

Code and tax reforms. The first case involves Taffuhis' claims through inheritance to rights to profits gleaned from the harvests of Jamrūra lands, in the absence of tapu certificates in their names. The case demonstrates that the tapu office and tapu system of proving land tenure did not fully replace pre-Tanzimat institutions and mechanisms that had been used previously for these purposes. While it suggests that by the end of the nineteenth century the tapu certificate had become the preferred document by the populace for proving land tenure, it shows that legal ownership continued to be able to be proven through documents procured from pre-Tanzimat, traditional institutions. It also addresses the question of the need for harmony between tax documentation and tapu (title-deed) certificates.

The second case, the Idhna case, supports the theory that the tapu system was becoming predominant in society. In this land dispute on the edge of Jamrūra, court was recessed so that officials could consult title-deed registers in the tapu office. This case brings to light an issue that has drawn much attention in scholarly literature on land reform in Palestine: the question of representative registration of ownership of lands in the name of a notable, in this instance the heads of the village's extended-family groups. We have seen samples of land-registrations like this in the *emlak* register, in Chapter 3. I argue that representational ownership in the registers was strategic on the part of villagers, not an attempt to evade reform or a relinquishment of rights. Stakeholders in this arrangement were also included on the title-deed. Thus, villagers created effective shareholder corporations under the name of their