A CLASH OF SPACE. REACCESSING SPACES AND SPEECH: A COGNITIVE-LINGUISTIC APPROACH TO PSALM 2

Joseph de Bruyn

School of Ancient Language and Text Study
North West University, Potchefstroom Campus
E-mail: jacobus.debruyn@gmx.com
(Received 19/09/2012; Revised 17/03/2013)

ABSTRACT
Applying cognitive linguistics to the text of Psalm 2 is shown to be indispensable for a more comprehensive understanding of this psalm. Studying the poet’s use of cognitive concepts such as “heaven” and “earth”, as well as his reference to Zion and certain body-parts, makes it possible to reconstruct the psalm as a form of “body-cosmology”. In this exegetical structure, Psalm 2 can be described as a liturgical poem which was possibly recited during the anointing ceremonies of the Judean kings. Here, a mere human being is re-created as the “son of Yahweh” to rule as an extension of Yahweh’s “god-space” over “that-which-is-below”. Any rebellion from within “earthly space” will be dealt with by Yahweh himself.

INTRODUCTION
In their daily lives humans express themselves through the use of language. When communicating, humans employ language in spoken or written form. Language provides humans with a means of encoding and transmitting complex ideas, by which they make sense of the realities of the world around them (Evans & Green 2006:6).

In the past 30 years, researchers have developed a new approach to the study of language and the way in which humans communicate. This new approach is termed cognitive linguistics (Evans, Bergen & Zinken 2007:3). Cognitive linguistics incorporates different aspects of philosophy, psychology, neuroscience and even computer science into a single scientific approach for the study of language. In previous linguistic studies, language was generally viewed from different perspectives, such as phonology, semantics, pragmatics, morphology and syntax (Evans, Bergen & Zinken 2007:3). However, this is not the purpose of cognitive linguistics. Briefly put, cognitive linguistics entails the study of the complex relationship between language and the mind (Evans, Bergen & Zinken 2007:3). Cognitive linguistics’ main difference with other approaches is that it is based on the thesis that language reflects
certain fundamental properties and design-features of the human mind (Evans & Green 2006:5). According to Geeraerts and Cuyckens (2007), cognitive linguistics examines the “cognitive function” of language. They explain that in this context, “cognitive” refers to the pivotal function of “intermediate informational structures with our encounters with the world”. Subsequently they posit the following thesis about cognitive linguistics: a human being’s interaction with reality is “mediated through informational structures in the mind”.

Three basic ideas can be derived from cognitive linguistics through which the biblical text can be approached by an exegetical method (Jordaan & Nolte 2010:527-529; Evans & Green 2006:179, 190-243):

1. Words are concepts of our human mind which embody our culture and worldview.
2. In interacting with the world around us, we as humans use our bodies as a metaphorical framework.
3. Language is not merely a reflection or representation of reality; reality is also constructed by language.

It is important to note: in the same sense that language is a medium of communication, texts (as written words) as such are also mediums of communication (Becker 2005:45). Biblical texts are the product of written words. Therefore, as with language, texts are embodied in the cognitive frameset of the people who wrote them. It is therefore essential for biblical scholars to take note of cognitive linguistics in order to enhance their understanding of the message transferred by biblical texts. This article will attempt to demonstrate that a cognitive linguistic approach to Old Testament texts is indispensable for a more complete understanding of such texts.

**PROBLEM**

In past research, the way in which Psalm 2 was approached differed as the emphases in exegetical approaches to the Psalter shifted. In the time of Augustine (354-430 CE), Psalm 2 was largely approached in an allegorical manner. In their exegesis, early Christian scholars often regarded Psalm 2 as a prophetic anticipation of the *parousia* of Jesus Christ. During this early period of the Christian Church, attempts were made to show how Jesus Christ fulfilled Psalm 2 (Briggs & Briggs 1927:ci-ciii, 13). In the time of the Reformation the Psalter was approached by focusing more on the dogmatic content and concepts (Briggs & Briggs 1927:cvi). However, in reaction to the
allegorical method of the Middle Ages, scholars during the Reformation also approached texts from a grammatical and historical angle. Although Psalm 2 was still primarily used to illuminate the work of Jesus Christ, scholars such as John Calvin did not view Psalm 2 as a prophecy about Jesus Christ (Briggs & Briggs 1927:cvi; Calvin 1847:294-295). Conversely, by the beginning of the 1900s the psalms were often approached as the work of individual authors (McCann 1993:16). Scholars tended to determine the timeframe when a psalm was written, as well as its intended audience and its historical background. Normally the psalms were dated to the post-exilic era (i.e., approximately the third to second era BCE) (Gillingham 2008:210; Brueggemann 2003:278-279; Gillingham 1994:174; McCann 1993:16).

Other research topics that have been undertaken on Psalm 2 can be summarised as follows:

- Psalm 2’s links with the Davidic covenant and 2 Samuel 7:11:16 (Mays 1994:47; Briggs & Briggs 1927:12);
- possible authors of Psalm 2 (Briggs & Briggs 1927:12);
- Psalm 2 and its New Testament usage (Mays 1994:49; Briggs & Briggs 1927:13);
- the adoption of the Judean king as son of God (Curtis 2007:56; Bullock 2005:179; Koch 2005:47-48; Rendtorff 2005:62);
- Egyptian and Babylonian influence on the ideology concerning the Judean king (Buttrick 1955:25);
- the possible relationship between Psalm 1 and Psalm 2 (Janse 2009:5, 22-23; Buttrick 1955:22);
- the probable origin of the Psalter (including Ps 2) within the cult (Hays 1998:162; Hilber 2005:3; Mowinckel 1962:13-14);
- Psalm 2 as a royal psalm that was recited as a liturgical song during the coronation ceremony of the Judean kings (Craige 1983:62-69; Kraus 1993:125); and,
- on the level of text criticism, research was done on various Aramaisms in the psalm, specifically on the בְּ found in verse 7 (Janse 2009:8-9).

In the most recent research, scholars have approached the Psalter as an editorial unit (Zenger 2008:6-8) which was used as a liturgical book for singing and prayer during the Second Temple period (Hossfeld & Zenger 1993:6). Thus, Psalm 2 is approached as part of the Psalter as a whole (Brueggemann 2003:290-291; Hays 1998:165). Research was also done on how different redactors utilised Psalm 2 to structure the Psalter around a central theme (Braulik 2004:22; Hays 1998:165; Mitchell 1997:15,
In this article, the text of Psalm 2 will be interpreted and analysed in the light of cognitive linguistics. Considerable attention was given, and is still being given, to the study of the biblical languages and their Sprachwelt. However, previously the focus was not so much on cognitive linguistics as a hermeneutical model within the exegetical process of studying biblical texts. To summarise: exploring the language of the text as a mechanism used by the author to construct certain realities, including those of a symbolic nature, has been neglected.

In using cognitive linguistics as a hermeneutical model, this article will pay special attention to the liturgical phrase בָּעֵן אַתָּה אַתָּה יְהוָה, יְהוָה יַזְכִּי (“Today I became your father”). At the same time, the way in which the poet implements the image of certain body-parts and concepts of space will be studied. In its analysis of Psalm 2, this article will show how and why cognitive linguistics is becoming indispensable in exegesis.

**METHODOLOGY**

It falls outside the purpose of this article to discuss all the research that was previously done on Psalm 2. The focus is rather to add some new insight regarding the interpretation of the song. As far as the dating of Psalm 2 is concerned, it is accepted that the psalm could have been recited in more than one historical setting throughout Israel’s history. The possibility exists of a later historical setting for the origin of Psalm 2. Nevertheless this article will first discuss the psalm within the possibility of an early historical setting, namely during the period of the kings. Therefore Psalm 2 may be recognised as a king-psalm (i.e., royal psalm). As a king-psalm, Psalm 2 describes the relationship between Yahweh and his anointed king. After discussing Psalm 2 within an early historical setting, this article will endeavour to show how a later historical setting may influence a cognitive linguistic approach to the psalm.

It is accepted that Psalm 2, in its written form, forms part of larger collection of psalms compiled into the editorial-shaped unit of Psalter. Psalm 2 may then form an editorial unity with Psalm 1, a psalm from a later period. However, the postulate of such an editorial unity as such cannot be used to assert that Psalm 2 also originated from a later period. It cannot be ignored that the thematic differences between the two psalms are more prominent than the correspondences are (Janse 2009:22-23). There is a distinct correlation between Psalm 2 and 2 Samuel 7:14, where 2 Samuel 7:14 refers
to the period of the kings.\(^1\) Furthermore, the thematic parallels between Psalm 2 and other so-called king-psalms, such as Psalm 89 and Psalm 110, cannot be denied. All these psalms echo the relationship between Yahweh and the anointed Davidic king. Therefore, this article will treat Psalm 2 as an independent psalm with thematic connections to Psalm 89 and Psalm 110.

**Body-cosmology**

Psalm 2 will be approached by applying the cognitive structure of body-cosmology to the text. In employing this approach of body-cosmology, two cognitive concepts will be incorporated, namely the domain of the human body and the domain of space (Evans & Green 2006:230-235). In Psalm 2, the domain of the human body is represented differently than, for example, in Psalm 110 or 2 Maccabees 14 and 15. In the last-mentioned examples the authors used individual body parts such as “right hand”, “hands”, “tongue” and “feet” to represent the domain of the human body. On the other hand, in Psalm 2 the cognitive concept of body is implied by the poet’s reference to humans as בני (nations, verse 1); בני (people, verse 1) and לוכ (kings, verse 2). Naturally, the cognitive body parts “tongue” and “head” could be derived from the way in which the text portrays humans as people who talk (tongue) and think (head) (cf. 2 Maccabees 14 and 15).\(^2\) At the same time, the way in which the poet portrays the deity of Israel, Yahweh, in verses 4-8 as having human qualities also supports the cognitive concept of body. In these verses Yahweh laughs, sits, and scorns. Again, these human qualities can be used to represent certain body parts.

The domain of space is represented in Psalm 2 by the author’s use of the two contrasting cognitive concepts, namely שמיים (earth, verses 2 and 8) and סלך (heaven, verse 4). In terms of body-cosmology, the earth could be described cognitively as “that-which-is-below”, “profane” or simply “bottom”. In contrast, heaven can be described cognitively as “that-which-is-above”, “holy” or the “top”. In the ancient world the heavens were seen as the dwelling place of the gods, and the earth was viewed as the place where humans lived. Therefore heaven can also be described as “god-space” or “holy space” and earth can be depicted as “earthly space” or “human

---

\(^1\) Yahweh promised David that his son will be God’s son. “I will be his father, and he will be my son” (KJV).

\(^2\) In the narrative of 2 Maccabees 14 and 15, Nicanor blasphemes against the temple and God; at the end of the narrative his head is cut off and his tongue is cut out.
(mortal)-space”.

The poet’s mentioning of Mount Zion in verse 6 is also a representation of space. For the ancient Israelites, Zion was an extension of Yahweh’s god-space on earth. Zion was viewed as Yahweh’s throne and dwelling place (Albertz 2003:55, 133, 152-157). From Zion Yahweh did not only reign over Israel, but held sway over the whole world (Ps 48). In addition, Psalm 2 is used to proclaim Yahweh’s government over “that-which-is-below” (earth). According to Judean (Israelite) theology, which we can refer to as Zion-theology, it was at Mount Zion that Yahweh gained victory over the mythological chaos-water (Pss 16:3, 7; 48:5-7; 76:4, 6-7; cf. Ollenburger 1987:15). Imbedded in Zion-theology was Yahweh’s commitment to his temple in Jerusalem and the lineage of the Davidic dynasty (Murphy 2002:30).

The temple in Jerusalem, which was erected on the highest peak of Mount Zion, was to represent the cosmological balance that was established by Yahweh when He created heaven and earth. It was a symbol of Yahweh’s victory over the forces of chaos (cf. Ps 29; Murphy 2002:68). Within the structure of body-cosmology, the balance between chaos and order is maintained in that the earthly body should represent the heavenly body (see Figure 1).

The temple of Yahweh, however, is not mentioned in Psalm 2, but the Davidic dynasty is indeed mentioned. The Davidic dynasty is implied by the poet’s reference to מושל (verse 2; Yahweh’s messiah). Furthermore, it is widely acknowledged that Psalm 2 was recited as a liturgical song during the anointing ceremony of the Judean kings (Bullock 2005:179; Koch 2005:47-48; Anderson 1979:238). This will be discussed in more detail below. Suffice to say that according to Zion-theology, as it is represented in Psalm 2, not only Zion and the temple were an extension of Yahweh’s god-space on earth, but also the Judean king himself.
APPLYING THE METHOD

Summary and discussion of Psalm 2

Thematically Psalm 2 can be described as a king-psalm (royal psalm) (Bullock 2005:178; Kraus 1993:125). This text was probably written as a liturgical song, which was sung on the day of the Judean king’s anointing. The psalm depicts the relationship between the deity of Israel, Yahweh, and the Judean king. This, however, does not mean that Psalm 2 could not have been reinterpreted in later or different historical settings within Israel’s history, such as after the Babylonian exile or in the era of the Hasmonean dynasty.

The Judean king is presented as not only a king, he is Yahweh’s king (Ps 2:6), or rather, he is Yahweh’s son (Ps 2:7). Yahweh Himself has appointed the king as His designated representative on earth. As קהָן משיח (Yahweh’s messiah) and son of Yahweh the king is made part of Yahweh’s god-space on earth. Thus, the king rules from Mount Zion as an extension of Yahweh’s heavenly authority on earth. Within the frameset of cognitive linguistics, Yahweh grants His newly anointed king the domain of earthly space to rule (Ps 2:8) on His behalf. This implies that all of the nations on earth fall under the divinely provided rule of the Judean king as an extension of Yahweh’s authority.

Verses 1-3

Under the leadership of their kings, the nations of the earth conspire against Yahweh and His king. Their minds are set to rebel against the government of Yahweh and of
the Judean king. The nations strive to break free from the bonds of Yahweh’s authority.

**Verses 4-5**

In heaven Yahweh laughs at the earthly nations’ attempt to break free from His rule and the rule of His מֶּשֶׁך.

**Verse 6**

The reason why Yahweh laughs at the rebellious nations is because He Himself has appointed the king to rule. Therefore, the nations are not only rebelling against an earthly king, they are rebelling against Yahweh Himself.

**Verse 7**

The relationship between Yahweh and the king is described in terms of the relationship of “father and son”. During the history of the early Christian Church, this verse was usually interpreted as a messianic prophecy about the coming of Jesus Christ (Van Rooy 2009:263-278). This was done as an analogy of the ideas found in the book of Hebrews in the New Testament. The following passages in Hebrews 1:5 and 5:5, Psalm 2 are put forward to argue that Jesus Christ is the Son of God. However, during the Reformation, John Calvin (1847:294-295), applying his grammatical-historical exegetical method, did not interpret Psalm 2 as pointing directly to Jesus Christ (Van Rooy 2009:263-278).

Currently it is accepted that the Judean kings were proclaimed as the sons of Yahweh (cf. Ps 89:28, where the king is referred to as the firstborn of God). Scholars, such as Curtis (2007:56), Bullock (2005:179), Koch (2005:47-48), Rendtorff (2005:62) and Fossum (1995:1488), all state that on the day of the Judean king’s anointment, the king was adopted by Yahweh as His son. The theory that the Judean king received the title “son of God” on the day of his inauguration correlates with the testimony of 2 Samuel 7:13-14. According to these verses Yahweh promised David that his son would be regarded in the same vein as the son of God for Yahweh are unto him as a Father.

However, by applying some ideas of cognitive linguistics to Psalm 2, it could be argued that the Judean king was not merely adopted by Yahweh to be His son. By uttering the liturgical phrase בְּנֵי אֲדֹנָי הָיוּ מְלָכֶה לָּהוֹ יְהוָה Yahweh rather re-created a mere human being into a new reality as the son of God. According to the theory of cognitive linguistics, language is not merely a reflection or representation of reality, reality is also constructed by language (Jordaan & Nolte 2010: 527-529; Evans &
Green 2006:179 190-243). This can be explained with the following examples.

The first example of how reality is constructed through language is the way in which human societies create laws. Laws are nothing less than word-constructed framesets within which citizens function on a daily basis. For example, when driving a car, it is done so within the reality of a specific traffic law, which was created by using language. This traffic-law-reality was ultimately designed as a result of a personally perceived bodily experience that two cars cannot occupy the same space at the same time. In other words, in this context, one car should cease to move, giving the other car the right of way.

Another example of language’s constructive capabilities concerns the well-known formula: “I pronounce you husband and wife”. With these words, the way in which we experience (view) the newly wedded couple immediately differs from the perception a moment before the phrase was uttered. No longer is the married couple perceived as part of an unmarried context; they now form part of the marriage reality. In a sense, by the very utterance of these few words “I pronounce you husband and wife” a new reality is constructed. Such a transformative aspect of language makes it possible to approach Psalm 2 as a creation or transformation psalm in which a mere human being is re-created or transformed into being the son of God. In this sense the king becomes the ultimate extension of Yahweh’s authority-space on earth.

Before the king was anointed, he was a mere mortal. This indicates that something happened to the king during the anointing ritual in terms of body-cosmology. This is because before his anointing the king merely formed part of the reality of the earthly body or “that which is below” (Figure 1). However, studying the Old Testament texts suggests that after their anointing, the Judean kings were no longer seen as mere humans sharing in God’s power. Indeed, after they were anointed, the kings of Judah were placed on much the same level as God. They were seen as part of the reality of God’s divine space or “that which is above” and holy. This is indicated by the following information:

- The king is called the “first-born of God” (Ps 89:28).
- The king is called רֵעֶה in Psalm 45.
- The new-born king is depicted as “god with us” (Is 7:14).
- Sometimes the king is depicted as wearing horns (1 Sm 2:10; Pss 89:18; 132:17; Dt 33:17). Research indicates that horns were usually associated with the demeanour of the gods (Batto 1992:124; Zeitlin 1991:12).
- In his person the king was holy and it was seen as a sin, punishable by death, to lift one’s hands against the king (1 Sm 24:7; 31:4; 2 Sm 1:14; Van der Ploeg 1974:253).
- Together with his anointing the king received a new heart (1 Sm 10:6, 9).

The new way in which the anointed king was described, indicates that something happened to the king during the anointing ritual. In terms of body-cosmology the king was re-created into the divine realm above, and thus separated from the earthly space below (De Bruyn 2012:464-465). Therefore the anointing ritual could be described as a ceremony in which an ordinary human being was transformed from one reality to another. For the king himself, a new reality was created: he was re-created as the son of Yahweh. As the son of God the king was placed above “that which is below” (i.e. that which is earthly, unholy and mortal).

**Verses 8-9**

If the new king is re-created as the son of God on the day of his anointing, it is only fitting that he should rule, as Yahweh does, over “that-which-is-below”. In these verses Yahweh grants the new king the domain of earthly space over which to rule. By implication all of the nations on earth now resort under the authority of the Judean king. The new king will rule this domain of earthly space with an iron sceptre.

**Verses 10-12**

The people who inhabit the domain of earthly space are warned to accept the new king as their rightful ruler, and thus they should serve the divinity afforded to the king. In subjecting themselves to Yahweh, the nations of the earth (by implication), must also subject themselves to the king as the son of God. If the nations refuse to serve Yahweh and his king, they would be crushed.

**A clash of cognitive spaces**

The peace between Yahweh and the people is disturbed, and by implication the peace between heaven and earth also (verses 1-5). This disturbance is the direct result of earthly (non-Israelite) governments who set themselves against Yahweh, rather than to reflect the reign of God in their own administrations. These earthly governments do not want to subject themselves to the authority of Yahweh; instead, they desire to
break free from God’s rule. Within the frameset of body-cosmology, this disturbance can be described cognitively as a “conflict of interests” between a heavenly body and an earthly body (figure 1). The earthly body, as it is represented by the kings and leaders of the nations, wants to break out of the boundaries of earthly space. In breaking free from the bonds of earthly space, the nations threaten Yahweh’s god-space. Therefore the disturbance of peace between heaven and earth could be described further as a conflict between god-space and mortal-space. It is from this description that the title for this article, “A clash of spaces”, is derived.

The above interpretation of the text is based on the way in which the poet describes the inhabitants of both earth and heaven. According to verses 10-12 there can only be order and peace in the cosmos if the earthly nations subject themselves to the reign of Yahweh and of his king. This means that the nations of the earth must accept the reality of the cosmos as it was ordered (created) by Yahweh (see figure 1). In a perfectly ordered universe all nations are bound to the space of earth or “that-which-is-below”. At the same time the Judean king is being re-created on the day of his anointment to rule the earthly space in the form of an extension of Yahweh’s government. All earthly nations must therefore subject themselves to the king as they would to Yahweh.

In terms of body-cosmology, the earthly nations are to use their minds (heads) and tongues (mouths) positively. To use their minds and tongues positively means that they should kiss Yahweh’s son (verse 10), the king, and rejoice in serving God (verse 9). To kiss Yahweh’s king means to subject oneself to his rule. However, instead of using their minds and tongues positively, the nations apply their bodies in a negative way. This is indicated by the following charges:

- They plan and rage against Yahweh (verse 1).
- They use their minds to counsel against Yahweh (verse 2).
- With their mouths (tongues) they utter their desire to break free from Yahweh’s bonds (verse 3).

The nations specifically use their mouths to “invade” Yahweh’s god-space. Naturally, the best way to confront Yahweh’s rule and his god-space is for the nations to set themselves against the Judean king, who as the son of God, is the direct extension of Yahweh’s god-space on earth. In setting themselves against the Judean king, the nations trespass on Yahweh’s own terrain (space).

In reaction to the nations’ negative use of their mouths, Yahweh also opens his
mouth. When Yahweh opens his mouth, his aim is not only to defend his son (king), but to defend his own god-space. At first Yahweh laughs at the earthly nations (verse 4). It seems as if Yahweh laughs at the nations and scorns them for their stupidity with the pretention to revolt against His divinely created order that He established in the cosmos. For example, in verse 5 when Yahweh opens his mouth again, it is with a wrathful voice. In defence of his king, Yahweh informs the rebellious nations that He Himself has set the Judean king on Zion to rule over them and over the earth as a whole (verse 6).

Sustained by the support of Yahweh, the king also opens his mouth against the nations (verses 7-9). The king responds to the nations by stating that Yahweh has re-created him to be part of God’s divine space and that Yahweh Himself has given him earthly space as part of his inheritance. The king also reminds the nations of a time when Yahweh opened His mouth and promised the king victory over his enemies (verse 9).

Finally, the poet of the song also “opens his mouth” (verses 10-12). This is done by writing down his thoughts on paper or by singing the song on the day of the king’s anointment. The poet proclaims to the nations that, rather than rebelling against Yahweh, His ordered cosmos and His king, they should submit to Yahweh and His king, in order for them to prosper by submission to divine protection.

From all the above the clash of space, as stated in the title, is depicted as mouths that are being opened against each other (see Figure 2). Altogether four “mouths” can be distinguished:

- the mouth of the earthy nations who speak against Yahweh and his king;
- the mouth of Yahweh;
- the mouth of the king; and
- the mouth of the poet.

**Figure 2**

```
Yahweh
King     ↔     Nations
Poet
```

From this cognitive analysis of the text it becomes clear that Psalm 2 is not merely a king-psalm; it is a creation-psalm as well. First, the psalm describes the perfect order
as God created it (refer to Figure 1):

- The cosmos is divided into earthly space and heavenly space.
- On earth, Zion, the Davidic king, and the temple form an extension of Yahweh’s god-space.
- The Judean king is an extension of Yahweh’s rule.
- Earthly space and the nations are to be ruled by Yahweh’s king.
- Earthly governments must represent God’s authority in their administrations by subjecting themselves to Yahweh.

Second, Psalm 2 describes the re-creation of a mere human being into the son of God. On the day of his coronation the Judean king is re-created to form part of Yahweh’s divine space.

**After the Babylonian exile**

The question can rightfully be posed: “How would a later dating of Psalm 2 affect an approach in terms of a cognitive body-cosmology to the psalm?” A brief answer would be that it would not really impact on such an approach. That is, except for the fact that, instead of Psalm 2 describing the creation of a Davidic king, it can then be theorised that the psalm describes the following creations: that of a coming messiah, Israel’s existence as a nation or the creation of a Hasmoneon king. The cognitive interpretation of Psalm 2 in terms of an invasion of Yahweh god-space would then still be valid, especially from an eschatological perspective. From the Jewish eschatology of the second century BCE, it seems that great emphasis was placed on the kingdom of God and the forces that threatened it (Horbury 1998:40; cf. Ezek. 38-39; Dan. 9; 2 Mac. 14-15 where Nicanor threatens the temple of God).

It is possible that after the line of Davidic kings was broken with the Babylonian exile, that royal psalms such as Psalm 2, was projected to the future in the hope of the restoration of the Davidic throne (Bullock 2005:182-183; Braulik 2004:21-30; Wilson 2002:709-710). If that is the case, Psalm 2 indeed could cognitively describe the recreation of a new messiah from the House of David. Then such an event could be described as Yahweh’s god-space threatened by the Babylonian exile (cf. Dn 1:1-3 – Yahweh’s king is taken prisoner, his temple is defiled and God’s city, Jerusalem, is invaded and plundered.). Psalm 2 could then be interpreted as the embodiment of the hope that Yahweh would recreate a new messiah and that He would repel those who threaten Israel as God’s chosen people. This interpretation could be reconciled with
the trend to democratise the royal psalms when omitting the theme of the Davidic kings.

In terms of the process of democratising, the promises that Yahweh made to the kings of Judah, were interpreted as promises made to Israel as a nation (Hilber 2005:42; Albertz 2003:134). By omitting the Judean kings, Israel as a nation became the son of God (cf. Hosea 11:1). In this regard Psalm 2 would then cognitively describe the creation of Israel as the son of God.

As stated above, the main purpose of this article is not to debate every possible historical setting within which Psalm 2 could have originated. However, even if Psalm 2 originated at a later historical period, it should be clear from the arguments above, and the interaction with other possible historical settings, that applying the cognitive frameset of body-cosmology to the text of Psalm 2 does not change much in different historical settings. In other historical settings different “characters” could be assimilated with the Davidic king to become sons of God. Such an assimilation of possible “characters” with the Davidic king thus will not invalidate a cognitive linguistic approach to the text of Psalm 2.

**CONCLUSION**

When Psalm 2 is approached within the cognitive frameset of body-cosmology, it becomes clear that the psalm is presented as more than a mere king-psalm. First, the psalm describes a clash of earthly and heavenly space. Yahweh’s god-space is invaded by governments who refuse to represent Yahweh’s authority in their own administrations. These earthly governments invade Yahweh’s god-space by using their bodies, specifically their mouths, negatively. In defence of Yahweh’s god-space Yahweh Himself, the king and the poet, open their mouths to repel the invasion.

Second, Psalm 2 is also a creation-psalm, seeing that it describes the re-creation of a human as being the son of God.

In its theology, Psalm 2 is Zionistically inclined. The psalm claims that the

---

3 According to Zion-theology, Mount Zion was viewed as the throne of Yahweh (Ps 48). It was on Mount Zion that the temple of Yahweh was built. As with most of the ancient Near Eastern cultures, the temple in Jerusalem (erected on Mount Zion) was seen as part of the dwelling place of God. The temple was built on the highest peak of Mount Zion. The temple was also meant to represent the cosmological balance that was created by God when He created heaven and earth. The temple was built to represent God’s heavenly dwelling,
Judean king is the true ruler of Israel and of the world as a whole. The king is portrayed as more than a mere mortal; he is revered as the son of God. Psalm 2 also defends the Judean king’s right to rule, by stating that Yahweh himself has inaugurated him as king. The authority of the king sprouts from Yahweh Himself. Therefore, anyone who defies the king defies Yahweh Himself and will be dealt with by God.

Overall it can be stated, as argued throughout this article, that applying some principles of cognitive linguistics to certain texts of the Old Testament can improve biblical scholars’ understanding of these texts. This also indicates the important role that cognitive linguistics can play in enhancing understanding in the exegetical process.
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which He established “over” the “ordered chaos” as a symbol of His victory over the forces of chaos (cf. Psalm 29; Murphy 2002:68). Thus, the temple was a symbol of God’s reign over both heaven and earth. In this sense, the temple also formed the boundaries of God’s sacred heavenly space on earth (Ps 48; Walton 2006:113-135; Murphy 2002:36-45).
Society.


