

Declaration of Independence that the subject really took off. So much research and publication has appeared since then that few scholars today would dispute the idea that, say, the Scottish Enlightenment made a major contribution to the developing culture of colonial, revolutionary, and postrevolutionary America. To that impressive body of recent scholarship, Alexander Murdoch's book is a most welcome addition.

Relatively short, the book is in two parts. The first concerns 'Scottish Trade and Settlement in America', the second 'Transatlantic Scotland: Cultural Exchange between Scotland and America'. Part One, that is, updates and expands our knowledge of Scottish emigration, the transatlantic trading link, and the Scottish attempt to create an empire in America. Canada and the West Indies are included in the detailed analysis. 'Cultural Exchange' in the title of Part Two is marginally misleading given that the topics addressed are restricted to Scottish involvement in slavery, Scottish relations with native Americans, and transatlantic Scottish Presbyterianism. Murdoch, that is, chooses not to focus on what has become the prime subject of the Scottish American bibliography: eighteenth-century Scotland's contribution to the educational, philosophical, intellectual and political life of the emerging USA. However, through his account of Scottish American Presbyterianism, Murdoch is able to validate one of the underlying themes of his book: how the traffic between the countries was never entirely one-way.

In a short epilogue, Murdoch glances at what has become one of the more public outcomes of the scholarly recovery of Scottish influences on the creation of the USA. He notes the adoption, in both Canada and the US, of 6 April as National Tartan Day to celebrate Scotland's contribution to both countries. The relevant Senate resolution in 1998 even insists that the Declaration of Independence was modelled on the Scottish Declaration of Arbroath: the 6 April 1320 letter to the Pope in which the Scottish nobility ask for the recognition of Robert the Bruce as the legitimate king of Scotland. Murdoch is rightly sceptical. However appealing to Scottish politicians, and Scottish national pride more generally, this idea lacks historical evidence. The key point is that the letter was called just that – a letter – until well into the twentieth century. The authoritative eleventh edition of the *Encyclopaedia Britannica* (1910–11), for example, in its entry on Arbroath, describes the letter but fails to call it the Declaration of Arbroath. In other words, the emergence of that term is a fine example of how, as Alexander Murdoch is keen to argue, it is sometimes America that influences Scotland.

*University of Glasgow*

ANDREW HOOK

*Journal of American Studies*, 44 (2010), 4. doi:10.1017/S0021875810001817

Daniel J. Dreisbach, Mark David Hall, and Jeffrey H. Morrison (eds.), *The Forgotten Founders on Religion and Public Life* (Notre Dame, IN: Notre Dame University Press, 2009, \$28.00/£24.95). Pp. xxi + 316. ISBN 13 978 0 260 02602 8, ISBN 10 0 268 02602 5.

Few historical subjects cause more disagreement in American constitutional jurisprudence than church–state relations during the nation's founding. In this valuable

book, historians and historically minded political scientists and law professors probe beyond these arguments' conventional boundaries.

Beginning with three thoughtful overviews, a foreword by Mark A. Noll, a preface by the editors, and an opening essay by coeditor Daniel Dreisbach examining whom we deem to be founders, the volume presents essays by Edith Gelles on Abigail Adams, Gary Scott Smith on Samuel Adams, William R. Casto on Oliver Ellsworth, Gregg L. Frazer on Alexander Hamilton, Thomas E. Buckley SJ on Patrick Henry, Jonathan Den Hartog on John Jay, David J. Voelker on Thomas Paine, Kevin R. Hardwick on Edmund Randolph, Robert H. Abzug on Benjamin Rush, Mark David Hall on Roger Sherman, and Rosemarie Zagarrri on Mercy Otis Warren. The selection has geographical and political balance, and reaches beyond "founding fathers" to include two distinguished American women.

The founders studied here have one large thing in common – their view of the proper relationship between religion and governance. All of them – even Thomas Paine, often arraigned as an enemy of organized religion – sought to undergird constitutional and political arrangements by drawing on religion to bolster the virtue of the republican political community, whether Calvinist Protestantism (Sherman, Samuel and Abigail Adams, Ellsworth, and Warren), Anglicanism or Episcopalianism (Jay, Henry, Randolph, and the dying Hamilton), or uniquely individualist religious views (Rush, Paine, and for most of his life Hamilton). At the same time, these authors capture a remarkable diversity of approaches to the common challenge, showing that Americans of the founding period were as diverse and conflicted in their views of church–state relations as we are today.

Every category of reader will profit from this fine book; its research is admirably wide and deep, and its standard of writing and argument is uniformly high. Readers may ask two further questions. First, how does this book fit with the argument that the leading founding fathers were deists or atheists, insisting on strict separation of church and state for secularist reasons? Though such writers as Christopher Hitchens, Steven Waldman, and Brooke Allen passionately maintain this view, it does not capture the diverse, complex picture of Americans' religious and political beliefs during the founding period – a picture that this excellent book significantly deepens. (Even so, strict separationist views grounded in a devout religious position also had their advocates in this era.) Second, will this book shatter the stale dichotomy between separationist and nonpreferentialist or accommodationist readings of the First Amendment's religion clauses that has persisted since the late 1940s? As an experienced historian who has seen historical inquiry brushed aside in constitutional adjudication all too often, I doubt it. But that question is for litigants, law professors, and judges – not for historians. Though this book likely will not affect the continuing jurisprudential battles over church–state relations, it still enriches our understandings of those issues' complexities in the founding period, and that is achievement enough.

*New York Law School*

R. B. BERNSTEIN