

THE USE OF PSALM 4:4 IN EPHESIANS 4:26¹

Shikai Ronnie Poon

Alliance Bible Seminary

I. Introduction

The use of the Old Testament in the book of Ephesians has not attracted a lot of scholarly interest in the past.² The reason for this lack of interest has been attributed to the relatively few Old Testament quotations in the book and the general scholarly trend in looking for the background to the letter in places other than the Old Testament.³

¹ Although I have used the more common verse reference of the modern translations in the title of the paper, I will switch to the verse number as presented in the Old Testament texts of the MT and LXX in the body of the paper unless I am quoting the work of another who uses the verse reference in the modern translations.

² Andrew T. Lincoln, "The Use of the OT in Ephesians," *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 14 (1982): 16-17. Cf. Thorsten Moritz, *A Profound Mystery: The Use of the Old Testament in Ephesians*, Supplements to Novum Testamentum, V. 85 (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1996), 1.

³ Clinton E. Arnold, *Ephesians, Power and Magic: The Concept of Power in Ephesians in Light of Its Historical Setting* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989).

This is a valid bias since the book is written in the Greco-Roman context and the initial readers are situated in a polytheistic culture of Asia Minor. Furthermore, the instances of Old Testament usages in Ephesians occur mostly in parenetic sections and do not contribute very much to the debate on the hermeneutics of the use of the Old Testament in the New Testament.⁴ However, since Old Testament quotations or allusions appear in every chapter of the letter except chapter three, this lack of interest is not entirely justified.

The shortage of scholarly discussion is especially serious in the various quotations of the Old Testament in the parenetic section of Ephesians 4:25-30.⁵ This lack of discussion is especially surprising in light of the existence of some sayings in this passage that seem to have been closely related to the Old Testament, some even taken verbatim from passages in the LXX version of the Old Testament.

It begins with Ephesians 4:25, "Speak truthfully each one to his neighbor (λαλεῖτε ἀλήθειαν ἕκαστος μετὰ τοῦ πλησίον αὐτοῦ)," almost quoting verbatim from Zechariah 8:16, "Speak the truth to one another (λαλεῖτε ἀλήθειαν ἕκαστος πρὸς τὸν πλησίον αὐτοῦ)." The only difference is the change of the prepositional phrase at the end from πρὸς τὸν πλησίον αὐτοῦ to μετὰ τοῦ πλησίον αὐτοῦ, which is similar in meaning. Both contexts deal with proper behavior among people within the community of the faithful.

⁴ See the discussion offered in G. K. Beale, *The Right Doctrine from the Wrong Texts? Essays on the Use of the Old Testament in the New* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Books, 1994); Kenneth Berding and Jonathan Lunde, eds., *Three Views on the New Testament Use of the Old Testament* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2008).

⁵ Even in Moritz's full length study of the use of the Old Testament in Ephesians, he devoted only about a page each on the five instances where use of the Old Testament is evident. Cf. Moritz, *A Profound Mystery*, 87-93. It is also given only a very brief discussion in G. K. Beale and D. A. Carson, *Commentary on the New Testament Use of the Old Testament* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2007), 825-26.

The clearest example of the use of the Old Testament in this section is found in Ephesians 4:26a, "Be angry and do not sin (ὀργίζεσθε καὶ μὴ ἀμαρτάνετε)," which is identical in wording with the LXX version of Psalm 4:5a (4:4 in English and Chinese translations), though most modern translation reflect the literal meaning, "to tremble," of the word used in the MT.

Then in the second half of the verse, after the quotation that we will discuss in detail later, we have in 4:26b, "Do not let the sun go down ... (ὁ ἥλιος μὴ ἐπιδύετω)," which reflects the terminology used in Deuteronomy 24:15, "before the sun sets (οὐκ ἐπιδύσεται ὁ ἥλιος ἐπ' αὐτῷ)." Both of them are commands for immediate actions without delay beyond the end of the day. In the context of Deuteronomy, the command is for proper recompense to workers, a positive command that should not be delayed beyond its proper time.

Two other allusions have also been suggested. The expression in Ephesians 4:28 "The one who steals must no longer steal (ὁ κλέπτων μηκέτι κλεπτέτω)" may be an allusion to Exodus 20:15, "do not steal (οὐ κλέψεις)," or a similar wording in Leviticus 19:11, "you must not steal (οὐ κλέψεις)." The clause in Ephesians 4:30 "do not grieve the Holy Spirit of God (μὴ λυπεῖτε τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον τοῦ θεοῦ)," seems to have turned a statement in Isaiah 63:10, "they rebelled and offended his Holy Spirit (αὐτοὶ δὲ ἠπειθήσαν καὶ παρώξυναν τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον αὐτοῦ)" into a warning.

The individual citations may not be entirely convincing by themselves.⁶ This is especially true of the last two allusions. But in the context of this short passage, when taken together, they give a sense

⁶ Sylvia Keesmatt goes even further to dismiss the "allusion" to Ps 4:5 in Eph 4:25-26 as "too faint to be warranted," cf. Sylvia C. Keesmaat, "In the Face of the Empire: Paul's Use of Scripture in the Shorter Epistles," in *Hearing the Old Testament in the New Testament*, ed. Stanley E. Porter (Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans Pub. Co., 2006), 192, n. 25.

that the influence of the Old Testament is probably very significant when the whole passage is put together. This should perhaps be compared to other passages in the New Testament that use a series of Old Testament passages to argue for their messages.⁷

In view of the above mentioned neglect in the study of the use of the Old Testament within this parenetic section of Ephesians, we should seek to examine more closely what a study of the use of Psalm 4:5a in Ephesians 4:26a would contribute to our understanding of the message that Paul intended to present in this section. In this paper, we will revisit the problem in the interpretation of this difficult clause in Ephesians 4:26a, especially of how a consideration of the contextual usage of the same clause in the LXX of Psalm 4:5 can contribute to the solution of the problem. First, we will consider the context of the Ephesians passage, particularly the options for its interpretation in light of the whole parenetic section. Then we will examine the textual and exegetical traditions of the text quoted during the intertestamental period. After that we will examine whether and how this Old Testament context would give insight in the interpretation of Ephesians 4:26.

II. The Problem of the Interpretation of Ephesians 4:26

The basic problem of the interpretation of Ephesians 4:26a is whether it is a command for Christians to be angry. If one answers positively, one has to deal with how this command can be consistent with the general concept of peacemaking and reconciliation in the Bible, and the prohibition of anger specifically in the immediate context (4:31). If, however, one answers negatively, one has to deal with the grammatical improbability of taking an imperative as anything other than a simple command.

⁷ Such as Heb 1:5-13, Ro 3.

Those who take the Old Testament quotation in Ephesians 4:26a seriously usually focus on the influence of the Hebrew verb (אָנַף) behind the Greek translation. Moritz argues, that "the Hebrew allows for taking the first imperative as hypothetical,"⁸ but he gave a translation of the verse as reflecting a concessive interpretation. Hoehner also argues for the importance of the Old Testament quotation and follows Craigie's interpretation of the Psalm to suggest a concessive meaning, that "they can be angry but not act out their anger sinfully."⁹ However, neither of them explains in detail how the use of the Old Testament quotation actually contributes to the final conclusion.

In a widely quoted article on this passage, Daniel Wallace lists seven options for the interpretation of this passage.¹⁰

- (1) Declarative indicative: "You are angry, yet do not sin."
- (2) Interrogative indicative: "Are you angry? Then do not sin."
- (3) Command imperative: "Be angry, and do not sin."
- (4) Permissive imperative: "Be angry (if you must), but do not sin."
- (5) Conditional imperative: "If you are angry, do not sin."
- (6) Concessive imperative: "Although you may get angry, do not sin."
- (7) Prohibitive imperative: "Do not be angry and do not sin."

⁸ Moritz, *A Profound Mystery*, 90.

⁹ Harold W. Hoehner, *Ephesians: An Exegetical Commentary* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2002), 620. Cf. Peter C. Craigie and Marvin E. Tate, *Psalms 1-50*, rev. ed., Word Biblical Commentary 19 (Nashville: Nelson Reference & Electronic, 2004), 81.

¹⁰ Daniel B. Wallace, "Ὁργίζεσθε in Ephesians 4:26: Command or Condition?," *Criswell Theological Review* 3 (1989): 354. The contents of this article is also summarized in Daniel B. Wallace, *Greek Grammar Beyond the Basics: An Exegetical Syntax of the New Testament* (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 1996), 491-92.

Wallace goes on to quickly dismiss options (1), (2), and (7) as being implausible.¹¹ He argues that option (7) is basically impossible grammatically. It requires the subsequent negative particle *μὴ* to cover both the following imperative and the one before but separated by the coordinating conjunction *καὶ*. This kind of usage is simply not supported by data in the Greek language. Although options (1) and (2) are possible grammatically, that is, it is possible to parse the form *ὀργίξεσθε* as a present middle/passive indicative of the verb *ὀργίζομαι*, it is highly unlikely in this present context. This section is filled with imperatival sentences, with a list of ten imperatives and two hortatory subjunctives to give instructions for Christians to follow. The only indicatives in this section speak of what God has done for believers to form the basis for the ethical instructions.¹²

Wallace also argues that options (4), (5), and (6) are basically similar.¹³ This is understandable since they all result in a sense where "anger" forms the context in which the command to "not sin" is given. So there are only two real options for the interpretation of this clause. We have to choose between taking the verb *ὀργίξεσθε* as an actual command and taking the verb as a hypothetical situation in which the readers are commanded not to sin.

Wallace lists four factors that should be considered in the interpretation of this sentence: "(1) the use Paul makes of Psalm 4:4; (2) the context; (3) the general biblical teaching on man's anger; and (4) the specifics of the syntax of the construction."¹⁴ However, after briefly discussing the possible interpretation of Psalm 4:4, he dismisses

¹¹ Wallace, "Ὀργίξεσθε in Ephesians 4:26," 354-56.

¹² Wallace, "Ὀργίξεσθε in Ephesians 4:26," 355. The phrases involved are: *ὅτι ἐσμὲν ἀλλήλων μέλη* (4:25), *ἐν ᾧ ἐσπυραγίσθητε εἰς ἡμέραν ἀπολυτρώσεως* (4:30), and *καθὼς καὶ ὁ θεὸς ἐν Χριστῷ ἔχαρίσατο ὑμῖν* (4:32).

¹³ Wallace, "Ὀργίξεσθε in Ephesians 4:26," 356-58.

¹⁴ Wallace, "Ὀργίξεσθε in Ephesians 4:26," 358.

its significance and argues that Paul is only using the wording of the Psalm rhetorically and that we should look to the context of Ephesians 4:26 to determine the interpretation of the clause.¹⁵

In the subsequent consideration of the syntax of Ephesians 4:26, he argues that we should treat the imperative as simple command, and that it is not grammatically feasible to take it as a conditional imperative. Then he argues that the context suggests that Paul is commanding believers to act properly in righteous anger by a discussion of the usage of the term *παροργισμῶ*. He argues that this word should be interpreted to mean "the cause for anger" instead of simply "anger." So the sense of the clause is "do not leave that which causes you anger beyond the end of the day." Thus he argues that Ephesians 4:26b is a command for believers to deal with the offending matter promptly.¹⁶

The above interpretation, though convincing as a syntactical and contextual analysis, raises the issue of Paul's attitude toward the Old Testament text which he cited. Did Paul regard the Old Testament context as important for how he made use of the text, or did he simply use the wording of the Old Testament text, taking it out of its context. The solution to this problem has been an important issue that confronts evangelical biblical scholars.¹⁷ It is also the contention of this present writer that a fuller consideration of the use of the Old Testament text in this passage contributes to the support of Wallace's interpretation.

¹⁵ Wallace, "Οργίζεσθε in Ephesians 4:26," 359.

¹⁶ Wallace, "Οργίζεσθε in Ephesians 4:26," 365.

¹⁷ Many studies have been done on this topic. See, for example, Beale, *The Right Doctrine from the Wrong Texts?/Essays on the Use of the Old Testament in the New*; Berding and Lunde, eds., *Three Views on the New Testament Use of the Old Testament*; Darrell L. Bock, "Evangelicals and the Use of the Old Testament in the New," *Bibliotheca Sacra* 142, no. 567 (1985); Walter C. Kaiser, *The Uses of the Old Testament in the New* (Chicago: Moody Press, 1985).

III. The Place of the OT Quotation in the Interpretation of Ephesians 4:26a

From the above summary of Wallace's study, we can see easily that his interpretation of this verse only gave token attention to the possible contribution of the quotation from Psalm 4:5 in solving the problem of this difficult clause in Ephesians 4:26a. In the following survey of recent commentaries, we will see that the same attitude towards the value of the quotation of Psalm 4:5 in Ephesians 4:26a is very persistent.

Harold Hoehner states that it is important to understand that Paul is quoting from the Old Testament. He uses the context of Psalm 4 to assist in interpreting both verbs as commands, but gave the interpretation a permissive nuance. He understands, with Craigie,¹⁸ that the command in Psalm 4:5 is addressed to the Psalmist's opponents. He argues that "this may well have become a proverbial statement which Paul uses for the situation in Ephesus."¹⁹ He interprets Paul's commands as saying that it is permissible to be angry when provoked, but one must keep this anger within oneself and not express it in the form of sinful actions.²⁰

Andrew Lincoln notes the quotation but states that "this is irrelevant to the use of the Greek version by the writer to the Ephesians."²¹ He assumes that the original Hebrew text is an injunction about an attitude towards God and its meaning would have no relationship to what Paul is saying in this section. He goes on to argue that the use of Scriptural wording may be indirect since similar themes

¹⁸ Craigie and Tate, *Psalms 1-50*, 81.

¹⁹ Hoehner, *Ephesians*, 620.

²⁰ Hoehner, *Ephesians*, 620-21.

²¹ Andrew T. Lincoln, *Ephesians*, Word Biblical Commentary (Dallas: Word, Incorporated, 2002), 301.

exist in the current Christian paraenesis which may have drawn from both Jewish and Hellenistic traditions.²² He also dismisses altogether the relevance of the Hebrew text of Psalm 4 for the interpretation in Ephesians 4:26 since Paul quoted from the Greek version.

Peter O'Brien states that "the Old Testament context is important for understanding its use in Ephesians."²³ He argues that for the Psalmist, anger is a problem that arose because of some false accusations, and that it is to be replaced by God giving him a heart full of joy and peace (Ps. 4:8-9). In this way, O'Brien seeks to link the sense of the Old Testament text in its context to that of Paul's citation in the Ephesians context. Although O'Brien accepts that it is possible to translate ὀργίζεσθε as a simple command, his interpretation is not much different from the concessional sense.

Marcus Barth states that this quotation from Psalm 4 "sounds like a proverb."²⁴ Following Hermann Gunkel, he interprets the command as a "concessive imperative." However, he does not provide further analysis of the relationship between the Old Testament quotation and this passage.

Bruce also notes that Paul used "words drawn from Psalm 4:4," but he does not discuss the significance of this usage.²⁵ He seems to hold a concessional interpretation when he cites the NEB translation for the Psalm in the footnote.²⁶

²² Lincoln, *Ephesians*.

²³ Peter T. O'Brien, *The Letter to the Ephesians*, The Pillar New Testament Commentary (Grand Rapids: W.B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1999), 339.

²⁴ Markus Barth, *Ephesians, Translation and Commentary on Chapters 1-3 and 4-6* (Garden City: Doubleday, 1974), 513.

²⁵ F. F. Bruce, *The Epistles to the Colossians, to Philemon, and to the Ephesians*. (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1984), 361.

²⁶ "However angry your hearts, do not do wrong." Cf. Bruce, *The Epistles to the Colossians, to Philemon, and to the Ephesians*, 361, n. 139.

Schnackenburg observes that the verse is "clothed in a scriptural form (Ps 4:4) which in its original context desires to prevent sinning against God through ill-humour (sic)."²⁷ This also seems to suggest a concessional interpretation but again the significance of the use of Psalm 4 is not discussed.

In his summary of Wallace's argument, Decker states that the use of Psalm 4:4 is probably not "exegetical/prophetic, typological, or even analogical, ... so the context of Psalm 4:4 is probably not relevant for our understanding of Ephesians 4."²⁸

Ernest Best, in his argument for a conditional interpretation of the clause, dismisses Wallace's suggestion that Paul wanted Christians to be angry when the occasion demands such a response. He states that Paul did not indicate an occasion in which such anger is justified.²⁹

The above survey of studies and commentaries adequately demonstrates that most scholars give only brief consideration to the use of Psalm 4:5 in this verse, and do not take the quotation seriously in forming their respective conclusions to the problem of interpreting this passage. It is the hope of this present writer to demonstrate that the Old Testament quotation does indeed contribute to our understanding of the commands in Ephesians. If Psalm 4:5 was quoted by design, then Paul may have indicated through the quotation an occasion for his command to be angry in the context involved in the Psalm.

²⁷ Rudolf Schnackenburg, *Ephesians: A Commentary* (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1991), 207.

²⁸ Rodney J. Decker, "Anger and Sin" http://ntresources.com/documents/eph4_26.pdf (accessed 08/10/2009).

²⁹ Ernest Best, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Ephesians* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1998), 449.

IV. The Jewish Textual and Exegetical Traditions of Psalm 4:5

A part of the problem of the use of Psalm 4:5 in Ephesians 4:26 is the interpretation of Psalm 4. We will consider the textual context and exegetical traditions to re-evaluate how Psalm 4 was interpreted as a background to Paul's use of it in Ephesians 4.

1. MT

The MT of Psalm 4:5a reads: רַגְזוּ יְאֵל-חַתְטָאוּ

The focus of the interpretation is on the use of the verb רַגַּז. The basic literal usage of the term is "shake, quake, or tremble."³⁰ However, it is not clear how the figurative force is applied. It is probably a metonymy of the effect for the cause, so that what is expressed is the cause of this trembling. The list of such figurative meaning includes "be agitated, be excited, perturbed, disquiet, disturb, provoke to wrath, tremble with rage or fear, rage, and be enraged."³¹

In Habakkuk 3:7, the word quite definitely refers to "fear, terror, or distress." But in Proverbs 29:9 and 30:21, the sense is that of "rage, wrath." Therefore we do not have a clear direction of how this should be taken in the MT tradition.

Whatever sense the verb signifies, it is clear that the MT has a Qal imperative to denote a command to the reader, either "to fear" or "to be angry."³²

³⁰ William Lee Holladay and Ludwig Köhler, *A Concise Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament, Based Upon the Lexical Work of Ludwig Koehler and Walter Baumgartner* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1971), s.v. "רגז".

³¹ Francis Brown, S. R. Driver, and Charles A. Briggs, *The New Brown, Driver, and Briggs Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament* (Lafayette: Associated Publishers and Authors, Inc, 1981), s.v. "רגז".

³² There have been attempts to interpret this imperative with the force of a subjunctive, making the sense conditional or concessive, but this has not been demonstrated convincingly. Cf. 張國定：《天道聖經註釋：詩篇》（香港：天道，1999），頁168。

2. LXX

The Old Greek translation of the verse, as is quoted in Ephesians 4:26, is: ὀργίζεσθε καὶ μὴ ἁμαρτάνετε.

This translation appears to be in line with the possibilities listed above for the interpretation of the Hebrew verb **אָנַף**. Therefore this textual tradition does not require us to posit a different reading for the original Hebrew underlying the translation. Not only does it represent a valid interpretation of the verse, it also gives evidence that there is very early exegetical tradition for understanding the first command in this verse in the sense of "be angry."

3. Targum

The Aramaic Targum of this verse is:³³ זעו מיניה ולא תחטון

This is translated by Edward Cook as "Tremble *for him*, and do not sin."³⁴ However, David Stec, in the Aramaic Bible Project, goes with another textual tradition and offers a translation as "Tremble because of me, and do not sin."³⁵ Both of these renderings basically agree with the MT tradition in the use of the imperative of a cognate verb **אָנַף** that overlaps in meaning to a great degree with that which appeared in the MT. The difference attested in the Targum is the addition of the prepositional phrase translated "for him/because of me" which is far from definite or clear in its meaning.

³³ "Targum Psalms", Hebrew Union College <http://cal1.cn.huc.edu/index.html> (accessed 10/10/2009).

³⁴ Edward M. Cook, "The Psalms Targum: An English Translation" (2001). <http://targum.info/pss/ps1.htm> (accessed 9/10/2009).

³⁵ David M. Stec, *The Targum of Psalms: Translated with a Critical Introduction, Apparatus, and Notes* (New York: T & T Clark, 2004), 32.

The confusion in the textual tradition concerning the additional prepositional phrase and its interpretation indicates that the translators were struggling with the initial imperative and sought to clarify its meaning with an additional explanation.

4. Midrash

This verse is cited in the Midrash Rabba on Ruth within the commentary on the genealogy of David in Ruth 4:18-22, "R. Abba b. Kahana opened [his exposition with the verse], Tremble and sin not (Ps. IV 5). David said to the Holy One, blessed be He, 'How long will they rage against me and say, ...'"³⁶ This usage suggests that they understood the usage of the verb in the sense of "anger, or rage" instead of "fear, or awe." This serves to intensify the question of the validity of taking the verb entirely in the sense of "Tremble in fear" in the modern translations of the Psalm.

V. Summary of Jewish Textual and Exegetical Traditions

This brief survey of the textual and exegetical traditions clearly indicates that there existed very early evidence within the Jewish traditions for taking the usage of the verse in line with what the LXX had preserved. Therefore it is entirely possible that this traditional understanding of the verse may lie behind the use of this verse in Ephesians 4:26a. If this is the case, then Paul is probably not using the LXX verse for its words only, but is also taking into account its contextual meaning.

³⁶ Jacob Neusner, *Ruth Rabbah: An Analytical Translation*, Brown Judaic Studies (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1989), 92-93.

VI. The Contextual Interpretation of Psalm 4:5

Psalm 4 has been called a Psalm of individual lament, and more specifically a Psalm of confidence.³⁷ It was probably used in public worship as an evening prayer since it was placed after a Psalm of Morning Prayer and that the last verse would lead to such a use quite naturally.

The translation and argument of the Psalm is, however, far from simple. Goldingay observed that the opening verses pose a number of textual questions and interpretive ambiguities.³⁸ The crucial question for our purpose is whether verses 4-5 give expression to a call for the faithful to respond properly to what God has promised for them, or to a taunt to the opponents to challenge them to realize that God is working against them.

The Psalm begins with an introductory call to Yahweh to hear his prayer (4:2) and a challenge to the opponents, addressed as "sons of men (שׂוֹנֵי אֲדָמָה)," concerning their ungrounded attack upon him (4:3). Then the Psalm continues with a series of imperatives to command proper response to what Yahweh has done (4:4-6). The Psalm concludes with a section of teaching that we should put our trust in Yahweh who will give us joy and peace (4:7-9).

Most commentators assume that those addressed in Psalm 4:4-6 are the same as the "sons of men" (שׂוֹנֵי אֲדָמָה) addressed in 4:3, making the addressees the opponents of the Psalmist.³⁹ If we take this direction, these imperatives should be warnings to the opponents and a call for

³⁷ Craigie and Tate, *Psalms 1-50*, 79; Hermann Gunkel and Joachim Begrich, *Introduction to Psalms: The Genres of the Religious Lyric of Israel*, Mercer Library of Biblical Studies (Macon: Mercer University Press, 1998), 121.

³⁸ John Goldingay, "Psalm 4: Ambiguity and Resolution," *Tyndale Bulletin* 57, no. 2 (2006): 161.

³⁹ Craigie and Tate, *Psalms 1-50*, 81.

them to repent. However, the existence of a minor break (פְּסוּקָה) at the end of that verse leaves the possibility that the addressees are different in the subsequent verses. So it is entirely possible that the Psalmist is calling the faithful to respond properly against the hardship pressed upon them by their opponents by observing the example of the Psalmist, and then to offer suitable sacrifice to Yahweh in faithful response.

There are three parts in the response that the Psalmist required. First, they should have proper knowledge of how Yahweh treats the Psalmist who identifies himself as the "godly one." He commands them to acknowledge that Yahweh has set him apart and will hear his prayer (4:4). Second, they should react with anger towards the opponents, thus setting themselves apart from those who oppressed the Psalmist. On the other hand, they should not sin by acting rashly, but reflect on what God is doing (4:5). Third, they should come before Yahweh in dependence and offer up the proper sacrifices (4:6).

An important factor in the above interpretation is the evidence from the LXX. The translation of רָדַף with ὀργίζεσθε instead of with a verb for "to tremble" suggests that the target of the command is not the opponents. This direction assumes that the LXX is a good translation of the original Hebrew text, employing one of the figurative senses of the Hebrew verb. It is the opinion of the present writer that this should be the assumption taken unless there is convincing evidence to the contrary. There are simply not enough arguments presented against the LXX translation to make it a superfluous meaning. It is therefore a reasonable solution to follow an interpretation of the Psalm consistent with its translation in the LXX.

In summary, I would suggest that we should take this verse in Psalm 4 as a command to the faithful to respond in (righteous) anger towards the opponents, but remain cautious in their attitude so that they would not fall into sin.

VII. Conclusion – The Possible influence of Psalm 4:5a on Ephesians 4:26a

As demonstrated by Wallace in his examination of the syntax of the New Testament text, the verse should probably be interpreted by treating both imperatives as true commands, where anger is taken as the proper response to unrighteousness, but believers should be watchful that they would not sin in the process.⁴⁰

This paper suggests that an examination of the use of Psalm 4:5 in this verse would add further weight to this interpretation. This involves taking the Old Testament text and context seriously, with a consideration of the way it has been understood in the Jewish tradition, to show that the text quoted by Paul can be an accurate reflection of the sense of the Old Testament text. A brief consideration of the context of the Old Testament text also shows that the sense in the Old Greek translation is not necessarily in conflict with the Hebrew text.

This study also demonstrates that Paul did not use the Old Testament passage simply for its words, but had given proper consideration to the meaning of the passage in its Old Testament context.

The implication of this is important. Although this is only one example of the use of the Old Testament in the New, it gives evidence that the New Testament author is conscious of the context of the Old Testament text which he quotes, and he is faithful to the intention of the Old Testament authors from which he quotes.⁴¹

⁴⁰ Wallace, "Ὀργίζεσθε in Ephesians 4:26," 372.

⁴¹ See the discussions listed for both sides of the argument in the collection of essays in Beale, *The Right Doctrine from the Wrong Texts?/Essays on the Use of the Old Testament in the New*.

ABSTRACT

This article studies the use of the Old Testament in the Ephesians 4:26. After a brief survey in the exegetical options for the difficult phrase expressed in Ephesians 4:26, this article argues from the series of Old Testament quotations and allusions in parenetic section of Ephesians 4:25-30 that the use of Psalm 4:4 is intentional. The study of the textual tradition of Psalm 4 then suggests that the MT and LXX represent two different interpretations of the Psalm in its context, and that the interpretation suggested from the LXX tradition that is quoted by Ephesians would offer support to see the imperative ὀργιζεσθε in Ephesians 4:26 as a true command. Thus the study of the use of the Old Testament in this passage may offer additional argument in support of a purely grammatical-syntactical analysis.

撮 要

這文章研究以弗所書四章26節中對舊約的運用。在文中先簡單地簡介了這節在解釋上的文法問題，然後從以弗所書四章25至30節中對舊約的多次運用，推論這是作者有意的運用。文中跟着比較所引用的詩篇第四篇的經文傳統，指出MT與LXX可能是代表着兩種對這詩篇的不同解釋，而被以弗所書所引用的LXX版本，可能保存了一個可以進一步支持將以弗所書四章26節中的命令語氣動詞ὀργιζεσθε，解釋為真正的命令。