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verse to relying on protest in redressing grievances whose root cause was unrepresentative government—in short, in showing citizens as “rioters.”
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This is a fascinating, powerful, yet curiously incomplete book: fascinating because of the weight of detail and powerful because it demonstrates that case studies of indigenous structures and institutions are essential to understanding socioeconomic change in India. Laurence W. Preston focuses on the Devis, a Desastha Brahman lineage with inamdar (revenue-collecting) rights to some twenty-two villages. The Devis of Cincvad also had other privileges not connected with religion. The British scrutinized these privileges (granted by Shahu and the Peshvas, heads of the Maratha state, from the seventeenth century on) after their conquest of the Deccan in 1817–18. They found the Maratha archives invaluable for investigation of claims on the state revenues.

Preston uses Marathi and English archival sources in Pune and Bombay to see how the Dev lineage fared in the transition from indigenous to foreign rule, how it adapted to the British government when questions of inheritance and status arose (p. 5–6). His painstaking use of, indeed reliance on, those rich sources is the book’s greatest strength, yet, in my view, problems with the sources make the book incomplete. It is liberally sprinkled with indigenous words, but there is no note on transliteration or glossary, and these words are not all in the index. Nowhere does Preston comment on the state of the records in either Pune or Bombay or the extent to which he was able to use them. He hints at problems (for example, p. 29 and p. 82), and other scholars would have benefited from even minimal comments (perhaps the press limited him here). But the most striking omission is that Preston does not indicate whether there are still Devs of Cincvad and, if any descendants of the lineage are alive (which seems likely), why he did not think it worthwhile to contact them.

As I and other authors of books that Preston cites can testify, descendants can furnish documents and stories that complement and extend archival sources. Preston indicates that, because of his sources, individual Devs recede behind the corporate entity (p. 12). But in his later chapters individuals are significant, and Preston speculates on their motives and strategies. Omission of family-held and oral materials may affect some of his arguments. He wants to examine the internal history of the lineage, but his sources are those that the lineage presented to the governments. Those who ceased to be represented in lineage records might have challenged his view that corporate unity was ultimately preserved.

There are other questions of interpretation, most of them possible only because of the rich material provided by the author. Nose down in the records, Preston’s view of the larger picture sometimes falters. He refers to the Maratha archives as “unique” (p. 245) and speaks of the granting of numerous small cash allowances as a characteristic feature of the “Hindu state” (p. 92). Yet the Nizam’s Hyderabad State archives are obviously very similar and the wording might better have been “Indian state.” Preston faults the British for getting enmeshed in inheritance regulation within the lineage, but surely that was what Shahu and the Peshva did when they resolved disputes between the Devs’ kinfolk and what the Mughals and Marathas routinely did when confirming succession to privileges. Finally, Preston wants to understand “indigenous categories of social organization” (p. 9), which is not really part of his agenda, and his intermittent efforts lead him into difficulties. Although he generally sees the Devis as acquiring knowledge of the British administration and strategically adapting their presentation of cases, he also says that “the petition to Bombay was a chance for the inamdar to express his own understanding of his rights” (p. 189). While he says “we should not doubt the sincerity of the Devis when they described their inheritance as devasthan” (granted to a deity, not a person), he immediately labels a widow’s appeal for that status for the estate as Machiavelian (p. 219). Later he imposes orthodox brahmanical inheritance doctrine on his lineage, despite his own evidence and recognition of the considerable “pragmatism” influencing its inheritance practices (p. 242). And rather than use indigenous terms, Preston borrows from Benjamin Disraeli the concepts of “rights” and “authority” for his final analysis: to safeguard their rights, inamdars and other privileged subjects must maintain corporate unity and, to maintain authority, the state must pay close attention to the limits of authority, particularly where the regulation of inheritance is concerned (pp. 238–39). Still attuned to his sources, Preston focuses in the final pages on the failures of the Inam Commission rather than on the internal history of the Devs (pp. 245–47).

Overall, this is a fine book, the result of long, hard work, and it makes significant contributions to our knowledge and interpretation of the eighteenth- and nineteenth-century history of India.
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