

# Moving Beyond Boundaries: a Sociological-Theological Reflection on the Parable of the Good Samaritan

Maksimilianus Jemali<sup>1</sup>,

{lianjemali@gmail.com<sup>1</sup>}

Universitas Katolik Indonesia Santu Paulus Ruteng<sup>1</sup>

**Abstract.** This paper explores the parable of the Good Samaritan (Luke 10:25-37) in a sociological-theological perspective. Qualitative descriptive research was employed with a literature review to delve into the concept of moving beyond boundaries. It combines sociological and theological perspectives to analyse the parable. The parable of the Good Samaritan is a well-known biblical narrative that continues to resonate with Christians. It recounts a dialogue between an expert in law and Jesus about the requirements for eternal life. In response, Jesus presents a parable involving three figures as a Priest, a Levite, and a Samaritan encountering a wounded man. The Samaritan, transcending social and religious divisions, offers aid to the injured man. Through this parable, Jesus imparts a significant message about loving God and neighbor in practical life.

**Keywords:** beyond boundaries; sociological reflection; a good Samaritan

## 1 Introduction

The Lukan parable of the Good Samaritan (Luke 10:25-37) is a well-known biblical narrative that resonates in many Christians. It depicts a dialogue between an expert in the law and Jesus regarding the requirements for eternal life, particularly the importance of loving God and neighbor. [1] The parable then unfolds, introducing the characters of the priest, the Levite, and the Samaritan, who encounter a wounded man.

Etymologically, the term “parable” comes from the Greek word *parabolé*, which means what is thrown or placed beside something.[2] This word also used in the Synoptics to denote “a characteristic form of the teaching of Jesus”.[3]

The parable is related to the existence of human beings. Human beings are inherently social existence as *homo socius*. Our identity is intertwined with our relationships with others. We rely on others for our development as learning to think, walk, talk, and behave through social interaction. Our encounters with others shape our understanding of the world and highlight the pluralistic nature of human existence.

In wider contexts, we are exposed to a variety of experiences in a constantly evolving life. Our interactions represent continuous progression, shaping the course of our lives. Our era is characterized by constant change. Today's events may bring different implications tomorrow, and past experiences can be reinterpreted over time. A social self is one that is open to the world,

actively engaging with others through dialogue and participation. It is a self that is always in a state of flux shaped by the ever-changing social landscape.

A socio-theological approach draws on concrete problems and explores the concept of the living God, critically examining and reevaluating it as needed. God, in practical terms, is not static but actively engages with humanity, seeking to reach and embrace all who need Him. Sociological-theological- reflection does not merely provide definitive answers about God but also encourages individuals to delve deeper into their personal relationship with the Divine. The focus shifts from abstract proofs of God's existence to the tangible ways "God's presence" in human lives. Therefore, in this context, becomes a tool for discerning God's liberating work in human history. By applying sociological insights to theological questions, we can make theology and Scripture relevant to contemporary society. God, as a social being, is not distant and aloof but actively involved in the world, inspiring and transforming human lives.

Throughout human history, God has been present in both joy and sorrow. The cross symbolizes God's presence in the world and in human suffering. God accompanies those who suffer, and their suffering becomes part of God's own suffering (theodicea). This theological understanding offers comfort to those who suffer, assuring them of God's constant presence and support.

From a socio-theological perspective, Christians are called to love both God and neighbor. In the faces of others, we can glimpse the face of God. Dialogue requires a willingness to give and receive, fostering a sense of community and shared understanding. Contemporary sociology is not merely an academic inquiry but a practical engagement with the world. Sociologists, as both givers and receivers of knowledge, contribute to the ongoing dialogue and growth of society.

The parable of the Good Samaritan illustrates the importance of helping others, regardless of their religious, cultural, ethnic, or social background. The Samaritan's actions inspire us to love our neighbors with sincerity and compassion. The concept of "moving beyond boundaries" suggests breaking down physical and ideological barriers. A sociological-theological reflection combines sociological and theological perspectives to analyze the parable of the Good Samaritan.

## **2 Method**

This paper employs a qualitative descriptive research methodology, complemented by a literature review. Qualitative descriptive research aims to describe phenomena to address current and future challenges. The data were obtained from the biblical text by literature review, while sociological-theological reflection and relevant contexts were applied for the data analysis. This literature enables a deep exploration and description of relevant theories. Additionally, the author gathered data from various sources, including books, journal articles, and dictionaries, pertinent to the research topic. When examining and selecting these texts, the author adhered to hermeneutical principles of biblical interpretation, considering the social context and theological implications of the texts.

### 3 Result

#### 3.1.1 *A Lesson in Love and Compassion*

In Luke 10:25-37, an expert in the Law tests Jesus' knowledge by asking how one can inherit eternal life. The expert, eager to correct any misstep, stands ready to pounce if Jesus gives an incorrect answer. Surprisingly, Jesus doesn't directly answer the question. Instead, He turns the question back to the expert, asking him to interpret the Law's commandment to love God and neighbor. The expert confidently recites the commandment, but little does he know, he's about to be challenged. Jesus affirms the expert's knowledge but encourages him to put it into practice. The expert, however, seems to struggle with the practical implications of loving one's neighbor.

The expert will be fine if he loves God with all his heart, soul, strength, and mind, and loves his neighbor as himself. This, Jesus suggests, is the path to eternal life. Yet, the expert seems unsatisfied with this response. Perhaps the challenge lies in the second part of the commandment: "Love your neighbor as yourself." Could the expert honestly say that Jews should love Gentiles, oppressors, sinners, enemies, or tax collectors? It seems unlikely that the expert would extend love to such groups. While he may have no problem loving God, loving one's neighbor presents a more complex challenge. Given these considerations, Jesus' question, "Who is my neighbor?" (10:29) becomes particularly relevant.

For Luke, Jesus tells this story in response to the expert in the Law, who feigns ignorance about the identity of one's neighbor. By asking, "Who is my neighbor?", the expert indirectly challenges Jesus. Instead of engaging in a debate, Jesus presents a parable about a traveler journeying from Jerusalem to Jericho (10:30), a dangerous road well-known to His audience. The traveler is attacked by robbers, beaten, and left for dead.

A priest and a Levite, both religious figures, also came upon the wounded man. However, they showed no compassion or concern. They simply passed by on the other side of the road (10:31-32). Perhaps they feared becoming unclean by touching the injured man or were more focused on their duties at the temple. In stark contrast, a Samaritan, often despised by the Jews, stopped to help the wounded man. He not only provided immediate aid but also transported the man to an inn and offered to pay for his care (10:35).

The Samaritan's compassion for the wounded man is truly remarkable. What's most impressive is the spontaneity of his act of love. He responds to the immediate need without hesitation or self-concern. The Samaritan embodies the spirit of interfaith dialogue, transcending religious and cultural boundaries to offer help. His background does not hinder his commitment to solidarity and compassion.

In the story's conclusion, Jesus poses a question to the expert, mirroring the expert's earlier inquiry. However, Jesus subtly shifts the focus. He asks the expert to identify the neighborly figure among the three men. The expert, unable to utter the word "Samaritan," simply replies, "The one who showed mercy" (10:37). This is significant, as Samaritans were often despised and ostracized by the Jewish community.

Jesus' response, "Go and do likewise," challenges the expert to extend love and compassion to all, regardless of their social or religious background. Notably, Jesus engages in

a respectful dialogue with the expert, avoiding hostility or suspicion. He uses this interaction as an opportunity to teach a valuable lesson.[1] Roukema interprets the parable as an allegory of Jesus's salvation of lost sinners.[4] Luke portrays Jesus as a compassionate savior who loves all people, including the oppressed, the poor, and the marginalized.

### *3.1.2 Highlights Several Significant Aspects*

The parable of the Good Samaritan highlights several significant aspects of this unexpected act of kindness: [5]

Firstly, if the wounded man was a Jewish, numerous barriers of hostility and suspicion would have separated the two figures, including ethnic identity, religious practice, socioeconomic status, and differing interpretations of Torah. The Samaritan's decision to help the wounded man exemplifies Jesus' command to love one's enemies and do good to those who hate us (Luke 6:27-36). Despite the animosity between their respective groups, the Samaritan offered his assistance.

Secondly, the parable explores the balance between love for God and love for neighbor. While the priest and Levite, religious officials, focused on their temple duties, the Samaritan prioritized helping a fellow human being. This personal engagement between two individuals from opposing social groups highlights the Samaritan's compassion and selfless nature. The term "Good Samaritan" has become synonymous with acts of kindness, emphasizing the Samaritan's genuine concern for the wounded man.

Historically, the Jewish and Samaritan communities experienced significant animosity. For centuries, they were estranged from each other, often viewing one another with hostility. While Jews worshipped at the Temple in Jerusalem, Samaritans established a place of worship on Mount Gerizim. Following the Assyrian conquest of Israel, Samaritans began intermarrying with the Assyrians. While both groups recognized the Pentateuch (the first five books of the Bible) as sacred scripture, Samaritans rejected the books of poetry and prophecy [6].

In the parable of the Good Samaritan, Jesus presents a Samaritan as the compassionate helper, challenging the audience's preconceived notions about their enemies. The Samaritan, by extending aid to a wounded man despite their historical animosity, demonstrates the importance of overcoming social and religious boundaries. His actions serve as an inspiration for acts of service, such as liberating the oppressed, sheltering the homeless, advocating for the poor, fighting injustice, and feeding the hungry, even when there is no expectation of reward.

Thirdly, the Samaritan engaged in a life-saving dialogue with the wounded man. Prioritizing the victim's safety, he disregarded the man's background and the negative stereotypes held by the Jewish community. With sincere compassion, the Samaritan crossed cultural and religious boundaries, embodying the spirit of interfaith dialogue. He chose to support life and help others, regardless of their background, religion, or ethnicity.

## 4 Discussion

### 4.2.1 *A Sociological-Theological Reflection in the Indonesian Context: Encountering and Learning from One Another*

From the parable of the Good Samaritan, we can conclude that we are called to love both God and neighbor. This is a fundamental commandment for Christians and (maybe) adherents of other religions. In the spirit of interreligious dialogue, we should respond to hostility with kindness, to generosity with gratitude, to persecution with forbearance, to truth with agreement, and to error with truth. Religious adherents from diverse faiths can come together to learn from one another about the meaning of the double love commandment and explore ways to love God and neighbor. [7]

The Samaritan in the Bible exemplifies the essence of humanity. The 'other' is not an enemy, but a fellow human being. N. Madjid, a prominent figure in Indonesian Islamic Neo-Modernism, stated, 'If you know who you are, you can understand others and learn from them. But if you are nobody, or just anybody at different times, you can neither learn from others nor teach them.' [8] This statement highlights two aspects of human identity.

Firstly, a person who is secure in their faith can engage in processes of change. The Samaritan, knowing himself, understands and respects humanity. He prioritizes 'loving action' towards the victim, disregarding societal barriers. His focus is on peace and the salvation of others. Madjid's statement also emphasizes the paradigms of inclusivity and exclusivity in the context of interfaith relations.

Secondly, an exclusive person, uncertain of their identity, may cling rigidly to it. The Priest and the Levite in the Lucan parable demonstrate a disrespectful and exclusive attitude towards the wounded man. The paradigm of inclusivity emphasizes openness, understanding, and learning from others. Belief can be a catalyst for change, making believers agents of transformation. Here, we can also draw insights from the concept of the 'Other' as explored by E. Levinas and M. Buber. The parable of the Good Samaritan and our contemporary reality reveal a diverse spectrum of human character. Daily, we encounter individuals with varied qualities, reminiscent of those in Luke's parable. We strive to learn from these encounters, guided by a strong sense of responsibility.

Levinas emphasizes the significance of the 'Other.' For him, an ethical responsibility arises when one encounters another. [9] This encounter is characterized by the recognition of the Other's unique identity, differences, similarities, and vulnerabilities. Through social power and ethical experience, we foster communities where individuals identify with the experiences of others. This shared understanding enables us to learn from one another and appreciate the divine goodness in the lives of others. The Other is a subject with whom we can engage in constructive dialogue.

Buber also delves into the nature of human relationships, distinguishing between the 'I-Thou' and 'I-It' attitudes. The 'I-Thou' attitude involves a dynamic, committed, and empathetic connection with the Other, recognizing their subjectivity. Conversely, the 'I-It' attitude treats the Other as an object, reducing them to a mere instrument. [10] In Luke's parable, the Priest and the Levite exemplify the 'I-It' attitude, prioritizing their own concerns over the suffering of the

victim. From 'I-thou relation', we can learn that religions become more 'self-reflective and more self-conscious' about their own traditions and values.[11]

The 'I-Thou' relationship fosters self-reflection and a deeper understanding of one's own traditions and values. The Good Samaritan's collaboration with the innkeeper illustrates the potential for peaceful coexistence and harmony within diverse religious and social contexts. This model inspires us to embrace a sense of brotherhood and sisterhood, recognizing the inherent rights and dignity of all individuals.

Inter-religious dialogue fosters an environment of love, harmony, and peace, encouraging cooperation and coexistence without suspicion or hostility. The parable of the Good Samaritan exemplifies this by depicting the collaboration between the Samaritan and the innkeeper in caring for the wounded man. This story highlights the potential for peaceful coexistence among individuals with diverse religious beliefs. As brothers and sisters within humanity, we share fundamental rights and dignity, including the freedom of religion. Everyone has the right to express their beliefs, values, and perspectives freely.[12]

Religious language can have significant psychological effects. The Indonesian philosophy of *Bhinneka Tunggal Ika* ("Unity in Diversity") should serve as a guiding principle for all Indonesians, recognizing the equal rights of all individuals to practice their faith freely and meaningfully in both their personal and social lives. Hick emphasizes that inter-religious dialogue necessitates a recognition of the inherent equality of all religions. There should be no claims of superiority or inferiority among different religious traditions. Religions should strive for successful communication, sharing their unique perspectives and experiences with one another.[13]

Building upon Hick's ideas, Pratt highlights the importance of humility and a willingness to learn from other religious traditions. Religions must approach inter-religious dialogue with a spirit of humility, recognizing the limitations of their own perspectives and seeking to understand the beliefs and practices of others.[14] Furthermore, drawing on the work of Lucette M.J. Moyaert, inter-religious dialogue can be fostered by acknowledging the inherent fragility of human existence. Our vulnerabilities and limitations create a shared ground for understanding and compassion. By recognizing our shared human condition, we can approach inter-religious dialogue with openness and a willingness to learn from others.[15]

#### *4.2.2 From Theological-Sociological Reflection to Principles of Inter-Religious Dialogue*

Jesus, in the Lukan Parable (10:25-37), modeled interreligious dialogue through His encounter with the expert in the law. Jesus responded to the expert's question without suspicion or hostility. Interreligious dialogue reflects a religious desire to learn from others and share one's own understanding of life. It necessitates openness and a willingness to engage with diverse perspectives. As Levinas asserted, we discover our own goodness through encountering the goodness of others.

Interreligious dialogue manifests in various forms and contexts. In the Indonesian context, Suseno identifies three key areas of interreligious dialogue: between nationalists, intellectuals, and NGOs; between religious leaders; and at the local level.[16] About this, generally, the documents from the Catholic Church describe four models or principles of inter-

religious dialogue for Christians: 'dialogue of life, action, theological, and religious experience'. [17]

Firstly, dialogue of life. The 'dialogue of life' emphasizes the everyday interactions and relationships that occur between people of different faiths. In Indonesia, with its diverse religious landscape (Islam, Roman Catholicism, Protestantism, Hinduism, Buddhism, and Confucianism being officially recognized), we observe numerous examples of interfaith collaboration and coexistence. Christians and followers of other religions frequently interact in various spheres of life, including the workplace. These interactions, often unconscious, demonstrate that religion can serve as a bridge to build stronger communities rather than a barrier to human connection. For instance, in Manggarai, Flores, Muslim and Christian women often work side-by-side in local markets, sharing stories and building relationships. These everyday encounters exemplify how individuals translate their religious beliefs into their daily lives, fostering understanding and respect, even if they may not explicitly articulate theological concepts of interfaith dialogue."

Secondly, dialogue of action. Christians and Muslims share a collective responsibility to foster peace, justice, and environmental sustainability in the world. This shared mission can be realized through collaborative efforts. For instance, the Indonesian government has established the concept of "Kerukunan Antarumat Beragama" (inter-religious harmony) and the "Forum Kerukunan Umat Beragama" (FKUB) to cultivate harmonious relations among religious communities. The primary objective of these initiatives is to create an atmosphere of mutual respect and understanding among religious adherents. Through sharing experiences and engaging in dialogue, the FKUB aims to develop new strategies for promoting peace and harmony, re-examining the role of religion in society and the state. These platforms facilitate inter-religious dialogue, enabling individuals from different faiths to enhance mutual understanding and empathy.

Thirdly, dialogue of theological. Christians are integral participants in inter-religious dialogue concerning doctrines and the substance of scientific theological ideas. In the parable of the Good Samaritan, Jesus engages in a dialogue with the expert in the law regarding the path to eternal life. This model of dialogue underscores the importance of both rational (philosophical) and theological accountability in the examination of doctrines and their interpretation across religious traditions. Theologians should engage in critical dialogue to gain a deeper understanding of the meaning and implications of various doctrines. Christians, Muslims, Jews, and individuals from other religious backgrounds should gather for respectful and honest inter-religious dialogue.[18] Furthermore, based on Church documents, Moyaert asserts that dialogue constitutes the core of contemporary theology. Christian theologians, along with their counterparts from other religions, should engage in inter-religious dialogue grounded in holy books, fundamental traditions, and magisterium.[19]

Fourthly, dialogue of religious experiences. Christians engaging in dialogue with adherents of other religions, such as sitting together in a mosque, church, or other sacred space, presents both opportunities and challenges in the global context. These interfaith encounters aim to foster mutual listening, respect, and solidarity, enabling individuals to learn from one another and work together to address social and religious challenges.[20] Through dialogue, Muslims can deepen their understanding of Islam, Catholics can strengthen their Catholic faith, and

adherents of other religions can likewise deepen their own understanding. Sharing one's faith in a spirit of openness allows individuals to live more authentically according to their beliefs.

While inter-religious dialogue offers significant potential for fostering understanding and cooperation, it also faces challenges. These challenges can arise from various sources, including fanatical adherents, religious extremists, and political interests that exploit religious differences for their own agendas. Prejudice and negative stereotypes about other religions pose significant obstacles to meaningful dialogue.[21] The parable of the Good Samaritan, with its depiction of the priest and the Levite who failed to show compassion for the injured man, serves as a cautionary tale about the dangers of prejudice and the importance of overcoming such biases.

To foster successful inter-religious dialogue, it is crucial to create a safe and inclusive space where all participants feel respected and valued. Everyone should have an equal opportunity to express their views and perspectives, even when disagreements arise. Participants should strive to listen attentively, understand different viewpoints, and work towards finding common ground. By embracing humility and recognizing the inherent value of all human beings, individuals can transcend their individualistic desires and work together towards a more just and equitable society. Inter-religious dialogue, at its core, is an act of giving – giving oneself to the process of understanding and learning from others. Through this act of giving, we not only deepen our understanding of other faiths but also enrich our own identity and contribute to a more harmonious and just world.

Another key principle of inter-religious dialogue is the significance of language. Muck introduces the term "missio-logoi" (Latin), or "a language of mission," to describe the appropriate language for inter-religious dialogue. Drawing on the parable of the Good Samaritan (Luke 10:25-37), he identifies three forms of missio-logoi.[22]

Firstly, "languages of analysis" are crucial. Analysis is essential for understanding religion, both theoretically and practically. Scholars, religious leaders, and missiologists must analyze the dynamics of mission in the contemporary world. Effective dialogue cannot occur without a thorough understanding of the specific context.

Secondly, "languages of media" play a vital role in facilitating inter-religious dialogue. Media platforms enable the sharing of information and experiences across geographical boundaries. Through various media channels, individuals and communities can learn about the realities and perspectives of others.

Thirdly, "languages of participation" are indispensable. Dialogue presupposes active engagement from all participants. It involves not only internal reflection but also genuine communication and interaction with others. This necessitates intensive conversation, an exchange of ideas, and a willingness to be open to diverse perspectives. Openness creates an environment where individuals can share their experiences and learn from one another.

Moyaert emphasizes the significance of language in inter-religious dialogue, beginning with a reinterpretation of the Tower of Babel story (Genesis 11:1-9). Instead of focusing on the punishment of humanity for their pride, Moyaert highlights God's intention to create diversity in the world. This diversity manifests not only in languages but also in cultures and traditions, each with its own unique value and significance.[15] Drawing upon P. Ricoeur's theory of language, Moyaert explores the connection between translation and inter-religious dialogue.

Ricoeur emphasizes the crucial role of language in human existence. Through language, religions can articulate and share their unique identities and connect with the broader human experience.[15]

Moyaert and Muck effectively demonstrate the significance of language translation in inter-religious dialogue. Translation, when grounded in both textual analysis and contextual understanding, enables us to grasp the deeper meaning of religious expressions in other languages. Each language reflects the unique identity of its speakers and carries within it profound messages. Humans primarily express their identity through language, and religion is no exception. Religion itself finds expression through language, opening itself to dialogue and understanding with other religious traditions. This openness to dialogue, alongside the assertion of one's unique identity, are fundamental aspects of successful inter-religious engagement.

Another principle of inter-religious dialogue is spirituality. Spirituality pertains to an intimate relationship with the Divine. The spirituality of dialogue is rooted in the belief in God's openness to all humanity. In this communication, God's message emphasizes the importance of humans working together to create a common good. Humans are called to accept and proclaim this message to others. The spirituality of dialogue emphasizes the importance of building intensive communication based on principles of equality among different religions.[23] In the Catholic Church, a significant document on the spirituality of inter-religious dialogue is *Nostra Aetate* (Latin for "In Our Time"). This document addresses the Church's relationship with non-Christian religions, particularly with Islam.[8]

This document contributes to a better understanding of the Church's positive relationship with Islam. Furthermore, it supports the Church in engaging in meaningful interreligious dialogue with other cultures, traditions, races, and religions. Through this document, the Church can also recognize its role as a catalyst in fostering interreligious dialogue.[24] Pope Benedict XVI emphasizes that the Church's role in interreligious dialogue is twofold: it must not only share its values with others but also actively learn from other religious traditions. Respect for the beliefs of others is paramount. The Church must demonstrate a genuine willingness to seek truth within other religions.[25]

Interreligious dialogue necessitates the support and cooperation of all religious adherents in Indonesia. The first principle of Pancasila, "Ketuhanan Yang Maha Esa" (Belief in the One Supreme God), affirms the freedom of religion and prohibits religious discrimination. This principle underscores the importance of religion in Indonesian society while simultaneously guaranteeing the freedom of all citizens to adhere to and practice their chosen religion. Pancasila has served as a powerful unifying force in Indonesia, embodying the principle of "Unity in Diversity" (*Bhineka Tunggal Ika*).[26] Guided by Pancasila, the Indonesian government has consistently supported the flourishing of religious life through various policies.

Küng emphasizes the significance of dialogability and steadfastness in the process of inter-religious dialogue.[27] This constitutes a key aspect of his public theology. He argues that dialogability is intrinsically linked to religious pluralism and the spirit of liberty, fraternity, and equality. Religions could respect one another and advocate for the protection of life. Dialogability, as a modern virtue, inherently critiques power structures and oppression. Through dialogue, religion can influence and critique the direction of public life. Religions strive not only to interpret their own beliefs and those of other religious communities but also to contribute

to the creation of a more just and equitable society. Religion can deeply reflect upon its own relationship with society, acknowledging the diverse histories and orientations within and between different religious communities.

Dialogability presupposes an openness to others with diverse backgrounds, including different religions, cultures, and traditions. Engaging in interreligious dialogue involves not only learning about others but also deepening our own self-awareness and reflecting on our own theological concepts, principles of openness, commitment to ecumenism, and advocacy for the poor and oppressed. We must continually strive for personal and communal transformation.

Dialogability and steadfastness provide an opportunity for people of diverse faiths and spiritual traditions to come together, to share their perspectives, and to engage in a meaningful dialogue. This process is characterized by attentive listening, respectful engagement, and genuine empathy. Pope John Paul II's interfaith gatherings in Assisi in 1986 and 2002 serve as inspiring examples of such interreligious dialogue, demonstrating the importance of inclusivity.

Dialogue and witness are not mutually exclusive. Dialogue does not aim to impose one's beliefs on others. Instead, it serves as a bridge for understanding and cooperation. The parable of the Good Samaritan, as depicted in the Bible, figured out this spirit of interreligious dialogue, highlighting the importance of extending compassion and assistance to those in need, regardless of their religious or social background.

The Samaritan's background does not hinder his solidarity (dialogue of life) with others. Inter-religious dialogue itself presupposes solidarity. The mission of solidarity is to overcome divisions, violence, and discrimination, ultimately uniting all humanity with the divine. Religion has the potential to contribute to the creation of inclusive communities. Respect for the beliefs of others is paramount in this endeavor. In the context of dialogue, we must recognize ourselves as both givers and receivers.

Dialogability, which is the capacity for meaningful dialogue, emerges as a crucial virtue for peace.[27] Our diverse society necessitates peace and harmony. A common good cannot be achieved without a foundation of peace. In other words, peace is intricately linked to the reconstruction of social, political, and psychological relationships, particularly in the face of differing interests. To cultivate peace, we must learn from past mistakes, such as intolerance, persecution, and war, and strive to avoid repeating them. Peace constitutes a vital dimension of the religious life of the Indonesian people. There is an intimate connection between peace and respect for all of humanity.

## **5 Conclusion**

The parable of the Good Samaritan in Luke 10:25-37 underscores the importance of respecting others in our daily lives. We are called to approach others with dialogue, Peacefully and harmoniously as well as to acknowledge their circumstances. This divine commandment calls us to love both God and neighbor. Social dialogue necessitates openness to giving-receiving and to foster collegiality-sociality giving and receiving. Additionally, it requires attention, respect, empathy, love, assistance, mutual trust, and acceptance. Individuals come to perceive themselves as part of a larger whole, nurturing social cohesion. Living in harmony

involves unity and togetherness. Thus, theology is not merely a systematic exploration of God and the human relationship but also a practical reflection of one's engagement and actions. By embracing the 'moving beyond boundaries' principle, we can transcend divisions and foster a more care for and compassionate world.

## References

- [1] Burris, R. Another look at the Good Samaritan: Luke 10:25–37. *Review & Expositor*, vol. 114, no. 3, pp. 457–461 (Aug. 2017), doi: 10.1177/0034637317721983.
- [2] Chidolue, O. P. Understanding the Parables of Jesus. *Sapientia Global Journal of Arts, humanities and development of studies (SGOJAHDS)*, vol.3, no.2, pp. 301-310 (2020).
- [3] Doerksen, V. D. The Interpretation of Parables. *Grace Theological Journal*, vol 11, no.2, pp. 3-20 (1970).
- [4] Roukema, R. The Good Samaritan in Ancient Christianity. *Virgiliae Christianae*, vol. 58, no. 1, pp. 56–76 (Feb. 2004).
- [5] Miller, A. C. Good sinners and exemplary heretics: The sociopolitical implications of love and acceptance in the Gospel of Luke. *Review & Expositor*, vol. 112, no. 3, pp. 461–469 (Aug. 2015), doi: 10.1177/0034637315598684.
- [6] Halkin, A. S. Samaritan Polemics against the Jews. *Proceeding of the American Academy for Jewish Research*, vol. 7, pp. 13–59 (1936).
- [7] Ferguson, D. S. Common word, common ground: The love commandments and the understanding of God. *Theology Today* (Apr. 2011). doi: 10.1177/0040573610394923.
- [8] Winkler, U. Respect for Religious Diversity: Christian Attitudes to Other Religions. F. Husein dan F. Hammer, Ed., *Religious Pluralism and Religious Freedom, Religions, Society and the State in Dialogue Contributions to the Austrian-Indonesian Dialogue*. Yogyakarta: CRCS (2013).
- [9] Lee, B. A Missional Hermeneutic of the Other: A Dialogue between Levinas and Confucianism. *Missiology: An International Review*, vol. 41, no. 4, pp. 312–426 (2013).
- [10] D. Lederman-Daniel. Creation of the 'Sphere of the Between' in Educational Dialogue. *Contemporary Education Dialogue*, vol. 13, no. 2, pp. 159–212 (2016).
- [11] D. H. Weiss, The Fruits of Contradiction: Evolution, Cooperation and Ethics in an Inter-Religious Context. *Stud Christ Ethics*, vol. 26, no. 2, pp. 186–195 (May 2013), doi: 10.1177/0953946812473026.
- [12] Haracemiv, S. M. C. & V. Branco. Religious Diversity in the School Culture among Youth and Adults. *Policy Futures in Education*, vol. 16, no. 5, pp. 565–566 (2018).
- [13] Karuveli, G. To Whom Am I Speaking? *Communication, Culture, and Fundamental Theology*. *Theological Studies*, vol. 76, no. 4, p. 695 (2015).
- [14] Pratt, D. *Rethinking Religion, Exploratory Investigations*. Australia: ATF Press (2003).
- [15] Moyaert, M. *Fragile identities, Towards a Theology of Interreligious of Hospitality*. Amsterdam-New York: Rodopi (2011).
- [16] Suseno, F. M. Inter-religious Dialogue: Indonesian Experiences. Stefan Hammer and Fatimah Husein, Ed., *Religious Pluralism and Religious Freedom, Religions, Society and the State in Dialogue Contributions to the Austrian-Indonesian Dialogue*. Yogyakarta: CRCS, pp. 169–172 (2013).
- [17] Schroeder, R. P. Proclamation and Interreligious Dialogue as Prophetic Dialogue.

- Missiology: An International Review, vol. 41, no. 1, p. 57 (2013).
- [18] Avakian, S. The turn to the Other: Reflections on Contemporary Middle Eastern Theological Contributions to Christian–Muslim Dialogue. *Theology Today*, vol. 72, no. 1, p. 81 (2015).
- [19] Moyaert, M. *Theology Today: Comparative Theology as a Catholic Theological Approach*. *Theological Studies*, vol. 76, no. 1, p. 46 (2015).
- [20] Helmer, J. E. Convergence, Incommensurability, Contradiction, or Overlapping Consensus? A Response to Daniel Weiss. *Studies in Christian Ethics*, vol. 26, no. 2, p. 203 (2013).
- [21] Burch-Brown, J. and W. Baker. Religion and Reducing Prejudice. *Group Processes & Intergroup Relations*, vol. 19, no. 6, pp. 784–785 (2016).
- [22] Muck, T. C. Missio-logoi, interreligious dialogue, and the parable of the Good Samaritan. *Missiology: An International Review*, vol. 44, no. 1, pp. 5–19, (Jan. 2016), doi: 10.1177/0091829615618893.
- [23] Nweke, K. C. Between Religiosity and Spirituality: Christianity and the Reemergence of the Immanentist Spiritualities. *Theology Today*, vol. 75, no. 2, pp. 240–244 (2018).
- [24] C. Orji. A Quest to Revitalize Nostra Aetate for an Emerging World Church. *Irish Theological Quarterly* 2017, vol. 82, no. 1, p. 40 (2017).
- [25] Anton, E. Mission Impossible? Pope Benedict XVI and Interreligious Dialogue. *Theological Studies Journal*, vol. 78, no. 4, p. 883 (2017).
- [26] Azra, A. Managing Religious and Cultural Pluralism in Indonesia. *ASEAN Religious Pluralism*, Imtiyaz Yusuf, Ed., Bangkok: Konrad Adenauer Stiftung, p. 95 (2014).
- [27] Küng, H. Dialogability and Steadfastness: On Two Complementary Virtues. Werner G. Jeanrond and Jennifer L. Rike, Ed., *Radical Pluralism and Truth*, David Tracy and the Hermeneutics of Religion. New York: Crossroad, pp. 237-242 (1991).