

intra-village conflicts over how to register their lands? There were not any villages who did not register at least their residences in the names of individuals, so fear of recording one's name does not seem a plausible explanation for *en bloc* registrations. It could not have been a measure to avoid taxes, because taxes were assessed and charged. The *en bloc* registration and payment of property taxes it entailed was a stake to official claim *by the village* on the land.

There is a growing consensus among historians that it was economic benefits that Ottomans sought foremost to gain in the second half of the nineteenth century through institutionalizing a fee-based property-registration and transference system, streamlining the tax system, instituting a broad-based property tax, and individualizing its levy. Accordingly, we can conclude that it was in Ottoman interest that the registration commissions displayed the flexibility and pragmatism that are known to be characteristic of Ottoman governance over its large and diverse empire. This allowed them to register the greatest amount of properties possible. In this light, *en bloc* registrations in the *emlak* register appear to have been a compromise. As long as the the land identified and the amount of its dunams recorded, a value for the land could be assessed and the *vergi cedit* (new property tax) could be levied.

For these same reasons of encouraging compliance with the law, it would also be prudent for the Ottomans in the decades to come to keep in place a variety of mechanisms to facilitate individuals' observance of the new regulations and procedures after the fact of their initial implementation. After all, it was from registrations, whenever they took place, and the