Singing the Lord’s Song:
A History
of the
English Language Hymnals
of the
Reformed Church in America

by
The Rev. James L. H. Brumm

Historical Society, RCA
New Brunswick, New Jersey
The Occasional Paper series is designed to provide an opportunity for the publication of important and useful research which will aid in the understanding of the life and mission of the Reformed Church in America. Publications in the series will include mission histories, congregational histories, transcriptions of original source material from the Reformed Church Archives and other pertinent historical documentation and studies.

The goal is that it will prove to be helpful and stimulating and will serve to challenge us in the present as we grow into the future.

Russell L. Gasero  
Office of Historical Services  
Reformed Church in America
CONTENTS

PREFACE .......................................................................................................................... 5

INTRODUCTION ........................................................................................................... 7

CHAPTER I: Psalters .................................................................................................... 9
  John Calvin and the Genevan Psalter
  English Metrical Psalmody
  The Collegiate Psalter

CHAPTER II: The First Denominational Effort ..................................................... 16
  Isaac Watts
  The First Edition of *Psalms and Hymns*
  The Second Edition of *Psalms and Hymns*
  Additional Hymns
  Pressure to Eliminate the Psalter

CHAPTER III: From Psalms And Hymns To The Second
  Denominational Effort ............................................................................................ 22
    *Sabbath-School and Social Hymns*
    The Wesleys
    The Special Committee on the Hymnal, 1845
    *Hymns of the Church*

CHAPTER IV: Rubber-Stamping Hymnals And
  Failure Of Control ................................................................................................... 28
    John Thompson’s Report
    Endorsing Hymnals
    The Committee Report of 1885

CHAPTER V: Cooperative Efforts ............................................................................. 34
  Hopes of Church Union
    *The Hymnal of the Reformed Church*
    *The Hymnbook*

CHAPTER VI: The Third Denominational Effort .................................................... 39
  The RCA’s Search for Identity
    Erik Routley
    *Rejoice in the Lord*

CONCLUSION: How Shall We Sing The Lord’s Song? ............................................. 44
APPENDICES

APPENDIX A: A Comparison of Psalm 98 As Set by
   Tate and Brady, Francis Hopkinson, and Isaac Watts ......................... 46

APPENDIX B: Authorship of the Psalms ................................................ 49

APPENDIX C: The Order of Hymns in John Wesley’s Collection .......... 51
   of Hymns for the Use of the People Called Methodists

APPENDIX D: John Thompson’s History of RCA Hymnody ............... 53

APPENDIX E: Two Presbyterian Hybrid Orders ................................. 56
   The Hymnal of the Reformed Church, 1929
   The Hymnbook, 1955

APPENDIX F: Biblical Hymn Order ..................................................... 59
   Rejoice in the Lord, 1984

BIBLIOGRAPHY .................................................................................... 61

ENDNOTES ............................................................................................. 65
It was the fall of 1985 when I set out to explore this territory because it had never before been surveyed. Little did I then realize how vast the parameters of this work could become; hymnology is, in many ways, an interdisciplinary discipline, encompassing music history, composition, poetry, theology, church history, and polity, to name only a few fields. While the scope of this paper was, theoretically, limited to the 360-plus year history of the Dutch Reformed Church on the American continent, the related subjects reach back as far as the Reformation, as far afield as eastern Europe, and through nearly every branch of American Protestantism. A definitive history of congregational music in the Reformed Church in America, despite the denomination’s small size, could encompass a few hefty volumes. This is more of a survey—specifically, a survey of the English-language psalters and hymnals produced or officially sanctioned by the denomination. While I hope that it answers many questions, it also shows how much scholarly work can be done in this field: a critical edition of Livingston’s *Psalms and Hymns*; an analysis of the German-language hymnals approved by the denomination; more research into exactly which unofficial hymnals have been used; an analysis of the tunes as used in the books, examining editorial variations from the original compositions (especially in the case of the Collegiate psalter); a compilation and analysis of the hymns produced by members of the denomination, especially Alexander Ramsay Thompson; and perhaps a comparison between this denomination’s hymnody and that of the Christian Reformed Church. The field which I have surveyed is very fertile, and I can only hope that it will be thoroughly plowed.

While mine is the only name which goes on the cover, many have contributed to the production of this paper. Many thanks are due my primary reader, John Beardslee, III, whose encyclopedic
knowledge of Reformed Church history and bibliography were irreplaceable. Thanks also to Renée House and the staff of Gardner Sage Library and Russell Gasero, denominational archivist, for their research assistance; to John Coakley and Daniel Meeter for their gracious consultations; and to Elizabeth Johnson for beginning every conversation with “How’s the thesis?” The work of Erik Routley, my first hymnology teacher, looms large in this paper and even larger in my thinking, and I can only hope I have done it justice. Most important, however, is the contribution of my wife, Kathy, who not only served as grammatical editor for this volume, but tolerated my late-night writing sessions and days off spent with library books rather than her so that this might be done. To Kathy, and to these and other friends who have helped me do this, I dedicate this work. Soli Deo Gloria!

James L.H. Brumm
Easter, 1989
INTRODUCTION

In the introduction to the fourth edition of Edward Corwin’s Manual of the Reformed Church in America, mention is made by the author of a history of the denomination’s hymnody written for the book by John Thompson, which, unfortunately, was not included in the Manual for want of space. The whereabouts of that history, which would have covered the same material, presumably, as the first three or four chapters of that paper, are unknown. On many occasions before and since, there have been recitations of cursory hymnal genealogies made on the floor of General Synod, usually to introduce a new book of hymns, but, to this author’s knowledge, there has never, before or since, been another attempt to examine the changes which have come about in our hymn singing, or any endeavor to ask why the books have come out the way they have, why certain efforts succeeded and others failed.

Since the first arrival of the Dutch on this continent, singing has been central to worship. It was only in this century that the Reformed Church (RCA) stopped binding its Standards and liturgy in the same book as its hymns. Yet there is little if any evidence of any effort to teach the worshippers why they sing the Lord’s song the way they do, why this tradition has been handed down—or, in some congregations, ignored. As the RCA faces an era of tremendous change in hymnody, with new books being produced, questions of language—regarding both inclusivity and militarism—being raised, and even century-old patterns for the structure of hymnals being challenged, it is also a denomination in search of its identity. A denominational hymnology is a necessary frame of reference.

No hymnology develops in a vacuum, but is instead influenced by the theology, musical preferences, politics, sociological influences, ecumenical concerns, and economic considerations of those
who produce it. All of these factors will be in evidence in this paper, not only from within the RCA itself, but from the multitude of influences from outside the church: the music of the first Dutch Reformed hymnals was produced by Frenchmen resident in Switzerland; the first American psalter was edited by an Anglican; the denomination’s most recent effort was edited by an English Congregationalist.

Just as the contents of the books produced were not isolated from outside influences, the historical experiences of the RCA were not entirely unique. Like many of her sister denominations in the American Presbyterian-Reformed tradition, the RCA has never quite been able to exercise control over what its congregations sing. While this is a history of the officially sanctioned RCA hymnals, even these books had to be produced with one eye toward the theological consideration of what the denomination felt was good for its parishioners, and another toward the political-economic considerations of what the parishioners wanted to sing. This experience has been common to many denominations, but few as small as the RCA, with a hymnology so easy to trace.

Therefore, the questions of why new books appeared when they did, what choices were made and why, and how these choices may have reflected (or even subtly caused) changes in the theological mind set of the denomination form the framework for the historical survey which follows. The particular genius—or lack thereof—with which the RCA answered those questions might indeed provide the answer for the question of why the congregations of this small denomination, and perhaps others, sing the Lord’s song the way they do.
When Jonas Michaelius arrived in New Amsterdam on the seventh of April, the year of our Lord 1628,
1 to begin leading worship services in a room over the mill on South William Street, the music of the Dutch Reformed Church came from the Genevan Psalter. This metrical psalter, officially titled *Aulcuns Pseaumes et Cantiques mys et chant*, was prepared by Clement Marot and Theodore de Beza at the request of John Calvin, and even included a few of Calvin’s own settings in the original French edition, with music provided by Louis Bourgeois. The massive project, including metrical settings of all 150 psalms as well as a metrical creed, the Lord’s Prayer, the Ten Commandments, and various canticles, was begun by 1539 (when the first edition was published in Geneva, hence the nickname) and not completed until 1562. So popular was this psalter among congregations of the Reformed tradition that it was translated not only into Dutch, but German and Hungarian as well. In fact, it is more than likely that there were French Genevan Psalters as well as the Dutch translations to be found in the colony of New Amsterdam, since Michaelius was leading services in French for those Walloons who spoke no Dutch. In truth, every Dutch Reformed congregation, wherever it might be worshipping, would have been using this book. The Articles of Dort, completed in 1619, left little room for interpretation about what could be sung:

The 150 psalms of David; the ten commandments; the Lord’s prayer; the twelve articles of the Christian faith; the songs of Mary, Zacharias, and Simeon, versified, only, shall be sung in public worship.

All of this serves as proof that the Dutch were transplanting John Calvin’s theology of music in
the Church to their American colony. The genus of his interpretation appears in Calvin’s *Institutes* of 1536. Quite abruptly, in the midst of a discussion on prayer, which he defines as essentially “an emotion of the heart within,” he states “From this, moreover, it is fully evident that unless voice and song, if interposed with prayer, spring from a deep feeling of the heart, neither has any value or profit in the least with God.” He continues, insisting that music should be “associated with the heart’s affection and serve it,” and, finally, “…since the glory of God ought, in a measure, to shine in the several parts of our bodies, it is especially fitting that the tongue has been assigned to this task…For it was expressly created to tell and proclaim the praise of God.”

Calvin saw that music could spring from sources other than the heart, which, in his opinion, would be worthless. But he believed that the music could be controlled as long as one’s mind was focussed on God. Under such control, music could be an aid to prayer. Calvin saw music taking a similar role during the Lord’s Supper, directing worshippers into a proper mood: “either psalms should be sung, or something should be read…” then, at the conclusion of the Sacrament, “thanks should be given, and praises sung to God.”

By the time the *Articles* of 1537 were written, music had taken a much larger role in Calvin’s worship theology: “The psalms can stimulate us to raise our hearts to God and arouse us to an ardor in evoking with praises the glory of his holy name.” On the other hand, Calvin had read Plato, and knew that music had the power to excite the senses and distract the worshipper. The Genevan reformer noted “There is scarcely anything in this world which is more capable of turning or moving this way and that the morals of men, as Plato prudently considered it” than music. Thus, he accepted Augustine’s conclusion that “no one is able to sing things worthy of God unless he has received them from Him.” Building on Augustine, we have Calvin’s discussion of decorum in worship: “ceremonies, to be exercises of piety, ought to lead us straight to Christ.”

For Calvin, the psalms did just that. The Law of Moses existed because God “willed to have his Word set down and sealed in writing.”

There then followed the prophets [which, for Calvin, included the psalms], through whom God published new oracles which were added to the law—but not so new that they did not flow from the law and hark back to it…Therefore, that whole body, put together out of law, prophecies, psalms, and histories, was the Lord’s Word for the ancient people.

The psalms were, for Calvin, part of the corpus of Scripture which harkened back to God’s first incarnation of Moses’ law. If they recalled the Word, Calvin would argue, they also pointed forward to the enfleshed incarnation of the Word, Jesus Christ. Further, “although the Psalms are replete with all the precepts which serve to frame our life to every part of holiness, piety, and righteousness, yet they will principally train us to bear the cross.” The psalms not only speak to us of Jesus, but also address the right way of life, being, for Calvin, a revelation of the discourse between the prophets and God. When Calvin uses the word “hymns” (and possibly the term “psalms” as well), he refers not only to the 150 canonical psalms, but also to the Ten Commandments, Nunc Dimittis, and the Songs of Zecharias, Mary, and Simeon, as well as the Apostle’s Creed (all part of the chosen Dutch hymnody), which was to be sung in Calvin’s liturgies for his congregations in Strasbourg and Geneva.

Calvin allowed Marot and de Beza to re-translate and, to some extent, paraphrase the psalms for their metrical settings, but closely supervised their work, to assure that Scriptural integrity was maintained. The singing of Bourgeois’ tunes was to be in unison, with no instrumental accompa-
Such standards were maintained for the German, Hungarian, and Dutch translations, and the four tongues of the Genevan Psalter were virtually identical, except for the fact that the Dutch chose to interline the text with the tune (much as it appears in modern American hymnals), in order to overcome problems associated with the length of the Genevan tunes; Erik Routley saw this difference as the reason why only the Dutch version has survived into modern usage.

This book of Dutch metrical psalms interlined with Genevan tunes was the hymnal of the New Netherland congregations until 1767 (and, for congregations outside the Collegiate church, even longer), over a century after Peter Stuyvesant’s surrender to the British fleet in 1664, which transformed the land into the English colonies of New York and New Jersey. It is difficult to believe that Dutch remained the principle language of secular life, and outside language and customs could easily creep into worship. The rules governing American congregations allowed that, “in things indifferent,” the customs of foreign congregations need not be rejected; Dutch Reformed congregations were joined by German and French Reformed worshippers and, in the days before the British conquest, by English and Scottish Presbyterians. If the Dutch were worshipping with these people, it seems reasonable that the linguistic barriers had been overcome.

But there were political considerations in maintaining Dutch as the official language of worship. Even though Article Two of the Treaty of Breda provided for the continuance of the Dutch church in the fort, and Article Eight declared “The Dutch here shall enjoy the liberty of their conscience in Divine Worship and church discipline,” English Governor Nicolls had received instructions from the Duke of York that it would be desirable for all citizens of New York to be of “one faith” and one church with the English. Beginning in 1674 (after a brief return of the colony to Dutch control), the English set out to Anglicize the population with a policy which exerted more and more pressure over the next quarter century. Governor Edmund Andros, though Dutch-speaking, was extremely unsympathetic to their culture; his attacks were particularly severe in the areas of religion and education. The Dutch public school system began to fade away. The church became the conduit for maintaining the Dutch language and culture and, conversely, the language and culture made the Dutch congregations unique, and probably allowed them to survive.

By the mid-eighteenth century, however, the political tensions between the English and Dutch were subsiding. Not only were the Dutch doing business in English, they were intermarrying into English speaking families as well. The “Great Awakening” of the 1730s and ’40s cut across denominational, cultural, and linguistic boundaries. As early as 1720, exclusive use of Dutch in worship was coming under attack. The custom of separating the sexes during worship was being abandoned and, in 1727, a pipe organ was installed in one of the New York City churches. The Dutch metrical psalter, intended to be sung a capella, was becoming an anachronism, but conservative forces were reluctant to relinquish it.

There were also fledgling struggles for autonomy among the American congregations. In 1747, a Coetus (association) had been formed by the Classis of Amsterdam for the Dutch Reformed congregations in America, to carry out ecclesiastical business and, with the express permission of the Classis, ordain and examine students. Johannes Ritzema, minister of the Collegiate congregation in New York, figured prominently in this group. By 1754, the majority of the Coetus members wished to become their own American Classis, and Ritzema was among those leading the movement. But Ritzema and the Collegiate consistory backed away from the measure for a variety of reasons; the Coetus went forward with its separatist action, and, in 1755, the New York congregation, along with a few others, formed a Conferentie (assembly) which remained subject to Amsterdam. This division would remain until 1771.
In 1763, the Rev. Archibald Laidlie was called to be the first English-speaking pastor of the Collegiate congregation in New York, and he instituted English preaching the following April, though there were some in New York who resented the notion of an English ministry. At its meeting of 5 July, 1763, the Collegiate Consistory proposed a psalter “in English rime [sic] according to our music…” and appointed a committee of the Rev. Dr. Johannes Ritzema, Cornelius Clopper, Theodorus Van Wyck, Pieter Ketelta, and Dirk Brinkerhoff to see to the work. Mr. Evert Byvank, an elder in the Collegiate congregation, though not actively serving at the time, was first assigned to the task.

The Consistory minutes, however, do not tell the whole story. Theodorus Van Wyck kept “A Journal of the Consistory of the Reformed Dutch Church in the City of New York in Regard to the Petitions of their Congregation for Calling an English Preacher…” which presented layers of concerns absent in the official record (translation from the Dutch is courtesy Daniel Meeter’s dissertation on The North American Liturgy of the Dutch Reformed Church). It was important that the new psalter should be a musical match for the old, “so that Dutch and English Psalms could be sung to the same tune at the same time.” Obviously, the Consistory wished to accommodate those who preferred the old style of worship even as they made way for the new. It is also clear that their unique political situation as a Dutch community, while less critical than before, still made it unwise to borrow from either the Presbyterian or Anglican metrical psalters.

There was also correspondence to Archibald Laidlie, the pastor-elect, on this subject, which has been effectively excluded from the historical record of the Reformed Church until Daniel Meeter’s recent work. The letter explains that the Consistory had decided against adopting Nicholas Tate and Nahum Brady’s metrical psalter, as “the Consistory and other leading members of our Congregation have…thought it more Edifying [sic] to have the English Psalms sung in the same Tunes now used in our Churches.” They are concerned, however, that the publishers of this version, already in use by the English-speaking Reformed congregation in Amsterdam, might try to block the publication of an essentially competitive work. The letter and the rest of the journal also reveal that, from the beginning, Byvank was intended as the supervisor of the work, while the principal translation was to be done by Mr. Francis Hopkinson (1737-1791), a lawyer and musician from Philadelphia. He was to begin what we shall later see was a long tradition of outsiders, and especially Englishmen, contributing to our denominational hymnody.

Hopkinson is principally remembered by history as a member of the New Jersey delegation to the Second Continental Congress and signer of the Declaration of Independence. An American who received his music training in England, he was, at the time when the Collegiate Consistory hired him, the organist at Christ Church, Philadelphia, and was probably the composer of A Collection of Psalm Tunes…for the use of the United Churches of Christ Church and St. Peter’s Church in Philadelphia, 1763. It is unclear how he came into the service of the New York church, but it is reasonably clear that he had little knowledge of Dutch—his writings make no reference to Dutch literature, and his library contained only one book in Dutch, which he apparently received from his father-in-law, Joseph Borden, whom Hopkinson had not even met until at least 1768. It is also reasonable to suspect that his primary motivation for taking on the job was to make some quick money—his only surviving mention of the work is in a letter to Benjamin Franklin dated 13 December, 1765:

I have finished the Translation of the Psalms of David, to the great Satisfaction of the Dutch Congregation at New York & they have paid me £145 in their Currency which I intend to
keep as a Body Reserve in Case I should go to England.42

Clearly, the Collegiate Consistory knew of the Amsterdam Tate and Brady psalter\(^4\) and didn’t like it, and that they were equally worried that some would rather see that book widely disseminated. For whatever reason—Van Wyck insists that Hopkinson provided examples of ten completed psalms “to prove that he was capable”\(^4\)—the Consistory felt that Hopkinson could create for them, rather than an English psalter, a Dutch psalter in English. Mr. Byvank, it seems, became dissuaded of this notion, and backed out of the project. At the Consistory meeting of 22 May, 1764, the following action was taken:

Resolved—That Mr. Evert Byvank be discharged from his engagement to versify the Psalms in English in the same manner as they are versified in the Low Dutch, and that the Committee with Mr. Hopkins [sic] enquire [sic] into the best method of doing this according to the genius of the English tongue, and the versifying be done accordingly.\(^4\)

Mr. Hopkinson, with his name spelled correctly, was mentioned again at the meeting of 29 June:

A letter was read from Mr. Francis Hopkinson dated June 11, 1764, concerning the versifying of the Psalms of David in English in the manner proposed; and the Consistory agreed to pay him for altering what has been done for forty pistoles, and for completing the whole one hundred pistoles, fifty of which shall be paid when the work on the new plan shall be half done if Hopkinson asks it; and since certain members are to pay the first mentioned forty pistoles, the Consistory agrees to repay them out of the first printed psalm books or out of other funds; and shall also make necessary arrangement for paying the last named 100 [sic] pistoles and other needful expenses in versifying the Psalms.\(^4\)

A new committee was appointed, with Laidlie replacing the Dutch Ritzema, an S. Roosevelt succeeding Mr. Ketelta, and the instruction given that they would receive, revise, and otherwise support Hopkinson’s work.\(^4\)

Byvank’s withdrawal from the project may have been caused by Hopkinson’s failure to translate the Dutch psalter into English. What Hopkinson did instead was to adapt Tate and Brady’s New Version of the Psalms of David to various Genevan meters.

A word needs to be said here about English metrical psalmody. Calvin, Marot, and de Beza did not do their work in a vacuum. Metrical psalms were banned at the University of Paris as early as 1531, and the Roman church was active in discouraging their use.\(^4\) In the very same year (1562) that de Beza was completing his work in Geneva, two Englishman named Thomas Sternhold and John Hopkins were completing their own metrical psalter, which remained the official psalm book of the Church of England through most of the seventeenth century.\(^4\) In 1698, it was superseded by Tate and Brady’s psalter,\(^6\) which became known as the New Version not because of any official authorization (as Sternhold and Hopkins’ “Old” Version possessed) but because it was so popular that it began to be bound in prayer books and Bibles—Tate and Brady’s settings were more singable—and completely supplanted the earlier psalm book in common usage.\(^6\) Even though the English had been exposed to Genevan psalmody (a book of 83 psalms was in use when English Protestants were exiled there in 1553\(^3\)), the Genevan tunes never caught on there, because the English words could not be made to fit the meters successfully. All English psalm settings came in
three meters—Common Meter, Short Meter, and Long Meter—matching the English ballad style, and the Anglicans had allowed much less paraphrasing than had Calvin.\textsuperscript{53}

In preparing the Collegiate psalter, Hopkinson simply took Tate and Brady’s texts and added a word here or there to make them fit the Genevan tunes which the Dutch wanted to sing (see Appendix A for a comparison of Tate and Brady’s own work to Hopkinson’s adaptation). This accounted for about 50% of the psalms, with another 15 percent being unadulterated Tate and Brady. It is difficult to determine the origin of the remaining 52 psalms: one of them appears in the book *Psalms carefully suited to the Christian Worship in the United States of America...*, which was published by Joel Barlow in 1786, but Barlow would have been but ten years old when Hopkinson was doing his work;\textsuperscript{54} it is possible that they are the work of Mr. Byvank, or Hopkinson’s own work, or even the work of the committee charged with receiving and revising his efforts. As for the music, it consisted mainly of fewer than a dozen of Bourgeois’ Genevan tunes (he had composed a separate tune for each text), used over and over again and modified here and there, most likely at Hopkinson’s hand. There was published, in 1774, *A collection of the psalm and hymn-tunes, used by the Reformed Protestant Dutch Church of the City of New York, agreeable to that Psalm book, published in English, In four parts, viz. tenor, bass, treble, and cantor...*\textsuperscript{55} The arranger of these tunes is unknown; that it was Hopkinson is doubtful, coming as it does so long after he had collected his money. But it does show how far the Dutch Church had come from Calvin’s mandate for unison singing.

Even before Hopkinson was finished, a committee was formed (at the Consistory meeting of 15 September, 1765) to take charge of printing the psalter; Ritzema was again the chair. The expectations for the book were quite high, with 2,000 copies ordered, to be bound with the Heidelberg Catechism (500 copies of the Catechism alone were also to be printed), and special instruction given to use the finest paper.\textsuperscript{56} There was soon trouble, however, and at the meeting of 15 December, 1766, a new printing committee was assembled, and the order was reduced to 1,800 copies; there was also an instruction that the psalms would be printed in the Dutch style (with notes and text interlined).\textsuperscript{57} At the meeting of 17 November, 1767, the title page was presented:

*The Psalms of David with the 10 Commandments, Creed, Lord’s Prayer, etc. in metre. Also the Catechism, Confession of Faith, Liturgy, etc., translated from the Dutch, for the use of the Reformed Protestant Dutch Church of the City of New York.*\textsuperscript{58}

Interestingly, Hopkinson is not mentioned on the title page, and little of the material was actually translated from the Dutch (the Catechism, Confession of Faith, and much of the Liturgy were taken from the Liturgy of the English-speaking Reformed congregation in Amsterdam\textsuperscript{59}). Much more honest was the prefatory note, which recognized that the psalter “is greatly indebted to that of Mr. Brady and Mr. Tate.”\textsuperscript{60} The book was not what it professed to be or what the Consistory had originally sought, and continued to be a disappointment. When the book was finally printed in December, 1767, 2,000 had been printed (despite the instruction of a year earlier), and the cost was £75 over budget.\textsuperscript{61} By the Consistory meeting of 20 March, 1769, only between six and seven hundred copies had been sold; of those that remained, nine hundred were bound, while four to five hundred were unbound, and the price was reduced to facilitate sales.\textsuperscript{62} The last mention of the book was at the meeting of 9 February, 1775, when some books still remained, and the price was again reduced so that they might be sold in bulk.\textsuperscript{63} The first Dutch Reformed effort at English hymnody resulted in a resounding failure, but it is not entirely clear why, because it isn’t wholly clear what was to be
accomplished. The Collegiate congregation of the 1760s seems to have possessed a dual personal-
ity, wishing both to remain Dutch (as evidenced by their participation in the Conferentie) and to
adapt to their new environment with the call to the English-speaking Laidlie. The psalter, intended
to be a set of English texts in a Dutch format, was a product of that duality. Was it an attempt to
prove that the American congregations could be truly American and still loyal to Amsterdam? Or
was it merely a ploy to satisfy the needs of an English worshipping congregation while pacifying
the more conservative elements? In the end, the book did neither. This version of the Psalms in
meter would fade quietly into the history of the denomination. By the time John Henry Livingston
chaired the committee which produced the denomination’s first edition of *Psalms and Hymns* in
1789, only 22 of the Collegiate psalter psalms would survive, and these would be gone by the
second edition of 1812.
America in 1787 was not only dramatically different from the world which Jonas Michaelius had entered in 1628, it had also changed dramatically from those waning days of 1767 when the Collegiate psalter was brought into the world. New York and New Jersey were no longer British colonies, but had become two of the new United States. The battle between Coetus and Conferentie was now over, and a new American denomination was being formed. Even before this new church had a constitution, the American Synod of 1787 formed a committee to prepare “another and better version of the Psalms of David, than the congregations as yet possess in the English language.” Six men were appointed to this committee, including three members of the former Coetus (David Romeyn, Jacob Hardenbergh, and Solomon Froelich), one first-generation Dutchman (Eilardus Westerlo), one Presbyterian transplanted into the church (William Linn, a former American army chaplain who came to the Collegiate church of New York after the war), a former Hardenbergh student (Isaac Blauvelt), and the Rev. Dr. John Henry Livingston.

Livingston, known as “the father of the Reformed Church in America,” is certainly the best remembered of the committee, having authored the Plan of Union which healed the Coetus/Conferentie division in 1771, having prepared the first RCA liturgy, and serving as the denomination’s first Professor of Theology thus establishing what was to become New Brunswick Theological Seminary. Livingston would also serve as the father of our hymnody, playing a very large role in this psalter and its successor.

Unlike the 1767 effort, which intended to create an English psalter in the Dutch style, this was to be “a new versification out of other collections of English Psalms in repute and received in the Reformed churches.” Thus, there must have been English psalm-books other than the Collegiate version (the instructions did say “collections”) already in use by Reformed congregations. Indeed, the synod of 1788 felt obliged to instruct the committee to “limit themselves to the known Psalm-
Books of the New York congregation [the Collegiate psalter], of Tate & Brady, and of Watts,” though they are given some latitude when they see a deficiency in these sources “to supply this lack from some other authors of acknowledged orthodoxy.” Most important, these instructions, combined with the existence of various English metrical psalters in the congregations, make it clear that this book is not to be an Anglo-Dutch psalter, as was sought two decades earlier, but something more English.

The psalmody of English pietist and dissenter Isaac Watts would comprise 51% of the completed book, and this would represent another shift (one can only guess whether it was witting or unwitting) in theology of hymnody. Where, for John Calvin, the psalms clearly prefigured Christ, and therefore stood just as they were as Christian hymns, they were simply Old Testament writings for Watts, unenlightened by the Gospel, but containing important Christian precepts. These thoughts were first outlined in A Short Essay toward the Improvement of Psalmody, published in 1705. A cornerstone of Watts’ argument was his interpretation of the Greek terms ἐλοαμο and υμνῶν, as well as the word ὕδη (song) in passages such as Colossians 3:16. Watts’ exegesis of what were psalms, hymns, and spiritual songs was much broader than Calvin’s.

A psalm is a general name for any thing that is sung in divine worship, whatsoever be the particular theme or matter…I confess in the New Testament the noun ἐλοαμο refers generally to the book of psalms…Yet this word is used once in another sense…

In other words, while the New Testament usually uses the word “psalm” in reference to those of the Old Testament canon, this is not necessarily the case. Anything sung in the worship of God is, for Watts, a psalm.

An hymn, whether implied in the verb υμνῶν, or expressed in the noun υμνῶν, doth always retain its original signification, and intend a song whose manner or design is praise: Nor [sic] is there any thing in the nature or use of the word either in scripture [sic] or other authors, that determines to signify an immediate inspiration, or human composure.

In Watts’ scheme, the word “hymn” is a stylistic designation referring to any song intended for praise, which may be scriptural (“an immediate inspiration”) but does not have to be.

A song, ὕδη, denotes any theme or subject composed into a form fit for singing, and seems to intend somewhat suited to the gospel-state, rather than any Jewish psalms or songs in all the five verses in the New Testament where it is used.

Again, while there are certainly songs in the New Testament, we are not to imagine that those are the only songs which we may sing.

Thus Watts gave himself an opening to introduce hymns of human composure. But first he would create a book of psalm paraphrases, and he made suggestions which are first and foremost to make the psalter more singable:

If it be the duty of the churches to sing psalms, they must necessarily be turned into such a sort of verse and metre as will best fit them for the whole church to join in worship: Now this will be very different from a translation of the original language word for word; for the
lines must be confined to a certain number of syllables, and the stanza or verse, to a certain number of lines, that so the tune being short the people may be acquainted with it, and be ready to sing without much difficulty…Now in reducing a hebrew [sic] or a greek [sic] song to a form tolerably fit to be sung by an English congregation, here and there a word must be omitted, now and then a word or two superadded, and frequently a sentence or expression a little altered and changed into another that is something a-kin [sic] to it.13

Clearly, Watts was intent on making the psalter more singable and more easily understood by the average worshipper. Indeed, his suggestions, seem to move closer to the practices of John Calvin than those employed by Sternhold & Hopkins and Tate & Brady. But Watts also wishes metrical psalmody to be applicable to the Christian community.

Where the psalmist uses sharp invectives against his personal enemies, I have endeavored to turn the edge of them against our spiritual adversaries, sin, satan [sic], and temptation. Where the flights of his faith and love are sublime, I have often sunk the expressions within reach of the ordinary Christian…Where the original runs in the form of a prophecy concerning Christ and his salvation, I have given an historical turn to the sense: There is no necessity that we should always sing in an obscure and doubtful style of prediction, when the things foretold are brought into open light by a full accomplishment. When the writers of the New Testament have cited or alluded to any part of the psalms, I have often indulged the liberty of a paraphrase, according to the words of Christ, or his apostles…Where the psalmist describes religion by the fear of God, I have often joined faith and love to it: Where he speaks of the pardon of sin, through the mercies of God, I have added the blood and merits of a Saviour… When he attends the ark with shouting into Zion, I sing the ascension of my Saviour into heaven, or his presence in his church on earth…14

Now since it appears so plain, that the Hebrew psalter is very improper to the precise matter and style of our songs in a christian church [sic]; and since there is very good reason to believe that it is left us, not only as a most valuable part of the word of God, for our faith and practice, but as an admirable and divine pattern of spiritual songs and hymns under the gospel; I have chosen rather to imitate rather than to translate; and thus to compose a psalm-book for Christians rather than the Jewish psalter.15

Once he had decided to imitate rather than translate the psalms, Watts had opened the door for modern hymnody. In the Essay mentioned above, he had suggested that, if the psalms were to be paraphrased in order to be useful for congregational singing, there should be no harm in paraphrasing other Scriptural ideas (especially New Testament theology) that these, too, might be sung.16 “There is almost an infinite number of different occasions for praise and thanksgivings, as well as for prayer, in the life of a christian [sic] and there is not a set of Psalms already prepared that can answer all the varieties of the providence and the grace of God.”17

This is the step which Watts took beyond Calvin’s theology of music. If we must paraphrase the psalms in order to sing them (Calvin allowed for paraphrases in his psalter), and they are still the Word of God, then we can also paraphrase other Biblical texts, especially in the New Testament, and use their ideas to make Christian hymns. Watts still insisted, however, that these hymns are to
be based on Scripture if they are to be used in worship.

It is arguable whether Watts’ psalms became popular because of this new theological basis, or that his theology of hymnody crept in because his psalms—not bound to literal translations of Scripture as Tate and Brady’s—were more singable. His work did indeed spread through several editions on both sides of the Atlantic by the time the Dutch Reformed committee had begun its work.

And yet, only 51% of the new psalter would feature Watts’ work while, in other instances, the clumsier psalms of Tate and Brady (and even the awful Collegiate psalter hybrids) were preferred. Perhaps this was because of the instruction that the settings used be “as nearly approachable and agreeably to the original psalms as possible,”18 or perhaps because the denomination was leery of any wholehearted adoption of Watts’ theology (as recently as 1762, the Rev. Abraham Keteltas had been found theologically unfit for being “too favorably disposed to the opinions of the Rev. Dr. Isaac Watts” about the divinity of Christ19).

But Watts’ psalm settings were being sung and, as we have noted, there is only a small step of logic to be made from his psalms to his hymns. Another of General Synod’s instructions to the committee would indicate that hymn singing was widespread.

And since it seems necessary that some well composed spiritual hymns be connected as a supplement with this new Psalm-Book, it is ordained that the committee also have a care over this matter, and print such hymns in connection with the Psalms.20

Thus, the book which was presented to the Synod of 1789 was titled The Psalms and Hymns of the Reformed Protestant Dutch Church in North America.21 In addition to 150 metrical psalms, there were 100 hymns, and all in an Anglo-American style for the 18th century, with texts only and no tunes. This was, as the title and number of hymns indicate, more than a psalter with a supplemental collection of hymns; the hymns were an integral, if subordinate, part of the book. But this is still a Dutch hymnal, thanks to the instructions of the Synod (which insisted that the Heidelberg Catechism, confession of faith, and liturgy be attached to the book22) and the genius of John Henry Livingston, who arranged the first 52 hymns to correspond to the questions of the Heidelberg Catechism, and devoted another 20 to the subject of the Lord’s Supper.

Some of the Watts psalm settings—51% of the book—were modified, presumably to make them more “Scriptural” (though Watts use of “Jesus” in Psalm 45 remained). Additionally, 26% were from Tate and Brady’s psalter, a mere fourteen per cent (22 psalms) came from the failed Collegiate psalm book, and just over seven per cent were the work of other authors. The Synod of 1790 thanked the committee, and especially Livingston, “who particularly has lent his hand and help,”23 and whose name was on the title page of the book. Should there be any doubt that this was to be the one hymnal of the Dutch churches in America, the Explanatory Articles of 1792 set things straight: “In the English language, the Psalms and Hymns compiled by Professor Livingston, and published with the express approbation and recommendation of the General Synod, in the year 1789.”24 This was to be the one collection for congregational singing.

Psalms and Hymns seems to have remained unchallenged and unaltered for nearly a quarter of a century, until it was recommended by the Classis of New York “that a very great change should be made in the psalm and hymn book for those who belong to our church.”25 The Synod of 1812 put Livingston to work on his own this time, with a committee to review his completed work.26 The committee, made up entirely of former students of Livingston (James V.C. Romeyn, James S. Can-
non, Peter Studdiford, and John Schureman), was probably little more than a rubber stamp, and even the necessary approval of General Synod indicated little if any real review; after all, Livingston was, by 1812, the grand old man of the Reformed Church.

The new edition was presented in 1813, with the same title and format,27 but a substantially altered content. Where Isaac Watts was the source of just over half of the psalm settings in the first book, he was now the author of nearly 78%; only 1.5% came from the Tate and Brady psalter; and the Collegiate psalm book was but a memory. Watts’ Christological references, largely edited out in 1789, were untouched in this edition, and there were subject headings for each psalm very much like those used by Watts (where Watts referred to Psalm 16 as “Christ’s all-sufficiency,” Livingston titled it “The Sufficiency of Christ”28). One notable, but unexplained, alteration: the canticle settings, present since the days of the Genevan psalter, had disappeared without comment.

There were also nearly ten settings of psalms and portions of psalms by Timothy Dwight, the compiler of The Psalms of David, imitated in the language of the New Testament, and applied to the Christian life and Worship, by I. Watts, D.D. A new edition, to which the psalms omitted by Dr. Watts are versified, local passage are altered, and a number of psalms are versified anew, in proper meters.29 This book, used by the Presbyterian Church in the United States, sought to do just what the title promised, as well as correcting what Dwight perceived to be errors in other editions of Watts:

In making such alteration’s [sic] to Doctor Watts’s version, as respected objects merely local, I have in some instances applied the psalm, or the passage, to the church [sic] at large, or to christian [sic] nations generally; and in others, particularly to our own country…

In altering such passages as were defective, either in the language, or the sentiment, I found two objects claiming my attention—the errors of the press, and those of the writer…

As the editions of Doctor Watts’s psalms have been very numerous, both in Great Britain and America, many typographical errors have crept into the modern copies of the work. Those I have carefully endeavored to correct.30

Dwight’s corrections, however, did not always match Watts’ original (as it appears in Watts’ Works, chapter IX), and these corrections are prevalent in Livingston’s Psalms and Hymns of 1812.

Just over 21% of the psalms in this edition came from various other sources, and tradition has often held that Livingston himself wrote some of them—Rejoice in the Lord31 even credits Livingston with writing “Searcher and Savior of my soul,” taken from a portion of Psalm 119 as set in 1812. While there is no absolute evidence that Livingston did not write metrical psalms, the evidence that he did is questionable at best. None of his surviving writings mention the versifying of psalms, and the principle item of evidence in favor of this argument is the 1860 printing32 of the 1859 edition of Psalms and Hymns, where the authors of psalm settings are first credited. The name “Livingston” is mentioned in a few places, including “Searcher and Savior,” but, since only last names are used, we cannot be sure they meant John Henry. Furthermore, there are other places where the wrong authors are credited for psalms, and it is only the 1860 printing, not the 1859 printing, that mentions Livingston.

With the greater prominence of Watts and his style, the door is opened to the singing of even more hymns. The second edition included as many hymns as psalm settings, although it maintained the distinctive order which Livingston had developed for the hymnal section of the first edition.
This version of *Psalms and Hymns* would not enjoy the long undisturbed reign of its predecessor. In 1830, the General Synod sent off a committee led by Thomas DeWitt to develop the first of many sets of additional hymns. The committee responded in the very next year by suggesting that the psalms, hymns, and new hymns be intermingled into one hymnal, as “The alphabetical arrangement of the psalms and hymns, combined according to their subjects…would present some convenience and advantage.” This notion was rejected, but the Synod did approve the printing of the new additional hymns in a separate book as well as in an appendix to the 1812 book. The Reformed Church now had both a psalter and a hymnal approved for worship use. DeWitt would be placed on another committee to add to the hymns in 1845, and there was a similar reply; “It is believed that the real value of our present hymns is not seen, from the fact of their being separated as they are…if Synod approve the selection now offered, and the whole are made one series, it is confidently believed that our hymn book may favorably compare with any in the country.” Once again this idea was rejected out of respect for Dr. Livingston’s work. The psalter remained intact through the edition of 1859, when the last set of additional hymns was added, and all of the hymns intermingled (thus eliminating Livingston’s Heidelberg Catechism order), resulting in a book of 700 hymns with a vestigial psalter. In 1846, the Synod flirted with rescinding the requirement that the Catechism, liturgy, and other forms be included in all printings of the hymnal. The psalter would remain as the final distinctly Dutch Reformed feature of our hymnody until 1869, by which time more American hymnals would have a solid foothold (but that is the subject of the next chapter).
For several years before *Psalms and Hymns* was replaced as the primary book of congregational song for the Reformed Church in America, marking a break with the denomination’s psalm-singing heritage, there were many hymnals prominent in the local congregations. This was officially begun with the book *Sabbath-School and Social Hymns*, approved by the General Synod in 1843.¹

When the committee was commissioned in 1842, it was instructed to prepare a book for the use of Sabbath-schools, in response to a request from the Sabbath-School Board.² The committee took the initiative of expanding its scope to include “weekly lectures and conference in social worship” and prayer meetings, apparently inspired by the concern that “in many parts of the church, Hymnbooks have been introduced into the prayer-meetings and lecture-room unauthorized by the Synod…. ” The resulting book, therefore, was intended to “at once be entirely suitable for the Sabbath-school, and at the same time be of sufficiently varied and elevated character, to supersede the use of unauthorized hymns in the lecture and prayer meeting.”³

Evidently, there were other hymnals (and other hymns) capturing the attention and imagination of the membership. The Synod seemed anxious to accommodate this desire while maintaining control—bending authority so that it will not break. Pursuant to this end, and ostensibly “In order to enlarge the variety of matter in the authorized Psalmody of the Church [sic], none of the psalms or hymns contained in our Psalm-book” were used in the Sabbath School collection.⁴

What was in the book? Everything from patriotic hymns of the day (a hymn in praise of George Washington) to Christmas carols (“Hark the herald angels sing”). For the first time, an extensive selection of hymns by John and Charles Wesley appear in a Dutch Reformed hymnal, and their influence is seen in the ordering of the hymns as well (by subject headings): Scriptures; Being & Attributes of God; Creation & Providence; Christ; The Holy Spirit; Worship; Prayer; The Sabbath; Alarming & Inviting (conversion hymns); Penitential; Christian Life; Early Piety (the instruction of children); Opening & Closing School; Monthly Concerts; Times & Seasons; Anniversary Occasions; Death; Judgment; Heaven & Hell; Dismission; Doxologies⁵ (To compare this to John Wesley’s
Volumes have been written on the lives of these two founders of Methodism, and the story need not be recited here. There are, however, certain points which we should remember: the brothers were Anglican priests who never wished to separate from their church—the Methodist preaching services were intended to supplement the parish Eucharist—rather, it was the church which rejected them; the two of them were, quite probably, brilliant (indeed, the family produced geniuses in music and a dozen other fields for a century and a half), and Charles was one of the most prolific hymnodists in history—Erik Routley estimated Wesley’s output at 3.4 poems per week from his conversion until his death fifty years later; and their work was profoundly influenced by the pietist hymnody of the Moravians, to which John had been exposed during his trip to America in 1737, and many of which he paraphrased from German.

Pietism, with its emphasis on personal salvation, was certainly evident in much of Watts’ work (one of his most famous hymns was “When I survey the wondrous cross”), but his primary concern was congregational hymnody, expanding upon the metrical psalter. Pietist hymnody in general, however, and that of the Germans in particular, was usually written for solo or small group singing referring, for the most part, to the first person (“Praise to the Lord, the Almighty”) or second person (“If thou but suffer God to guide thee”) singular—the one notable exception, “We gather together to ask the Lord’s blessing,” was written as a family table grace. Reinforcing this soloist intent were the tunes originally wed to many of these texts, which Routley described as difficult, if not impossible, for congregational singing. The Wesleys introduced a more evangelistic flavor to the style—seeking not only to discipline, but also to invite—but retained, in much of the work, that same focus toward the soloist or small group (as is witnessed by Handel’s tune GOPSAL, and its oratorio style, written for Charles’ text “Rejoice, the Lord is King”). This was often necessary, since open-air gatherings lacked hymnals. The other intended audience for many of the hymns was the small gathering, such as the Methodist classes which the Wesleys formed, very much like the prayer-meetings and lecture groups for whom the Reformed hymnal committee intended their work a century later.

Indeed, over one hundred years passed by between the Wesley’s conversion and their first significant impact on the official hymnody of the Reformed Protestant Dutch Church in North America (although one or two of John Wesley’s modifications of Watts’ metrical psalm paraphrases appear in Psalms and Hymns, most notably at Psalm 100); this does not say anything about the unofficial hymnody of the church, which was the concern of the committee which reported to General Synod in 1843. The very fact that Wesleyan hymns were created for small group meetings such as those which the report described would make them easily received. Actually, Charles Wesley built on Watts’ idea that hymns of human composure, based upon Scripture, were perfectly acceptable. Wesley was, after all, a priest, trained in theology, and his hymns show the discipline of doctrine, filled with Scriptural references (Routley found no fewer than twelve allusions in “Hark the herald angels sing”) even though he attempted no actual paraphrases of Scripture until 1762. There is but a subtle theological shift, from the Calvinist comprehension of the glory of God to the celebration of the Christian year and the bliss of personal conversion. And, just as Watts’ writing showed a profound improvement over the psalmody of his predecessors, Wesley showed a greater facility and variety than Watts, using over 80 meters compared to Watts’ half dozen or so. If Watts’ theology had in any way crept into the eighteenth century Reformed corpus through the back door of singability, there is no doubt that Wesley could do the same, perhaps even better, in the nineteenth century.
As for the ordering of the hymns, this was very important to John Wesley. In the preface to his *Collection of Hymns for the Use of the People Called Methodists*, John felt it important that the hymns not be “carelessly jumbled together.” This collection was to contain “all the important truths of our most holy religion…and to prove them both by Scripture and reason.” Therefore, in order to be useful, the hymns must be “carefully arranged under proper heads, according to the experience of real Christians.” These hymns were not to be simply a component of the liturgy, but a response for average Christians to what Wesley perceived as the everyday affairs of life. By adopting this style of ordering, however, the General Synod committee was abandoning the distinctly Reformed ordering according to the Heidelberg Catechism, which was supposed to be the Reformed Christian’s guide for response to the earthly life.

In any event, this was the collection of “between three hundred and three hundred and fifty hymns” which was presented and endorsed by the Synod of 1843. Another of these social worship hymnals was the *Fulton Street Hymn Book for the use of Union Prayer meetings, Sabbath schools, and Families*, which, in 1862, became the first of many hymnals which the Synod approved but did not itself initiate, and which was an outgrowth of the Fulton Street prayer meetings held at the North Church Chapel of the Collegiate Church beginning in 1857. This parallel strand of hymnody seemed to be servicing a parallel, mostly lay-run, church structure.

But similar influences were becoming evident in the transfigured *Psalms and Hymns*. Under pressure to create an intermingled collection of hymns and metrical psalms since 1830, a special committee was appointed in 1845 to consider “the whole subject of the Hymn Book.” This committee added 350 hymns, and intermingled the original and additional (1830) hymns, resulting in 797 hymns and a separate psalter (despite the committee’s recommendation). This number, it was felt, would “make the ‘poetical liturgy’ of the Church complete.” Whether or not this was true, it certainly seems sufficient to make this a hymnal unto itself, with psalter attached.

These hymns were arranged under Wesleyan-style subject headings, and still appeared with only texts on the page. Isaac Watts is represented by nearly one out of every seven hymns, while Charles Wesley occupies only 2.9% of the collection (not bad, considering that there are 137 authors represented). Five others are prominent: Philip Doddridge (1702-1751) and John Newton (1725-1807), both English clergy influenced by Watts and the Wesleys; American church musician Thomas Hastings (1784-1872); and British Baptists Anne Steele (1716-1778) and Benjamin Beddome (1717-1795). Hastings, a native of New York’s Hudson Valley working in Manhattan congregations (thus he might well have been in touch with Dutch Reformed folks), was the only author in the set contemporary with the committee, but it is difficult to discern which hymns were added in 1845-46 and which were present since 1812.

By the very next Synod, overtures and complaints were being entertained from the Classis of Bergen and the North Classis of Long Island, regarding the large number of preaching hymns (90 out of 797), numerous “heretical expressions” (a line by line defense of which occupies two and a half pages in the *Acts and Proceedings*), and what was perceived to be a large number of “Peculiar Metres” and a confusion as to metrical initials. There was also some question as to the method and authority used by the hymnal committee, which did not amuse the committee on overtures.

The acts complained of were acts of former General Synods, over which the present Synod has no control. It is, however, perhaps due to that committee, to say, that on investigation, all difficulty and doubt vanish entirely. They were appointed by Synod to perform the precise duty which they have performed, and deserve alike the gratitude and commendation of
In 1848, the requirement that the liturgy and standards be bound with all hymnals was restored. At that same Synod, it was reported that several congregations wished to continue using the “old” (i.e. pre-1846) version of Psalms and Hymns. In 1859, two versions of a Book of Selections from the main book, one for Social worship and another for Sabbath schools, were prepared, and, in 1866, the Synod approved The Book of Praise, which was Psalms and Hymns with a collection of tunes. This does not mean that the texts were wed to tunes in the way that we would think of them: instead, the pages of the book are split in half, with tunes up top and texts down below so that, in as much as meters permit, tunes and texts could be interchanged. There was very little activity in this area during the War between the States, and the only other action prior to 1868 was the appointment of a committee by the Synod of 1864 to produce a new Sabbath School book—which, by the way, took some time to accomplish.

By 1868, the war had ended, and the modern name of the denomination, “Reformed Church in America,” had been adopted. Moreover, Psalms and Hymns was 55 years old, and even its latest revision—which was only of the hymns—was twenty years old. People in the parishes could once again turn their attention to such matters as hymns; the whole matter of renaming the church made it clear that this denomination no longer wished to be Dutch. If they were now an American church, shouldn’t they have a hymnal just like all of the other American churches?

The Sabbath School hymnal begun in 1864 was finally presented at the Synod of 1868. It contained “none of the psalms and hymns contained in our Psalm Book…in order to enlarge the variety of matter in the authorized psalmody of our church.” There does not seem to be a surviving copy of the book, but it added 250 hymns to the approved repertory. At the very same Synod, the South Classis of Long Island inquired about a certain “Hymn Book,” and various other hymnals were also presented for approval. In order to make sense of this, the Synod appointed a special committee: John Bodine Thompson, New Brunswick professor, remembered as the RCA’s premiere hymnologist; Ashbel G. Vermilye, who had attended New Brunswick as a Presbyterian and was ordained as such before serving in the Reformed Church; and Alexander Ramsay Thompson, minister in the Collegiate church and John’s younger brother, who, despite John’s fame within the denomination, is one of few members of the RCA listed in Julian’s Dictionary of Hymnology, and was probably the most accomplished RCA hymnodist of his century. The younger Thompson contributed two hymns to the new book which the committee created, and is credited by Julian as being co-editor (although Corwin and the Synod minutes dispute that claim).

The book which the committee presented in 1869 was titled Hymns of the Church, and was, in terms of style and order more than content, a radical departure from what had come before. There were texts and tunes, not bound interchangeably with split pages as in The Book of Praise, but definitely wed, with two or three texts to a tune, in the English style, not the interlined style which has become typically American. In fact, this new book seemed quite English, and there is little doubt that it was the daughter of a very famous British hymnal.

Hymns, Ancient and Modern, for use in the services of the Church is probably the most successful hymnal in the history of the Anglican communion, having been published in various editions from 1861 until the present. It was developed by a group of Anglican clergy (the Church of England does not produce official hymnals) for use in their parishes. While it was not the first book to attempt the wedding of texts and tunes (one to one—and, in Hymns of the Church, the Ancient and Modern hymns would only be wed to their one tune), it was the first to be successful; Erik
Routley wrote that this book was to that movement “what Luther was to the Reformation,” while the others “take their place with Wyclif and Hus.”

The book was conceived as a companion to the Prayer Book, and thus set itself up on a similar order: Morning, Evening, Sunday, the days of the week; the Church Year, Advent through Trinity, with “General Hymns” for the Sundays after Trinity; Holy Communion and Baptism; Confirmation (and, later, Children’s Hymns); Marriage, Ember Days, Missions, Burial; Special Occasions, Saint’s Days, and Celebrations. The book’s third successful innovation came as the result of an error; the misinterpretation of Ambrosian hymn manuscripts led them to add “Amens” to the end of all hymns (Routley insisted that the rest of the world, “operating under the delusion that the Anglicans knew what they were doing when it came to liturgy,” copied this mistake).

While the journey is unclear (the publishers have lost many of their nineteenth century records), it seems that certain high church factions in the American Episcopal Church arranged for Ancient and Modern to become available through publishers in the United States at a time when that denomination was searching for a hymnal to use until their first full-fledged hymnal was available. Either of the Thompson brothers, given their hymnodic interests, could have had a copy of the book for their own. The effect upon Hymns of the Church approaches plagiarism: the ordering and section headings are nearly identical, the tunes, with a few minor alterations, are harmonized in the American book as they are in the British, and the texts and tunes taken wholesale from the mother book include the (then new) Amens. The two leading contributors were still Isaac Watts (16.7% of the book), followed by Charles Wesley (7.6%), with other leaders including Philip Doddridge, James Montgomery, Augustus Toplady, William Cowper, Reginald Heber, and John Keble—all of them British, and most of them Anglican. There was but one American prominently represented: the Congregational church musician Lowell Mason. The Anglo-Reformed flavor was reinforced by the presence of Canticles (for the first time since 1813) and Anglican Chant settings of psalms (the chanting of prose had been recommended in an article in the Christian Intelligencer of 4 June, 1863).

The new hymnal was announced with great fanfare:

We are glad to announce the publication of the much-desired compilation of hymns with tunes, bearing the above title [Hymns of the Church]. The work is issued in an excellent style, by A.S. Barnes & Co.

It will be remembered that the Synod of 1868, through a committee, examined this work, and authorized its publication and use [according to the minutes, the Synod appointed the committee to compile the book]. Revs. J.B. Thompson, Ashbel G. Vermilye, and Alexander R. Thompson, were directed to prepare it for the press, and perform the editorial work necessary to its completion. In this they were aided by the Rev. Dr. Eddy of Brooklyn, a gentleman of fine taste, and an expert in the science of music.

The result of the labors of the committee was presented to the General Synod at its recent session, in completed copies of the work. The Synod with great cordiality approved the book, and it will now be for the Church to adopt it into use.

It is not intended to substitute the “Hymns of the Church,” for the older compilations, except as this last work shall receive preference. We believe it will soon win its way, by its great merits to general favor: Among these merits we specify the following:

First. It is the best collection of Psalms and Hymns that has yet been made. Advantage has been taken of the experience of former compilers, and nothing has been admitted to
this collection which has not received the seal of experiment or the verdict of a severe criticism.

Second. The music is especially designed to promote choral or congregational singing. Quartets may object that it is not sufficiently twisted, difficult and inexpressive, but for worship these tunes are all that the Church can desire.

Third. it retains all the old, dear, familiar Psalms and Hymns found in our standard compilation, and with them are intermingled hymns which the whole Church has been singing with hearty accord.

As a specimen of editorial care and of typographical beauty, this work is worthy of very great praise. We anticipate for it a large sale, not only in our own, but in other denominations.  

From that article, it is easy to deduce a few expectations placed upon the book. First, they wished for a large sale, and with good reason: the Synod of 1869 arranged for the denomination to receive a royalty from A.S. Barnes on the sale of these books. Second, the book was to be sold outside of the RCA, which means that it may not have been expected to be too distinctly Reformed. Last—and this may have been the area of greatest disappointment for some—it would seem that at least some people expected another version of Psalms and Hymns; the new hymnal was certainly not this.

But praise was not to be universal. During October of 1869, there was a brief debate in the Intelligencer between an E.E. and a T.W.C. regarding the merits and/or shortcomings of the new collection. The Synod of 1870 noted that Hymns of the Church was being used in 50 congregations, and asked the committee to revise some of the tunes, over which there had been complaints. In 1871, Hymns of Prayer and Praise was authorized, being a selection of about 325 hymns from the 1869 book, for private devotions and social worship. And, as we will see in the next chapter, a new book altogether would be present before the decade was out. Even though Hymns of the Church would be officially recommended until the turn of the century, there would be several approved books, accompanied by an erosion in the Synod’s control over hymnody.

Hymns of the Church comes at the end of a long evolutionary process toward a different kind of hymnal for the Reformed Church in America, but it seems to have lost its way somewhere. Like Hymns, Ancient and Modern, which it emulates, the RCA book came out of a period of denominational upheaval. But the issue for the Anglicans was the Oxford Movement, a crisis of liturgy, while for the RCA, it was more an issue of identity. This sort of incorrect response to the denominational situation would have dire consequences for the church’s hymnody over the next century.
When John B. Thompson, chair of the Committee on the Publication of the Hymn Book, presented their work to the General Synod of 1869, he prefaced it with a brief history of denominational hymnody up to that point, which can be found at Appendix D. Leaving aside the inexplicable errors (the music of the Dutch psalter was that of Bourgeois, not de Leeuw, and there is no official record of the 1773 Dutch psalter receiving much American use), it is a fascinating account. What is all the more fascinating is the element which he chose to stress at several points in the brief discussion—the italics are from the General Synod minutes:

The Church orders ratified by the National Synod of Dordrecht (A.D. 1618, 1619) which are still “recognized as containing the fundamental principles of our Church government,” (Minutes of Synod for 1833, p. 202), declare that “the one hundred and fifty psalms of David; the Ten Commandments; the Lord’s Prayer; the twelve articles of the Christian faith; the Songs of Mary, Zacharias, Simeon, versified only, shall be sung in public worship. The Churches are left at liberty to adopt, or omit, that entitled O Thou who art our Father God! All others are prohibited.” This usage prevailing in the Netherlands, was transferred to this country.

The Articles of Union adopted in 1771, make no mention of Psalmody, but agree to “abide in all things,” by the regulations of the Synod of Dort, hereinbefore quoted .

…In 1787, General Synod appointed a committee to compile a Psalm-book “out of other collections of English Psalms in repute and received in the Reformed Churches—no congregation, however, to be obliged thereto, where that of the New York Consistory is in use.”… and the committee was “also empowered, as soon as the majority agree in relation to the compilation, to forward said Psalm-book to the press.” This, however, they did not do
until they had reported the same to the extraordinary session of Synod in 1789, and obtained its approval thereof, after which it was speedily published.

In 1812…requested “Dr. Livingston to make the selection, agreeably to the views expressed,” which he did, submitting it to the Synod of 1813, whereupon a mandatory order was issued, that it “be forthwith introduced into public worship in all our Churches!” It’s use was recommended, also, “to all families and individuals, instead of the book hitherto in use.” No radical change has been made in the Psalmody of the Church from that day to this.

It is worthy of note also, that in 1846…did General Synod authorize an edition of the Psalm and Hymn-book…suggesting that they had endeavored “to make the poëtical liturgy of the Church complete.”

Four times in the space of as many pages in the Synod minutes, Thompson invokes historical references to the authority of General Synod to dictate what will be sung within RCA congregations. He even goes so far as to recall—and emphasize—the words of the 1846 Synod which linked the hymnal to the liturgy; and the liturgy, of course, was and is part of the denomination’s constitution, unalterable except by act of the whole church. One suspects that Thompson would like a mandatory order, similar to that of 1813, making Hymns of the Church the only acceptable worship hymnal for the whole of the Reformed Church in America.

Thompson’s concept of hymnody was indeed that fostered by the polity of the nineteenth century. The minutes of General Synod note repeatedly occasions on which the Synod approved new hymns—not hymnals, but hymns—to be used in worship; the 1846 edition of Psalms and Hymns prompted overtures and debates over individual lines of hymns and their theological virtue or lack thereof. It was a remnant of the government which had been transplanted from Holland, and probably found its roots in John Calvin’s realization that, while music could reach the human spirit at levels which preaching could not, it could also be a dangerous thing, and therefore must be strictly controlled. Certainly, the repeated insistence that the Standards and the Liturgy be bound with the hymnal indicates some understanding that hymns are also a medium for the interpretation of Scripture.

Despite the evidence of history, the committee’s official motion, carried by Synod, was that “the General Synod approve and authorize the book entitled ‘Hymns of the Church,’… and recommend it to all Churches…” The weight which said recommendation carried is doubtful, since, within four years, the Classes of Poughkeepsie and Hudson were requesting the approval of Songs of the Sanctuary, which, according to Corwin, was already “extensively used.” In other words, this was not only a request for permission to reject the denominational hymnal; this was an announcement that several parishes had already done so, and now wished the Synod’s retroactive approval. The Synod of 1873 denied the request.

The importance of the Hymnology of the Church, and the provision of music fitted to assist devotion, is evident.

It is also desirable, when practicable, that the entire denomination should observe uniformity in the use of that which is best. Progress, however, in this department of public worship has rendered it difficult to keep pace with the times. To aid this direction Synod has already approved of more than one mode of public praise, so that absolute uniformity is interrupted.

The question now occurs, what Synod ought further to do in response to the present
requests. It seems that the last book of praise approved by the General Synod is not objected to on account of its poetry, but chiefly on account of its many unsatisfactory tunes. Many hymns, which in the memory of the Church have been associated with particular tunes, have been separated therefrom, and set to music of modern composition, to the exclusion of much music of superior excellence.

Therefore your Committee recommend,

1. That a Committee of five, representing as far as possible the whole denomination, be appointed to unite with the present Committee on Hymnology, to revise the music and hymns of the book entitled “Hymns of the Church,” and endeavor to secure, if possible, its publication at a lower price.5

This particular incident set out the issues which would dominate the RCA’s discussions on hymnody for the better part of the next century. First, there is the very notion that the Synod was being asked to give its stamp of approval to a fait accompli. But the idea of congregations acting without the approval of Synod in this matter was nothing new. When the first committee for Psalms and Hymns was set to work by the Synod of 1787, it was instructed to limit itself to those books already in use within the denomination. Officially, there was but one English language psalter in use—the Collegiate psalter. And yet, Tate and Brady’s version, as well as that of Watts, were on the accepted list, and the works of other hymnodists, presumably in use in the denomination, were to be found in the finished product. There was, indeed, historical precedent for choosing the book first and dealing with the Synod’s reaction later. And the tradition would continue; the Classis of Poughkeepsie would again ask for approval for Songs of the Sanctuary and The Church Hymn Book in 1874 (and again the Synod refused). Over the next 90 years, there would be several similar requests,6 and, while it is never again overtly stated that a book was already in use before approval was requested, it is hard to imagine that, in every case, a Classis had bothered with the overture process before some money had been invested; and none of this would account for a congregation which might decide that what Synod didn’t know couldn’t hurt it, electing simply not to tell anyone what book was in use. We may never know how many congregations defied the rule of Synod, but we can be sure it happened.

Why would there be so much dissension, so much plurality in an area where there seems to have been an earnest desire for unity? The answer lies in the report to the 1873 Synod: “it is difficult to keep pace with the times.” Congregations were using a multitude of English psalters before the denomination responded to the need. The call for a hymnal without a metrical psalter began in the 1830s, and wasn’t answered for over three decades. The denomination was slow in responding to the desires of its congregations. Furthermore, those demands were, in all likelihood, by no means uniform; the 1873 report acknowledged a plurality of approved hymnals, and Thompson’s history in 1869 also mentioned adaptations for special situations.7 The complaint over the various tunes employed by Hymns of the Church is a case in point; from 1787 until 1869, the RCA did not have any book which wed certain texts with certain tunes, and so the “memory of the Church” regarding such weddings was probably not uniform. A new standard of uniformity was being imposed upon parishes which were defying the standards already laid down. The issue of cost would also be present for many years to come. Even though the Synod was seeking ways to reduce the cost of Hymns of the Church, one item which, undoubtedly, added to the cost was the royalty of fifteen to twenty-five cents which the Synod was collecting on every book.8 But the cost of the book to congregations was, obviously, a conflicting concern, and the two interests would influence Synod
decisions into the twentieth century; it was simply easier to endorse hymnals already prepared. As recently as 1979, cost was to be a factor in the decision to proceed with a new hymnal.

The slowness of denominational response and the desire to save money proved to be a paralyzing combination. *Hymns of the Church* was to be the primary hymnal—in the opinion of the heierarchy, at least—of the RCA until just before World War I. Three other hymnals and a collection of hymns would be approved, but they would prove to be substantially the same as the 1869 volume. In 1879, the Synod approved *Christian Praise*, which was prepared by John B. Thompson, and contained only 50 new hymns among its 500. Watts and Wesley were still dominant, and many of the same British names found in the 1869 book (Doddridge, Montgomery, Cowper, Keble, and Steele) were still prominent, as well as another Anglican associated with *Hymns, Ancient and Modern*: John Mason Neale. The Anglican prayer-book order had been abandoned, however, and American Thomas Hastings was restored to prominence; there were even two texts by noted RCA preacher George Bethune, and a psalm setting from the Collegiate psalter. The book’s scheme of printing three to five tunes, with some meters duplicated, opposite three to five texts in similar circumstances, allowed for a greater measure of discretion in wedding texts and tunes. Whatever the secret, the book proved popular: by 1882, 16,000 copies were in circulation withing the RCA, and Corwin makes mention of this work, and not Thompson’s effort for the denomination, in the *Manual*.

In 1884, the *Laudes Domini* by Charles Robinson was approved, on the condition that editions be provided containing the Standards and Liturgy. Robinson was a Presbyterian who studied at Union (New York) and Princeton seminaries, holding pastorates in Troy and Brooklyn, New York; Paris, France; and, finally, in New York City. By 1884, he had edited *Songs for the Church, Songs for the Sanctuary, Spiritual Songs*, in addition to *Laudes Domini*. The book was ordered in a sort of Presbyterian hybrid format, combining elements of the liturgy and church year found in the ordering of *Hymns, Ancient and Modern* with the Christian experience topics used by Wesley. John Julian wrote, “*Songs for the Sanctuary* has probably had a wider sale than any other unofficial American collection of any denomination.”

After making this recommendation, the committee which did so made a futile attempt to put forth a more substantial solution.

However great the acknowledged merit of other Hymnals, and however slight the encouragement which experience affords, it is the judgment of many that our Church should have a hymnal distinctly its own and published by our Board, or under Synod’s control. Even if the first resolution should prevail [recommending Robinson’s book], this would still be desirable. The endorsement of any other Hymnal would probably be destructive to all hope in this direction, unless this work is undertaken at once. The present diversity of usage is deplorable. The adoption of the first resolution would tend to increase its perpetuation. The adoption of the second, if resulting in the compilation of a Hymnal of superior excellence, while in the first instance increasing the existing diversity, might tend to ultimate and lasting unity.

*The Church Hymnary*, edited by Edwin Bedell, was approved by the Synod of 1890. This book was an even more rigid interpretation of the *Ancient and Modern* style of hymnals than was *Hymns of the Church*, with the prayer-book order and a definite wedding of one text per tune. One interesting feature was the interlining of the first verse of each hymn with the tune, looking forward to contemporary American hymnals (or backward to the Dutch style).
The last book which Synod would approve for worship while having no hand in the preparation was *Hymns of Worship and Service*, which was already in use by many churches when request was made to Synod, and which the Board of Publication even had some hand in printing. This employed the Presbyterian hybrid order, with first verses interlined with tunes, and Amens at the end of every hymn (the first time for an approved RCA hymnal). Again, the contents were much the same as those approved in 1869; 41 years without a substantial change.

So there was very little change in denominational hymnody, and very little American input into the corpus, all during an era when there was an explosion of new American hymns. Texts were contributed by major American poets, such as John Greenlief Whittier, Russell Lowell, Oliver Wendell Holmes, Julia Ward Howe, and Eliza Scudder. But an even greater challenge to the official hymnody may have been the Gospel Song: simple; repetitive; Atonement-centered; Erik Routley wrote "It is the music of an uncomplicated activist religion that has little time for subtleties, doubts, or speculations and is the reverse of the contemplative." Written by such folk as Fanny Crosby, Ira Sankey, P.P. Bliss, and William Bradbury, and carried through the country at revival and camp meetings (which were ideal, as their simple, repetitive style did not require written copies for everyone). While their simplicity sometimes undermined sound theology, they were popular with many people for decades, as witnessed by articles, both con and pro, which appear in the *Church Herald* in 1957 and 1959, respectively. These hymns often found their way into RCA parishes through the door of the Sunday School which, being a lay-run organization, was even less responsive to denominational authority than the local parish. The proof of this might be found in a survey taken in 1898: even though there were only three approved hymnals for Reformed Church Sunday Schools, some 58 were in use, many with hymns which were "faulty in teaching, morbid, sentimental" and tunes which were "trivial and rollicking." The *Sunday School Hymnal of the Reformed Church in the United States* was approved by the Synod of 1900, but there is no indication that this stemmed the tide of unapproved hymnody in the Christian Education departments.

While there was much disdain over the condition of hymnody and the proliferation of unauthorized hymnody, especially in reports to the Synod in 1884 and 1890, there is no record that there was any attempt to educate parishioners in what was considered acceptable or unacceptable hymnody. As a result, people were being raised on the diet provided by the Sunday Schools, and discovering that the official church hymnody bore no resemblance to the music they had come to know and love.

We again come upon the danger of music recognized by John Calvin, and affirmed by John Thompson in the preface to *Christian Praise*: "Music is the language of emotions, as words are of intellect. These two languages, in proper combination, must produce a much greater effect than either alone." People will not accept perfectly good words with tunes they do not like, as early problems with *Hymns of the Church* proved. Conversely, people sing pleasant tunes without worrying about the orthodoxy of the text. Thus, Gospel songs found their way into the Reformed Church; and nothing was done to reconcile this popular hymnody with the official hymnody. The problem was, however, recognized by the committee reporting to Synod in 1885, as they recommended a new hymnal, which was never attempted.

…A hymn must be “plain in diction, chastened in imagery, fervent in sentiment, and humble in its approach to God”… It is true that in both hymns and music the wants of the great heart of God’s people are to be regarded, rather than the critical taste of the cultivated few; al-
though these last should not be ignored…

And yet these conditions should not be maintained too rigidly. A few hymns of inferior merit are so dear to the heart of the Church that the most critical taste may well tolerate them. Even didactic and horatory hymns need not be wholly excluded. Many of the Psalms are didactic as well as devotional. And it may not be wholly improper that we should “teach one another and admonish one another in psalms and hymns and spiritual songs.” But these should be the few carefully chosen exceptions to the general rule of selecting truly devotional lyrics only.

….The simpler melodies and harmonies which the people love, or will love, are most to be desired. The plea is not for musical mediocrity; still less for inferiority and triviality; but for simplicity and seriousness, sweetness and strength, both of melody and of harmony, which should be the essential characteristics of the music of our Church Hymnals.28

This may have been the RCA’s last, best hope of retaining a single, central hymnody under the Synod’s guidance, but it was not to be. The book was not attempted, and the continuing disparity tended to undermine the constitutional authority of General Synod in this area. It was, once, overtly challenged by the Classis of Poughkeepsie, which overtured to have Article X, Section 5 of the Constitution amended so that each Classis would decide what hymns would be sung by congregations within its bounds. Action on this overture was postponed by the Synod of 1876, and never revived.29 Nothing so overt was ever again attempted, but the Constitution was simply ignored: the Christian Intelligencer regularly carried advertisements for unapproved hymnals,30 and an article entitled “Teach the Children to Sing” encouraged the use of The Golden Chain and Sabbath School Hosanna, neither of which was ever officially approved;31 another article advocated “choose the music you deem best, and then educate the people to sing it, and the thing is done…”32 Ultimately, the denomination would abdicate its strict control. When the Book of Church Order supplanted the old Constitution in 1966, the requirement had been reduced to “The hymns used in public worship shall be in harmony with the Standards of the Reformed Church in America.”

If Hymns of the Church was not as distinctively Reformed as Livingston’s scheme for Psalms and Hymns, this new situation was not even remotely Reformed. Unity had been lost, theological consistency had been lost, and the ability to require the binding of the Standards and the Liturgy in all books had been lost. Since people in the pews would continue to interpret the Scriptures, to some extent, in terms of the hymns they sang, this could only weaken the true teaching relevance of the creeds and confessions. The next phase of RCA hymnody would reflect attempts to define this denomination in terms of others.
Even if hymnody developed in a vacuum, the next step in this history would be logical. For nearly two centuries, the Reformed Church in America had been developing hymnals which were more and more like the hymnals that other American churches used, from the use of English, to the loss of interlined music, to the increased use of Watts and Wesley, to the fading of the metrical psalter, to topical ordering and, finally, the interlining of hymns and tunes (which, oddly enough, was the second Dutch characteristic to be abandoned). In a quest to sing the same songs that others were singing, it would only make sense that the next step would be cooperation with some of those others on a hymnal.

But, as we have seen, hymnody does not develop in a vacuum, and even the logical sometimes has a little bit of help. In this case, we have the stories of two hymnals which grew in the same soil which was producing overtures for organic unity with their respective denominations. In the late nineteenth century, the RCA was cooperating with other Presbyterian-Reformed bodies in foreign mission fields and domestic and international conferences; the denomination was a charter member of the Federal, National, and World Councils of Churches, as well as the Alliance of Reformed Churches Throughout the World Holding the Presbyterian Order (which became, after uniting with another group in 1970, and to the relief of their stationers, the World Alliance of Reformed Churches). Many in the denomination soon realized the implications of such rudimentary unions—that organic union was a possibility—and many such overtures were made in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. At the same time, those who united with the RCA after the second Dutch immigration in the mid-nineteenth century were more isolationist, and repeatedly blocked such mergers by threat of succession. This tension would be attendant at the birth of our next two hymnals.

A report was received by the Synod of 1914 from a special committee charged to confer with a
similar body from the Reformed Church in the United States (German) on the joint compilation of a hymnal. The 1913 Synod had responded favorably to an overture from the Classis of New Brunswick that union with the RCUS be explored; such an attempt had failed twenty years earlier. It had been 44 years since the RCA had a direct hand in producing a hymnal, and it is reasonable to suspect that there was some interest in trying again. With the German church also forming a committee for such a project, the joint undertaking would seem quite natural. The Rev. Dr. Edward Payson Johnson, of First Church in Albany, chair of the committee, reported that preliminary discussions were quite favorable, and that several criteria had been agreed upon.

These brethren strongly believe even as your own Committeemen believe, that the church congregation of to-day will find of the greatest practical value, a hymn book noteworthy for these special features, namely;

1. A choice collection of reverent, deeply spiritual, nobly poetical hymns,—the true-heart hymns of God’s gifted and inspiring singers of all the Christian centuries.
2. A light, compact, clearly printed volume of not more than 650 hymns;—(since for the best results the average congregation needs a practical, portable, service book, rather than an elaborate Christian anthology).
3. The omission of many hymns and tunes, seldom, if ever, used in our churches.
4. The bringing into congregational use of many truly inspired and inspiring hymns of the last twenty-five years,—hymns of praise, of the kingdom of God, of brotherhood of social service, national hymns and missionary hymns.
5. A more judicious mating, or placing, of certain worthy hymns and tunes now in use.
6. A minimum price per copy of 75¢ to 80¢.
7. A true “Book of Praise,” like the Heidelberg Catechism, equally prized and equally employed by their congregations and our own.

Four people were added to the original three member committee, so that there would be an even division between Easterners and Westerners. In 1917, the committee reported on its progress (and also reported that none of the Western members were able to attend any of the meetings, which were all held in Philadelphia). They presented a “Dummy Hymn Book,” which was called “the product of nearly five years of most careful examination of all the latest hymn books of all the leading Churches in this country and Great Britain; and...also the net result of the pains-taking (sic) revision of our own lists no less than five times.” The new book was to have 646 hymns, with about 120 modern hymns displacing some “of the old hymns formerly occasionally used;” yet everyone was assured that “the old immortal favorites have been retained.” In arranging the book, the committee “endeavored to combine the Church Year with the Modern arrangement as found in the best hymn books of today”—what this paper has termed a Presbyterian hybrid (indeed, this book and The Hymnbook of 1955 are two of the best examples of that, and are outlined in Appendix E). Realizing the vast disparity of tune tastes in the two denominations, the committee proposed two tunes for some hymns, sometimes putting the Dutch favorite first, sometimes the German, while referring to alternate tunes for others. In the spirit of union and cooperation, the book was titled The Hymnal of the Reformed Church—“for although two Churches have engaged in this undertaking, they are ‘so nearly alike, and so closely akin’ as to faith, and polity and history, that the Committee believe this new Hymnal ‘may be the prophecy and the beginning of a still closer union’ of the two Churches.”

The resulting book still counted Isaac Watts as its biggest single contributor, though down to a
mere six percent of the hymns, while Wesley had but three per cent. Neale, Montgomery, and Doddridge were also dominant, and several other familiar names appeared. But there were also more contemporary authors, such as Rudyard Kipling, Samuel Longfellow, Alfred Tennyson, and Frank Mason North, as well as the first significant appearances by revivalists such as Fanny Crosby and Frederick Faber in a formally endorsed RCA hymnal. George Bethune and Denis Wortman each represented their denomination, while the German influence introduced hymns by Martin Rinkart and Philip Nicolai, and paraphrases of German hymns by Catherine Winkworth. There was also a wider representation of ancient hymnodists, such as John of Damascus, St. Andrew of Crete, and Bernard of Clairvaux, then was present in earlier RCA hymnals. The first verses of hymns were interlined with their tunes, and every hymn ended with a plagal cadence Amen, which was, by now, common practice in America. Most interesting of all is what was omitted: while the RCA edition contained the denomination’s liturgy, none of the Standards—not even the Heidelberg Catechism—were present; there is no mention of this dramatic change in the official record, it just happens (it had, of course, happened long ago in many congregations using unofficial hymnals).7 The negotiations toward organic union ran hot and cold over the next several years,8 and so did the process toward actual production of the hymnal. A report to the RCA Synod of 1918 indicated several problems, principally with the musical editor appointed by A.S. Barnes and Company, resulting in Barnes being rejected as the book’s publisher.9 In 1920, seven years after the project was begun, the book was finally presented to the Synod, at a higher price than estimated, owing to post-war inflation. Dr. Johnson, in his report, lamented the trials associated with the work.

Frequently the chairman was the only member of your Committee who was able to be present at meetings of the Joint Committee in Philadelphia; he with his one vote against seven in controverted questions. It speaks well for the Christian courtesy of the German Reformed men that such frequent concessions to Dutch Reformed preference and belief were granted. In many respects your chairman was consciously inferior in special qualifications or equipment to his German Reformed brethren; yet far oftener than he could have expected he was given his own way.10

The last effort toward union with the RCUS died at the Synod of 1927,11 and the fortunes of this hymnal died over the next decade. By 1929, new overtures were being received—though not approved—for other hymnals to be endorsed. In 1937, the Classis of Grand Rapids overruled General Synod to begin the process all over again, appointing a special committee to either prepare a new hymnal or endorse another book. When that committee reported in 1938, survey results were presented showing The Reformed Church Hymnal to be in use in 84 congregations, with 57 of those dissatisfied. Of the fourteen other books reported in use, the Church Hymnary, approved before the turn of the century, was still the most popular.

A “Permanent Committee on Ministry of Music” was formed, largely, it seems, to deal with requests for the endorsement of new hymnals. Christian Worship and Praise was endorsed in 1939, but the endorsement was withdrawn in 1944 upon overture from the Classis of Cascades, which pointed out that Synod approval implied endorsement of the entire book, including some very un-Reformed liturgical forms.12 This was the end, once and for all, of Synodical attempts to endorse hymnals it had not prepared.

Another special committee on hymnals was appointed, this time by the General Synod Board of Education. This Special Committee on Hymn Books is notable for being the first to include women. Its first report, to the Synod of 1945, advocated an apparatus for educating Sunday School, youth
groups, and congregations on the best hymns and hymnals to use, including an attempt to stop the use of unapproved books. Unfortunately, there are no indications that such educational programs were ever set in place.

In 1948, there was a report that the Special Committee was working with a committee from the United Presbyterian Church to develop a congregational hymnal and an accompanying hymnal for Christian education and youth programs. All of this came at a time when there was quite a bit of fervor over the possibility of uniting the two denominations, with a Plan of Union to be presented at the 1949 Synod—the preparation of a common hymnal made perfect sense. The RCA would reject that unity, but work on the hymnal would continue, bringing in a wide range of Presbyterian groups, as interest in various avenues of Presbyterian union—finally with the Presbyterian Church in the United States—would continue.

The youth hymnal, *Songs for Christian Worship*, was sent off to the printer in 1949, but it would take six more years for the main hymnal to be completed. Beginning from a list of 400,000 potential hymns, the committee sought to achieve “the inclusion of the old and familiar hymns and the introduction of some of the newer hymns.” Just as that list was being whittled down by the two denominations at work, many others joined in, so that, ultimately, there would be five participating denominations: the Associate Reformed Presbyterian Church; the United Presbyterian Church; the Presbyterian Church, U.S.; the Presbyterian Church, U.S.A.; and the Reformed Church in America. When the book came out in 1956, it was to great fanfare—at least in the RCA, where an entire issue of the *Church Herald* (that of 20 January) was devoted to the new hymnal.

*The Hymnbook* is the answer to a conscious or unconscious need in our churches. We must be called to an evaluation of our Reformed heritage not only in our sermons, but also in our songs. The confusing disparity between our proclamation and our singing needs most serious attention.

After all, we Christians should be the best bearers of Christianity among culture. Our concern should be for the highest and the richest, God’s directives in His Word should command and inspire us. The trivial and the cheap, answering to most primitive rhythms, are not for us. We need constant development of our tastes in music as well as the persistent appreciation of sermons based on Scripture. All that is implied in our being creatures in the image of God.

And so, great things were expected of *The Hymnbook*, and it is arguable that great things were achieved. Never before—and never since, in the United States—was there any example of so many denominations cooperating successfully (or cooperating at all) on one hymnal. And the book was indeed a success; despite the advent of Vatican II, Christian folk music, and the call for contemporary and inclusive language in worship, *The Hymnbook* remained a dominant force in the Presbyterian-Reformed world—or at least within the RCA—for the next three decades (a 1987 survey would show 29% of RCA congregations polled to be using it). But was it a great hymnal? The answer, alas, is probably not. It was certainly not as innovative as *The Reformed Church Hymnal* had been 30 years earlier, nor as daring as *Rejoice in the Lord* would be as many years later. In fact, it is probably the only hymnal ever endorsed by the Reformed Church in America that offered the Church nothing substantially different. There are no tunes, and only one hymn, “Morning has broken,” in the book written within the 35 years preceding its publication (though there are one or two tunes arranged in that time, most notably the four arranged
by David Hugh Jones, the book’s musical editor). Jones himself, when asked what was the greatest innovation of *The Hymnbook*, replied that all of the hymn numbers were on the outer edges of the pages, for easier use.23

The roster of hymnodists in this book is basically similar to its German-Dutch predecessor, with some notable exceptions: Watts and Wesley, while still leading the roster in volume, had their margin depleted yet again, as Crosby, Faber, and other evangelicals grew somewhat stronger; the great literary names present in the earlier book were largely absent (Kipling and Longfellow were gone—Tennyson retained two hymns, and North one); just over one-sixth of the book was metrical psalmody, the largest representation in over a century; and the selection of RCA-produced hymns was reduced to Denis Wortman’s “God of the Prophets.” Again, a Presbyterian hybrid arrangement was employed and, this time, all of the verses of the hymns are interlined (as we accept as standard today). In addition to surrendering some hymnody, the RCA also surrendered the inclusion of its liturgy in the new book.24 There was nothing distinctly Reformed, and nothing excitingly new, about this hymnal.

Actually, this is not surprising. Why should the book be distinctly Reformed if the goal is to sing what everyone else is singing? And no new hymnal was being particularly adventurous after the Great Depression, erring instead on the side of the familiar, with two notable exceptions: The Episcopalian *Hymnal, 1940*, and the *Pilgrim Hymnal* of 1958.25 The first book represented, to Erik Routley, “a renaissance comparable to that of [Percy] Dearmer [whose *English Hymnal* heralded a new age of English dominance in Church Music] in Britain.”26 The second book, developed by Ethel and Hugh Porter at Union Theological Seminary, took the best of the Episcopalian book and put it into a Presbyterian format, with a greater variety of texts and tunes than *The Hymnbook*, with a more readable presentation (thanks to better paper and larger print).27 Like the RCA-endorsed book, these two have remained in active use into the 1980s.

In fact, it is impressive that the more conservative book did so well. Generally, the impetus for a new hymnal seems to be the search for a new way to sing of the same historic faith. But this book provided more comfort than novelty. Perhaps, with such a broad spectrum of constituencies, and the many discussions and dreams of unity in the air, the joint committee sought to produce a hymnal which offended no one. Perhaps, at least for the RCA, the desire was not so much for something new (as this was not) as for a book not associated with the failed effort at unity that had passed, and instead linked to the hopes of unity ahead. But, even after these new hopes faded in the late 1960s,28 *The Hymnbook* remained popular; sort of a sweatshirt for the RCA—not very stylish, but familiar and comfortable.
THE THIRD
DENOMINATIONAL EFFORT

In 1978, the Reformed Church in America celebrated the anniversary of Jonas Michaelius’ Church in the Fort as its 350th birthday. This, perhaps combined with the bicentennial of the United States in 1976 and the television presentation of “Roots” in 1977, both of which created a popular interest in matters of heritage and history, fueled a renewed interest in the denomination’s identity. The last ten years have brought denominational identity consultations, resulting in an identity statement, and two programs aimed at church growth and built on the proposition that the RCA has something special to offer: On the Way and Putting People in Mission. Fewer than twenty years ago, Eugene Heideman developed Our Song of Hope as a possible new Standard for the church. It is in this climate that the latest RCA hymnal was created.

During the 350th anniversary year, the Commission on Worship suggested that the time for a new official hymnal was approaching. The Hymnbook was nearly a quarter-century old, and had been very conservative even for its day. The trends toward modern and non-sexist language had made the book seem even more outdated. A hymnic explosion, begun in Britain by the likes of Brian Wren, Fred Pratt Green, and Timothy Dudley-Smith, was becoming firmly established in the United States. The new Lutheran Book of Worship and the Roman Catholic Worship II were recently published, and the Episcopal Church was at work on Hymnal, 1982. Every new hymnal which was produced served to make The Hymnbook seem that much less adequate, as was pointed out by the then president of New Brunswick Theological Seminary, Howard Hageman, in an article in the Church Herald. And so, the Synod of 1978 appointed a committee to study the options for endorsing or creating a book. The committee, consisting of Roger Rietberg of Hope College, Lawrence Van Wyk of Orange City, Iowa, Gloria Norton of Spring Valley, New York, and Howard Hageman as its chair, delivered this report to the 1979 Synod:
1. The last hymnbook produced by the Reformed Church in America was that of 1869. Ever since that time we have endorsed the hymnbook of some commercial publishers or cooperated with another denomination in publishing a book, the last such being the *Hymnbook* which was produced in 1955 with a consortium of Presbyterian churches. It has, therefore, been 110 years since the Reformed Church in America has produced a hymnal for its own use.

2. A large variety of hymnals has been produced in the last decade, some by denominations, others by commercial publishing houses, but there is none of them which your committee feels able unreservedly to recommend as the *hymnal* for the Reformed Church in America.

3. It would, of course, be possible to endorse a number of hymnals as fitting the various needs and situations of our church, but it seems to us that following such a plan would be permanently to accept and even further the differences and divergencies that exist among us.

4. A survey of the most competent outside opinion which we could find strongly indicates that there would be interest in a *Reformed hymnal of excellence* beyond the bounds of our denomination. We define a Reformed hymnal of excellence as meaning:
   a. a hymnal that recognizes our Calvinist heritage of psalmody as a central element in the praise of God;
   b. a hymnal that uses Biblical and theological integrity as a primary criterion in its selections;
   c. a hymnal which, while accepting the best in contemporary hymn-writing, strives to avoid the ephemeral and the *trendy*.

5. A preliminary survey of the cost factors leads us to believe that such a book could be produced at today’s prices for a maximum of $75,000 to $100,000 as a capital outlay. A sale of 15,000 to 20,000 copies at $5 per copy would recover the investment. Our research indicates that in the past 24 years about 75,000 copies of the *Hymnbook* have been sold in the Reformed Church in America. To be sure, a necessary inflation figure has to be factored into any cost estimate, but we do not believe that the financial side of the enterprise should at this point be considered a deterrent.

6. While we are fully cognizant that no hymnal produced could ever satisfy the requirements of all our congregations, we believe that working on such a project could well prove to be a unifying factor in our denominational life, especially since it is a task we have not attempted in more than a century.

From the outset, the new committee sought to answer certain historic questions: what will it cost, and is everyone expected to like it? There was not even any illusion that the Synod could think of requiring the use of this book in local churches (a power which had long since been surrendered). But there was an appeal to the thirst for identity: the criteria for a new book described it with the terms “Calvinist,” “Biblical,” and “heritage of psalmody;” and it was promised to be “a unifying factor in our denominational life.” The Synod quickly approved the notion, and the committee was expanded by three members—Robert DeYoung, Norman Kansfield, and Merwin Van Doornik—so that all six particular synods were represented. The committee’s first official action was to hire The Rev. Dr. Erik Routley to edit the new book.

Erik Routley was a graduate of Mansfield College, Oxford, and spent most of his career as a
parish pastor of the United Reformed Church of England and Wales. Like Francis Hopkinson centuries before, Routley was an avocational church musician during that time, although, as part of that hobby, he served as the first editor of the *Bulletin* of the Hymn Society of Great Britain and Ireland, and was the first non-Anglican to be made a fellow of the Royal School of Church Music. In retirement, he joined the faculty of Westminster Choir College, in Princeton, New Jersey, finally becoming a professional church musician. In what turned out to be his last Westminster chapel service, Routley remarked on how he had never expected to spend his retirement ministering to people young enough to be his grandchildren in a place thousands of miles from home.

Over a span of 43 years, he wrote 50 books and monographs, four hymnal companions, 600 published articles, 10 unpublished book-length manuscripts (two of which were published posthumously), and 150 unpublished articles, lectures, et cetera. In addition he edited seven books and was on the editorial committee of another fifteen hymnals, composed about 110 hymn and other tunes and 70 other original compositions; his hymns and tunes appear in over 90 hymnals worldwide.

Despite Routley’s full and varied career, the RCA book was to be the first major hymnal for which he was sole editor. Howard Hageman had been in touch with him about the project before it officially existed, and Routley (after telling Hageman, regarding the latter’s job as chair “If you don’t want to be deluged with this sort of thing, keep your big mouth shut!”) put forward what was to become the hymnal’s unique ordering, created for a hymnal, which never came to be, for the Coventry diocese of the Anglican Church (see Appendix F). Thus, the committee was able to hit the ground running—its first act was to appoint Routley as editor, and its second to approve Routley’s scheme of ordering the book. The book was to be known as *Rejoice in the Lord*, and this new scheme of ordering the hymns would earn it the subtitle *A Hymn Companion to the Scriptures*. The order of a hymnal was important for Routley, who considered a book of hymns to be like a kit of precision tools, each with a specific job. He sought to present hymns “according to a pattern determined by Christian experience as we follow it though the Bible,” beginning with God’s creation and ending with “the final and profoundest mysteries of faith.”

This was to be an important guiding principle, not only regarding where the hymns went, but which hymns were included: “We want to look for texts which treat Scripture as a living witness, not a collection of isolated and unrelated incantations, which, I think, is the difference between a Reformed and a Fundamentalist view of the Bible.”

The Bible, which is still common to all of the Church, would be the guiding force, and its treatment as a unified work would cause the committee to accept three corollary theses:

1. God’s self revelation is witnessed in Canon and not just anywhere.
2. God’s self revelation is witnessed in Canon and not just in our favorite little corners of the Bible.
3. God’s self revelation is witnessed in Canon and not just in history.

The first thesis excluded certain hymns, such as “I come to the garden alone,” which, despite their beautiful and inspiring imagery, simply did not reflect Christianity as experienced through the Scriptures; many nature hymns fell into this category. The second criteria forced the committee to look beyond hymns which directly described Christian events, to deal with psalms as psalms, and other sections of the story of Israel as they appear in the Scriptures, free of Christian typologies (a return, in a way, to Calvin’s notion that all of Scripture speaks to the Christian experience just as it is). The third criteria required that the contents of the book be grounded both in the temporal and
the eternal: “the canon continually describes God as breaking into and out of our history.”

There were to be other exchanges: the precise terminology of classical theology, which describes God as Trinity, would be replaced with less precise—although more Reformed—portraits such as “The God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob,” “The Lamb of God,” and “Spirit of Truth, Spirit of Power.” On the other hand, just as there is an overarching flow to the canon of Scripture, there would be a similar flow, a narrative quality, to the hymns in Rejoice, as they moved from one biblical event to the next—this would be described as “a hymnal with a plot.”

The issue of inclusive language would be, according to Howard Hageman, “a most vexing problem” for the committee, as it has been for all hymnodists for several years. In most cases, where a male reference was made for the body of Christians, the term was changed in such a way as the original writer might have dealt with it. In a few cases, this was impossible; sometimes a hymn was excluded but, where inclusion was felt to be necessary, a notation was made to warn those sensitive to such matters. Masculine terms for God, however, which appear in the Scriptures (i.e. “Father,” “Son,” “Lord,” or “King”) or similar uses of “he”—English has no genderless animate pronoun—remained in the book. For better or worse,” Routley wrote, “we have gone as far in the matter as our times and good sense would allow. We leave this struggle to those who edit the hymnbooks of succeeding decades.

Watts and Wesley enjoy a larger role in this book than in The Hymnbook, with 40 and 30 hymns, respectively. There is also a significant representation of contemporary hymnody, featuring names such as Brian Wren, Thomas Troeger, Timothy Dudley-Smith, Fred Pratt Green, Ruth Duck, and Elizabeth Cosnett among the authors, and recent hymnody from within the RCA by Melody and Daniel Meeter, Howard Hageman, Norman Kansfield, and Eugene Heideman.

But in replacing the “old with the new” we are not in fact merely replacing the ancient with the modern. Not infrequently we are recovering the ancient and inviting the less distinguished modern to make way for it. Our own prayerful guess has been that today, after a generation of rejection of the old, we are ready for exactly such a rediscovery.

It was Routley’s conviction that hymns are music for the un-musical, but also that it did no harm to challenge and expand the horizons of the singer in the pew. Presumably with this in mind, a wide variety of tunes were wedded to the texts of this book. As with the texts, some of these were new, some old but neglected, and some familiar. Routley reharmonized an extensive selection of tunes, and some were restored to original harmonizations which had not been used in many hymnals. Plagal cadence Amens were removed from the hymns, restoring them to the style prevalent before Hymns, Ancient and Modern came about.

Production of the book was set back by the sudden death of Dr. Routley in October of 1982. Anne Mackenzie was engaged to finish the detail work and proofing of manuscripts, but many typographical errors remained in the first printing. Other delays were caused by the money-saving decision to set the type in Korea. The book finally appeared in June of 1985 (a copy of it was present at my wedding), and was the centerpiece of an International Hymnody Conference in Bethlehem, Pennsylvania, that August.

The book has been criticized for some odd uses of texts and tunes: British hymnodist Alan Luff called it a “Middle Atlantic” hymnal—too British for the Americans and too American for the British (a problem reflecting Routley’s post-retirement pilgrimage). Two promised editions, one a text-only version for private devotions and the other a large-type version, have yet to appear, largely
due to the resistance of Hope Publishing Company, which owns many of the necessary copyrights. Even worse, there is no more effort to educate the denomination than there was a century ago, when a tremendous shift in hymnal style was, largely, rejected. There are also a great many unofficial hymnals in use, with no official authority to change that situation. The worst of all its flaws, however, may have been in its inception: it was the child of a committee of exclusively northern European heritage in a denomination which now includes the offspring of Asians, Hispanics, Africans, and Native Americans. Unlike the late nineteenth century, when the RCA was concerned with the hymnody of its minority to the point of printing French and German hymnals, the denomination seems rather unconcerned with needs in this area, further eroding unity. *Rejoice in the Lord* is definitely a Reformed hymnal and, as Erik Routley hoped, a contribution to the hymnody of the larger Church. It is not, however, the same kind of Reformed hymnal that was found in New Amsterdam or created by John Henry Livingston, because the RCA is now a different denomination. This is not the perfect, or final, musical expression of our faith, but it is a milepost: the way in which the RCA uses, is taught by, and adapts this book will determine the way in which the denomination will sing the Lord’s song in the twenty-first century.
CONCLUSION:
HOW SHALL WE SING THE LORD’S SONG?

In this closing decade of the century, the Reformed Church in America finds its official hymnody to be of much the same temperament that it was when the Collegiate psalter was published: ‘We want to sing something like what everyone else is singing, but we want to do it on our terms.’ This is why the denomination produced *Rejoice in the Lord* instead of the *Psalter Hymnal.* This has, in fact, been a driving principle since the first Genevan Psalters arrived in New Amsterdam. Perhaps this is why the RCA has produced so little of its own hymnody—or, if it was produced, the people tended not to sing it—choosing instead to draw on the songs of its neighbor churches. Even as the theology of the denomination effected the contents of the hymnals, the contents also effected the theology.

The need for some level of consistency in RCA hymnody is as evident today as it was a century ago, but it will be difficult to get congregations to surrender the freedom of choice which has been ceded to them. A first step might be to enforce the rule laid down in the *Book of Church Order* (chapter 1, part 1, article 2, section 6 d.): should it not be included among the Constitutional inquiries? A second step would be education; the denomination must make sure that those responsible for leading the congregation’s music know what they are doing and why. Simply selling a book is not sufficient.

What of the next century? It has been suggested that hymnals are becoming outmoded in this audio-visual age, but a good and varied menu of congregational song requires a hymnal of some sort be present. Could it be that the hymnal of the next one hundred years, instead of trying to suit all of the people all of the time (far beyond the capacity of any such book) should be a core curriculum book, to which each congregation gives its own particular flavor using supplemental hymnals, audio-visual aids, and other additions which modern technology makes possible? Then, the RCA could maintain both the unity and the diversity necessary to its church life. Such a core curriculum
might well include the Liturgy and Standards, as a constant reminder that these stand at the center of our denominational identity.

Barring a return to a Livingstonian *Psalms and Hymns*, the best course might be the revision (and later re-revision) of *Rejoice in the Lord*, instead of repeated experimentation. This would allow the RCA to build on, rather than run away from, its previous efforts.

The hymnic explosion is not over. Every day, new hymns are written, and parishes and denominations struggle with the issues of inclusive language and God-imagery. *Rejoice* will be five years old this year, and it may not be advisable to wait twenty-five years for a revision (G.I.A.’s *Worship II* gave way to *Worship, Third Edition* in 1987, after little more than a decade). It may not be too soon for the RCA to consider its own careful process toward the next hymnal.

The last major changes in the way we sing the Lord’s song came at the hands of Isaac Watts nearly three centuries ago. There is no reason to expect such radical changes in the century ahead but, for hymnody to remain a vehicle for the people’s response to God, we must continue to be open to singing that song in new and different ways.
APPENDIX A
A COMPARISON OF PSALM 98
AS SET BY TATE AND BRADY
FRANCIS HOPKINSON,
AND ISAAC WATTS

Tate and Brady

Sing to the Lord a new-made song,
who wond’rous things has done;
With his right hand and holy arm,
the conquest he has won.

The Lord, has through th’astonisht world
displayed his saving might,
And made his righteous acts appear,
in all the heathens’ sight.

Of Isr’rels house his love and truth,
have ever mindful been;
Wide Earth’s remotest parts, the pow’r
of Isr’els God have seen.

Let therefore Earth’s inhabitants
their cheerful voices raise;
and with all universal joy,
resound their Maker’s praise.

With harp and hymns soft melody
into the consort bring,
The trumpet and shrill cornet’s sound,
before th’almighty King.

Let the loud ocean roar her joy,
with all that seas contain;
The Earth and her inhabitants,
join consort with the main.

With joy let rivers swell to streams,
to spreading torrents they;
And echoing vales, from hill to hill,
redoubling sounds convey.

To welcome down the World’s great Judge,
who does with justice come,
And, with impartial equity,
both to reward and doom.

Francis Hopkinson

With new-made songs let God be praised,
Who wond’rous things for us hath done;
With his right hand and arm upraised,
A glorious conquest he has won.
The Lord hath to the World, dismayed,
Declared his strength, and saving might,
He hath his righteous acts displayed
before th’astonished heathen’s sight.

The Lord, in love and truth excelling,
If Israel’s house hath mindful been;
And nations in Earth’s corners dwelling,
the saving pow’r of God have seen.
Let Earth’s inhabitants, combining,
to him their joyful voices raise;
Let all in songs of triumph joining,
Loudly resound their Maker’s praise.

With many tuneful harps surrounding,
Let him into the concert bring
Trumpets and cornets, shrilly sounding,
And hymn glad praises to their King:
Let the ocean roar, transported,
With all that spacious seas contain,
Be Earth’s inhabitants exhorted,
To join in praise the noisy main.

Let streams, thro’ fertile meadows bounding,
In larger torrents dance and play;
Let hills and vales their joy resounding,
Far off redoubled shouts convey:
To welcome down the King renowned,
Who does in awful triumph come,
With never fading glory crowned,
With justice to reward and doom.

Isaac Watts

Part I

To our almighty maker God,
new honours be addressed;
his great salvation shines abroad,
and makes the nations blessed.

He spake the word to Abraham first,
his truth fulfills his grace;
the gentiles make his name their trust
and learn his righteousness.

Let the whole world his love proclaim
with all her different tongues;
And spread the honours of his name
in melody and songs.

Part II

Joy to the world! the Lord is come:
let earth receive her King;
let every heart prepare him room,
and heaven and nature sing.

Joy to the world! the Saviour reigns:
let men their songs employ;
while fields and flood, rocks, hills, and plains
repeat the sounding joy.

No more let sins and sorrows grow,
nor thorns infest the ground;
he comes to make his blessings flow
far as the curse is found.

He rules the world with truth and grace,
and makes the nations prove
the glories of his righteousness,
and wonders of his love.
APPENDIX B

AUTHORSHIP OF THE PSALMS

In *The Psalms of David...for the use of the Reformed Protestant Dutch Church in the City of New York*

Written by Tate and Brady: 50, 60, 63, 68, 72, 73, 76, 87, 89, 92, 95, 100, 103, 104, 109, 113, 114, 116, 119, 123, 128, 137, 139

Modifications of Tate and Brady: 1, 2, 3, 6, 9, 12, 14, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 27, 29, 31, 33, 34, 35, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 46, 48, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, 59, 61, 62, 64, 65, 67, 69, 70, 71, 75, 78, 79, 80, 81, 82, 83, 85, 88, 93, 94 (first word only), 96, 98, 102, 105, 106, 107, 108, 111, 120, 121, 122, 124, 125, 126, 127, 129, 130, 131, 132, 133, 134, 135, 138, 140, 141, 142, 143, 144, 147, 148, 150

Appearing in Josiah Barlow’s Psalter: 28


In *Psalms and Hymns...of the Reformed Protestant Dutch Church in North America, 1789*

Written by Tate and Brady: 1, 2, 6, 11, 14, 17 (part 1), 18, 29, 34, 35, 37 (parts 2-4), 40 (part 3), 42, 43, 53, 57 (part 1), 60 (part 1), 62 (part 1), 67, 68 (parts 1, 3, 5), 69*, 72, 73 (parts 1-2), 76, 80, 86 (part 1), 88, 89, 93, 95, 103, 104 (except verse 9), 106, 107*, 109, 112, 115 (part 2), 118 (part 1), 119 (parts 1, 3), 121, 124, 127, 128, 129, 130, 132 (parts 1, 3*), 139, 141 (part 2), 142, 144 (parts 1-2), 149

* altered

Written by Isaac Watts: 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 10*, 12*, 15, 16, 17 (part 2), 19, 20, 21*, 24, 25, 26, 30, 31 (part 3), 32, 33, 36 (part 1), 37 (part 1), 38, 39, 40 (parts 1-2), 44, 45, 47*, 48, 49, 50, 51, 55, 56, 57 (part 2), 58, 61 (part 1), 62 (part 2), 63, 65, 66, 68 (part 4), 71, 74, 77, 82, 84, 85, 87, 90, 91, 92, 94, 97, 98, 100*, 101, 102, 110*, 113, 114, 115 (part 1), 116, 117, 118 (part 2), 119 (part 2), 120, 122, 123, 125, 126, 131, 132 (part 2), 135 (part 2, part 3 vs. 13 on), 136, 138 (part 2) 141 (part 1), 143, 144 (part 3), 145, 146, 147*, 148 (part 1)*

* altered

Appearing in Josiah Barlow’s psalter: 28, 52, 54, 70, 137

Source unknown: 36 (part 2), 59, 60 (part 2), 61 (part 2), 64, 68 (part 2, vs. 26), 785, 104 (verse 9), 135 (part 3, vss. 11-12), 148 (part 2), 150

In *Psalms and Hymns...of the Reformed Protestant Dutch Church in North America, 1812*

Written by Tate and Brady: 34 (part 1)*, 42 (vss. 1-3), 121 (part 1)

* altered


* altered  
**Altered according to the Timothy Dwight edition.

From the “Collegiate” Psalter: 23, 46 (part 1)

Appearing in Josiah Barlow’s psalter: 79

Written by Timothy Dwight: 18 (part 4), 28, 42 (vss. 4-6), 43, 54, 65 (part 3), 70 88, 100 (part 2), 108 (part 1), 137, 140, 150 (part 1)

Source unknown: 2, 3 (part 2), 22 (part 1), 31 (part 3), 34 (part 4), 36 (part 2), 52 (part 2), 53 (part 1), 59, 60, 61 (part 2), 64, 72 (part 3), 75, 86 (part 2), 108 (part 2), 119, parts 19-22), 132 (part 3), 148 (part 2), 150 (part 2, except verse 3)
APPENDIX C

THE ORDER OF HYMNS IN JOHN WESLEY’S

COLLECTION OF HYMNS FOR THE USE OF PEOPLE CALLED METHODISTS

Part First
Section I. Exhorting Sinners to return to God
   II. Describing  1. The Pleasantness of Religion
                   2. The Goodness of God
                   3. Death
                   4. Judgment
                   5. Heaven
                   6. Hell
   III. Praying for a Blessing

Part Second
Section I. Describing Formal Religion
   II. Inward Religion

Part Third
Section I. Praying for Repentance
   II. For Mourners convinced of Sin
   III. For Persons convinced of Backsliding
   IV. For Backsliders recovered

Part Fourth
Section I. For Believers  Rejoicing
   II. Fighting
   III. Praying
   IV. Watching
   V. Working
   VI. Suffering
   VII. Seeking for full Redemption
   VIII. Saved
   IX. Interceding for the World
Part Fifth

Section I. For the Society
  II. Meeting
  III. Giving Thanks
  IV. Praying
  IV. Parting

Additional Hymns

On Divine Worship
On the Lord’s Supper
On the Resurrection and Ascension of Christ, et cetera
Miscellaneous Hymns
The Church orders ratified by the National Synod of Dordrecht (A.D. 1618, 1619) which are still “recognized as containing the distinctive and fundamental principles of our Church government,” (Minutes of Synod for 1833, p. 202), declare that “the one hundred and fifty psalms of David; the Ten Commandments; the Lord’s Prayer; the twelve articles of the Christian faith; the songs of Mary, Zacharias, and Simeon, versified only, shall be sung in public worship. The Churches are left at liberty to adopt, or omit, that entitled O Thou who art our Father God! All others are prohibited.” This usage prevailing in the Netherlands, was transferred to this country. Several copies of the Psalm-books, which the fathers brought with them, are in the hands of the Committee. They are invariably bound up in the same volume with the Bible, or the New Testament at least, the Catechism and Liturgy. These Psalms, in Hollandish, are the version of Peter Dathe, the eminent biblical scholar and critic, by whom they were translated, however, not from the original, but from the French.

This was the first book in use in the Reformed Church, in America. It contains, besides the Psalms, the Ten Commandments, the song of Zacharias, the song of the Virgin Mary, the Apostle’s Creed, the Lord’s Prayer, the Articles of the Christian faith, translated out of German by Jay Uytenhoven, the Morning prayer, the Evening prayer, the prayer before Sermon, prayer before eating, prayer after eating, the evening prayer entitled Christe qui Lux es et Dies, and a translation by Abraham Van der Meer, from the Greek Bible, of the one hundred and fifty-first of the Psalms of David. Every word of these Psalms, and Creeds, and Prayers, is set to music of a simple recitative character, in which all might join, by Cornelius de Leeuw. This book was in use in all the Dutch Churches in this country until the Consistory of the Reformed Protestant Dutch Church of the city of New York found it necessary to have divine service performed in the English language, and, on the 9th of November, 1767, approved and recommended for use in their Church and schools an English Psalm-book, published by their order, “which is greatly indebted to that of Dr. Brady and Mr. Tate; some of the psalms being transcribed verbatim from their version, and others altered so as to fit them to the music used in Dutch Churches.” (Prefatory note). This book contains, besides the Psalms of David, fifteen pages of “Hymns,” viz: the Ten Commandments, song of Zacharias, the song of the Virgin Mary, the song of Simeon, the Creed, and the Lord’s Prayer, all set to the simple music, in which all the people joined, so that the compiler could truthfully say, “A great part of the divine worship consists in harmonious singing. This first book in English was the second book in use in our Churches.
The Articles of Union adopted in 1771, make no mention of Psalmody, but to agree to “abide in all things,” by the regulations of the Synod of Dort, hereinbefore quoted.

In 1773, a new version of Psalms and Hymns was compiled and adopted in the Netherlands, and was soon after introduced into some of the Dutch Churches in America, constituting the third book thus used. Of this, the Committee have not, as yet, been able to secure a copy, but it is believed that it differs from the proceeding chiefly in the higher critical character of the Psalms. In 1787, the General Synod appointed a committee to compile a Psalm-book “out of other collections of English Psalms in repute and received in the Reformed Churches—no congregation, however, to be obliged thereto, where that of the New York Consistory is in use.” Additional instructions were given in the next year, to print “some well-composed hymns, in connection with the Psalms,” and the committee was “also empowered, as soon as the majority agree in relation to the compilation, to forward said Psalm-book to the press.” This, however, they did not do until they had reported the same to an extra-ordinary session of Synod in 1789, and obtained its approval thereof, after which it was speedily published. It contains, besides the Psalms of David, a century of hymns, of which “1 to 52 are suited to the Heidelberg Catechism; 53 to 73 are adapted to the Holy Ordinance of the Lord’s Supper; and hymn 74 to the end are on miscellaneous subjects.” Among these occur such titles as “Christmas,” “The Song of the Angels,” “Resurrection,” “Ascension,” “Whitsunday,” “New Year,” &c., &c., &c.

This first book prepared by the order of General Synod, being the fourth book used in our Churches, is without music, as have been all subsequent books thus prepared until this time. This selection continued in use for a full quarter of a century, and is still an admirable one. Many of its selections, which had been unaccountably dropped from succeeding books, have been restored in the one herewith presented to Synod.

In 1812, on petition of the Classis of New York, referred to General Synod by the Particular Synod of New York, Synod declared it, “desirable that our Psalms and Hymns be improved and enlarged,” and requested “Dr. Livingston to make the selection, agreeably to the views expressed,” which he did, submitting it to a committee, by whom it was reported to the Synod of 1813, whereupon a mandatory order was issued, that it “be forthwith introduced into public worship in all our Churches!” Its use was recommended, also, “to all families and individuals, instead of the book hitherto in use.” No radical change has been made in the Psalmody of the Church from that day to this. This second book, prepared by order of Synod, being the fifth book in use in the Churches, has been increased by successive additions, but is essentially the book still in use. The order of hymns in this books is that same as in that which preceded it, but the number was increased to two hundred and seventy-three (273). In 1831, the Rev. Thomas DeWitt, chairman of a committee appointed for that purpose, reported one hundred and seventy-two (172) other hymns, which were approved and published as an appendix, called “Book II” of hymns. The book thus enlarged may be regarded as the sixth book in use in our Churches.

In 1843, three hundred and thirty-one (331) other hymns were approved by Synod and published under the title of “Sabbath School and Social Hymns.” The direction of Synod to separate the Sunday school from the social hymns was not observed.

In 1845, it was “Resolved, that the whole subject of the hymn-book be referred to a special committee,—to consider the importance of a new arrangement of our hymns for social and Sabbath school worship; and that they report to the next General Synod, with the addition of such new hymns as may make the collection more complete. (p. 478) In 1846, the Rev. Isaac Ferris, Chairman, reported three hundred and fifty additional hymns, which were approved. Of these, eight (8)
were added to the “Sabbath School and Social Hymn Book,” and three hundred and forty-two (342) were published separately, under the title of “Additional Hymns.” These, together with those before constituting “Book I.” and “Book II.,” were all re-arranged and numbered as they now stand in the book in use in our Churches. This may be regarded as the seventh book thus used in the Reformed Church in America. The committee presided over by the venerable Thomas DeWitt, as well as that presided over by the Rev. Chancellor Isaac Ferris, both suggested the convenient arrangement of classifying the Psalms and Hymns in one general arrangement, though the work was not performed by either. In the book of 1789, this distinction was made with propriety, the versions of the Psalms being comparatively close, and the hymns of a widely different character. But in all succeeding books, it has been a distinction without a difference, some of the so-called “hymns” being much more nearly accurate versions of Psalms than others classed as such; and some of the “Psalms” partaking very slightly of the character of the Hebrew Psalm of the same number.

It is worthy of note also, that in 1846, for the first time, did General Synod authorize an edition of the Psalm and Hymn-book without the Liturgy, the committee advising it and suggesting that they had endeavored “to make the poetical liturgy of the Church complete.”

In 1862, the Board of Publication laid before the Synod the “Fulton Street Hymn-book,” containing three hundred and twenty-six hymns, twenty-two (22) of which had “never been authorized by any Synodical action, with the view to obtain its sanction for the use of the hymns here pointed out.” These hymns were accordingly examined by the Committee on Publication, and, on their recommendation, were “sanctioned and approved,” and “the book recommended to the Churches.”

In this chronological sketch, no allusion has been made to books in the French and German languages; but so long ago as 1792, Synod approved and recommended, “in the French language, the Psalms and hymns compiled by Theodore De Beza and La Moret; and in the German language, the Psalms and hymns published at Marburgh and Amsterdam, used in Reformed Churches in Germany, in the Netherlands, and in Pennsylvania.”

In 1853, the German Evangelical Mission Church of New York, through its pastor, the Rev. J.C. Guldin, petitioned General Synod “in relation to the preparation and publication of a hymn-book in the German language; whereupon a committee was appointed to select and arrange materials for such a book.” The committee was directed to submit it, when prepared, to the inspection of another committee, and it was “Resolved, That when approved by them, the Board of Direction be authorized to make a contract for having them printed, without delay.” Accordingly, the excellent book compiled by , now in use in our German Churches, was published in October of the same year.

The Board of Publication has also published a German book for Sunday schools, with music, and an edition of our standard Psalms and hymns, with music.

This statement, it is believed, completes the outline of this history until the inception of the present enterprise.
APPENDIX E

TWO PRESBYTERIAN HYBRID ORDERS

The Reformed Church Hymnal, 1929

Call to Worship
The Lord’s Day
Morning
Evening
Close of Service
General Praise
God the Father
Our Lord Jesus Christ
    Advent
    Nativity
    Epiphany
    Temptation
    Life, Ministry and Example
    Triumphal Entry
    Passion and Crucifixion
    Resurrection
    Ascension and Reign
The Holy Spirit
The Holy Trinity
The Holy Scriptures
The Christian Life
    Invitation
    Repentance
    Love for Christ
    Aspiration and Growth
    Prayer and Intercession
    Light and Guidance
    Trust and Confidence
    Security and Peace
    Consecration and Faith
    Trial and Conflict
The Church of Christ
    The Church
    Baptism
    The Lord’s Supper
    Ordination and Installation
Dedication Services
The Kingdom of God
Brotherhood
Social Service
Missions
The Communion of Saints
The Future Life
Occasional Hymns
Marriage
The Home
The Burial of the Dead
The Year
Seasons and Thanksgiving
National and Patriotic
Reformed and Anniversary
Temperance
For Those at Sea
Childhood and Youth
Evangelistic Hymns
Occasional
Chants, Responses, and Doxologies

*The Hymnbook, 1955*

Worship
Adoration and Praise
Morning
Evening
The Lord’s Day
Closing

God
God the Father
His Eternity and Power
In Nature
His Love and Fatherhood
His Presence
Jesus Christ
Adoration and Praise
His Advent
His Birth
His Epiphany
His Life and Ministry
His Triumphant Entry
His Passion and Atonement
His Resurrection
His Ascension
His Presence
His Coming in Glory
The Holy Spirit
The Holy Trinity
The Holy Scriptures

Life in Christ
The Call of Christ
Repentance and Forgiveness
Discipleship and Service
Dedication and Consecration
Stewardship
Hope and Aspiration
Pilgrimage and Guidance
Loyalty and Courage
Trial and Conflict
Faith and Assurance
Prayer and Intercession
Love
Joy
Peace
The Life Everlasting

The Church
The Church
The Lord’s Supper
Holy Baptism
Marriage
The Christian Home
Hymns for the Young
Hymns for Youth
Christian Fellowship

The Kingdom of God on Earth
Brotherhood
World Friendship and Peace
Missions
The City
The Nation

Miscellaneous
The Dedication of a Church
The Ministry
Travelers
Thanksgiving
The New Year

Service Music
APPENDIX F

BIBLICAL HYMN ORDER:
REJOICE IN THE LORD, 1984

Part I: The God of Abraham Praise

A. In the Beginning
   1. Creator of Heaven and Earth
   2. The Earth is the Lord’s
   3. Who Pardons All Your Iniquities
   4. God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob
   5. Full of Grace and Truth

B. Praise the Lord
   1. Psalms Praise Him
   2. Come, Magnify the Lord with Me
   3. Trust in the Lord

C. The Glory of the Lord Shall be Revealed
   1. Thus says the Lord
   2. Comfort! Comfort! My People

Part II: Behold the Lamb of God

A. He Became Flesh
   1. Advent
   2. Nativity
   3. Epiphany and Youth
   4. Ministry
      a. Baptism and Temptation
      b. Signs and Wonders
      c. Teaching

B. Christ has Died! Christ is Risen!
   1. Passion and Death
      a. Triumphal Entry
      b. Last Supper
      c. Crucifixion
   2. Resurrection and Ascension
      a. Resurrection
      b. Ascension

C. The Song of the Lamb
   1. Worthy is the Lamb
   2. Jesus Christ is Lord
Part III: Spirit of Truth, Spirit of Power

A. The Holy Spirit will Come Upon You
   1. Pentecost
   2. Gifts and Power
   3. Scriptures
B. The Fellowship of the Holy Spirit
   1. The Church’s Founding
   2. The Church’s History
   3. The Church’s Unity and Fellowship
   4. The Church’s Ministry and Mission
C. Children of the Spirit
   1. The Christian as Believer
   2. The Christian as Disciple
   3. The Christian as Witness
   4. The Christian as Neighbor
   5. The Christian as Citizen

Part IV: The Hope of Glory

A: There Remains a Sabbath: The Church at Worship and Prayer
   1. General Worship
   2. Church Music
   3. Special Times of Worship
   4. Marriage, Family, Friends
B: Tokens of Eternity: The Sacraments
   1. Baptism
   2. Lord’s Supper
C: Everlasting Fellowship
   1. Cloud of Witnesses
   2. Heavenly Company
D: Lord of Lords
   1. Enthroned Eternally
   2. Coming in Glory
E. Fullness of God
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