

**B: Incompletism: (Grammatical Blemish) – minus 4 points**

For beginning a line with a pointless start creates an incomplete statement. That was meant to sound wrong. Imagine simply saying to a stranger, “Because you’re a stranger.” You’d be thought a strange stranger, because *because* is like an unconnected bridge in the middle of the ocean, not really making sense either end—or at best like a jetty. This is how some songs are structured. For example, *I Exalt Thee*, lifted from Ps.97:9 (KJV),<sup>1</sup> when the psalmist’s thought began in the previous verse—“Zion rejoices...for (that is, because) you, Yahweh....” Part A, connective, part B. Besides its language being archaic, the song begins with a connective, a bridge from nowhere, and going nowhere. Sanchez should either have kept the connective *and* connections, or dropped the connective *along with its* connections. The *issue* is Zion’s joy *for/because* Yahweh is the Most High. “For you’re wise. I’ll trust you,” isn’t real life talk unless something came before it. “You’re wise! I’ll trust you” makes sense as related stand-alone statements. “*Because* you are great, *therefore* I’ll trust you” at least makes some sense, or, say, “you’ve sorted it out *for* you are wise. I’ll trust you.” A simple Yahweh you are most high / above all the earth / you are exalted far above [our/human] gods / I exalt you my lord, would have been fine.<sup>2</sup> Similarly, many

<sup>1</sup> Pete Sanchez Jr. (1977) For Thou O Lord art high above all the earth / Thou art exalted far above all gods / I exalt thee. This ignored the KJV marker (periphrasis), and God’s name (that is, it was detetragrammatonised). David Hodges’ undated medley incorporates this, but adds your name is Jesus...your name is father: so Hodge replaced Yahweh with Jesus as the father (not the son), leaving us his children to rejoice at how easily we can change eternal ontology.

<sup>2</sup> Few songs challenge centuries of sidetracking God’s name. One can still sing *Guide Me O Thou Great Jehovah* (William Williams: 1771 English edition), then Merla Watson’s (1974) *Jehovah Jirah*. Pete Lawry wrote *Yahweh! Jehovah Is The Lord Our God* (1983): exclamation indeed. *Second Chapter* has a Yahweh song. So too has Reuben Morgan (Lam.5:19), although I am unhappy with his song, and he has a long history of the “Jesus, you alone are God” theology, characteristic perhaps of *Hillsong*. Why should we be baptised in the same heretical baptism wherein (I fear) he/it is baptised? (While Morgan has sung to the father (*Still*) and spoken of the father’s son (*The Fear*), see his *Mighty To Save; You Alone Are God; Inside Out*, and *Let Us Adore*, for clear expositions of Jesus Onlyism. *My Redeemer Lives*, et al, probably also stem from Onlyism. Several of his songs (for example *All The Heavens*, and *Eagles Wings*) are ambivalent, and admittedly getting ones head around trinitarianism is difficult since counterintuitive.) Even Page 2004:96, which is mostly correct, misleadingly states that *Jehovah* isn’t in Scripture—the ASV/NWT have high *Jehovah* quotient. What he probably meant was that the hybrid form of God’s name, *Jehovah*, is inauthentic.

plaques have featured Jhn.3:16. Some begin, “~~For~~ God...” Some correctly begin, “God...” The latter show some awareness of the incongruity of beginning with a connective: *for* carries on from v15. It was a “because of what’s just been said.” If you say the word *for* is not redundant, I reply that therefore neither is v15: keep both or drop both.

Another form of incompletism is the expression, *worthy*. If someone says “I give you,” you might like to know what, and why. If someone says “you are worthy,” you might ask, “of what?” A clip around the ears, a promotion, a rejection, a compliment, death? Are you to be left wondering what you’re worthy of? In *Revelation*, we read that because of his deeds and help, the Lord God was worthy to receive the submission of human glory and honour and power (4:11): we defer to him. Likewise, because of what the eschatological lamb had done, the Lamb was worthy to receive power, wealth, wisdom, strength, honour, glory, and praise (Rv.5:4,9,12): all gifts submitted to their source. What are you worthy of, and why are you worthy of it? *You are worthy*, like *I give you*, is an incomplete thought. But then, for Christian songs it doesn’t matter—does it? Religious verbiage goes a long way. Darlene Zschech’s polydirectional *Worthy Is The Lamb* (2000), has a lot of thanks, and lists items of praiseworthiness, yet features a repeatedly undefined worthy is the Lamb.<sup>3</sup> We can sing “you are worthy” till our eyes glaze over, yet never go anywhere. Praise isn’t repetition. Praise is going somewhere. *Revelation* completes all its *worthy* sentences: *worthy to walk in white* (3:4); *worthy...to receive...because* (4:11); *worthy to open the scroll* (5:2); no one was found *worthy to...* (4); you are *worthy to...because* (9); *worthy...to* (12). My college’s notes BS11 (*Revelation*) cover this more.

<sup>3</sup> *Darling of Heaven* to one side, crown you now with many crowns is an incomplete statement—needed because we crown you with many crowns wouldn’t fit the music? Also worthy is the Lamb, if to the Lamb, should be worthy are you, Lamb. Even so, she still didn’t even answer the question, “what are we saying he is worthy of?” So, another incompletism. Incidentally, while I don’t insist that Hillsong be trinitarian, some lines might have been better so. Is the grace from the father mediated by the son, and isn’t it the spirit who applies (washes by) the blood, in Levitical terms?