1. In his paper “The Psalm of Habakkuk” in the *Robinson Jubilee Volume* ¹) W. F. ALBRIGHT says on p. 7, n. 24: “it will be evident that Psalm criticism now (i.e. after the Ugarit finds) stands on the threshold of a new day, in sharp contrast to the situation between 1900 and 1935”. He has expressed the same opinion in somewhat fuller form elsewhere ²).

In another place ³) he speaks of the “pre-Ugaritic” period of Psalm exegesis and declares “the sanest study” of Ps. lxviii from that period to be M. BUTTENWIESER’s treatment of this psalm ⁴).

It is against the background of this feeling of having inaugurated a new era that we must understand Prof. ALBRIGHT’s verdict in his note on the present writer’s book ⁵) on the Psalms, in *BASOR* 126 (April 1952), p. 34: “The author is very pessimistic about the reviewer’s insistence on the fundamental importance of Ugaritic literature for all future study of the Psalter (e.g. p. 601 f.)”. By the way, I cannot agree that my refutation of some of ALBRIGHT’s arguments for Davidic authorship (pp. 601 f.) is rightly characterized as “pessimistic about the importance of Ugaritic literature” for future Psalm study, especially when read in the light of what I have said in my book on that theme (e.g. pp. 448 ff.). In this respect, however, I cannot attribute to the Ugarit texts “fundamental importance” in
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³) *Archaeology and the Religion of Israel*, p. 211, n. 103.
the sense of the first quotation from Albright, and that is just what I shall try to prove in the present paper.

That is also the reason why I have quoted Albright's verdict on Buttenwieser's treatment of Ps. lxviii. Buttenwieser's commentary represents the extreme consequences of the zeitgeschichtliche interpretation of the Psalms with its mania for fixing the date of every single Psalm and its superstitious belief in the possibility of this method, a mode of interpretation that has learnt nothing from the form- and type-critical and cult-functional points of view, which have been elaborated in the very period between 1900 and 1935. Buttenwieser's commentary is in no way typical of the methods, viewpoints and results of Psalm research, at least not in Europe. Methodologically it belongs in fact to the period before 1900. Albright does not seem to have fully appreciated the actual state of Psalm research in "pre-Ugaritic" times. If he had, he could not have talked about "a new day" and the "sharp contrast" to the situation between 1900 and 1935.

The importance of the Ugarit texts is, generally and preliminarily speaking, that they give us the historical and literary Canaanite background of Israelite religious poetry. Albright has given a good sketch of this background and its general influence on Israelite sacred poetry in his Archaeology and the Religion of Israel, pp. 14-16. The Ugaritic texts have given us samples of religious poetry in "the language of Canaan", from a time before the Israelite immigration, representing a culture adopted by the Israelites, and a religion from which, to say the least, they took over many religious forms and conceptions, positively as well as negatively (by "contrast influence"). We must now ask, in what definite respects? and, what can these texts teach us about the Psalms?

Here we have to remember that real Psalms are scantily, if at all, represented among the Ugarit texts. The most evident samples are two fragments in the Accadian language 1), the first one with the typical hymnic introduction, "I will sing to the Lady, the goddess of ...."; the second one beginning "O Majesty, Lady of the source ...." seems to be an invocation for help in some distress (a "psalm of lamentation"), as the Lady is being addressed as "Lady of magic, witchcraft and incantations". More uncertain is the text in
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