

“Who is My Neighbor?”: The Concept of the Neighbor in the Parable of the Good Samaritan (Luke 10:25-37) as a Social Phenomenon

Nicolae CRETU

*Rev. PhD(c.), Aurel Vlaicu University of Arad, Arad, Romania
nicu_cretu@yahoo.com*

ABSTRACT: In this article, we aim to examine how the Parable of the Good Samaritan in Luke 10: 25-37, a biblical concept, was reflected in various modern social sciences. Following the research, we will analyze the concept of neighbor and how this biblical quotient gave rise to new areas of social research. In addition to the aspect of social love, commanded by the Savior, we can see how European social psychology reflects the example of the good Samaritan in its development. In addition to this science, we also focused on Ricoeur's sociology, but also on the development of the phenomenon of social justice.

KEYWORDS: neighbor, good samaritan, social psychology, social justice, sociology, love

1. Introduction

The parable of the good Samaritan is an integral part of the teaching that the Savior uses in the elaboration of the most important commandment in the Scriptures, namely, the commandment of love. Although the Savior presents that the most important commandment is "And thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind, and with all thy strength: this is the first commandment" (Mark 12:30) he adds in the immediate verse next that they must, because they are integral, "Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself. There is none other commandment greater than these" (Mark 12:31). But the first answer that the scholar receives to the question, "which is the first of all the commandments?" is that the first commandment, the most important, which is, the first is this: "Hear Israel! The Lord our God is one Lord" (Mark 12:29).

Somehow the Law Teacher asks a question, but gets three answers. The first is to listen, the second is to love, and the third is to fulfill. Here we can see a triad. We could easily say that we have three different actions but integrated in one commandment. First of all, I would like to understand that we cannot talk about obedience to God if we do not love God. Obedience to God and love of God are inseparable. We cannot talk about them as a dichotomy, about something we can separate, or something that will one day be separate. There is an inseparable connection between the two, it is the connection that makes the connection with God and develops the image of the true relationship between man and God. Also, secondly, we cannot talk about love if we do not fulfill what God says. Love begins with pleasure, attraction, develops with sacrifice, continues with dedication and exists through the power of fellowship. These are the things we should understand so that we can develop and fulfill God's plan in our lives. Man is called to sacrifice his life, even if the last and greatest beneficiary is also, in favor of the love of God, to dedicate his existence in the hands of God, to have the eternal presence

in eternal life, and to develop fellowship. with God to fulfill the primary purpose of man's creation. And third, we cannot talk about fulfilling God's will if we do not listen to what God wants us to do, which is presented as a benefit to human existence. Obedience, as action directed from man to God, is the essence of a blessed experience. Obedience is what develops the relationship between man and God, it is the key factor that develops faith in human life, faith without which we can not have a relationship with an intangible being, intangible but also close, immanent, in human life.

Starting from the above ideas, I would like to understand that the love of neighbor and the love of God must be made together, at once, and in no way temporarily separated from each other.

The problem that arises in this parable actually falls on what the scholar, or the teacher of the Law, presented before the Savior, opens, namely, the problem of the neighbor: "And who is my neighbor?" (Luke 10:29). This problem, to which the teacher of the Law wants the answer, develops the answer offered by Jesus through the power of example, because Jesus offers the example, not the theory, and in this context, Jesus prefers the applicative part to the detriment of the theoretical part.

In this study, we set out to analyze how this biblical parable underlies modern research, how the parable has developed as a true social phenomenon. We will analyze the parable from a psychological, social, theological point of view but also from a legal perspective. The authors I will mention are those who were the basis for the development of their fields of research and how each, in turn, contributed to an openness to help those around us.

We believe that it is necessary in our research to explain to understand that this biblical example not only inspires man's spiritual life, but even more, this example is an applied spirituality, i.e., the example of the Good Samaritan has more to do with the public, social, of life than with inner living. And through the analysis of social psychology, social justice, sociology and theology we approach the main branches of human life.

How will we do this? In the following, we want to discuss how Jesus Christ poses the problem when he answers this question and the Savior's answer comes as an example. What did Jesus mean by this parable? What feelings does Jesus imply through these words? What is meant and what is meant by the parable of the merciful Samaritan? How can a biblical example be applied in a secular society? These are just some of the problems to which we want to look for answers in the following and to explain and understand the example I want to appeal to different researchers who in their social studies have used the image of the good Samaritan.

2. Social psychology

Social psychology has developed by answering certain questions or social problems encountered throughout life. Willem Doise defines social psychology as the science of the phenomena of ideology (cognitions and social representations) and of communication phenomena. And this, at different levels of human relationships: relationships between individuals, between individuals and groups, between groups in turn" (Doise 1982, 7). Instead, Serge Moscovici speaks of this as "the science of the conflict between the individual and society" (Moscovici 1997, 12), that is, it relates people directly to the problems that society, and the members of society, face in the past.

Many times, these questions were not answered immediately and therefore it took a certain amount of time to think. As in the beginning, the same questions, or kinds of questions, bother us today. Social psychology wondered at first why we pass so

carelessly around people who need our help? Why do some motorists go through accidents and injuries and continue their journey only with new information in their minds, that of a new accident, without being part of the information of others, that they are the ones who helped them? Why don't train commuters intervene when they see a young woman being assaulted next to them? Starting from these ideas, Serge Moscovici, the father of European social psychology, wonders why we are bad Samaritans and tries to explain how we can become good Samaritans (Moscovici 1998, 62-63).

Serge Moscovici remarks very clearly that the way in which a man can become, can change, even transform, from the human existence specific to the priest and the Levite to that of the Samaritan, is only through a deep meditation. This deep meditation is done with the purpose and desire to have an altruistic character. This, accomplished in a high form, must lead to a detachment from everyday haste and an emphasis on the everyday events and circumstances around us. Social psychology makes a direct connection between how we live and what happens around us. He recommends that through deep meditation man overcome the emphasis placed only on personal life and become active, involved, in helping those in need, just as the Samaritan stopped his journey to offer help to the fallen, hit and beaten.

Thinking about these aspects, Serge Moscovici discusses the example, and then the explanation, that C. D. Batson made with the students from Princeton Theological Seminary. Batson refers to the example of the Good Samaritan by referring to the great cities where the priest and the Levite represent those people in a hurry for their work, focused on what they have to do, and the Samaritan represents the man who is "less pressed by time" (Moscovici 199, 63), the man willing to change his direction, the program to allocate time and sacrifices to others, in other words, to make himself available to others.

Batson's example begins with the moment he asks some students to "shut up, after which they are invited to a conference, which for half of them referred to the parable of the Good Samaritan. He then led them to a recording studio in a neighboring building. Some of the students were notified in a natural tone: "It takes a few more minutes, but you can go." The others were told, "You're late. You've been waiting for a few minutes. So you better hurry." On the way, both of them passed a collapsed man in front of the entrance of a building, with his head bowed, coughing and moaning. It was observed that among the hurried students, 10% offered him help, and among the others, about two thirds (Moscovici 1998, 63).

This example makes us think seriously if there is any difference between a student who knows and studies the example of the Good Samaritan, but who does not change or influence his life with anything more than it influences those of commuters who look indifferently at the abuses of around them, or maybe even those drivers who do not offer their support to those who need it. Moscovici observes with sadness and concludes that those who were in fact "preachers of the model of the Samaritan good proved to be a model of evil" (Moscovici 1998, 63-64).

Concluding Batson's example, S. Moscovici states that "the parable thus staged shows that an altruistic person, always ready to sacrifice his goods and time, proves to be the same even if he is not promised any reward in exchange for his services. This person is not disinterested; on the contrary, she is interested in the other, through a kind of relationship she generally has with others, being convinced that the world would certainly be better if everyone proceeded in the same way" (Moscovici 1998, 64).

The example and application of the parable to our times, from the point of view of social psychology, looks quite good and really gives us a real problem of our society. It presents strictly the problem of social relations, a problem that is also found in the heart

of the priest and the Levite. This social problem is very close to the meaning that Jesus wanted to leave to those who listened to him and to those who will hear this parable. One thing that should be mentioned is that Serge Moscovici refers to this parable to present his idea within the science he represents and does not want to offer a theological interpretation of this parable.

3. Social Justice

Nicholas Kasirer, a law professor at McGill University, member of the International Academy of Comparative Law and a puisne justice of the Supreme Court of Canada, is one of the promoters of the so-called legal aid debt. In the article "Agape = Agape" he discusses the fact that the example of the merciful Samaritan is mentioned by those who support and promote the recognition of "the legal debt of aid, even supporting the idea that it is latent in civil liability" (Kasirer 2001, 576).

He speaks very clearly of how in the legal texts, compared to those of theology, the representation of the Parable of the Good Samaritan deviates quite considerably from the meaning of theological agape as "Christian mercy, evangelical love, charity - and duty to his neighbor. "But he, in his research, starts from this example and wants to provide a clear and concise analysis of the problem of the existence of legal aid debt in private law, through reflections on "possible major reconfiguration of the concept of civil liability" (Kasirer 2001, 578-579).

For the first time in history, the notion of neighbor and of course the Parable of the Good Samaritan was used in court in 1825, in the city of Massachusetts in the United States of America, in the process called *Mills vs. Wyman*. In this lawsuit, *Mills Vs. Wyman* 20 Massachusetts 207, the events in the case resemble those in the Parable of the Good Samaritan. In this case, a 25-year-old man left his parents' house. At one point, while returning home, he became ill among strangers. A man who acted like a good Samaritan took care of him and offered him shelter until he died. The defendant, ie his father in this case, found out about what happened and promised the one who took care of his son that he would pay him everything he spent on his son's care, but for various reasons, the father broke his promise. After this trial, the number of judges who reflected on the goodness of the Samaritan, for example, increased. John Copeland Nagle is of the opinion that this example still has much to offer in the field of justice, especially in the field of social justice (Nagle 2020, 1).

It must be understood, compared to the period in which this charitable event that the Savior exposes to the public, happened, that things have changed a great deal. A topicality of the facts would open many judicial possibilities today. The robbed man would have the opportunity to have his property recognized in court and could even sue him and reward him morally. Local authorities in Jericho could be blamed for failing to protect passers-by on this road. Even the good Samaritan or the innkeeper could wake up with a criminal trial, if their service had not been to the liking of the robber. Jesus, the parable, could easily be accused of public slander by the priest or Levite. Chris Marshall, in the face of these possibilities, "recognizes that it is important to recognize the need for biblical reflection on justice in a larger world cultural and religious vision, which is quite different from that of modern secular society. To understand the theme of justice in the Bible, we must move into a social and political world very different from our own. Then, after we have passed, we must decide what to bring back, what is relevant to our world. This is a task that requires a hermeneutics that is quite difficult to perform" (Marshall 2012, 11).

Our goal is not to create here a legal norm applicable to the world judicial system, but our desire is from the private way in which the biblical concept of neighbor, found

in the parable, started a legal branch and to go into review in which it is found today in various penal codes in different modern countries. Chris Marshall admits that it is quite difficult to create a biblical justice based on the text of the Holy Scriptures because "the large amount of data to be considered is discouraging. There are hundreds of texts in the Old and New Testaments that speak explicitly about justice and justice, terms that coincide and even overlap in meaning. Biblical data are also very diverse" (Marshall 2012, 12), he concludes.

The American judiciary refuses to impose a legal obligation to be a good Samaritan, to apply social responsibility to the precepts deriving from the principle of being close to the suffering. Although it refuses to do so in general, this social debt does exist in certain circumstances (see *TransCare Maryland, Inc., et al. Vs. Bryson Murray, et al.*, 431 Maryland, 225, April 22, 2013, 64 A.3d 88). What seems interesting, however, is that the American law on judicial crime has also reached a consensus on the second question raised by the example of the Good Samaritan. "He who acts like a good Samaritan should not be held accountable for any harm that the volunteer negligently causes. This is the import of the statutes adopted by almost every state. California adopted the first status of this Samaritan good in the 1950s. Since then, states have adopted different versions of a law on the immunity of the Samaritan good (Nagle 2020, 5-8).

Indeed, the courts have distinguished between the voluntary employment of the Samaritan property and the obligations established by law. "The priest and the Levite did not violate any rule of law when they crossed over to the other side of the wounded," a court explained. "The Good Samaritan did not act in obedience to a legal duty when he took pity on him, cared for him, and took him to the inn" (see *Tucker v. Burt*, 152 Mich. 68 (1908), March 31, 1908 · Michigan Supreme Court · Docket No. 135, 152 Mich. 68). In another case, *Whiteside v. Southern R. Co.*, Nagle recalls a judge who referred to his efforts to "alleviate pain, suffering, and death, and appeals to the feelings of humanity for which the Good Samaritan has always been revered. and praised the shame and condemnation of the priest and the Levite and who watched and passed without help to the suffering" (Nagle 2020, 5).

But the involvement of the neighbor in justice, starting from the proof of closeness in the Parable of the Good Samaritan, did not find references only in the American judicial system, but from the whole world the so-called "law of the Good Samaritan" was created. The Christian world, in a general sense, believes that this parable is only a universal moral duty, but the Good Samaritan Law is a universal concept according to any legal system that seeks to support and encourage people and help those in need (Jaeck 2021, 1-2).

Petere Cooke notes that in the United Kingdom, the involvement of one's neighbor in the act of social justice began with Lord Goff's ruling in the House of Lords, the highest court of appeal in Britain, in the case of *Smith v Littlewoods Organization Ltd (1987)*, when he said that "Common law does not impose liability for what are called pure omissions", he said, noting that "there is no general duty of care by one person to prevent harm to another." Thus, applying English law, those in the biblical story who passed by the wounded before the coming of the Samaritan have the right to do as they did. Whatever their moral duty, they had no legal obligation to come to his aid and could not be held liable before an English court for non-compliance" (Jaeck 2021, 5).

In France, Francois Jaeck presents that for the beginning the first indirect references to the principles of the good Samaritan of social coexistence were made with the advent of the Penal Code, although the link between that article and the parable itself was not mentioned. Article 223-6 of the French Penal Code states that "French

law not only does not seek to exonerate the rescuer from any liability in the event of inadequate assistance, but, on the contrary, intends to punish him - both in criminal law, as well as in the civil one - on the spectator who, directly witnessing a dangerous incident, does not intervene even if this would not present any risk for him or for a third party". Moreover, Art. 1382, often regarded as the cornerstone of French crime law, states that "any act which causes damage compels the person who caused the damage to be credited to him" (Jaeck 2021, 7).

Peter Schetter remarks that in Germany, although the German Penal Code was copied to a large extent after the French one, at art. 323c,, who fails to provide assistance in case of disaster or imminent danger or suffering, although this (aid) is necessary and reasonable in these circumstances, (and is) especially without considerable danger to one's own being and without breach of other duties possible, will be punished with imprisonment of up to one year or fined" (Jaeck 2021, 9)

Lawyers such as Walter Verstrepen in Belgium, Tatu Henricksson in Finland, Joao Paulo Teixeira de Matos in Portugal, Igor Beades Martin in Spain, also discuss the implications of the Good Samaritan law in the criminal codes of their countries. Despite the rather opposite approach to the main legal system facing Europe, we still find that applying the idea of helping or punishing those who do not help is a very common law. Even if the "Law of the Good Samaritan", as a legal concept, offers only a defense against crimes resulting from the attempt to save, in countries where the legal system is based on common law, and imposes the obligation to save, in countries where the legal system based on the Penal Code, we note that the "Law of the Good Samaritan," as a universal moral duty, is legally protected (Jaeck 2021, 9-20).

As human beings, in most cases, we look down on those who do evil and try to distance ourselves from such people. Taking an example from everyday life we can say that anyone accuses the perpetrator of a crime, and we are right, and we want him to be punished for what he does, but why don't we think that maybe just as guilty? there are also those who let others die without offering them their help. How many people died because they were left without the help of those who could give them a continuation of their lives and how many people died as an act of crime? Can't those who kill be equally guilty but also those who, through their lack of reaction to the needs of others, determine them, maybe we can even say that it helps others to die? Does man's thinking have a reaction when the one next to him has reached the end? Don't we have to look around us and feel responsible for the lives of those around us, legally speaking? Jimmy Carter, the 39th president of the United States of America, in the book *Source of Strength* remarks so well that the presence of a person in our life can be a transformative experience in our lives. In those moments there may be a difference between life and death (Carter 1997, 53).

We must understand that this view of social justice is quite close to the meaning that Jesus Christ wanted to give to the teacher of the Law, but it is not fully understood. However, Christian justice focuses normatively on solidarity with and restoration of sinners, not on harsh punishment and rejection. This is also clear in Paul's instructions to the Corinthians regarding the treatment of someone who violated community standards by offending, in this case, against Paul himself. The community has previously punished the offender, probably by expulsion, but Paul is concerned about this punishment" (Marshall 2012, 18) and demands his rehabilitation.

Jesus Christ in his call to make us the neighbor of others and to become man as the neighbor of another does not bring direct accusations, as we see that he does the legal duty of help, but he brings to man's thinking a drawing that represents the portrait of the man His understanding. Jesus Christ, through his answer, passes the action of the neighbor as a model for humanity, beyond an act springing as a result of an obligation,

or criminal coercion, He presents us with an example of how we can exercise our love through our deeds, the way in which we take love, as a feeling and emotion, to the level of action, transforming the obligation to help into the desire to help. It is the duty of each of us, in our places, and according to our ability, to help, to help and to relieve anyone who is in danger and in need (Rotaru 2012, 5).

4. Sociology - the socios and the "neighbor"

Paul Ricoeur, an important representative of hermeneutics, starting from the statement that if sociology is the science that deals with "human relations in organized groups" then we do not have a sociology of neighbor. "If there is no sociology of neighbor, there may be a sociology starting from the neighbor's frontier" (Ricoeur 1996, 112).

Starting from this idea and using the Parable of the Good Samaritan, Ricoeur, brings into discussion three great ideas, or astonishments, as he presents them. First, we find out how Christ responds to the teacher of the law. Jesus "answers the question by a question, but by a question that has been reversed by the corrective virtue of the story." If the first one asked, "And who is my neighbor?" Jesus answered, "Which of these men behaved as if they were near?" (Ricoeur 1996, 113).

In these words we see, how Ricoeur argues "that near is not a social object - it did not even come from the second person - but a behavior in the first person. The neighbor is the very conduct of making you present. That is why the neighbor is of the order of the story: there was once a man who became the neighbor of a stranger whom the robbers left almost dead ... we do not have a close one; I make myself close to someone" (Ricoeur 1996, 113). So, at Ricoeur, the problem is not who I am, but who I am close to. The emphasis is not on the external ones to me, which enter into a relationship with me becoming my interiors, but on the internal ones that I externalize in order to reach the interiors of others, of the ones through which I make myself close to another.

Secondly, we find that another Ricoeurian astonishment is that of the way in which the culmination of the parable is the presence of one person to another. The first walkers, the priest and the Levite, as the living parable of the man in office, "of the man absorbed in his role, and whom the social function occupies to such an extent that it makes him unavailable for the surprise of an encounter; the institution - namely the ecclesiastical institution itself - blocks in it the access to the event". The other, the Samaritan, who wants to be present for the presence of the robber, is also a category, a category of the Stranger, "he is not part of the group; he is man without a true past and without an authentic tradition; devoid of race and piety; less than a pagan; a relapse". He is the man unoccupied and unconcerned with those of social functions. He is the traveler who changes his journey according to his availability to be "available for the meeting and for the presence. And the conduct he invents is the relationship from "man to man" ... his whole pity is a gesture beyond role, beyond character, function; it innovates a hypersociological reciprocity of the person towards the one in front of him" (Ricoeur 1996, 113).

Third, Paul Ricoeur's astonishment is found in the prophetic interpretation he gives to this parable. "Amazement is born of the parable and is reborn from the prophecy ... The parable of the story of the encounter today, the prophecy tells the story of an event at the end of history that retrospectively discovers the meaning of all the meetings in history." Thus, for Ricoeur the intention of uttering the parable is a double intention, a practical one, go and do the same, and the other theological, Christological, prophetic, which has an eschatological meaning that goes beyond the one who became

close to another. The practical meaning is given by the significance of the neighbor who represents it the way I meet the other, the way I am close to another, “beyond any social mediation; and then, in the sense that the significance of this meeting does not belong to any criterion immanent in history, it cannot be definitively recognized by the actors themselves, but will be discovered on the Last Day, as a way in which I will have met it without knowing it. , on Christ ” (Ricoeur 1996, 114-115).

Paul Ricoeur's opinion is quite well argued and sometimes anchored in the biblical hermeneutics of the parable. Although in the biblical conception the Christian is called to be close to all, I do not think that in this parable it is precisely this that Jesus wanted to allow himself to be understood. The presented context of the parable is that of understanding the call to love and the category to which this call applies. And Paul Ricoeur's mistake is that he develops the idea of neighbor as a category and the context refers to love as a category and indirectly to neighbor as a subcategory of love.

5. Love as a social experience

When Jesus Christ uses the discourse, as a way to show the power and purpose of his existence, he, not infrequently, uses the parables to make the message more understandable, most of the time, but also to make it incomprehensible. for the general public to be explained to the disciples (see the disciples' requirement to be told the parable of the tares, Matthew 13:36) Vincent Cheung in *The Parables of Jesus* argues that “Jesus uses parables to hide spiritual truths in the dark ... but they offer spiritual teachings to those whom God has called to light” (Cheung 2003, 8).

C.W. Hedrick argues that parables are a "representation of actions that have taken place or would have taken place, and raises the question of whether the representation corresponds to human life" (Hedrick 1994, 80-81). The parable of the Good Samaritan is part of Hedrick's classification and which I personally introduce in those events that would have taken place, an event that Jesus takes from His omniscience.

Joachim Jeremias, one of the greatest scholars of the parables of Jesus Christ, states in the introduction to the explanation of this parable that here we are talking about love, but not any kind of love, but "boundless love" (Jeremias 2000, 241).

The teacher of the Law, of the Mosaic Law, being aware that his theological knowledge would be useless if the love of God and the love of the neighbor were not found in him, he approaches Jesus and wants to find out the scriptural answer to the identity of the neighbor. Even if in a general sense the neighbor referred to “compatriots, including full proselytes, but there was a disagreement as to the exceptions; the Pharisees were inclined to exclude the Pharisees. The Essenes demanded that man hate all the sons of darkness; a said rabbis decided that heretics, informants and renegades should be pushed into the ditch and not thrown out” (Jeremias 2000, 242). Thus, commenting on this situation, Jeremiah refers to the fact that Jesus was not asked for a definition of what his neighbor means but was asked for a delimitation, a classification of people who are integrated in this expression. Thus, the meaning of the question is: "How far does my responsibility extend?" (Jeremiah 2000, 243).

In this context, of the interpretation of the double law of love, Jesus brings into question this parable of the man who descended on the so-called "Way of the Blood", from Jerusalem to Jericho. The first to pass by the robber was a priest. The explanation of this priest's attitude can be made in two ways: either the Savior discredits the priests or the past priest thought that man was dead and how the Law (Leviticus 21: 1) forbade him to touch a corpse other than that of a family member, he did not want to violate this law.

The second passer-by, a Levite, also passes by the robber and he was asked for ritual cleansing only during the "ritual activities. If the Levite, like the priest, were traveling from Jerusalem to Jericho, nothing would stop them from touching a dead body by the roadside. It must be assumed that if he was determined by ritual considerations, he was on his way to Jerusalem to perform his official duties there. The text does not exclude this assumption ". We must mention that the ascension of the Levites to Jerusalem was done in groups, and the Levite, for example, is alone, which, Jeremiah concludes, "is difficult to regard the Levite as being driven by ritual considerations" (Jeremiah 2000, 244).

According to folk tales in triadic form, the people expected the person who did good to the fallen to be a layman. But Jesus specifies that the one who did him good was a Samaritan, one of those people with whom the Jews were in a state of enmity, hatred, irreconcilable hostility, as evidenced by the teacher's failure to pronounce the term Samaritan. "Thus it is clear that Jesus deliberately chose an extreme example; comparing the desertion of God's messengers with the unselfishness of that hostile Samaritan, his listeners had to be able to measure the absolute and unlimited nature of the duty to love" (Jeremias 2000, 245-246). If that Law teacher's question was about the object of love, Jesus asks him about the subject of love. The Law Teacher thinks of him when he asks the question Jesus thinks of the fallen. The teacher seeks a theoretical answer and Jesus gives him a practical answer. When we understand the message of Jesus' parable, we will be able to perceive and understand the true calling and the categorical imperative of love.

Through this parable, concludes Jeremiah, Jesus wants to show the Law teacher that although the neighbor is the fellow citizen, the term "is not limited to this. The example of this despised *corcitura* must teach him that no human being was beyond the scope of his love. The law of love called him to be ready to lay down his life for the need of another" (Jeremias 2000, 245-246).

The law of love is not a law applied to a random category, chosen on contexts, opportunities or possibilities of realization on the condition of mutual help, but it is an imperative, but not any kind of imperative, but a universal law, a categorical imperative.

Conclusion

The parable of the Good Samaritan is, as we have seen, part of a wide circle of research in terms of the social fields that appeal to this image, or example. This parable is a standard of living, regardless of space and time, for existing humanity, and with the development of various social fields of research, we can discuss the parable of the good Samaritan as a true social phenomenon.

Although social psychology, social justice or the legal duty to help, the sociable and the neighbor, are some topics that emerge from this example, very interesting and effective in its application by humanity, we still see that Jesus Christ started from a theme to he arrives at a teaching, he has gone from theory to practice. As we have noted above, to understand does not mean to impose on the text your own finite capacity for understanding, but to expose yourself to the text and receive from it a wider self.

Following this study, we can draw some essential conclusions. First of all, Serge Moscovici's European social psychology developed from the principle of the Good Samaritan, a social science that emphasizes inter-human relations starting from this biblical approach. Second, the law of the Samaritan good, with the first reference in a criminal trial in 1825, began to develop as a principle in international criminal codes. And thirdly, the way Ricoeur develops his partner or neighbor principle, with strong

emphasis, not on identifying the neighbor but on who we make our neighbor, how we relate to the social problems of those around us.

And fourthly, the biblical neighbor is not only the one I want to have as a neighbor but the neighbor is anyone who belongs to the same existential category as mine, the category of humanity, and this close I am called to help in love and for love, my love for him so that his love may become the love of another.

In this parable, we find concentrated the idea of full and total love and sacrifice, to which humanity is called, regardless of its purpose and social activity. We are called to have everyone in love as close, as Jeremias presents, but also to be close to all, as Ricoeur presents, and all this in the category of love under the categorical imperative of love for a social better.

References

- *** The Holy Bible. 2004. *King James Version*. Dallas, TX: Brown Books Publishing.
- Cheung, Vincent. 2003. *The Parables of Jesus*. Bloomington: Xlibris Corp.
- Carter, Jimmy. 1997. *Sources of Strength, Meditations of Scripture for a Living Faith*. New York: Times Books.
- Doise, Willem, (éd). 1983. *Current Issues. in Social Psychology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, vol. 1.
- Harvard Law School, Case Law Acces Project, *Tucker v. Burt, 152 Mich. 68 (1908), March 31, 1908 · Michigan Supreme Court · Docket No. 135, 152 Mich. 68*, accessed 4 december 2020, <https://cite.case.law/mich/152/68>.
- Hedrick, C. W. 1994. *Parables as Poetic Fiction: The Creative Voice of Jesus*. Peabody: Hendrickson.
- Kasirer, Nicholas. 2001. „*Agape=Agape*”, in: *Revue Internationale de droit compare*. Paris: Societe de legislation compare, nr. 3, jul-sep, p. 575-600.
- Jaeck, Francois, and Cooke, Peter, and Verstrepen, Walter, and Henriksson, Tatu, and Schetter, Peter, and Matos, Joao Teixeira de, and Martin, Igor Beades (ed.). 2014. *The Good Samaritan Law Across the Europe*. The Dan Legal Network, accessed 5 december 2020, https://www.daneurope.org/c/document_library.
- Jeremias, Joachim. 2000. *Parabolele lui Isus (The Parables of Jesus)*. Bucharest: Anastasia.
- Marshall, Chris. 2012. *Divine Justice as a Restorative Justice*. Centre for Christian Ethics, Baylor Univeristy, accessed 13 december 2020, <https://www.baylor.edu/content/services/document.php/163072.pdf>.
- Moscovici, Serge. 1998. *Psihologia Socială a Relațiilor cu Celălalt (Psychologie sociale des relations a autrui)*. Iasi: Polirom.
- Moscovici, Serge. 1997. *Psihologia Socială sau mașina de fabricat zei (Social Psychology or the Machine for Making Gods)*. Iasi: Polirom.
- Moscovici, Serge. 2011, *Influență socială și schimbare socială (Social Influence and Social Change)*. Iasi: Polirom.
- Moscovici, Serge, and Markova, Ivana. 2006. *Psihologia socială modernă: Istoria creării unei științe sociale internaționale (The Making of Modern Social Psychology: The Hidden Story of How an International Social Science was Created)*. Iasi: Polirom.
- Nagle, John Copeland. 2020. *The Good Samaritan as a Legal Parable*. Lecture held at the Pepperdine School of Law Annual Conference, accessed 13 december 2020, <https://law.pepperdine.edu/nootbaar-institute/annual-conference/content/johnnagle.pdf>
- Ricoeur, Paul. 1996. *Istorie și Adevăr (History and Truth)*. Bucharest: Anastasia.
- Rotaru, Ioan-Gheorghe. 2012. “Trăiește și tu după modelul lui Iisus Hristos!” (“Live in the model of Jesus Christ!”). *Argeșul ortodox (The Orthodox Arges)*, XI, No. 562: 5.