

P 3) There is no parallelism in v.11.

-A synthetic parallelism is possible, adding the idea that rejoicing should be mingled with fear or respect.

A 4) The Hebrew and Aramaic words for "son" occur in the same Psalm. This is unprecedented and implies a textual error.

-How strange is לֵב? A 9th century BC Phoenician inscription was found which had the term לֵב on it (Phoenician is nearly identical to ancient Hebrew).
-David lived around 970 BC.

|| -This implies that לֵב is an old Hebrew word for "son" rather than an Aramaic form. לֵב is the newer form.

-It is not uncommon to have Old Hebrew and Hebrew words which mean the same thing mixed in the same Hebrew poem, since poets generally use different words to express an idea in several ways.

-Even if לֵב is Aramaic, this is not a real problem as most surrounding nations spoke Aramaic. Note that the surrounding nations are called upon in the context to submit to the Lord and kiss the Son.

-Aramaic is used elsewhere in the Bible: Jeremiah 10:11 uses Aramaic in addressing surrounding nations.
-Aramaic is no longer considered to be a late language.

-Liberals use arguments like these to attack the Messianic passages in the OT. By forcing contradictions and removing prophecy in these areas, they show their bias against the Messiah (fulfilling Psa. 2:1-3).

Note: The ^{NEB}TEV, RSV and perhaps the NEB eliminated "son" completely from their translation, and refer to "he" instead (which then becomes the Lord in the context).

-This shift violates the context of the Psalm:

-2 persons are seen in the previous 3 stanzas of the Psalm:

2:1-3 Revolt "against the Lord and his Anointed One."
-Note 2 people in v.2

2:4-6 "I will set my king upon Zion" (v.6) 2 people.

2:7-9 "The LORD has said unto me, 'This day I myself have begotten you.'" (v.7) 2 people.

2:10-12 Conclusion.

-Because the son has the right to rule, quit this rebellion and kiss the son.