

months. As noted in previous chapters, one finds in the *Emlak* register of 1876 occasional references noting that lands recorded within had been registered “according to the division in the tapu defter”.<sup>357</sup> Of course, neither this (literally) marginal evidence nor the date on the tapu certificate(s) recalled by Isma ‘il of Taffuḥ in court sheds light on whether these registrations were part of a systematic tapu *survey* in the district or whether they were done on a voluntary basis. Nevertheless, this evidence does permit us to narrow the realm of possibilities. It is possible, on the one hand, that in Hebron the tapu preceded the (or, this) *Esas-ı Emlak*. This chronology may be an indication that there had been a previous *esas*, tax-evaluation survey which, for one reason or another, had been scrapped.<sup>358</sup> In the neighboring Jerusalem subdistrict, Gerber found evidence of a property-tax survey having been conducted in 1868. The next survey he found mention of, however, did not occur until early 1886. This would seem to suggest that the processes of reform implantation in these two subdistricts of the Jerusalem *mutasarrıflık* were not synchronous. It is also possible, on the other hand, although directly contrary to predominant understandings in the field regarding tapu registration in Palestine, that in Hebron some of the villages or some of the villagers registered large tracts of farmlands voluntarily. More research is needed to answer

---

<sup>357</sup> Such is the case, for example, in Yaṭṭa, where the town’s musha had been divided into sixty-four shares of thirty-three dunams each.

<sup>358</sup> I am grateful to Martha Mundy for generously communicating with me at length on this question of timing.