

ble by the comparatively large number of early manuscripts, some of which date back to the first quarter of the 14th century; many more can be shown to be direct copies of such early manuscripts. KAMOLA discusses the resulting versions at length in a very convincing and thought-provoking way, using certain markers for the individual versions. The work behind this becomes visible in the appendices, one of the essential parts of the book: Appendix A (183–208), “The *Collected Histories* and its *Illustrations*”, gives an overview over the structure of the work as intended by Rashīd al-Dīn and preserved in various versions; references are to the Rawshan-Mūsavī edition and to Thackston’s translation. Appendix B (209–271) is a full catalogue of all known manuscripts of the work.

In sum, KAMOLA not only makes a new foundation for Persian historiography of the Mongol period necessary, but he has also taken more than the first steps himself, providing close links between the making of the text and the evolution of the political, military, and religious situation in the Ilkhanid state. A welcome by-product of KAMOLA’s research is an assessment of the Timurid historian Ḥāfiẓ-i Abrū and his dealings with the *Collected Histories*, including an effort at restoring two fragmentary manuscripts which had found their way into the Timurid scriptorium at Herat (Epilogue, 178–182). These few pages make clear how much Timurid historiography is indebted to its Ilkhanid predecessors, but also how much the later authors followed their own agendas.

It is the focus on the manuscript tradition that gives special value to KAMOLA’s book. It is also a very useful reminder that printed editions, how very critical they may be and how very faithful they may follow the state of the art, cannot in all cases render the recourse to the manuscripts themselves superfluous.

Nobuaki Kondo, *Islamic Law and Society in Iran: A Social History of Qajar Tehran*, London: Routledge, 2017, 196 pp., ISBN 978-0-415-71137-1.

Reviewed by Denis Hermann, CNRS, Institut Français d’Études Anatoliennes (IFEA), Istanbul, Turkey, dnshermann@gmail.com

<https://doi.org/10.1515/islam-2020-0040>

Nobuaki KONDO’s book on the legal system in Qajar Iran was long awaited by the scholarly community. KONDO is one of the outstanding researchers working on *waqf* documents in Qajar Iran (1200–1344 H/1786–1925 CE); and is particularly meticulous in his reading of sources, especially the *waqfnāma* (*waqfiyya* in Arabic), the legal documents issued to transform property into a *waqf*. Reading and understanding these documents requires substantial training – apart from the difficulties in accessing them faced by scholars not affiliated with the Iranian

Der Islam, c. 97, sy. 2, 2020 Berlin, s. 602–609.

Waqf Organization (*Sāzmān-i awqāf va umūr-i khayriyya*). Like KONDO’s numerous previous publications, this new work contributes to our understanding of the structure and use of the *waqf* in Qajar Iran.¹

In the introduction, KONDO points out that Qajar Iran did in fact possess laws and legal institutions, although the reformist debates in Iran at the end of the 19th century focused on the need for society to be framed much more by law (*qānūn*), leading to the constitutional movement of 1906–1911 CE. The study concentrates on the system of courts and the organization of *waqf* and is mainly based on three rich collections of different sources. The first group includes three registers from religious courts in Tehran covering the years 1867–1889 CE; the second contains various documents associated with *waqf*; and the third contains government documents, including reports, inventories of royal properties (*khālīṣejat*), and documents establishing the state’s accounts (*dastūr al-‘amal; jam’ va kharj; mafāsā hisāb*).

Notwithstanding the book’s important contribution to our knowledge of the legal system in Qajar Iran, there is a discrepancy between what it claims to cover and discuss and what it actually deals with. Contrary to what KONDO indicates on page 1, the book is only partially (specifically, in chapters 2 and 3) a study of “legal practice in the urban society of nineteenth-century Iran” and the execution of Islamic law. And, contrary to the subtitle of the volume, this book is not *per se* a social history of Tehran in the Qajar period. Beyond the title, the structure of the work reveals an ambiguity about the object of the book and the intentions of its author. The introduction is vague and far too succinct. KONDO states that he wishes to demonstrate first that there were not two types of jurisdictions (religious, *shar‘ī*, and customary or civil, *urfi*) in the Qajar period, and second that customary or civil courts could hardly be considered courts at all because of their absolute dependence on the authority of the religious courts.

The first chapter (“The historical development of Tehran,” 11–21) deals with the origins of the city of Tehran and in particular its development since the Safavid period (906–1134/1501–1722). It does not really relate to the introduction or the following chapters. Although chapters 6, 7, and 8 deal with different aspects of how the *waqf* was used in Tehran during the Qajar period, they cannot be considered either a social history of Tehran in that time, nor a history of legal practice in urban Qajar Iran.

¹ Notable works by KONDO include his article in *Orient*, where he translates the titles of an important list of unpublished PhD dissertations into English, books, and articles produced in Japanese on Iran: Nobuaki Kondo, “Iranian History: Reaching a New Stage,” *Orient* 37 (2002): 49–64. See also Nobuaki Kondo, ed., *Persian Documents: Social History of Iran and Turan in the Fifteenth to Nineteenth Centuries* (London: Routledge, 2004).

MADDE YAYIMLANDIKTAN
SONRA GELEN DOKÜMAN



01 Temmuz 2021