

focused on Jamaica, which fills many of the gaps of existing scholarship. Bolt's primary argument is that the missionaries were not racists, for they believed in the unlimited potential of the former slaves to reach the heights of civilisation with the aid of the regenerating power of the Spirit. This point will be familiar to those who know the scholarly literature on Protestant missions, but Bolt pushes it further. He argues convincingly that apparently racist pronouncements by the missionaries about the moral condition of the former slave population are to be understood as statements about the continuing debasing effect of slave society on black morals, and claims, reasonably enough, that such statements greatly undervalued the resilience of slave character. The missionaries, therefore, were ethnocentric cultural imperialists, but not racists. The next stage of the argument becomes more moralising and less persuasive. The paternalism of the missionaries is described as 'poisonous', 'stifling and deadly', to such an extent that it carried consequences 'more invidious and pernicious than if they were outright racists' (p. 150), on the grounds that it postponed to the indefinite future the day when the former slaves might assume positions of independent church leadership. The apparent implication that straightforward racism would somehow have been morally preferable to paternalism is surely not what Bolt intends to say, and is, in fact, consistently undermined by much of his own argument. He adduces plentiful evidence to show that the Baptist missionaries, at least, were regularly attacked for the level of confidence that they placed in blacks to assume pastoral leadership, and their preparedness to view even the 'Native Baptists', whose churches functioned independently of any mission connection, with a measure of favour. Bolt appears to be torn between the direction in which his archival research led him and a sense of political obligation to Caribbean black identity that prevents him from giving the missionaries too positive a school report. The other problems about this book are the result of poor, or even non-existent, editorial control. The chapters are not numbered. The text is prolix and would have been improved by shortening of the voluminous quotations. Errors in referencing abound. A quotation from W.J. Woodstock, a CMS missionary, about his schools' work in South India, is inserted in the narrative immediately following a discussion of the Baptist missionary J. M. Phillippo's views on why Jamaican blacks were not yet ready for autonomous leadership, and readers may not notice that the geographical location and denominational reference have suddenly been changed within the same paragraph. Such blemishes may prevent this book from receiving the scholarly attention that it deserves.

UNIVERSITY OF EDINBURGH

BRIAN STANLEY

Philanthropy and the funding of the Church of England, 1856-1914. By Sarah Flew. (Perspectives in Economic and Social History, 37.) Pp. xvi + 251 incl. 5 figs and 57 tables. London-Brookfield, VT: Pickering & Chatto, 2015. £60 (\$99). 978 1 84893 500 6
JEH (67) 2016; doi:10.1017/S0022046915002808

This is an important and pioneering book, contributing significant new evidence about financing the Church of England and also about secularisation and

women's roles. Using a case study of funding 'home mission' in London diocese, Sarah Flew has applied her professional skills in accounting and financial management to a functional analysis of successive bishops' strategic responses to their diocese's population growth of about 40,000 a year, producing what they described as 'spiritual destitution' amongst the poor. Traditional parochial strategies were overwhelmed, and episcopal initiatives in 'home mission', staffed by additional clergy and especially laity, including women, required new funds. Until 1914 Church of England dioceses lacked corporate financial structures and legal identities. The Bishop of London's Fund, the Lay Helpers' Association, the East London Church Fund, the Parochial Mission Women's Association, the London Diocesan Deaconess Institution and the Ladies' Diocesan Association were established, under the aegis of the bishop, and supported by leading laity and clergy from across the churchmanship spectrum, to raise and administer funds for 'home mission' amongst the poor. The latter three were largely for work amongst, and managed and funded by, women. Using annual reports, subscription lists and account books, Flew has investigated their fundraising strategies, analysed the demographic base of their subscribers and identified many of them, enabling her to trace trends in funding streams. For comparison she analysed the pan-Evangelical London City Mission's fundraising strategies and subscription lists. A few aristocratic owners of great London estates generously contributed throughout the period, but, from the 1870s, new generations of rich merchants and businessmen, apart from some Evangelical bankers and brewers, ceased to contribute to these funds. By 1900 the typical subscribers were women, giving small amounts. Flew points out that mid nineteenth-century middle- and upper-class churchmen still regarded themselves as stewards of God-given wealth, and subscribed to projects for their poorer neighbours as part of their Christian philanthropic duty. A new movement in the 1860s, focused by the Systematic Beneficence Society, and encouraged by bishops, promoted systematic and regular 'stewardship' by lay-people, including to 'home mission' projects. However, from the 1870s church fundraisers tended to adopt commercial models – large-scale bazaars, 'sales of work', concerts and dramatic performances. Although encouraging upper- and middle-class women to utilise and develop their managerial skills, Flew suggests that they, inadvertently, refocused fundraising for the salvation of the spiritually destitute from Christian philanthropic duty, to apparently leisure-orientated activities. New generations of rich business and professional men, no longer seeing themselves as stewards of God-given wealth, regarded their riches as theirs to spend as they pleased, on pleasurable activities – weekending, golf, lawn tennis, yachting – activities regularly denounced by incumbents of fashionable London churches for taking them away from church. Flew believes the Church of England's failure to gain the philanthropic commitment of younger rich men in the last quarter of the nineteenth century demonstrates that the Church was losing their allegiance. As Hugh McLeod suggested forty years ago, the Church not only lost the lower classes, but also the upper classes: here is the evidence to support the claim.

KING'S COLLEGE
LONDON

W. M. JACOB