

individual ownership, registration under the Ottoman code gave separate title deeds for “shares” in the land of a village “without” dividing the land.⁷⁴ In other words, what the Ottoman code did not recognize was communal ownership (i.e., the land being held by the village as a unit), but the Ottoman state did not generally interfere with the practice of *musha’a* as long as taxes were paid. This, of course, made for better tax collection, which was one of the main aims of the Land Code as part of the *Tanzimat* movement.

Another indicator of the impact of the Land (Settlement of Title) Ordinance of 1928 on the breakdown of *Musha’a* can be seen by comparing the number of land title registration before and after the promulgation of the ordinance (see Table 3.4), although part of these lands was not held in *musha’a* at the time. Whereas the average number of registrations in the 1921-1927 period was 7,763, in the next six years (i.e., starting with the year of the ordinance), the number was doubled; and in the next six years, it more than doubled. This land registration (i.e.,

Table 3.4. Annual Average Number of Title Registration

Years	Number
1921-1927	7,763
1928-1933	16,199
1934-1939	35,733
1940-1945	36,298

Source: Derived from *Survey I*, 242.

⁷⁴Firestone, “Land-Equalizing,” 107.