

value of the land.³³¹ Article 9 of the Tapu Law of 1859 determined the cost of administrative fees that would also be charged the inheritor: three kuruş for the cost of paper on which the tapu certificate was written and a one-kuruş clerk's fee.³³² Article 9 of the 1860 law increased these administrative charges to also cover a clerk's fee as well as a fee equivalent to five percent of the value of the land.³³³ While these fees were not insignificant – the average value of field-crop land as assessed in the 1876 *Emlak* survey was 150 kuruş per dunam, so a small, ten-dunam inherited plot assessed at the prescribed fee-rate would cost 225 kuruş plus administrative fees to register – they were still far less than the *bedel-i misl* (equivalency) charged owners who claimed land through means other than transfer by sale, gift, or inheritance. These fees were equal to the assessed value of the land in its entirety.³³⁴

How can we determine that this was the goal of the case? Unfortunately, available evidence does not permit a discussion of whether internal and/or external pressures had arisen, prompting villagers to update tapu certificates after two decades. While there is no direct evidence to prove that this was indeed the villagers' motivation, three elements suggest its probability. Firstly, as suggested, the case was not conflictual. The defendant's recorded role in the case was minimal. From the court record one learns about him only that in some (undefined) capacity he had claim to some of the profits of Jamrūra's harvests, and

³³¹ *Ibid.*, 74, 93.

³³² *Ibid.*, 74-75.

³³³ *Ibid.*, 93-94.

³³⁴ See, for example, Article 44 of the 1858 Land law (Ongley: 23).