

(22 Rajab 1292), six months before the *maliyye* year of 1292 began and the *Esas-ı Emlak* register was recorded.

This case was framed as a lawsuit, but it was not actually conflictual. The twenty-four claims of ownership dating back to 1875 were not challenged in court by Husayn, the defendant. It was not mentioned in the court record that tapu certificates had been requested or presented in court. Actually, the ownership of the original group was not in question. Husayn acknowledged the ownership rights of the twenty-four individuals, whose names were read aloud and duly recorded in the court record.³²⁵ Husayn asked only for proof that Ismaʿīl and those he represented were indeed entitled according to Islamic law to inherit the rights of the now-deceased tapu holders. The burden of proof was satisfied through witness testimony, in accordance with traditionally accepted rules of substantiation in the sharia court. This is undoubtedly why the case was held in the village square. The group of sixteen was comprised of first- and second-generation inheritors, since some direct descendants of the twenty-four had already died. As one can imagine, between the numbers of individuals invested in the outcome of the case and those called to witness right to inheritance, the crowd gathered must have been sizable.

³²⁵ They were: Muslim al-Sāida, Salāme Sulīmān, Husayn Muhammad, Ibrahim al-Hājj, Ibrahim Salāme, Maḥmūd Qāsim, Salḥī Abu Sneine, Khalīl al-Muṭāliqa, Muhammad ʿIsa al-Qawma, Salāḥ al-Ṣawāyreh, Badawī b. Muhammad Badawī, Muslim al-Khmeise, Jābir ʿUthmān, Jibrīn Muṣṭafa, al-Ḥajj Sulīmān, Sulīmān Ḥamīdān, Salāme Shihāda, Ḥassān al-ʿAṭiyāt, Ismaʿīl Jibrīn, Muhammad Naṣrallah, Anīm(?) al-Ṣawāir, Husayn Khalīl, Sʿaīd Badrān, and Muslim Abu Zreiq [Zreiqāt].