

Exegeting “Places” : Territoriality and Hospitality in Luke 16:19-31*

Hortensius Florimond**

Place and spatial dimensions were much forgotten in academic and theological discourse.¹⁾ On one hand, the importance of place is obvious; we all live in a place and nothing exists without place. On the other hand, it is precisely because we are “in a place” from the very beginning of our life that we have not thought very much about this very fact. It is evident that spatial motives and themes have a prominent place in the Bible. The Bible begins with the story of the creation of a “living place” for all creatures. The story of Israel is a story about promising, leaving, having, and losing a place (the land).²⁾ Mark’s Gospel can be outlined according to three indications of “place”: Galilea, the Way, and Jerusalem. Matthew and Luke, by and large, follow Mark with some elaborations and modifications. The author of John’s Gospel sometimes plays a very interesting combination between “time” *and* “place” (cf. ἄνωθεν = “again” and “from above”). The “Way” (journeys, sailings, shipwrecks, etc) becomes a prominent motive in Acts. Pauline letters were sent to “local” churches. These large amounts of evidence need a critical reading that gives more attention to spatial dimensions of the text. The following study is an attempt to shed some new light in that direction. Luke’s well-known parable *Lazarus and a Rich Man* will be used as a methodological test-case to provide some new insights into reading and translating the biblical text.

* United Bible Societies Asia-Pacific Area Translation Consultation Paper, June 2007.

** Indonesian Bible Society Translation Officer.

1) H. Moxnes, *Putting Jesus in His Place* (London: Westminster John Knox Press, 2003), 6-8.

2) Some scholars, therefore, prefer to speak of “Enneateuch” (nine scrolls) instead of Pentateuch. For them, history of Israel is based on the central theme of *land*. The land is promised (Genesis), traveled toward (Exodus-Numbers), conquered (Joshua), defended (Judges), united and divided (1-2 Samuel, 1-2 Kings), and finally lost. This is the Israel’s “primary history” that needs to be differentiated from the “History of the Chronicler” (1-2 Chronicles and Ezra-Nehemiah) which pays a particular attention to Davidic dynasty.

1. What is “Place”?

1.1. Place: Identity, Power, and Normality

Spatial theorists have provided the concepts and language for studying space and place critically. They insist that humans are historical, social, and spatial.³⁾ *Place* is a cultural element produced by societies, and has the function of replicating (and sometimes subverting) those societies’ power structures. Place, therefore, is not just an inert container for human action, and is not seen merely as a projection screen for human activity in history. A social and anthropological reading brings forth several aspects that inherently come together within a place. First, place is closely related to *identity*. In the Bible, we find examples that show how closely place is connected with identity. Place *identifies* someone or a nation/people. In NT times, a person’s identity was *given* by his/her place in society. So, we have Jesus (from) Nazareth, Maria (from) Magdala, Simeon (from) Kirene, etc. The place makes the person distinctive, unique, and different from other persons with the same name. Second, place is a matter of *power*. Having a place means having the power to control access to and from that place. To maintain a place means also gaining advantage from that place, etc. Place maintains power and control. Third, place is connected with *normality*. Place is used to protect and maintain normality, and to keep everyone and everything “in his/her/its place”.

1.2. Territoriality

The above three aspects of place introduce us to the discussion of *territoriality*. R.D. Sack defines territoriality as “the attempt by an individual or group to affect, influence, or control people, phenomena, and relationships, by delimiting and asserting control over a geographic area ... Territories require a constant effort to establish and maintain”.⁴⁾ Simply stated, territoriality means: classification,

3) For modern spatial theories see among others: H. Lefebvre, *The Production of Space* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1991); D. Harvey, *The Condition of Postmodernity* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1989), E. Soja, *Postmodern Geographies: The Reassertion of Space in Critical Social Theory* (London: Verso, 1989).

4) R. D. Sack, *Human Territoriality. Its Theory and History* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986), 19; also: J. Neyrey, “Spaces and Places, Whence and Whither, Homes and Rooms:

communication, and control.⁵⁾ *Classification* refers to the ways in which humans invest space with meaning or label it for some purpose. Territoriality, for example, involves every attempt to classify a place as my/our and your place, and so classification implies inclusion and exclusion. *Communication* refers to every attempt to communicate that a place "belongs to me". A person always personalizes (with name, colour, style, arrangement, ornaments, decorations, etc) his/her place to communicate that this particular place is "my place". *Control* refers to the power and ideology that *manage* a particular place. In "my place", I am the hero; I have the full control and power over my place (Louis XIV: "the Kingdom is me"). Place, therefore, expresses control and power. In other words, territoriality is the geographic expression of power. Furthermore, a place also fixes control and power as something usual, natural, and normal, as *normality*.⁶⁾

With the help of these socio-anthropological insights, let us now turn to the Lukan text. Our attention will be focused upon how the narrator creates and develops each of his actors in relation to his/her place, how power and normality is connected with a place, and how the narrator questions it.

2. Structure and Location

The pericope can be divided into three parts according to indications of place:

In the *first scene* (vv. 19-21), the narrator places the rich man in his own house and Lazarus at the rich man's gate. As we shall see, each place replicates each social-place and identity. No change of place or dialogue takes place between the two in this scene (and there is no dialogue between them even in the whole story!). In the *second scene* (v. 22), there is a change of place regarding the two main actors. They are both dead and each goes to his own new place. The *third scene* (vv. 23-31) takes place in the new place for each: Lazarus in Abraham's bosom and the rich man in Hades.

'Territoriality' in the Fourth Gospel", *Biblical Theological Bulletin* 32 (2002), 60-63; H. Moxnes, *Putting Jesus in His Place*, 12-16.

5) *Ibid.*, 60-61.

6) For the commonsense and everyday nature of ideology, created and maintained by and through a place, see T. Cresswell, *In Place, out of Place: Geography, Ideology, and Transgression* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1996), 14-18.

Both actors, then, are placed in different places, and they undergo a change of place. Lazarus's place is changed: from the rich man's gate, he is carried by the angels and then stationed in the bosom of Abraham. He is absolutely passive throughout the story. His place is determined by others: put or simply "thrown" (ἐβέβλητο) at the gate, "carried away" (ἀπενεχθήναι) by the angels, "comforted" (παρακαλείται) by God. Note that the verbs are all in passive voice. Lazarus is placed in *his place*, each time *higher* (gate - Abraham's bosom) by others, who are also increasingly exalted in their 'places' (men - angels - God).

The rich man's place is also changed: from his house, down to the grave and finally is stationed at Hades, "the lowest place on earth" (Psa 86:13). In contrast with Lazarus, the rich man is more active throughout the story. In the first scene, he is depicted as a round character, who actively *controls* his place (house): dresses in purple and fine linen and feasts sumptuously everyday. In other words, he actively builds his image/self-identity by his dress and feasts. He remains active even after his death in a lively dialogue with Abraham.

3. A Reading⁷⁾

3.1. Social Place

Luke (the extra-diegesis narrator) through Jesus (the intra-diegesis narrator) opens the story by introducing two principal actors. The Greek construction highlights the 'social places' of the two actors:

Ἄνθρωπος δέ τις ἦν πλούσιος, *a certain man ... rich*
 πτωχὸς δέ τις ὀνόματι Λάζαρος *a poor man ... by the name of Lazarus*

Not only are these introductory clauses nicely balanced literally, but they also

7) The term 'reading' is used to underscore the role of the reader in producing meaning. Reading is a reflective act that produces meaning, not merely a 'preparatory' stage in exegesis/interpretation. A. Thiselton, *New Horizons in Hermeneutics: The Theory and Practice of Transforming Biblical Reading* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1992), 498: "The paradigm of 'reading' in literary theory and the question about 'reading competence' have tended to replace the hermeneutical terminology about 'interpretation' and understanding".

show the *distance* between the two actors’ places within society. The narrator, from the first line of the story, provides definition and classification. The rich man is anonymous, nameless but full of possessions; the other is poor, empty except for a name. Only in this parable is an actor given a proper name. Naming is a way to express the narrator’s point of view. Naming provides the reader with some expectation regarding the dynamics of the story and each actor’s fate. Lazarus means “God helps”.⁸⁾ The choice of the name cannot be accidental for its meaning holds out a promise.

3.2. House, Dress and Feast

Place expresses and maintains identity. The rich man is in his house. The “gate”⁹⁾ (πυλῶνα) indicates a big and luxurious house, normally owned by landlords at that time. This big, luxurious house, therefore, speaks about the identity of its owner: he is a rich man, and above all, he is a man of honor. His wealth and honor are exemplified and communicated by his clothing and eating habits:

ἐνεδιδύσκετο πορφύραν καὶ βύσσον
He habitually dressed in purple and fine linen

Dress is closely related to honor-shame values in ancient Mediterranean culture. Dress displays and communicates who you are (identity) and what you are (social standing).¹⁰⁾ “Purple” as a sign of royalty is well attested (Jdg 8:26; Est 8:15) and fine linen is a sign of luxury (Pro 31:22; Rev 18:12). Purple and fine linen, therefore, places the man among the elites and the rich who have the power of a king! In his society, he is a *patron*.

εὐφραίνόμενος καθ’ ἡμέραν λαμπρῶς.
feasted sumptuously everyday

8) It is a grecisized, shortened form of Hebrew or Aramaic ‘*El ‘āzār*. The fuller Greek form would be *Eleazaros*. See, J. E. Fitzmyer, *The Gospel According to Luke*, I (New York: Doubleday, 1981), 1131.

9) *Pylōna* (different from ‘door’ *tyra*) is normally used for the gate of a fortified city (Rev 21:12), the Temple (Act 14:13) or palace (Mat 26:71).

10) J. J. Pilch, *The Cultural Dictionary of the Bible* (Collegeville, Minnesota: The Liturgical Press, 1999), 19-20.

“You are what you eat”. The rich man habitually uses his big and luxurious house to hold parties for his guests. The word εὐφραίνόμενος does not mean simply “joyously living” (NAB) or to “live in luxury” (NIV) but “making a feast” as Luke uses it elsewhere (Luk 12:19; 15:23, 24, 32). The text, however, should not be read as simply talking about an individual lunch/dinner. It is a party with many guests. Feasting and eating together are ways to express and maintain honor.¹¹⁾ By holding a party everyday, the rich man expresses and maintains his social standing as a man of honor and as a patron. Feasting and eating together have another function: it strengthens one’s group identity and underscores their difference from another group. So, by “feasting sumptuously everyday”, the rich man also strengthens his group as the rich and maintains his *social distance* from Lazarus and his group. In this text, feasting then functions as a boundary-marker: to keep Lazarus outside, always as a stranger, and to keep the rich man and his rich fellows inside. Everyone is in his place. It continues everyday as a normal way of life; the imperfect ἐνεδιδύσκετο and καθ’ ἡμέραν underscore this. The place maintains distance and boundaries as normality!

The adverb λαμπρῶς — derived from the verb which has the meaning: to give light, shine, be bright, etc — fittingly underscores the function of feasting as a display (communication) of honor. Display of richness (by feasting every-day and wearing luxurious dress) serves to maintain, promote, and enhance the honor of the rich man and his group.¹²⁾ The point here is not simply an individual’s lavish lifestyle or insensitivity, but honor and self-definition. The rich man *displays* his richness in his big-luxurious house, which he ‘personalizes’ by his clothing and eating habits. In terms of territoriality, the big and luxurious house *defines* and *classifies* him as a man of honor and power, who takes full *control* in his house (see below), and *communicates* it by his clothing and eating habits.

3.3. The Gate and the Skin

Literally, Lazarus is “thrown” (ἐβέβλητο) at the rich man’s gate. He does not choose his place of his own will. The poor is forced to the gate by others.¹³⁾ Lazarus

11) J. J. Pilch and B. J. Malina, *Biblical Social Values and Their Meaning* (Massachusetts: Hendrickson Pub, Inc. 1993), 76-79.

12) This is a part of ‘dramatic orientation’ in ancient Mediterranean culture and mentality, *Ibid.*, 47-49.

13) The verb is usually used to depict a person confined to his or her sickbed (cf. Mat 8:6, 14; Mar

has to receive his place at the gate. In other words, he has to receive his identity as a poor man at the gate. At the Rich Man’s gate, Lazarus is not yet “the one whom God helps” but “the one whom men have thrown at the gate”.

The gate is a place through which one can come in or out. It is a means to let in or to keep out. The gate, therefore, is *a means of control*: to oversee and select who can come in and who cannot. For the rich man, the gate is a means of letting his fellow rich people come in and participate in his banquet, but at the same time the gate is used as a means to keep Lazarus (and his fellows poor people) outside. The gate is also a possibility for the rich man to show himself as a patron for the poor,¹⁴ as Luke underscores it elsewhere (cf. Luk 14:12-14). Here, the rich man fails to perform his function as a patron for the poor. He fails to perform hospitality to Lazarus. He fails to receive Lazarus, the outsider and stranger, and transform him into his guest. For him, the gate simply serves as a means to control and select his guests. The gate serves as a boundary-marker or a margin that must always be guarded so that the unclean cursed poor person such as Lazarus cannot come in and defile his house.

The well-guarded gate of the rich man is contrasted with the *unguarded skin* of Lazarus. Skin is the margin of the human body and keeps the body as an enclosure by keeping bodily fluids inside (i.e. in their place), and so keeps the body “pure”.¹⁵ Skin is always guarded and controlled in relation to bodily emissions that come out or everything (especially food) impure that comes in. Skin diseases make someone impure because they are a sign that the body’s margin is uncontrolled. Lazarus’ skin “covered with sores” (v. 20 and v. 21) is, therefore, a sign of an impure condition. As the luxurious house provides a self-definition of the rich man, so the skin with sores functions as a definition of who Lazarus is: he is an impure person. This condition underscores his status as a cursed one.¹⁶

Lazarus is placed at the gate with “dogs”. In the narrative, dogs have two

7:30) and points to his/her helplessness (cf. Joh 5:7).

14) Altruism is an inescapable obligation for the rich in a society of ‘limited good’ and as a key way of maintaining honor and avoiding shame. See, *ibid.*, 7-8.

15) Purity and holiness also have the connotation of *wholeness*, see M. Douglas, *Purity and Danger: An Analysis of Concepts of Pollution and Taboo* (London: Routledge and Keegan Paul, 1966), 51-53.

16) The passive *heilkōmenos*, “be covered with sores”, further underscores Lazarus’ passivity. His identity is given and communicated by the narrator, not something he actively acquires and displays.

functions. First, they underscore¹⁷⁾ Lazarus' impure condition/status. Dogs are unclean animals for the Jews. There are OT references that dogs consume the dead, especially the cursed one (cf. 1Ki 14:11; 16:4; 21:24; Psa 16:2; Jer 5:3). Here the description of Lazarus's impurity reaches its climax! He is impure not merely because of his ulcers, but above all, because he is now a dying man, a near corpse that would be consumed by dogs. For the Jews, this is the most degrading condition that a man can undergo.¹⁸⁾ Second, dogs further contrast the rich man and Lazarus. In his house, the rich man is feasting sumptuously with his fellow rich men, while at his gate, Lazarus is accompanied by dogs. The rich-honorable-blessed group is clearly contrasted with the poor-impure-cursed group! In his house, the rich and his friends are eating and drinking abundantly daily, while at his gate, Lazarus is competing with dogs to feed himself with what is left from the table.

The first scene shows two persons in their own places. No change of place has occurred, though the 'gate' provides the possibility for that. The rich man maintains his place: his identity as a rich man and a man of honor. He takes control over his place for his own advantage (maintaining honor and friends), and he communicates it by his daily feasts and way of dressing. Lazarus is put in his place (gate) by others and kept there by the rich man. He cannot control his own place. The gate reveals his identity as a poor, cursed, and impure person. Sores and dogs communicate that! So, everyone is in his place, which maintains the distance, control, and power as normality!

3.4. Death: Departure (v. 22)

Death becomes the scene of transition: the change of the two actors' places takes place as they both *depart* from their respective places.¹⁹⁾ The Greek construction

17) *Alla kai* in v. 21 can have an intensive tone "and worst of all".

18) The imperfect *epileichō* points to a habitual situation, hence seen as *normality*. Note that the corpse is also impure (Lev 21:1-2). All this evidence weakens A. Hultgren's opinion that Lazarus is most likely to be understood as pious, see A. Hultgren, *The Parables of Jesus* (Cambridge: W. E. Eerdmans Publ. Co, 2000), 112. It is true that Luke commonly equates poverty and piety (as in Luk 1-2), but that is very unlikely here!

19) Even the verb *apothnēskō* maintains the local nuance from *apo*, implying 'separation'. The noun *thanatos* is generally also thought to be a 'place'. Modern languages maintain this local/spatial nuances of 'death': 'meninggal' or 'berpulang' (Indonesian), pass away (English), 'su jalan' (Kupang), etc.

shows this change. Luke uses his typical ἐγένετο δε to introduce this decisive point in the story (cf. 3:21). Lazarus is presented first and his fate is lavishly described (ἀπενεχθῆναι αὐτὸν ὑπὸ τῶν ἀγγέλων εἰς τὸν κόλπον Ἀβραάμ), while the rich man’s fate is marked by poverty and starkness of language (ἐτάφη). The *distance* between the two is maintained. The poor man is lifted out of this world into the bosom of Abraham, and the rich man is buried in the ground (in this world). With his death, any patron-client relation is aborted.

The rich man is buried. The narrator gives him a new self-definition: he is no longer taking control over his ‘place’; he is a passive corpse (cf. aorist-passive [ἐτάφη]); he is a dead man as many other human beings. Honor that he has displayed, communicated and maintained during his life, makes no difference!

3.5. Hades

Two actors are placed in their new places: Lazarus at Abraham’s bosom and the rich man in Hades. Abraham is a model of hospitality (cf. Gen 18:1-15).²⁰ Lazarus who had been ignored as a guest by the rich man is now carried away by angels. Whatever its source, the point of the way it is expressed is that the divine care is being lavished upon Lazarus. He is now welcomed by Abraham as his special guest. Lazarus’s new place in the bosom of Abraham points to a banquet context (as in John 13:21, see Luk 13:28-29). This new place gives Lazarus a new identity: he is an honorable guest at Abraham’s banquet. The meaning of his name, “the one whom God helps”, is now realized.

The rich man is now in Hades. Luke’s usage of Hades here is maybe under the influence of LXX. In LXX, *Hades* almost exclusively stands for *sheol*. Sheol generally points to a ‘place’, that is the lowest place on earth (cf. Exo 32:22; Psa 86:13, Eze 31:14-18) to which the dead must descend (*yrd*) (Num 16:30; Job 7:9), a *place* of darkness (Psa 143:3; Lam 3:6), and a *place* of dismal silence (Psa 94:17; 115:7).²¹

The new place gives the rich man a new identity. But now he cannot control and personalize his place; he cannot take advantage of his place. It is the narrator who

20) See B. B. Scott, *Hear Then the Parable* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1989), 153 for later speculations on the virtue of Abraham’s hospitality in the Midrash.

21) D. E. Gowan, ed., *The Westminster Theological Wordbook of the Bible* (Louisville, London: Westminster John Knox Press, 2003), 188-190.

‘personalizes’ the rich man’s place. Note how his ‘new’ condition is depicted in spatial terms: he is “being in torments” (ὑπάρχων ἐν βασάνοις vv. 23 and 28; *basanos* has a “spatial” meaning: the *touchstone* for testing gold, etc). In v. 24, the rich man also communicates his new place as a place of “great pain” and a “place of fire” (ὀδυνῶμαι ἐν τῇ φλογί). His territoriality changes: from one who controls and manages his place to one who has lost control of it and suffers a lot because of his place (cf. passive ὀδυνῶμαι = suffer torment). His place of honor is now completely lost.

3.6. Here and There

In v. 24, the rich man seeks to bridge the gulf separating himself and Lazarus²²⁾ for the first time in the story. Lazarus remains passive. The rich man makes a request of Abraham because he is the model of hospitality. By calling Abraham as “father” (also in vv. 27 and 30), the rich man is defining himself as a descendant of the patriarch and insisting on his kinship with him (Abraham responds by calling him his child in v. 25). But at the same time, the request shows that the rich man tries to maintain control over his place. He asks Lazarus to come, move from his place, and serve him. In other words, he sees Lazarus as a *client* who serves him. He is still defining himself as a *patron*; he wants to control his place and Lazarus’s place for his own advantage.

Abraham’s answer indicates the change of the place of the two actors:

ἀπέλαβες τὰ ἀγαθὰ σου ἐν τῇ ζωῇ σου	you received your good things <i>in your life</i>
καὶ Λάζαρος ὁμοίως τὰ κακὰ	and Lazarus likewise evil things
νῦν δὲ ὧδε παρακαλεῖται	now he is consoled <i>here</i> ²³⁾
σὺ δὲ ὀδυνᾶσαι	but you are tormented

The surface structure of these verses graphically reverses each place. The construction of Greek text shows us *spatially* how in the past, “in his life” (ἐν τῇ

22) The adverb *makrothen* “from afar” in v. 23 already suggested a ‘spatial distance’ between the two actors.

23) The best reading is the adverb *hōde*, “here”, although it can be taken as demonstrative pronoun “this one”. We take “here” as a spatial contrast with “in your life”, maintaining the spatial dimension of the text.

ζωῆ σου), the rich man is presented first and Lazarus last. Now, “here” (ᾧδε), Lazarus comes first and the rich man last. Abraham is simply stating each place then and now, there and here. Note the difference in verbal usage here. In life, the rich man actively “receives” (ἀπέλαβε)24) his “good things”. This language points to his honor that has been actively acquired and maintained by his luxurious house, banquets, dresses, and friends. Lazarus also “receives” evil things: his place at the gate, dogs as ‘friends’, and ulcers in his skin! But now, here, the situation is changed. All the verbs are in passive voice. New places are *given* to both of them, and each place communicates a new condition: Lazarus is consoled, and the rich man is tormented! It is true that the rich man is Abraham’s descendant, and Abraham seemingly does not refuse their kinship (cf. τέκνον in v. 25), but the power to control the place now is in someone else’s hands!

3.7. The Great Chasm

V. 26 is clearly formulated in territorial terms. There is a clear *classification*: μεταξύ ἡμῶν καὶ ὑμῶν “between us and you (plural)”, between here (ἔνθεν “from here”) and there (ἐκεῖθεν “from there”). Abraham and Lazarus are classified as one group; Lazarus is aligned with Abraham, the father of the Jews, and a clear distance between Abraham and Lazarus on the one hand and the rich man (and others like him) on the other hand is established!

The two groups are now separated by a great chasm. This χάσμα μέγα *communicates* a fixed classification and distance. The difference and distance that have existed throughout the parable now come to have divine sanction (ἔσθρικται ‘has been fixed’ is a theological passive). The divisions in the afterlife reflect those on earth: those divisions are the result not of divine will but of human insensitivity. The great chasm here has the opposite function to that of the gate. If the gate has the possibility to let Lazarus in, the great chasm marks the impossibility for the two parties to come together.25) The gate gave the rich man the possibility to perform hospitality; the great chasm marks the *impossibility*26) of any patron-client relation

24) Or even ‘receive *in full*’ if we take into account the intensive/perfective force of *apo*, see M. Zerwick, *Biblical Greek*, J. Smith, trans., (Roma: Editrice Pontificio Istituto Biblico, 1994), 45.

25) See the two verbs expressing ‘distance’ in v. 26: διαβῆναι and διαπερῶσιν.

26) It is well underscored by μὴ δύναται, μηδὲ ... of v. 26.

or act of hospitality. The place for each has been established by God. Everyone is in his place forever! God takes control over the place. No human being can take advantage of his/her place now. The rich man cannot help himself, and neither can Abraham nor Lazarus help him.

3.8. Back to the World: Father's House

Many scholars have concluded that the main point of the parable is to be found in this part (Luk 16:27-31).²⁷⁾ The parable is primarily a warning to persons who, like the five brothers of the rich man, still have time to repent and do the will of God. From the territorial point of view, it is in these verses that the narrator *questions* power and normality expressed through places up to this point. The narrator now provides 'imagined places'²⁸⁾: places that conjure up new meanings and possibilities for spatial practices. The narrator brings back the readers to this world, i.e., to the 'house/home' of the rich man's father.

Home/house is a place of identity, socialization for children, and religious worship. In the ancient world, there was no division between private and public place in homes, as there is in modern times. Galilean homes displayed the 'house with a shop (*taberna*)' style.²⁹⁾ Households conducted business and domestic affairs together. One's identity was defined by one's house, village, and kinship. When the rich man asked Abraham to send Lazarus to "my father's house" (τὸν οἶκον τοῦ πατρὸς μου), it is the *household* that is intended. A household is a group of people who share a residence, and who also share work. A household is most often under the leadership of a *pater familias* (father). This group includes husband and wife, children, sometimes other relatives, servants, and other dependents living in the house.

It is this household that must be changed and become an *imagined place*. How is

27) So for example Fitzmyer, *The Gospel According to Luke*, I, 1128-1129. Scott, *Hear Then the Parable*, 146, regards these verses as a Lukan addition to the original Jesus parable and says: "nothing in the first part of this parable implies the supposed conclusion". From the territorial perspective, however, the parable is a continuous and coherent story, well intertwined by 'having and losing place' theme/motif.

28) See especially Moxnes, *Putting Jesus in His Place*, 12-14. He suggests that '*oikos/oikia*' is better translated as 'house/household' and not as 'home' which -in our modern mentality- has the nuance of 'private' in contrast to 'public'.

29) *Ibid.*, 39. See his chapter 2 for a detailed discussion on 'home and place'.

this “change of place” possible? Abraham, the model of hospitality, gives the key: by hearing (i.e. obeying, v. 29 and v. 31: ἀκούω) the Scripture! The household must become a new place for identity-making, socialization for children, and religious worship which are based on hearing Moses and the Prophets! The Scripture will change the household to become an “imagined place”, where places are determined not by differences and divisions but by hospitality and solidarity; where the rich man does not fail to come through the gate.

4. “Places” in Translation

This kind of text reading gives several insights into translating “places”. *First*, “place” is not merely a geographical concept, but also a socially, culturally and ideologically loaded notion. In the analysis of the above parable, for example, I have given some insights into the implications of the “gate” and “house” of the rich man, and how these are closely related to Lazarus’s body and skin. These places tell more about both actors’ social standings and how those places are maintained as something normal and natural. So we should not simply translate πύλαια with the generic word such as ‘door’ but rather ‘gate’. Maybe we should also make it explicit that the rich man is in a ‘big and luxurious house’ so that the readers can catch the meaning better.

Second, we have to recognize our own places and how they color our translation. H. Moxnes³⁰) mentioned how the translation of *oikos/oikia* gives an impressive example. KJV translated these terms almost exclusively as “house” and only in the four instances as “home” (Mat 8:6; Mar 5:19; Luk 9:61; 15:6). Then there is a steady increase in the use of “home” (RSV had 21, NRSV has 24, NAB has 43, GNB has as many as 62). This reflects the change in cultural presuppositions in modern society about “home” with its stronger meaning of private in contrast to public. As we have noted, in first century Palestine, there was no division between private and public places in homes, as there is in modern times. In several instances, this modern stereotypical usage of “home” is used even when it is not appropriate. For example, Luke 23:56 “they went back *home*” (GNB): this does not refer to their

30) Ibid., 26. He also cites several instances where GNB –with this modern mentality– added “home” for clarifying (Luk 2:43; 12:43; 15:27, 30; 19:12).

(the women's) own houses in Galilee, but rather to Jerusalem (presumably to acquaintances with whom they stayed). Similarly, in the narrative on "hospitality", GNB uses "home" in the sense of modern secluded and private area, whereas the story clearly intends there to be on "public display" in a house (see Luk 10:38; 14:1; 19:7).

Third, a place is closely related to identity. One's identity was defined in the house and the village, and by kinship. This must be taken into consideration in our translation of verses like those of Mark 10:29-30 οὐδεὶς ἐστὶν ὃς ἀφήκεν οἰκίαν ἢ ἀδελφούς ἢ ἀδελφὰς ἢ μητέρα ἢ πατέρα ἢ τέκνα ἢ ἀγροὺς ἕνεκεν ἐμοῦ καὶ ἕνεκεν τοῦ εὐαγγελίου, ἐὰν μὴ λάβῃ ἑκατονταπλασίονα νῦν ἐν τῷ καιρῷ τούτῳ οἰκίας καὶ ἀδελφούς καὶ ἀδελφὰς καὶ μητέρας καὶ τέκνα καὶ ἀγροὺς μετὰ διωγμῶν, καὶ ἐν τῷ αἰῶνι τῷ ἐρχομένῳ ζῶν αἰώνιον. Note how οἰκίαν ("house", the physical place in which the household lives) and ἀγροὺς ("land", the center of work for their livelihood) frame the references to family members, and hence situate them in a broader context. It is the household as a working group, interdependent for work to secure a living that is in focus. Therefore, Jesus' call to "leave the place" should be heard as a call to be displaced from one's place of identity (acquired in one's house, village, and kinship) into a new place (or "no place"?) of identity. A classic example from the OT is the relationship between *ha'adam* and *ha'adamah*, human being is from fertile soil, human from humus. In Genesis 2:15, the human being's relation with the garden is expressed with two ambiguous verbs *'abad*: to work it and to work *for* it and *shamar*: to protect and "observe" (i.e. learn from it, respect the limits it sets, etc). Land gives identity to human beings; the relationship between them must, therefore, be of mutual service.

5. Conclusion

Our special interest in "places" in the Lazarus story has given us some new insights into reading and translating biblical texts.

First, space and place in biblical texts are implicated in the production of social relationship, and are themselves, in turn, socially produced. This social and ideological subtext should be made explicit both in reading and translating biblical texts.

Second, space and place are situated within relations of power. Power is performed through spatial relations and encoded in the representation of space as 'normality'. The Lazarus story has revealed, for example, that the house and the gate should not be read and translated simply as an architectural/physical setting for a scene, but as a communication of power or powerless.

Third, spatial relations and places associated with those relations are multiple and contested. A place does not mean the same thing for one group of social agents as it does for another. The 'gate' is a means of control and a boundary-maker for the rich. It is a place that communicates his identity as a man of honor and a place to let his guests in and Lazarus out. For Lazarus, it is a place forced unto him by others and a place that keeps him out as a stranger. But by the end of the story, the narrator transforms these dynamics of power and boundaries by redefining and promoting household as an 'imagined place', where human places are determined not by differences and divisions but by hospitality and solidarity.

<Keyword>

territoriality, place, identity, power, normality, hospitality, honor.

<References>

- Douglas, M., *Purity and Danger: An Analysis of Concepts of Pollution and Taboo*, London: Routledge and Keegan Paul, 1966.
- Fitzmyer, J., *The Gospel According to Luke, I*, New York: Doubleday, 1981.
- Gowan, D. E., ed., *The Westminster Theological Wordbook of the Bible*, Louisville, London: Westminster John Knox Press, 2003.
- Harvey, D., *The Condition of Postmodernity*, Oxford: Blackwell, 1989.
- Hultgren, A. J., *The Parables of Jesus*, Cambridge: W. E. Eerdmans Publ.Co, 2000.
- Moxnes, M., *Putting Jesus in His Place*, London: Westminster John Knox Press, 2003.
- Lefebvre, H., *The Production of Space*, Oxford: Blackwell, 1991.
- Neyrey, J., “Spaces and Places, Whence and Whither, Homes and Rooms: ‘Territoriality’ in the Fourth Gospel”, *Biblical Theological Bulletin* 32 (2002), 60-74.
- Pilch, J., *The Cultural Dictionary of the Bible*, Minnesota: The Liturgical Press, 1999.
- Pilch, J. and Malina, B., *Biblical Social Values and Their Meaning*, Massachusetts: Hendrickson Pub, Inc. 1993.
- Sack, R. D., *Human Territoriality. Its Theory and History*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986.
- Scott, B. B., *Hear Then the Parable*, Minneapolis: Fortress, 1989.
- Soja, E., *Postmodern Geographies: The Reassertion of Space in Critical Social Theory*, London: Verso, 1989.
- Thiselton, A., *New Horizons in Hermeneutics: The Theory and Practice of Transforming Biblical Reading*, Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1992.
- Zerwick, M., *Biblical Greek*, J.Smith, trans., Roma: Editrice Pontificio Istituto Biblico, 1994, 45.

<Abstract>

**“공간”을 해석하기:
누가복음 16:19-31에 나타난 영역과 수용을 중심으로**

호르텐시우스 플로리몬드
(인도네시아성서공회 번역실)

이 글은 현대의 비평적 공간 이론들로부터 나온 통찰들을 바탕으로 누가복음의 비유를 사회-인류학적으로 풀어본 것이다. 그 해석은 누가복음에 등장하는 나사로와 부자의 이야기를 충분히 이해하기 위해 공간적인 차원들의 중요성을 강조한다. 공간은 본래 정체성, 권력과 정상적인 상태와 연관되어 있다. 어느 한 구체적인 영역이 누가복음의 이야기 전반에 걸쳐서 표현되고 있다. 나사로는 부자의 대문 앞에 버려져 있다. 그의 정체성은 그에게 부여되어 있다. 부자는 그의 크고 호화로운 집에 자신을 위치시키고 있다. 그는 자신의 유익과 명예를 위해 그의 공간을 통제하며 관리한다. 그의 집에서 그는 -자신의 의복과 잔치를 통해- 그가 누구이며 어떠한 사람인가를 드러낸다. 그는 영예로운 자리에 있는 사람이다. 이리하여 두 행위자들의 공간은 이 세상에서 그들이 점하고 있는 사회적 공간을 나타낸다. 상황은 사후에 완전히 뒤바뀐다. 나사로는 영예로운 자리, 즉 아브라함의 품에 있으나 부자는 음부에 놓여진다. 모두 각자의 공간에 영원히 있다! 하나님이 공간을 지배하신다. 화자는 그런 다음 가정이 “상상되어진 공간”, 즉 모세와 선지자들을 경청하는 것을 기반으로 정체성과 어린아이들의 사회화, 그리고 종교적인 예배가 이루어지는 공간이라고 제안한다. 성서(말씀)에 순종한다는 것은 가정을 ‘상상된 공간’으로 바꾸는 것을 의미하며, 인간의 공간은 구별과 분리가 아닌 수용과 일치됨에 의해 결정된다는 것이다.