

To reassert its control, the state reaffirmed its *raqaba* rights over *miri* land, but at the same time embarked on the issuance of titles to the holders of such land. Warriner provides an interpretation of this seemingly contradictory policy. “The state’s claim to ownership really meant only that the state did not recognize ownership unless the title was registered and the land therefore taxable.”¹⁹ Moreover, the new Land Code did not recognize any form of communal ownership (*mushaa*). It also declared that land left uncultivated for three years could be confiscated, and that land could not be sold without permission from the government.²⁰

In addition to the issuance of titles, the code also extended the rights of inheritance; both measures intended to provide incentives for the improvement of land. It also allowed for land to be rented, and placed no restrictions on the size of privately owned land.²¹

The complex forms of land tenure, the tentative and incomplete transitional nature of the *tanzimat* period, and, as yet, the lack of detailed local information on the different parts of the empire have given rise to various interpretations on the intentions and results of the Land Code. For example, Sluglett and Farouk-Sluglett reject the assertion by Warriner that one of the intentions of the Land Code was to

¹⁹Warriner, “Land Problems,” 73.

²⁰Baer, 84.

²¹Kerpat, 87-8.