

THE SEMITISMS IN THE SHEPHERD DISCOURSE AND THEIR TRANSLATION

I. Introduction

In this paper I want to focus on a specific problem in Bible translation, namely the question of how to translate Semitisms in the New Testament. We will investigate this issue through the example of the Shepherd Discourse in John 10:1–18. In two previous contributions to the STT journal¹ I have given a short introduction to the topic of New Testament Semitisms. However, I think it is still valid to ask the most fundamental question once again, namely, what actually is a Semitism? Martin Luther would answer this question as follows: “the Hebrew way of speaking in the New Testament”.² Hence our topic is that of Hebrew and Aramaic diction, which seems unusual in the Greek language. Yet, the New Testament is first attested in Greek according to the oldest manuscript evidence.

A similar phenomenon of unusual diction in a foreign language can be observed here in Swabia on an English sign of a local sports store which reads „enjoy the nature“. This obviously is a literal translation of the corresponding German phrase „Genieße die Natur“. However, in correct English the article needs to be left out and the sign should therefore read „enjoy nature“. Nevertheless, a true Swabian is not interested in such detailed rules for the use of the article in English. Rather, he employs the English language as it seems fitting for his German feel of the language. In like manner we also have to approach the time of the New Testament in which ancient Palestine was infiltrated by the

Greek language and culture especially in the city centers along the Mediterranean coast.³ Yet the Jews of that time did not simply give up their traditional Hebrew and Aramaic diction, but rather used the Greek language according to their Semitic habit. Thus, the investigation of Semitisms also leads us to the related question of formative tradition behind the Greek text of the New Testament and to the issue of the relationship between the Old and New Testament which has been investigated by Prof. Haacker under the heading of “Biblical Theology”.⁴ Therefore the investigation of Semitisms in the New Testament is not an unnecessary theological burden, but rather a fundamental building block of an awakening theology which is directed against liberalism.

The Semitisms in the New Testament lay open our occidental limitations and fall-*en*ness similarly to what August Tholuck (1799–1877) emphasized after the enlightenment.⁵ However, here is not the place to debate such fundamental questions as the correct approach to a healthy theology, but rather we want to apply the question of Semitisms to the field of Bible translation and assess how established Semitic and German Bible translations deal with the most obvious Semitisms in the Greek text. Are the Semitisms perceived at all by the translators? Do the translators reproduce the Semitisms for the reader in a reasonable manner? Are Semitisms re-formulated or even skipped over? From this perspective of Semitisms we

want to dare to evaluate how modern German translations in particular adhere to the biblical principle „*you shall not add to it or take from it*“ (Dtn 12:32; Rev 22:18f). This principle Martin Luther summarized in his well-known hymn *Ein feste Burg (A Mighty Fortress)* with the words „*Das Wort sie sollen lassen stahn*“ (“*the word they shall allow to stand*”). With all this in mind we now want to turn to the Shepherd Discourse in John 10:1–18 and to the translation of its’ Semitisms.

II. The Semitisms in the Shepherd Discourse and their Translation

The first obvious Semitism in the Shepherd Discourse is the Hebrew transliteration אָמֵן אָמֵן (“*Amen, Amen*”) in verses 1 and 7. Besides saying *Amen* at the end of a prayer we are also familiar with the repeated *Amen* as a reply of the congregation upon the blessing of the minister at the end of a traditional church service. This usage in a church setting comes very close to the usage among the Jews in the Second Temple Period. This can be observed, for example, in Neh 8:6 where Ezra praises the LORD and the congregation in return answers: “*Amen! Amen!*”. Yet, the twofold *Amen* as it is employed in the Gospel of John in the Shepherd Discourse is used in a different manner as an affirmative preamble in the words of Jesus. This usage, however, has no parallel in the entire literature of ancient Judaism.⁶ Hence we have here a newly formed usage of *Amen* in the words of Jesus. Now if we turn to the translation of this affirmative formula in Semitic Bible translations we are able to observe that in the Syriac Peshitta-Bible from the 5th century AD (Sy^P) and in its’ more ancient source from the 2nd–4th centuries (Sy^{Sin}), which renders the Greek original text more freely⁷, the twofold *Amen* is preserved literally. The same is true for the Hebrew translations by Delitzsch (Hb^{Dlz}) and Salkinson-Ginsburg (Hb^{Sik-G}), a fruit of the 19th century great awakening in Europe. Hence understanding this usage of *Amen* seems to be no problem in the context

of Semitic languages due to the wide dispersion of the root אָמֵן. Only in currently used Arabic translations, such as the Smith&VanDyck (the Arabic KJV, which also was an outcome of the 19th century great awakening)⁸ or the Al-Hayat-translation (the Arabic NIV)⁹ *Amen* is translated with *al-ḥaqqā, al-ḥaqqā* الحَقُّ الحَقُّ (“*verily, verily*”) in the same manner as our Bibles stemming from the time of reformation. However, with this translation comes a slight semantic shift towards “*true, correct*”¹⁰ in contrast to the equally possible Arabic root *amina* اَمِنَ (“*to be faithful, reliable, at peace*”)¹¹. In German translations, however, preservation of the twofold *Amen* is rather the exception (ZÜR, EIN). Through his both understandable and formally equivalent translation „*wahrlich, wahrlich*”¹² (“*verily, verily*”) (LUT, ELB, MNG), Martin Luther provided the most influential translation in German. On the other hand the GNB „*Amen, ich versichere euch*” (“*Amen, I ensure you*”) takes a middle path between preservation of this Semitism and free rendering into German, while the most current NGÜ completely skips over the twofold *Amen* and thus withholds it from the reader.

The second obvious Semitism is the participle ὁ (δὲ) εἰσερχόμενος (“*the one who enters*”) used with an article at the beginning of verse 2. In like manner the participle is often employed in Hebrew.¹³ In Classical Greek this initial position of the participle used with an article in nominative case is rather unusual.¹⁴ Furthermore, a look into the Semitic translations clarifies that this usage is a distinct expression in Hebrew as both the Aramaic and Arabic translations insert the relative pronoun “*who*” (الَّذِي). The Hebrew translation of Salkinson-Ginsburg renders this typical Hebrew phrase most precisely with article + participle (הַבּוֹא), whereas Delitzsch, like Aramaic and Arabic, resolves the participle into a relative clause (אֲשֶׁר יָבוֹא). In German translations resolving the participle into a relative clause is also mandatory. But while

Luther at least preserves the definite article „*der*“ (“*the*”) in order to give the rendering of the participle as relative clause a distinct flavor, the majority of the remaining translations (ZÜR, ELB, MNG, EIN) employ the usual relative pronoun „*wer*“ (“*who*”), while GNB and NGÜ combine the relative clause and the following statement into one sentence and thus skip over the actual task of translating this Semitism.

A third Semitism is the position of the verb before the subject which appears in verses 6 and 7. The frequent use of the verb in initial position is one of the surest Semitisms in the NT.¹⁵ Hence it is not astonishing if this typical west-Semitic word order is preserved in all consulted Semitic translations. However, in German translations the word order is not so uniform. Particularly the NGÜ (verse 6) and the ELB (verse 7) abandon the Semitic pre-position of the verb once, whereas the remaining translations preserve it in both cases.

In verse 10 another Semitism appears in the exception οὐκ ... εἰ μὴ (literally “*not ... if not*”) which has its exact equivalent in the Aramaic *lā ... ’ela* ܠܐ ... ܐܠܐ (Sy^{Sin.P}) and the Arabic *lā ... ’illa* لا ... ٴ (Ar^{SVD.Al-Hayat}) “*not ... if not*”. In contrast, Hebrew employs the slightly different expression *lō ... kī ’im* לוֹ ... כִּי ʾִם (Hb^{Diz (Silk-G)}) “*not ... indeed, if*”, so that here we most likely have Aramaic or Aramaic infiltrated Hebrew behind the Greek text.¹⁶ In all German translations “*not ... if not*” is translated by „*nur ... um zu*“ (“*only ... in order to*”). The only exception is Luther’s September-Testament from 1522 and his complete Bible from 1545 which both translate this Semitism more visibly with „*Ein Dieb kommt nicht, denn dass er stehle ...*“ (“*a thief does not come except that he steals ...*”).

We have reached verse 11. In this verse there are two more Semitisms, namely the repeated ὁ ποιμὴν ὁ καλός “*the good shepherd*”, repeated in verse 14 (three times in total) as well as the phrase τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ

(τίθησιν) ὑπὲρ “*he lays down his soul for*”. Firstly we want to look at ὁ ποιμὴν ὁ καλός which literally translated does not mean “*the good shepherd*” but rather “*the shepherd, the good (one)*”. In the original Greek text the adjective is placed behind the subject with the article and the article is repeated a second time before the adjective as is also the case in all Semitic translations. In contrast, the German translations all place the adjective before the subject and do not repeat the article as is usual in German. In Greek, however, both the Semitic post-positioned word order ὁ ποιμὴν ὁ καλός “*the shepherd, the good (one)*” as well as the Indo-European pre-positioned word order ὁ καλός ποιμὴν “*the good shepherd*” is possible.¹⁷ Yet, since we have three cases of ὁ ποιμὴν ὁ καλός “*the shepherd, the good (one)*” according to Semitic word order and no example for the Indo-European word order ὁ καλός ποιμὴν “*the good shepherd*” it is evident that this is another Semitism.¹⁸

The phrase τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ (τίθησιν) ὑπὲρ “*he lays down his soul for*” was already recognized as a Semitism by Adolf Schlatter in comparison with the oldest exegetical writings of Rabbinic Judaism (e.g. Mekhilta on Ex, Sifra (Lev), Sifre on Num and Sifre on Dtn).¹⁹ Thus in Mekhilta on Ex 15:1 the almost exact parallel phrase “*he gave his soul for*” לַעֲשׂוֹת נַפְשׁוֹ appears, where it is employed to describe the complete obligation of Moses for the law. The German New Testament scholar Joachim Jeremias²⁰ confirmed this Semitism further through a comparison with Paul, who expresses the complete investment of Jesus’ life, for example, in Gal 1:4 τοῦ δόντος ἑαυτὸν ὑπὲρ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν ἡμῶν (“*who gave himself for our sins*”) or 2:20 τοῦ ἀγαπήσαντός με καὶ παραδόντος ἑαυτὸν ὑπὲρ ἔμου (“*who loved me, and gave himself for me*”) in more common Greek with ἑαυτὸν (“*himself*”) instead of τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ (“*his soul*”).²¹ Hence it is to be expected that in almost all Semitic translations (except the modern Arabic Al-Hayat translation²²) “*his*

soul” is literally preserved through *naḫšō/naḫšēh/naḫsahū*. In contrast, there exists no unified translation for the preposition ὑπὲρ (literally “over”; לְעַל in the Mekhilta) in the various Semitic Bible translations. Of course this also depends on the slight differences in the use of prepositions among the Semitic languages. In German translations the Semitism “his soul” is translated with „sein Leben“²³ (“his life”) (except the GNB which renders it as “sterben; die”) whereas ZÜR as only translation precisely renders τίθησιν as „einsetzen“ (“deploy”). However, there exists unity in the translation of the preposition ὑπὲρ (“over; for the benefit of, for”) with “for”. Finally, in verse 12 another Semitism follows, which is a sequence of actions joined together monotonously with καὶ (“and”). For our logic and orderly feel for the language, such a sequence of actions, called parataxis in linguistics, seems rather unordered.²⁴ Yet, this monotonous sequence of actions is very common in Semitic languages. Conversely, in Greek, with its’ more precise possibilities to express logic division in a sentence (e.g. through the connecting particles μὲν and δὲ), long sequences with καὶ (“and”) are rather exceptional.²⁵ However, the first unusual “and” is replaced by a relative clause even in the consulted Semitic translations. The same is true for the majority of German translations (LUT, ZÜR, ELB, MNG, EIN). Yet, ELB is the only German translation that preserves the first “and”. In contrast, the current GNB and NGÜ translations both re-phrase this Semitism freely.

III. Conclusion

We now come to the evaluation of the translation of Semitisms in the Shepherd Discourse. It is important to state first, however, that this of course is a preliminary and limited evaluation which depends on the selection of translations. Particularly LUT and EIN are currently in the process of renewed revision of which the results have not yet been published. Therefore my analysis of Bible trans-

lations is only a preliminary step in applying the topic of Semitism research to the field of Bible translation. Still I think it is possible at this stage to at least draw three general conclusions from this analysis of Semitisms and the evaluation of their translation, namely:

1. Cohesively none of our German Bible translations can reach the closeness to the original text of the Semitic translations when it comes to the translation of Semitisms.
2. The Luther Bible shows the most consistent and conscious rendering of Semitisms among the German Bible translations, and yet still remains understandable.
3. Semitisms are barely recognizable or disappear completely in the more accessible Bible translations for inexperienced readers like the GNB and NGÜ.

My question, therefore, is if an important intention of the Gospels is hidden when we follow Eugene A. Nida, who was not so well-versed in Hebrew, in his very free and contextualized approach of rendering the original text as our modern German translations do in many places.²⁶ For particularly in the Gospel of John Semitic words are often explicitly explained in context, which needs to be seen as a conscious attempt to bring the Semitic linguistic and cultural context in which Jesus appeared closer to the reader. The intention was perhaps to prevent a too culturally one-sided approach to the text, as has been applied again and again in western theology. The aim of a Bible translation, especially of the Gospels, should therefore be to aim the reader to a state of questioning his own language and culture when reading the Bible, for we know from church- and mission history since the reformation that this process can lead to a spiritual renewal- and awakening movement.²⁷ For such a process of questioning one’s own traditions in light of the Bible is exactly what results from mission work in other countries. Hence we should not be over-cautious in not expecting a cer-

tain amount of willingness from the modern reader to become familiar with Semitic language and culture. The authors of the Gospels also expected this from their original readers. Rather, we should become more cautious to not simply skip over the not always so easily translatable Semitisms. Likewise we should pay attention to not simply fit them into our own cultural context through our “additions” as Proverbs 30:6 exhorts us “*Do not add to his words, lest he rebuke you, and you be found a liar*”. Only the one who is willing to read God’s word as an uncultivated beggar and to keep and translate it, can Jesus help out of the complete human corruption, which includes both our own language and culture as well as the target language and culture of a Bible translation.

ENDNOTES

- 1 Cf. “The Biblical-Semitic Background of the New Testament Part 1: Lexical Semitisms,” *STT* 6 (2011): 93–104 and „The Biblical-Semitic Background of the New Testament Part 2: Grammatical Semitisms,” *STT* 7 (2012): 21–32 (summarized and re-printed in this anniversary volume).
- 2 Cf. *WA Tischreden* 1: 524f.
- 3 Cf. S. E. Fassberg, “Which Semitic Language Did Jesus Speak?” *CBQ* 74 (2012): 263–280, here 276.
- 4 Cf. K. Haacker, *Die Autorität der Heiligen Schrift*, Calwer Hefte 125 (Stuttgart: Calwer Verlag, 1972), idem, *Biblische Theologie heute*, Biblisch-Theologische Studien 1 (Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener, 1977) as well as idem, „Biblische Theologie,” *ELThG* 1: 269–270 (in print).
- 5 Cf. A. Tholuck, *Die Lehre von der Sünde und vom Versöhner: oder die wahre Weihe des Zweiflers* (Gotha: Perthes, ⁸1862), 22f and 135–138 in connection with J. Wallmann, *Kirchengeschichte Deutschlands seit der Reformation*, UTB 1355 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, ⁷2012), 211–216, esp. 212f.
- 6 Cf. J. Jeremias, *Neutestamentliche Theo-*

logie: Erster Teil, Die Verkündigung Jesu (Gütersloh: Mohn, 1971), 43.

- 7 Cf. S. P. Brock, *The Bible in the Syriac Tradition*, SEERI Correspondence Course (SCC) on Syrian Christian Heritage (Kottayam: St. Ephrem Ecumenical Research Inst. (SEERI), 1989), 24–32, esp. 26f.
- 8 On its historical formation, in which German orientalists (esp. E. Rödiger from Halle) were involved as well, cf. J. A. Thompson, “The Origin and Nature of the Chief Printed Arabic Bibles,” *The Bible Translator* 6 (1955): 98–106, esp. 99.
- 9 The Old Testament of this version was mostly translated by S. Shahid, who was a guest speaker at our conference in 2007, cf. idem, “The Impact of Christianity on the Arab Peninsula in Pre-Islamic Times,” *STT* 2 (2007): 17–20.
- 10 Cf. H. Wehr, *Arabisches Wörterbuch für die Schriftsprache der Gegenwart: Arabisch – Deutsch* (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, ⁵1985), 275–278.
- 11 Cf. Wehr, *Arabisches Wörterbuch*, 43–45.
- 12 So already in Luther’s September-Testament from 1522, cf. John 10:1–18 (fol. 159 and 160) in the online-edition by the Württembergische Landesbibliothek (<http://digital.wlb-stuttgart.de/purl/bsz351727574>, accessed on 20.10.2015).
- 13 Cf. for example Ps 103:3–5.
- 14 Cf. K. Beyer, *Semitische Syntax im Neuen Testament*, Vol. 1, *Satzlehre Teil 1* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, ²1968), 204 and 211 as well as the examples in E. Bornemann and E. Risch, *Griechische Grammatik* (Frankfurt a. M.: Diesterweg, 1978) (= BR), § 149, 1 n. and 242, 2 in connection with BDR § 413. On the impossibility of a negated conditional participle in Semitic languages (as \acute{o} $\mu\eta$ $\epsilon\iota\sigma\epsilon\rho\chi\acute{o}\mu\epsilon\nu\omicron\varsigma$ in verse 1) cf. *Semitische Syntax*, 206. Cf. also my article “The Biblical-Semitic Background of the New Testament Part 2: Grammatical Semitisms,” *STT* 7 (2012): 21–32, here 25f.
- 15 Cf. J. H. Moulton, *A Grammar of New*

- Testament Greek*, vol. 2, *Accidence and Word-Formation: With an Appendix on Semitisms in the New Testament*, by W. F. Howard (Edinburgh: Clark, 1929), 417f.
- 16 On this see Beyer, *Semitische Syntax*, 105.
- 17 Cf. BR § 58, 2.
- 18 In contrast the Indo-European phrase τὰ ἴδια πρόβατα in verse 3 (however τὰ πρόβατα ἴδια in verse 12) could result from the fact, that ownership cannot be expressed in Semitic languages with an adjective but rather with a suffixed personal pronoun (e.g. sheep-(of)-him).
- 19 Cf. A. Schlatter, *Die Sprache und Heimat des vierten Evangelisten* (Gütersloh: Bertelsmann, 1902), 103f.
- 20 Cf. J. Jeremias, *Abba: Studien zur neutestamentlichen Theologie und Zeitgeschichte* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1966), 226.
- 21 Cf. also 1 Tim 2:6 and Tit 2:14.
- 22 Which translated „his soul“ instead with „his life“ (cf. LUT and KJV).
- 23 Luther pioneered this translation as well in his September-Testament from 1522.
- 24 Cf. Beyer, *Semitische Syntax*, 271 and 280.
- 25 Cf. Beyer, *Semitische Syntax*, 278 in connection with BR § 145 and 253.
- 26 On this cf. S. Felber, *Kommunikative Bibelübersetzung: Eugene A. Nida und sein Modell der dynamischen Äquivalenz* (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2013), 387–392, esp. 387 in connection with E. A. Nida, *Message and Mission: The Communication of the Christian Faith* (New York, NY: Harper, 1960) as well as E. A. Nida und C. R. Taber, *The Theory and Practice of Translation, Helps for Translators* 8 (Leiden: Brill, 1969). Already in Cicero (*De finibus bonorum et malorum* 3,15) and Seneca (*De tranquillitate animi* 2,3) there existed similar dynamic translation approaches which, however, were regarded as inapplicable by Hieronymus to the field of Bible translation, cf. K. Haacker, „Dynamische Äquivalenz in Geschichte und Gegenwart,“ in *Bibelübersetzung zwischen Inkulturation und Manipulation*, ed. by C. P. Thiede (Paderborn: Deutsches Institut für Bildung und Wissenschaft, 1993), 19–32.
- 27 Cf. especially Luther’s autobiographical witness from 1545 in *WA* 54, 185f.

CLEMENS WASSERMANN, Stuttgart, is a research fellow at EUSEBIA School of Theology (EST) with main research in Semitic languages and New Testament.

The Semitisms in the Shepherd Discourse (Semitic Translations)

with an evaluation of closeness to the original text/comprehensibility (+ positive / 0 neutral / - negative)

NA ²⁸	Sy ^{Sin}	Sy ^P	Ar ^{SVD}	Ar ^{Al-Hayat}	HB ^{Dz (Sik-G)}
1 Ἄμην ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν	אמנה אמנה אמנה להם +++ / +++	אמנה אמנה אמנה להם +++ / +++	أَلْحَقْ أَلْحَقْ أَقُولُ لَكُمْ ++ / ++	أَلْحَقْ أَلْحَقْ أَقُولُ لَكُمْ ++ / ++	אָמֵן אָמֵן אָמֵן אֵינִי אֹמֵר לָכֶם +++ / +++
2 ὁ δὲ εἰσερχόμενος διὰ τῆς θύρας ποιμὴν ἐστὶν τῶν προβάτων.	הוא יבוא דרך הבית +++ / ++	זהו זה יבוא דרך הבית +++ / +++	وَأَمَّا الَّذِي يَدْخُلُ مِنَ الْبَابِ فَهُوَ رَاعِي الْخِرَافِ. ++ / ++	أَمَّا الَّذِي يَدْخُلُ مِنَ الْبَابِ فَهُوَ رَاعِي الْخِرَافِ، ++ / ++	וְאִשֶׁר יָבֹא (אֵינִי אֹמֵר) דֶּרֶךְ הַשַּׁעַר הוּא רֹעֵה הַצֹּאן (++) / (++++)
6 Ταύτην τὴν παροιμίαν εἶπεν αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς	הוא היה מלמד חכמה ++ / ++	הוא היה מלמד חכמה ++ / ++	هَذَا الْمَثَلُ قَالَهُ لَهُمْ يَسُوعُ ++ / ++	صَرَبَ يَسُوعُ لَهُمْ هَذَا الْمَثَلُ ++ / ++	הַשַּׁעַר הַזֶּה דֶּרֶךְ יְשׁוּעָה בְּאֵינִיקִים ++ / +
7 Εἶπεν οὖν πάλιν ὁ Ἰησοῦς· ἀμὴν ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν	אמנה אמנה אמנה להם ++ / ++	אמנה אמנה אמנה להם ++ / ++	قَالَ لَهُمْ يَسُوعُ أَيضًا، أَلْحَقْ أَلْحَقْ أَقُولُ لَكُمْ ++ / ++	أَلْحَقْ أَلْحَقْ أَقُولُ لَكُمْ ++ / -	וַיֹּסֶף יְשׁוּעָה לֵבְדַּר אֲלֵיכֶם אָמֵן אָמֵן אֵינִי אֹמֵר לָכֶם ++ / +
10 ὁ κλέπτης οὐκ ἔρχεται εἰ μὴ ἵνα κλέψῃ καὶ θύσῃ καὶ ἀπολέσῃ.	הוא בא להם כדי לחטא +++ / +++	הוא בא להם כדי לחטא +++ / +++	السَّارِقُ لَا يَأْتِي إِلَّا لِيَسْرِقَ وَيُبْذِخَ وَيُهْلِكَ +++ / +++	السَّارِقُ لَا يَأْتِي إِلَّا لِيَسْرِقَ وَيُبْذِخَ وَيُهْلِكَ +++ / +++	הַגֹּבֵה לֹא יָבֹא כִּי אִם-לְגַנֹּב וְלִקְרוֹג וּלְאַבֵּד +++ / ++
11 Ἐγὼ εἶμι ὁ ποιμὴν ὁ καλός· ὁ ποιμὴν ὁ καλὸς τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ τίθεισιν ὑπὲρ τῶν προβάτων·	אני אהיה רועה להם +++ / +++	אני אהיה רועה להם +++ / +++	أَنَا هُوَ الرَّاعِي الصَّالِحُ، وَالرَّاعِي الصَّالِحُ يَبْذُلُ خَيَاتَهُ فِي خِزْفِهِ عَنِ الْخِرَافِ +++ / ++	أَنَا الرَّاعِي الصَّالِحُ، وَالرَّاعِي الصَّالِحُ يَبْذُلُ خَيَاتَهُ فِي خِزْفِهِ +++ / +	אֲנִי הָאֵלֶּה הָרֹעֶה הַטּוֹב הָרֹעֶה הַטּוֹב יָצִיא אֶת-נַפְשׁוֹ בַּעַד צֹאֲנוֹ +++ / ++
12 ὁ μισθωτὸς καὶ οὐκ ὢν ποιμὴν, οὐκ ἔστιν τὰ πρόβατα ἴδια, θεωρεῖ τὸν λόκον ἐρχόμενον καὶ ἀφήσιν τὰ πρόβατα καὶ φεύγει· καὶ ὁ λύκος ἀρπάξει αὐτὰ καὶ σκορπίζει·	הוא רועה זר {מסתכן} < אלה הוא מלמד את רועה אחר הוא רועה זר הוא רועה זר הוא רועה זר +++ / +	הוא רועה זר הוא רועה זר הוא רועה זר הוא רועה זר הוא רועה זר +++ / ++	وَأَمَّا الَّذِي هُوَ أَجِيرٌ، وَلَيْسَ رَاعِيًا، الَّذِي لَيْسَتْ مَلَكَةٌ مَعَهُ، إِذَا بَرَى الذَّنْبَ قَلِيمًا، يَتْرُكُ الْخِرَافَ لِيَنْخُو بِنَفْسِهِ، فَيَخْطِفُ الذَّنْبُ الْخِرَافَ وَيُبْذِئُهَا +++ / ++	وَلَيْسَ الْأَجِيرُ كَالرَّاعِي، لِأَنَّ الْخِرَافَ لَيْسَتْ مَلَكَةٌ مَعَهُ، إِذَا بَرَى الذَّنْبَ قَلِيمًا، يَتْرُكُ الْخِرَافَ لِيَنْخُو بِنَفْسِهِ، فَيَخْطِفُ الذَّنْبُ الْخِرَافَ وَيُبْذِئُهَا +++ / +	וְהַשֹּׂכֵר אֵשֶׁר לֹא רֹעֵה הוּא יִרְצֵא לֹא-צֹאֲנוֹ הוּא יִרְאֶה כִּי-בָרָא הַזֵּב וְעָזַב אֶת-הַצֹּאן וְנָס וְהַצֹּאן יִקְרָב וְהַצֹּאן אֶת-הַצֹּאן יִקְרָב וְהַצֹּאן אֶת-הַצֹּאן +++ / ++

The Semitisms in the Shepherd Discourse (German Translations)

with an evaluation of closeness to the original text/comprehensibility (+ positive / 0 neutral / - negative)

NA ²⁸	LUT (ZÜR)	ELB	MING (EIN)	GNB	NGÜ
¹ Ἀμὴν ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν	Wahrlich, wahrlich (Amen, amen) ich sage euch: ++/+++ (+++/+)	Wahrlich, wahrlich, ich sage euch: ++/+++	Wahrlich, wahrlich (Amen, amen) ich sage euch: ++/+++ (+++/+)	Amen, ich versichere euch +/+++	Ich sage euch: -/0
² ὁ δὲ εἰσεργόμενος διὰ τῆς θύρας ποιμὴν ἔστιν τῶν προβάτων.	Der (wer) aber zur Tür hingeht, der ist der Hirte der Schafe. ++/+++ (+/+++)	Wer aber durch die Tür hingeht, ist Hirte der Schafe. +/+++	wer aber durch die Tür hingeht, der ist der Hirt der Schafe. +/+++	Der Schafhirt geht durch die Tür hinein; -/0	Der Hirte geht durch die Tür zu den Schafen. -/0
⁶ Ταύτην τὴν παροιμίαν εἶπεν αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς	Dies Gleichnis (Bildwort) sagte (sprach) Jesus zu ihnen ++/+++ (+++/+++)	Diese Bildrede sprach Jesus zu ihnen ++/+++	Dies sagte Jesus ihnen in bildlicher Rede (dieses Gleichnis erzählte ihnen Jesus) +/+++ (+++/+++)	Dieses Gleichnis erzählte Jesus +/+++	..., was er ihnen mit diesem Vergleich sagen wollte. -/0
⁷ Εἶπεν οὖν πάλιν ὁ Ἰησοῦς· ἀμὴν ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν	Da sprach Jesus wieder (noch einmal): Wahrlich, wahrlich (Amen, amen), ich sage euch: ++/+++ (+++/+++)	Jesus sprach nun wieder zu ihnen: Wahrlich, wahrlich, ich sage euch: -/+++	Da sagte Jesus von neuem (weiter sagte Jesus) zu ihnen: Wahrlich, wahrlich (Amen, amen) ich sage euch: ++/+++ (+++/+++)	Darum begann, Jesus noch einmal: »Amen, ich versichere euch: +/+++	Deshalb fuhr Jesus fort: »Ich sage euch: +/+++
¹⁰ ὁ κλέπτης οὐκ ἔργεται εἰ μὴ ἵνα κλέψῃ καὶ θύσῃ καὶ ἀπολέσῃ.	Ein (der) Dieb kommt nur, um zu stehlen, zu schlachten und umzubringen. +/+++ (+++/+++)	Der Dieb kommt nur, um zu stehlen und zu schlachten und zu verderben. +/+++	Der Dieb kommt nur, um zu stehlen und zu schlachten und Unheil anzurichten; +/+++ (+++/+++)	Der Dieb kommt nur, um die Schafe zu stehlen, zu schlachten und ins Verderben zu stürzen. +/+++	Der Dieb kommt nur, um die Schafe zu stehlen und zu schlachten und um Verderben zu bringen. +/+++
¹¹ Ἐγὼ εἰμι ὁ ποιμὴν ὁ καλός, αὐτοῦ τὸν τίθησιν ὑπὲρ τῶν προβάτων.	Ich bin der gute Hirte. Der gute Hirte lässt (setzt) sein Leben (ein) für die Schafe. +/+++ (+++/+++)	Ich bin der gute Hirte; der gute Hirte lässt sein Leben für die Schafe. +/+++	Ich bin der gute Hirt! Der gute Hirt gibt sein Leben (hin) für die Schafe hin. +/+++ (+++/+++)	Ich bin der gute Hirt. Ein guter Hirt ist bereit, für seine Schafe zu sterben. -/+++	Ich bin der gute Hirte. Ein guter Hirte ist bereit, sein Leben für die Schafe herzugeben. 0/+++
¹² ὁ μισθωτὸς καὶ οὐκ ὢν ποιμὴν, οὗ οὐκ ἔστιν τὰ πρόβατα ἴδια, θεωρεῖ τὸν λύκον ἐργόμενον καὶ ἀφήσιν τὰ πρόβατα καὶ φεύγει· καὶ ὁ λύκος ἀρπάζει αὐτὰ καὶ σκορπίζει.	Der Mietling (Lohn-arbeiter) aber, der nicht Hirte ist, dem die Schafe nicht gehören, sieht den Wolf kommen und verlässt die Schafe und flieht - und der Wolf stürzt sich auf die Schafe und zerstreut sie - , ++/+++ (+++/+++)	Wer Lohnarbeiter und nicht Hirte ist, wer die Schafe nicht zu eigen hat, sieht den Wolf kommen und verlässt die Schafe und flieht - und der Wolf raubt und zerstreut sie - , +++/+	Der Mietling aber (der bezahlte Knecht), der kein Hirt ist und dem die Schafe nicht zu eigen gehören, sieht den Wolf kommen, verlässt die Schafe und flieht; und der Wolf fällt sie an und zerstreut sie: +/+++ (+++/+++)	Einer, dem die Schafe nicht selbst gehören, ist kein richtiger Hirt. Darum lässt er sie im Stich, wenn er den Wolf kommen sieht, und läuft davon. Dann stürzt sich der Wolf auf die Schafe und jagt die Herde auseinander. -/+++	Einer, der gar kein Hirte ist, sondern die Schafe nur gegen Bezahlung hütet, läuft davon, wenn er den Wolf kommen sieht, und lässt die Schafe im Stich, und der Wolf fällt über die Schafe her und jagt die Herde auseinander. 0/++