

If we adopt the view that the Empire's primary concern was to generate income in the form of registration fees and tax revenue, then its foremost concern would have been to have a name or a group attached to every property in use. This is not to suggest that the tapu and tax surveys were careless or that it did not reflect reality. On the contrary and in contradistinction to a commonly held view, the property-tenure reform laws make it clear that the Ottomans tried to foresee every possibility of ownership, inheritance, mortgage, debt, temporary abandonment, illness, travel, flooding, inability to pay fees and more, and to create procedures and regulations that allowed ordered supervision and strove for accuracy and fairness. Concerns of correlation between registers may have arisen only when conflict arose. While this scenario might be seen as having created a semi-fiction on paper – at least to the eyes of the outsider – this court case suggests that the non-fictional arrangements of land tenure continued to be both definable and honored.

### **Idhna: strategies to safeguard landholdings—division and endowment**

Khalīl b. Muhammad Salāme ('Awād)<sup>370</sup> versus Jibrān b. 'Aṭiyya al-Zayr

The village of Idhna is located just south of the southern border of Jamrūra, northwest of Hebron. Until today, the town is composed of two main family groupings, the Ṭumeizī and

---

<sup>370</sup> Khalīl's surname was determined by consulting family trees in *Majmū'a min al-bāḥithīn* (A group of researchers), ed., *Idhna qaryatun lahā tārikh* (Idhna is a village with history), *Kai Lā Nansa* (So That We Won't Forget) series, No.2 (Hebron: *Markaz al-Baḥth al-'Ilmī* (Center for Scientific Research), University of Hebron, 1995, second printing); see p. 49.