

that was valid. Further, it has been shown that it was not necessary to have a tapu certificate in order to claim ownership for the *emlak* commission and pay taxes. Taxes were another way of claiming ownership. This demonstrates that proving tenure through tapu and tapu alone is a requirement imposed *after* the Ottoman period, anachronistically. Under subsequent regimes, the tapu ironically has come to have more legal weight than it did under the government that created it.

Further, these court cases establish that villagers in Hebron were aware of and familiar with the law. The way that villagers in these three cases constructed their arguments, arranged their proofs, and presented their demands to the court proves that one generation after the land and tax commissions, reforms had been integrated into societal procedure, and villagers were conversant in the ins and outs of the new laws.