

## F. The Psalm Titles of Individual Psalms.

### 1. Attitudes toward the Psalm titles.

#### a. The Psalm titles are wholly worthless and misleading.

-This is the general attitude of liberal scholars.

-Note that the NEB omits all Psalm titles, saying:  
"They are almost certainly not original"

However, they add the designations of speakers in the Song of Solomon which they admit are truly not original.

#### b. The Psalm titles are of value, but they are not inspired.

-This is the attitude expressed by John Richard Sampey in his article on the Book of Psalms in the International Standard Bible Encyclopedia (ISBE).

-Sampey's argument: Psalm titles are obviously very old.

-Are in LXX but the translators did not know what some of the words in the titles meant.

=> Existed long before the LXX translation was made.

-Even if titles were added during or after the exile, are still valuable as editors were closer to the time of writing and had better sources concerning date and authorship than we now have.

-Liberals say that scribes read the OT and connected Psalms with stories in Kings and Chronicles.

-But there is historical data in Psalm titles not in OT narratives (cf. Psalm 7 -- who was Cush?).

-Sampey says some titles may be original or from before the exile.

-This is also the view of Perowne: Some are genuine (by the original author), others are based on correct data, while others are simply conjecture and tradition.

-Try to judge reliability by critical methods (internal evidence, etc.).

-The editors of the TEV put the Psalm titles in their footnotes, not do not include them in the text.

-Will omit portions of titles ("to the choir director" in Psa. 51, 56) and paraphrase the rest (cf. Psa. 51, 56).

#### c. The Psalm titles are inspired.

-This is the attitude commended to the class.