
The Servant of the Lord: A Study in its New Testament Significance

Tom Holland

The prophecy of Isaiah is the most important part of the OT in understanding of the New. This statement is obviously open to challenge but a brief reflection on the major themes of Isaiah and how they are developed or possibly better, applied in the NT, would point to the truth of this statement. Such subjects as the attributes of God, God's work in creation, the work of salvation touching on such important issues as covenant, election, prophetic call, the remnant, and other vital biblical doctrines, all have their origin in the prophecy of Isaiah.

The extent of this article cannot possibly present the evidence for the extent of Isaiah's influence. However, by way of showing an example of his influence a brief look at eschatology in the NT will illustrate his underlying and often unnoticed contribution. Boremann¹ has traced 19 OT influences in the five verses of 2 Thessalonians 1:6-10, eight of them from Isaiah.

The oversight of Isaiah's contribution to NT eschatology may be in part due to too much attention being given to the Son of Man prophecy given by Daniel, which whilst very important is only a small part of the overall OT contribution.

The theme I wish to focus on is that of **the Servant of the Lord**. Justification

Attention Please!

We welcome regular and new readers and trust you will all find the contents of this nineteenth issue both stimulating and informative.

This issue of *Foundations* is the first in the new subscription series. The cover is different and the price has regrettably been slightly increased.

It is being sent to all those who have been subscribing up to and including issue 18. We are confident that you will want to continue receiving subsequent issues. Many of you have already taken advantage of the **SPECIAL OFFER** of £9 for the next **SEVEN** issues, 19—25.

If we have not yet received your renewal a blue slip is enclosed for you to complete and return to the BEC office.

You will be supporting improvements in future issues by recommending *Foundations* to new readers and encouraging them to take up this **SPECIAL OFFER**.

for choice of this topic can be had from N W Porteous² who said, 'Isaiah is the theologian par excellence of the Old Testament, but his importance for theology lies, not so much in any abstract formulations he may have reached about the oneness and creative power of God, as in the way in which he seems to have given living embodiment to his understanding of Isaiah's call to be God's servant in the world'.

Concept in the OT

An examination of the Hebrew text of the OT will show that *EBED*, servant, was a title that was applied to a whole range of people. There were no alternative titles available for the OT writers, so the variations in meaning had to be got from the context the individual word was used in. So *EBED* was used for kings, Is 37:24; prophets, Is 20:3; the nation of Israel, Is 41:8,9; the Messiah, Is 42:1; and even ordinary Israelites, Is 65:13-15. What can be said of *EBED* is that it spoke of someone who was in submission in some way to another, whether the master be God or man.

Where the problem arose was when the OT was translated into Greek. A study of the Hebrew text alongside the Septuagint LXX will show that there was no uniformity in the minds of the translators as to the selection of an appropriate Greek word for a particular type of *EBED*. The two terms available were *doulos* and *pais*. The evidence shows that *pais* was not only used of the ideal servant, but also of Israel, and in such a way as to remind her of her unworthiness, for her 'unadopted' name Jacob is used in parallel to this term (cf Is 42:19; 44:1-2; 44:21; 45:4). *Pais* is also used of individual prophets (cf Is 20:3; 32:20; 44:26; 50:10). The problem is made even more complicated when we see that this same term is applied to domestic servants or used generally as a title of anyone who is in an inferior position to another (Is 24:2; 36:11; 37:5). What adds confusion to confusion is that this very term used in these various ways is augmented by the use of *doulos* in each respect. So we find *doulos* applied to the ideal servant (Is 53:11); to the nation in Is 42:19; 48:20; 49:3; 49:7; and to domestic servants in Is 14:2. In the Hebrew text the context clearly was the key to the proper understanding of the particular use of the term. The translators of the LXX evidently failed to distinguish accurately between the various usages, and hence to designate a corresponding Greek word to cover a particular category of servant being considered.

This apparent indiscriminate use of *pais* and *doulos* is not limited to the LXX. We also find the same range of usages for both terms in the New Testament. We find *pais* used for a domestic servant, Mt 8:6,13; for Israel, Lk 1:54; for David, Lk 1:69. We also find *doulos* being used with an equally wide range of meanings. It was used for a slave, Mt 8:9; for a domestic help, Jn 18:10; for a prophet, Rev 10:7; for Christians, Rom 6:17 and for Christ himself, Phil 2:7. It is evident that the indiscriminate use of *pais* and *doulos* by the translators of the LXX influenced the thinking of the NT writers, and it would, therefore, be imprudent to attach significance to the use of either term without deliberate reference to the context.

This confusion has obscured the significance of the repeated use Paul made of

the term *doulos*. It has normally been seen as a reference to a bond slave, someone without legal standing or personal claims; someone owned by another for that is what the *doulos* was in Greek/Roman Society. This connection assumes two fundamental points. First, that the Roman idea of *doulos* was the same as Paul's concept, and secondly, that the Roman concept was the same as the OT concept. This latter connection must be assumed to exist for Paul assumed that his understanding of *doulos* was the same as that of the *EBED/doulos* in the OT. Now it is a point in dispute as to whether Israel ever knew of slavery amongst her own people in the classical Greek or Roman sense.

De Vaux summarises the general picture:

'Certain writers, and especially Jewish scholars, have denied that real slavery ever existed in Israel; at least they maintain Israelites were never reduced to slavery. There is a semblance of justification for this view if we compare Israel with classical antiquity. In Israel and the neighbouring countries there never existed those enormous gangs of slaves which in Greece and Rome continually threatened the balance of social order. Nor was the position of the slave ever so low in Israel and the ancient East as in republican Rome, where Varro could define a slave as 'a sort of talking tool', 'instrumenti gener vocale'. The flexibility of the vocabulary may also be deceptive. Strictly speaking *EBED* means slave, a man who is not his own master and is in the power of another. The king, however, had absolute power, and consequently the word *EBED* also means the king's subjects, especially his mercenaries, officers and ministers; by joining his service they had broken off their other social bonds. By a fresh extension of meaning, the word became a term of courtesy. We may compare it with the development of its equivalents 'servant' in English or 'serviteur' in French, both derive from *servus*, a slave. Moreover, because a man's relations with God are often conceived on the model of his relations with his earthly sovereign, *EBED* became a title for pious men, and was applied to Abraham, Moses, Josue or David, and finally to the mysterious Servant of Yahweh.

By 'slave' in the strict sense we mean a man who is deprived of his freedom, at least for a time, who is bought and sold, who is the property of a master, who makes use of him as he likes; in this sense there were slaves in Israel and some were Israelites.³

De Vaux then proceeds to make comparison between the semitic form of slavery and the Greek/Roman form, to show how the former was much more controlled and humane.

De Vaux however fails to distinguish the essential difference between the Hebrew slave who is sold into the possession of another, and the slave of Yahweh. It is not merely one of the status of the owner. The essential difference is one of covenant. The king was the *EBED* of Yahweh because he had been elected, called and anointed to that office, and not because of anything less (1 Sam 10:1; 11:4; 16:1; 2 Sam 7:8,9). The ministers of the king

in turn represented Yahweh and fulfilled the purpose of the covenant, to establish righteousness. To fail to see this is to miss the whole point of the *EBED* of Yahweh. In social terms it would be equivalent of seeing little difference between the role of a housekeeper and the role of a housewife in Western society today. It would also be foolish to think that the role of the housekeeper could evolve into the role of the housewife. Language may evolve, but a covenant relationship does not; it requires a decisive act of commitment and acceptance.

Concept in the NT

It is inevitable that ambiguity in Old Testament theology will lead to ambiguity in New Testament theology, and indeed this is the very thing we find. For example, C K Barrett notes an aspect of the problem produced, when, on commenting on Romans 1:1 he says 'Paul describes himself in the first instance as a slave of Jesus Christ. This is a common term with him (cf especially Gal 1:10; Phil 1:1), imitated by other New Testament writers (James 1:1; 2 Pet 1:1; Jude 1). It is particularly appropriate to an apostle, but can be used of any Christian before he goes on to mention his special status and vocation. The description is more striking in a Greek work, such as this epistle, than in semitic literature. A Greek did not think of himself as a slave (*doulos*) of his ruler or king, nor did he think of himself as the slave of his divine king, or god, or speak of his service to the god as slavery. The Semitic king, however, was a slave (e.g. 2 Sam 9:19). Other distinguished members of the theocracy are described in the same terms (e.g. Ps 26:42; Amos 3:7). Thus Paul, as the slave of Jesus Christ, appears as a member of a people of God analogous with the People of God in the Old Testament.'⁴

Barrett is suggesting that the Old Testament concept of the servant of Yahweh was the same as slavery, only elevated from a human situation. But this is not so, as we have seen. Barrett does move in the right direction when he goes on to say Paul 'appears as a member of a people of God analogous with the people of God in the Old Testament', but as we have seen, misunderstands the Old Testament theology of the Servant of God.

If we allow the trend of de Vaux's and Barrett's arguments to continue, and seek to work out a slave concept in the New Testament, there are some important questions that must be raised. Are we to conclude that Paul not only claims that he has no rights of his own because he is in bondage to Christ, but also that he is serving Christ against his own will? If Paul is saying he has no rights, how can he look forward to a reward or payment for his labour; a 'crown of life'? (2 Tim 4:8). A slave concept totally precludes such a possibility. Furthermore, when Paul's use of the term in Romans 6 is examined carefully we come up against these same problems in specific statements. 'Do you know', he says, 'that when you offer yourselves to someone to obey him as slaves, you are slaves to the one you obey — whether you are slaves to sin, which leads to death, or obedience, which leads to righteousness' (Rom 6:16). This slavery begins in an act of 'offering to someone' and the slave is clearly choosing which master he will serve, something which would never arise in slavery. It may be argued that this is a reference to the Old Testament practice

of the slave choosing to stay with his master when the year of jubilee arrives, and that it alludes to the free decision that the slave takes to have his ear bored and be the lifetime possession of his master (Deut 15:16-17). This argument, however, fails to resolve the problem. First it is moving between Hellenistic or classical concepts into Semitic concepts without any indication as to which practice is being followed in which part of the illustration. Also, the basic meaning of *doulos*⁵ is that of one born into slavery. Under the controlled form of 'slavery' which the Old Testament permitted for those needing to sell themselves into service for a period of time to recover from debt, children were not born into permanent slavery. In such a case the 'slave' was released, along with all that was his, in the year of jubilee (Lev 25:39-43). Finally, at the conclusion of the chapter Paul states 'The wages of sin is death, but the gift of God is eternal life through Christ Jesus our Lord' (Rom 6:23). It is inconceivable that Paul could speak of a wage being paid in a slave relationship.

NT Terms

Before we attempt to unravel the information we have available, it will help if we clarify some of the usages of terms found in the New Testament regarding Christian service, setting them against their corresponding Greek terms and assessing their relevance for our present enquiry.

The first term to take note of is the verbal form of *doulos*, *douleuo*. The thing which becomes apparent from an examination of the use of this verb throughout the New Testament is that it is never used of unwilling service. It always describes service, regardless of the motive which may be either moral or immoral, as willingly rendered. The older son in the parable of the prodigal son says 'all these years I've been slaving (*douleuo*) for you and never disobeyed your orders' (Luke 15:29). The translators of the NIV may feel justified in rendering *douleuo* as slaving in order to emphasise the bitter feeling of the son at what his unworthy brother is receiving, but he is arguing that it was rightfully his property because the younger son had already taken his portion. In addition he had worked for his father, and what was now being 'misused' he had earned by his devoted work. Paul testifies to the Ephesian Elders 'I served (*douleuo*) the Lord with great humility and with tears' (Acts 20:10). He exhorts the Romans 'Never be lacking in zeal, but keep your spiritual fervour, serving (*douleuo*) the Lord' (Rom 12:11). See also Luke 16:13; Rom 6:6; 6:25; 9:12; 12:11; 14:18; 16:18; Gal 4:8; 5:13; Eph 6:7; Phil 2:22; Col 3:24; 1 Thess 1:9; 1 Tim 6:2; Tit 3:3. The very use of the verbal form of *doulos* therefore suggests a situation quite different from a bond slave concept. There are other terms which Paul employs in regard to serving, but these relate to tasks to which one is appointed within the Christian community; i e *latreuo*, a task done solely for God, *diakonia*, spiritual ministry and *diakonis*, the position the servant has in relation to those to whom he ministers.

The last term is '*diakoneo*'. It is the verbal form used for the outworking of the position that the '*diakonos*' holds. So, Matt 20:28, 'The Son of Man did not come to be served, but to serve, and to give his life a ransom for many'.

(See also Matt 4:11; 8:15; 27:55; Mark 1:13,31; 10:45; 15:41; Luke 4:39; Acts 19:22; 2 Cor 3:3; 2 Tim 1:18; Philemon 5; Heb 6:10; 1 Pet 1:12; 4:10,11).

Now all these references, to the deacon or minister, pinpoint his position and the work he does. However, they fail to make specific reference to the relationship that existed between him and the Lord he served. These terms have nothing to say on this. In the LXX '*doulos*' can have a whole range of meanings, from a slave made so by being taken as a prisoner of war, to one who serves Yahweh in the context of the covenant purpose. We have also seen that in the New Testament the verbal form of *doulos* suggests willing service, and that there are also statements made by Paul which seem to conflict with a slave situation.

Paul the Servant

How then did Paul understand the context of the title *doulos*? Did he see it in some 'adjusted' classical sense, as Barrett suggests, or was there some other perspective from which he viewed it? Paul's claim to be a Hebrew of the Hebrews not only points to competence in the Hebrew language, but also a zeal for the Hebrew culture.⁶ What did he intend to convey to those who could not share directly in his training but had to be taught through the medium of a common language?

For Paul's biographer, so deeply influenced by Paul himself, Paul was not in the classical mould (which would have been most natural for Luke as a Greek) but the Hebrew theological one. Luke saw Paul's calling to be the Shadow of his Master, who so clearly fulfilled Old Testament expectation of the ideal servant. Throughout Paul's biography he is constantly robed with the mantle of Christ. Paul is separated to do the Messianic covenant work spoken of by Isaiah, to be a light to the nations (Acts 9:15; 13:47). He is rejected, especially by his own countrymen as was Christ (Acts 9:29; 13:50; 14:19; 17:13; 22:17-21). As G Bornkamm points out, there is a parallel in the offence of their work. Christ was rejected because he sought to win sinners, Paul because he sought to win Gentiles — who to the Jews were sinners.⁷ The preaching of Christ and of Paul produce the same effects on those who do not believe, blindness and hardening, and both outcomes are based on the predicted results of Isaiah's ministry in Isaiah 6:9-10 (Luke 8:10; cf Acts 28:26). Paul's vision in the Temple is acknowledged by some⁸ to be based on Isaiah's own vision (Acts 22:17,18). Paul's journey to Jerusalem is certainly paralleled with that which Luke had already recorded (Luke 9:51; 13:22; 18:31), of One who set his face like a flint to go up and be betrayed. Both are subjected to similar exhortations to consider the unreasonableness of their missions (Luke 13:31; Acts 21:10-14). And finally, like Christ, Paul is misrepresented by the leaders, hounded by the mob and tried by the governor of Jerusalem (Luke 23:1; Acts 25:1,2). Here the parallel finishes, for Christ's death at Jerusalem was inevitable, Paul's was not.

This picture of Paul as the servant, in the Hebraic theological sense, is no coincidence. It is upheld by Paul's own description of his ministry. He considered his call, described in Galatians 1:15 as being set apart from birth, a

call which parallels the Old Testament prophets.⁹ In 2 Cor 3-7 Paul compares the Old and New Covenants and their ministries. In 3:6 Paul says 'He (God) has enabled us to be ministers of the New Covenant'. In 4:1 he says 'Since through God's mercy we have this ministry, we do not lose heart'. Paul then proceeds to develop his comparison between the two covenants with reference to the motive of his ministry. He says 'Christ's love compels us, because we are convinced that one died for all, and therefore all died. And he died for all, that those who live should no longer live to themselves but for him who died for them and was raised again' (5:14,15). This reference to the death of 'one for all' links with Romans 5:12-19 a passage accepted by some scholars¹⁰ as referring to Isaiah 53. That this Corinthian passage also reflects that same prophetic passage is borne out in that Paul proceeds to speak of the new creation (2 Cor 5:17) which is produced by this representative death (2 Cor 5:21). This is the very theme of Isaiah, for he also goes on to speak of all things being made new (Is 65:17) in the context of the New Covenant which the Servant's death establishes. Thus Paul sees his ministry to proclaim the fulfilment of all that Isaiah had predicted. He is elevated above the evangelical prophet in that he proclaims the fulfilment and not the anticipation.

Perhaps the most significant passage of the epistle is Chapter 6. Paul starts the section which describes the sufferings into which his work brings him by quoting from the Servant Songs, and concludes it with a further quote from the Songs (Is 49:8 and 52:11). 'As God's fellow workers we urge you not to receive God's grace in vain — for he says, "At the time of my favour I heard you and on the day of salvation I helped you." I tell you, now is the time of God's favour, now is the day of salvation' (vv 1-2).

'As God has said: "I will live with them and walk among them, and I will be their God, and they will be my people." "Therefore come out from them and be separate, says the Lord. Touch no unclean thing, and I will receive you. I will be a Father to you, and you will be my sons and daughters, says the Lord Almighty" ' (vv 16-18).

It is evident Paul saw his own ministry as a servant of the New Covenant, as did Moses, Isaiah and Israel herself, the servants of the Old. As the prophets addressed Israel and appealed for fidelity, so Paul appeals to the church at Corinth. The credentials of Paul's ministry, as outlined before his appeal to separation, is that he is fulfilling all that the suffering servant(s) suffered in their ministry to Israel.

Christian Suffering

The question is, does Paul see himself in line as a suffering servant because he is an apostle, or because he is a Christian? The importance of this question lies in that, if it is because he is an apostle, then it follows that this experience of suffering is part of the apostolic office and does not apply to Christians in general. If it is because he is a Christian, then all Christians are called to this same realm of suffering, and when *doulos* is applied to Christians, as in Romans 6, it is not to be equated with slavery, but with the covenant figure of the servant of the Old Testament.

There can be no question that Paul ever saw his sufferings as unique. They were part of the sufferings to which **the corporate servant**, i.e. the Church, was called. 'For you, brothers, became imitators of God's churches in Judea, which are in Christ Jesus. You suffered from your own countrymen the same things those churches suffered from the Jews, who killed the Lord Jesus and the prophets and also drove us out ...' (1 Thess 2:14,15). This suffering was not a thing to be merely endured, for it actually formed part of the will of God (2 Thess 1:4-5).

This suffering is in no way vicarious, as was Christ's passion, but it is essentially the same as the sufferings Christ experienced during his ministry of proclamation. Because of this, Paul frequently links his own suffering, and that of other believers, with Christ. To be God's servants means being rejected by those who purpose to walk in darkness.

'Now I rejoice in what was suffered for you, and I fill up in my flesh what is still lacking in regard to Christ's afflictions, for the sake of his body, which is the church. I have become its servant by the commission God gave me to present to you the word of God in its fulness — the mystery that has been kept hidden for ages and generations, but is now disclosed to the saints. To them God has chosen to make known among the Gentiles the glorious riches of the mystery, which is Christ in you, the hope of glory' (Col 1:24-27).

Such suffering is not in isolation, for the believer is part of Christ's body, and he is the head. 'I am Jesus whom you are persecuting' (Acts 9:5). 'Its parts should have equal concern for each other. If one part suffers, every part suffers with it; if one part is honoured, every part rejoices with it' (1 Cor 12:25-26).

For Paul, suffering is not merely a sign of being a part of the kingdom of God. It is a means of spiritual maturing and preparation for the glory and splendour of Christ's appearing. This parallels the theme of Isaiah who saw Israel's suffering being necessary for the bringing in of the Messianic Kingdom (Is 40:1-10; 53:54).

'Not only so, but we also rejoice in our sufferings, because we know that suffering produces perseverance, perseverance character, and character hope. And hope does not disappoint us, because God has poured out his love into our hearts by the Holy Ghost, whom He has given us' (Rom 5:3-5).

'Now if we are children, then we are heirs — heirs of God and co-heirs with Christ if indeed we share in his sufferings in order that we may also share in his glory. I consider that our present sufferings are not worth comparing with the glory that will be revealed in us' (Rom 8:17-18).

Kingdom Purpose

There is deep significance in this passage which speaks of the suffering of believers. As we have seen, the theme of suffering for the believer goes back to Romans 5:3-5. Not that that is considered to be the first reference to suffering in Romans. In chapter 4:25 Paul has stated of Christ 'He was delivered over to death for our sins and was raised to life for our justification'. Some see both

4:25 and 5:15-17 reflecting Isaiah 53.¹¹ Now if this is so, and Paul links all believers (as he does in 5:12ff) with the suffering of their representative, they will not only be his servants (6:14) but also share his rejection and suffering. This is the theme of 5:3-5 and also of Romans 8. In chapter 8 Paul emphasises the relationship and its blessings. They are in Christ Jesus, they have no condemnation, but they do share in his sufferings as the suffering servant.

We may note firstly how Paul links his own suffering with those of other believers e.g. 'I consider that our present sufferings (8:18); the Spirit helps us in our weakness (8:26); if God is for us, who can be against us (8:31); we are more than conquerors (8:37)'. This is an attitude quite different from that which Paul adopts towards the Corinthians and Galatians, who had moved from the truth of the Gospel because of its intellectual or religious offence. There he sets his sufferings against their considered superior position (2 Cor 10-11; Gal 2:17-3:5). He relates to the Thessalonians and the Philippians as he does to the Romans, because they are partakers of the sufferings of the Gospel (Rom 8:22-38; 1 Thess 2:14f; Phil 1:2,9f).

Secondly, Paul in this section (8:36) quotes from Ps 44:8. Examination of this Psalm shows it to summarise the message of Is 40-66¹² the message to those suffering in exile. The same historical background is alluded to, and even the same language is used, not for an individual, as in Is 53, but for the nation. Paul seems to be deliberately linking the experience of the Church waiting the consummation of its salvation with the faithful Jews awaiting their deliverance from exile to return to the place of promise.

That it is no coincidence that Paul selects Psalm 44 is shown in that in Romans 10 he goes on to describe the work of the Church in proclaiming its message, and he quotes from Is 52:7. This passage gives a similar picture to that painted by Psalm 44, but it tells of the work of the faithful remnant who have waited for God's redemptive act. They are God's servants chosen to proclaim the message of deliverance and renewal.

'How, then, can they call on the one they have not believed in? And how can they believe in the one of whom they have not heard? And how can they hear without someone preaching to them? And how can they preach unless they are sent? As it is written "How beautiful are the feet of those who bring good news!" ' (Rom 10:14-15).

G Bornkamm sets the original passage in Isaiah in its context when he says, 'In its original context the quotation describes the situation of the few who at the time of the exile stayed on in Jerusalem after it was laid waste and eagerly awaited the return of the exiles from Babylon. Watchmen were posted on the heights surrounding the city and looked forward to seeing the forerunners of the return. At long last the first messenger appeared afar off on the mountains. Thereupon the watcher broke into shouts of rejoicing. These passed from mouth to mouth. The forsaken city resounded with jubilation. Their tidings of joy were the dawn of Jerusalem's salvation. This, as Paul sees it, is the condition of the whole world; the message about Christ which sets men free is to sound to the ends of the earth (Rom 10:18 with its citation of Ps 19:6).'¹³

Thus Paul is not only quoting from the prophecy, but actually drawing his theology from the prophecy.¹⁴ As Jerusalem was under judgment for its sin, so is the world. As Yahweh reserved to himself a remnant so he has also now. As the task of the remnant, isolated by Isaiah from the nation in its faithlessness, and given the title servant, was to announce the restoration, so it is the Church's task to prepare men for that Day. God has put all men, Jew and Gentile alike, under judgment. The true remnant is made up of all who have saving faith, which is what distinguishes the true Jew from the mere physical descendant of Abraham (Rom 4). This argument becomes even clearer when one perceives Paul's use of Isaiah throughout his letter as its theme progresses.

Space does not permit our quoting all the parallels in full but they will well repay closer study. (Rom 2:24, Is 52:5; Rom 3:15-17, Is 59:7-8; Rom 9:27-9, Is 10:22-3, 1:9; Rom 9:33, Is 8:14, 28:16; Rom 10:11, Is 28:16; Rom 10:15, Is 52:7; Rom 10:16, Is 53:1; Rom 10:20, Is 65:1; Rom 11:7-8, Is 29:10; Rom 11:26-7, Is 59:20-1, 27:9; Rom 11:33-4, Is 40:13; Rom 14:11, Is 45:23; Rom 15:21, Is 52:15.) Taken together they not only show Paul's dependence upon the prophecy for his gospel, they summarise the whole doctrine of soteriology, a history of salvation from God's electing and calling to his purpose being gloriously achieved.

But what is of immediate interest is that it also helps to establish, as a corollary, that the threefold use of the 'servant' in the Old Testament, found with particular clarity in Isaiah, is in Paul's mind when he uses *doulos*. Paul sees Christ, the Apostles, and the Church to be cast in the same mould as Isaiah saw the Messiah, the Prophets and Israel.¹⁵

Conclusion

Thus we conclude that our study has detected a fundamental error in the understanding of scholarship regarding the use and meaning of *doulos* in New Testament studies. The traditional Hellenistic setting which the *doulos* is set in has been shown to be inadequate to explain the theological implications which surround its use. The Semitic setting however, proves itself authentic for many of the concepts in which Paul has been found to be apparently lacking clarity.

The Rev Tom Holland BD is pastor of Grange Baptist Church, Letchworth

References

1. Reproduced in H H Kennedy's ST PAUL'S CONCEPT OF THE LAST THINGS, p.48
2. N W Porteous, The Theology of the OT, article in PEAKE'S COMMENTARY ON THE BIBLE, p.157. Our claim for the influence of Isaiah on the NT is supported by E J Young who noted that Isaiah is quoted more times in the NT than all the other OT prophets put together. AN INTRODUCTION TO THE OT, p.205.
3. Roland de Vaux, ANCIENT ISRAEL, Vol.1, p.80.
4. C K Barrett, ROMANS.
5. Abbott-Smith gives to *doulos* nothing more than the classic meaning of the word (p.122) as does Little (p.179). Cremer gives a much more theological appraisal of the use of the word. (H Cremer, BIBLICO-THEOLOGICAL LEXICON OF NEW TESTAMENT GREEK, pp.215-217).

6. 'Apart from Christianity itself, it is most probable that Palestinian Judaism was the only determinative influence in Paul's life'. (Ellis, PAUL'S USE OF THE OLD TESTAMENT, p.38).
7. G Bornkamm, PAUL — see fly leaf review by F F Bruce.
8. For an argument that the record of Paul's vision in Acts 22:17ff was composed on the pattern of Isaiah's temple vision (Isaiah 6:1ff) see O Betz, 'Die Vision des Paulus in Tempel von Jerusalem', in VERBORUM VERITAS, Festschrift für G Stählin, ed. O Böches and K Haocker (Wuppertal, 1970), pp.113ff.
9. Margaret Thrall saw the similarities between Paul's call and that of the Old Testament prophets, and claims it was the realisation that Christ's call had to be seen in the light of Yahweh's call to the prophets that became the cornerstone for Paul's Christology. See M E Thrall, THE ORIGIN OF PAULINE CHRISTOLOGY (in Apostolic History and the Gospel, pp.305-313).
10. 'In the statement that the Grace of God abounded to "the many" (RV) the expression "the many" is probably a deliberate echo of Isaiah 53:11, where the Servant of the Lord justifies "The many" (MT, LXX)'. F F Bruce, ROMANS, p.132.
11. 'Who was delivered for our offences.' This may be a quotation from some primitive confession of faith; the language appears to be based on Isaiah 53. The verb 'deliver' in this sense (*paradidomi*) occurs twice in the LXX version of that chapter: in Isaiah 53:6 'the Lord has delivered him (the Suffering Servant) up for our sins' and in Isaiah 53:12 'because of their sins he (the Servant) was delivered up'. (F F Bruce, ROMANS, p.118.)
12. There is considerable difference of opinion as to the historic setting of the psalm. The early church fathers of the Antioch school saw it as originating in the Maccabean period, a date also accepted by Calvin. Morgan sees the setting as exilic whilst Leupold dates it pre-exilic, written by David after his experience recorded in 2 Samuel 8:13-14, when he was severely beset by the Syrians to the north and the allied Edomites and Ammorites to the south. Leupold rejects the later dating saying that there never was a time when the faith of the nation was as high as in the reign of David, and it is a high concept that is contained in this psalm. (THE PSALMS, pp.344,5.) It is probably safest to agree with Weiser who says, 'our lack of knowledge regarding the details of its historical background does not allow us to fit the exact date of the psalm (PSALMS, p.355).
The uncertainty of the date of the psalm does not affect our thesis, for Dodd has shown the method of exegesis followed by the early church was not by a strict historical parallel but by expansion, development and application of the original principle. (ACCORDING TO THE SCRIPTURES, p.133.) In this case, the psalm speaks of God's faithfulness to his people in the midst of judgment, which is a timeless principle spanning both covenants.
13. G Bornkamm, PAUL, p.165.
14. The dependence of the New Testament writers upon the Old Testament for their interpretation of history is summed up by C H Dodd. 'It must be conceded that we have before us a considerable intellectual feat. The various scriptures are actually interpreted along lines already discernible within the Old Testament Canon itself or pre-Christian Judaism — in many cases, I believe, lines which start from their first historical intention — and these are carried forward to fresh results.
'They interpret and apply the Old Testament upon the basis of a certain understanding of history, which is substantially that of the prophets themselves. Though not stated explicitly in the New Testament, it is everywhere presupposed. History, upon this view, or at any rate the history of the people of God, is built upon a certain pattern corresponding to God's design for man His creature. It is a pattern, not in the sense of a kind of master-plan imposed upon order of human life in this world by the Creator Himself, a plan which man is not at liberty to alter, but within which his freedom works. It is a pattern, disclosed "in divers parts and divers manners" in the past history of Israel, that the New Testament writers conceive to have been brought into full light in the events of the gospel story, which they interpret accordingly.' (ACCORDING TO THE SCRIPTURES, pp.109 and 128.)
15. T H Robinson, PROPHECY IN ANCIENT ISRAEL, p.78.