation to the deceased. Thus, for example, one could own half a store, one-sixth of a tree, one-eighth of one-fourth of a room (*bayt*), etc. Mundy and Saumarez-Smith (2007) found that in Ajlun, Transjordan, many villages registered their musha in shares (*sahm*s or *qīrāṭ*s), as opposed to individual plots with named borders. The variety of ways communal properties were recorded in the *Emlak* register was discussed in Chapter 3. One illustration of how this ownership was reflected in the tapu registers has been discussed in this chapter, in the Idhna case. The reference to