

01/01/2026

**Christian MAHOUKOU**

*Philosopher, Independent Researcher | Phenomenology of Interpellation*

# HOSPITALITY AS RESONANCE

*A Dialogal Phenomenology of a Universal Experience*

*in the light of the triadic structure Appel-Réponse-Résonance  
known as the Mahoukou Law*

---

*"Hospitality is the name of what we do when we open the door before  
knowing who is knocking."*

— Mahoukou Law

*"The unconditioned gives itself. And in its giving, it calls. In its call, it  
awaits a response. In the response, it gives itself fully — as inter-given,  
as co-appearance, as Resonance."*

— Mahoukou Law

2026

## FOREWORD

### Genesis of the Project: The Footnote as Turning Point

It sometimes happens that thought pivots on a detail. Not on a central thesis, not on a carefully constructed demonstration, but on a footnote — those margins of the text where the philosopher, freed from the obligation to prove, sometimes allows what he thinks most deeply to find expression. It is just such a footnote that lies at the origin of this work.

It appears in a doctoral thesis in philosophy devoted to the phenomenology of donation in Jean-Luc Marion and its dialogal transcendence. It reads as follows: "The notion of hospitality as a form of the gift is developed notably by Jacques Derrida in *Of Hospitality* (Calmann-Lévy, 1997) and by Emmanuel Lévinas in *Totality and Infinity* (Nijhoff, 1961), section III. Marion situates himself within this tradition but shifts the emphasis: in Lévinas, hospitality is an ethical obligation grounded in the vulnerability of the other's face; in Marion, it can be read as a form of donation that suspends all calculation and expectation of return."

Three names. Three positions. And between them, a philosophical space that the footnote merely cracks open. What immediately strikes one is that each of these three positions says something true about hospitality — and that none says everything. Lévinas sees in hospitality an ethical obligation grounded in the vulnerability of the other's face: this is true. Marion sees in it a form of donation that suspends calculation and expectation of return: this is also true. Derrida sees in it an aporia — the irresolvable tension between unconditional hospitality, which alone deserves the name of hospitality, and conditional hospitality, which alone can be practised: this is true as well.

But if all three are right, and none entirely right, it is because something is missing in each. That something is what this work seeks to name. And the name it proposes — Resonance, in the sense given to it by the Mahoukou Law — is precisely what all three philosophers sensed without being able to formulate entirely: what hospitality produces between the one who welcomes and the one who is welcomed, what emerges in the space of the encounter and was present in neither host nor guest before they met.

This work was born from that footnote. It remains faithful to it insofar as it takes as its departure point the three positions the footnote identifies — Derrida, Lévinas, Marion — in order to move beyond them toward something they were all seeking together without finding together. But it moves beyond them also by considerably broadening the field of inquiry: for hospitality is not only a question for French phenomenology. It is a universal phenomenon — one of the few that all human cultures have thematised, ritualised, and elevated to the rank of supreme value. And it is from this universalism that the philosophical question takes its full scope.

A word, finally, on method. This work is a dissertation with the breath of an essay — it borrows from the doctoral dissertation its conceptual rigour, its precise distinctions, its notes and bibliography; it borrows from the philosophical essay its freedom of movement between traditions, its taste for unexpected associations, its conviction that truth can also be said in the beauty of a well-struck formulation. This marriage of forms is not a compromise — it is a necessity. For hospitality itself is at once a rigorous concept and a lived experience, a phenomenological structure and an everyday gesture. Doing it justice requires both registers simultaneously.

## GENERAL INTRODUCTION

### Hospitality: Universal Phenomenon, Elusive Concept

#### *§ 1. The Inaugural Paradox*

There is in hospitality a paradox that everyone has experienced without always being able to formulate it. To welcome the other into one's home is to risk no longer being entirely at home. To open one's door is to let in something that will modify the interior space — not only the physical space, but the space of the self. The guest changes the host. The presence of the other in my dwelling reveals something of myself that I did not know, obliges me to accommodations I had not foreseen, forces me out of my habits and into a new relationship with my own home.

And yet it is precisely in this risk that the most precious dimension of hospitality resides. For if the host risked nothing — if the guest had no power to modify him — it would not be hospitality. It would be condescending tolerance, calculated charity, a policy of integration. Authentic hospitality requires that the host be vulnerable to what he welcomes. It requires that he can be changed by the encounter. It requires, in other words, that the door he opens also be the door of his own transformation.

This paradox — to welcome the other is to risk losing oneself, and this is the condition for finding oneself fully — is the philosophical knot of this work. It runs through all the traditions we shall summon. It runs through Lévinas, for whom the face of the other calls me into question before I have been able to constitute myself. It runs through Derrida, for whom authentic hospitality is that which welcomes without conditions — and which is therefore, in its very purity, impossible to realise entirely. It runs through Marion, for whom donation precedes all reception and constitutes the one who receives before he can decide to receive. And it runs through African, Buddhist, Taoist, and Abrahamic traditions — each of which has understood that hospitality is not one virtue among others, but a structure of the human being in relation.

## **§ 2. What Hospitality Is Not**

Before saying what hospitality is, one must say what it is not — for confusions are numerous and philosophically costly.

Hospitality is not tolerance. Tolerance endures the other without truly receiving him — it makes room for him in public space while maintaining a principled distance between itself and him. Tolerance is an indispensable civic virtue; it is not hospitality. Hospitality does not maintain distance — it suppresses, at least provisionally, the boundary between inside and outside, between host and guest.

Nor is hospitality charity. Charity gives to the one who lacks from the position of the one who possesses. It is asymmetrical by definition: the donor places himself in a position of moral superiority, the beneficiary in a position of debt. Authentic hospitality refuses this asymmetry — not that host and guest are in a perfectly equal relationship, but because hospitality is not measured by what the guest lacks, but by what the encounter can produce for both.

Hospitality is no more reducible to simple politeness. Politeness regulates social relations according to agreed codes — it allows beings to coexist without friction. Hospitality goes further: it risks the encounter, exposes itself to the unpredictable, accepts that the other may not behave according to expected codes and that one must improvise a response to what was not foreseen.

## **§ 3. The Central Problem**

The question governing this work may be formulated as follows:

*Is hospitality a form of donation, a dialogal structure, or both at once? And if it is both — if it is at once the donation that opens the space of the encounter and the dialogue that fulfils its promise — what does the Mahoukou Law reveal about what hospitality, at its summit, is capable of producing?*

## **§ 4. The Mahoukou Law: A Preliminary Presentation**

A word is needed here concerning the Mahoukou Law — the central concept of this work, drawn from the dialogal phenomenology developed in the thesis of which this work is the extension.

The triad Call–Response–Resonance (A2R) describes the formal grammar of every authentic dialogal encounter. Every encounter event bears these three moments: a Call — something or someone presents itself, addresses, interpellates; a Response — the one who receives the Call engages his freedom in a reaction that is not mechanical but constitutive; a Resonance — something new emerges from the encounter between Call and Response, something that was present in neither and that transforms both.

But A2R alone does not yet say what distinguishes a hospitable Resonance from a hostile one, an encounter that enriches from one that destroys, a welcoming that liberates from one that alienates. This is where the Mahoukou Law intervenes.

The Mahoukou Law is the phenomenological law of the hospitable accomplishment of Resonance. In its preliminary formulation it may be stated thus: every authentic Resonance transforms the two partners of the encounter in such a way that each becomes, through the encounter, more fully himself than he was before — and that something new emerges between them that surpasses what each could have produced alone.

This law has three corollaries. First corollary: hospitable Resonance differentiates by connecting — it does not fuse the partners but renders each more themselves through their relation. Second corollary: hospitable Resonance is asymmetrical in its effects — it does not transform the two partners in the same way. Third corollary: hospitable Resonance is fertile — it produces something that can in turn become a Call for others.

### **§ 5. *Architecture of the Work***

This work unfolds across three parts and twelve chapters. The first part explores the great cultural forms of hospitality: the Abrahamic tradition, Ubuntu philosophy, Buddhism and Taoism, trans-individual Senegalese and Malian hospitality, and the anthropology of the gift from Mauss onward. The second part engages in philosophical confrontation with Derrida, Lévinas, Marion and Kearney. The third part proposes the dialogal phenomenology of hospitality, deploys the Mahoukou Law in its full scope, and brings this phenomenology into confrontation with contemporary challenges.

PART ONE

# **HOSPITALITY ACROSS CULTURES**

*A Comparative Phenomenology*

*"Before philosophising about hospitality, one must have lived it — in Abraham's tent, in the African palaver, in the silence of the Buddhist monastery, in the potlatch feast. Philosophy does not precede experience: it is experience's rigorous memory."*

---

## **CHAPTER 1 — ABRAHAMIC HOSPITALITY: THE FOUNDING FIGURE**

*"O Lord, if I have found favour in your sight, do not pass by your servant." — Genesis 18:3"*

---

### **I. The Scene at Mamre: Paradigm and Mystery**

There is a scene in the Hebrew Bible that has haunted two and a half millennia of reflection on hospitality. It is of a disarming sobriety. Abraham is sitting at the entrance of his tent at Mamre, in the full heat of the day. Three men appear. He does not know who they are. He does not know whether they are men, angels, or God himself — the Hebrew text plays deliberately on this ambiguity, moving from the plural (they) to the singular (he) in the verses that follow. Abraham runs to meet them, prostrates himself, implores them not to pass by without stopping. He has water brought to wash their feet, food, milk, butter, a tender calf. He stands near them while they eat — in the posture of servant, not master.

And it is in response to this welcome — to this hospitality offered without condition, before knowing who knocks — that Abraham receives the announcement of the promise: Sarah, his aged wife, will give birth to a son.<sup>[1]</sup>

The structure of this scene is that of a Call, a Response, and a Resonance. The Call: three strangers present themselves at the entrance of the tent. The Response: Abraham runs to meet them, offers everything he has, makes himself servant of those he receives. The Resonance: the promise — something new emerges from this encounter, something Abraham did not expect and that changes his life irrevocably. He had opened his door; he receives a birth. He had offered food; he receives a future.

But what makes this scene philosophically remarkable is precisely what Abraham does not know at the moment of welcoming. He does not know who these three men are. He does not know whether they deserve his hospitality. He does not know what his generosity will

produce. He opens his door before knowing — and it is this *before knowing* that is the mark of authentic hospitality. Emmanuel Lévinas will ceaselessly comment on this scene, seeing in it the paradigm of ethical openness to the face of the other: hospitality precedes knowledge, welcome precedes judgement.<sup>[2]</sup>

## **II. The Three Abrahamic Traditions and Their Understanding of Hospitality**

The scene at Mamre is the common source of the three great Abrahamic traditions — Judaism, Christianity, Islam — and each has drawn from it a distinctive and irreplaceable understanding of hospitality.

In Judaism, hospitality — *hachnasat orchim*, literally "bringing guests in" — is one of the fundamental *mitzvot*. The Talmud goes so far as to affirm that hospitality towards travellers is greater than receiving the divine presence (Shabbat 127a). This affirmation says something profound: the presence of the other human being, in his vulnerability and strangeness, is the privileged site of the manifestation of transcendence.<sup>[3]</sup>

In Christianity, the central figure of hospitality is that of the stranger as figure of Christ: "I was a stranger and you welcomed me" (Mt 25:35). Christian hospitality is structurally epiphanic — it is after the fact that Resonance reveals who the guest was.<sup>[4]</sup>

In Islam, hospitality — *diyafa* — is one of the cardinal virtues. The Prophet Muhammad is reported to have said: "Whoever believes in God and the Last Day must honour his guest" (*Sahih Bukhari*). Islam also specifies the duration of obligatory hospitality — three days — a wisdom that delimits a temporal space in which Resonance can take place, then releases both partners.<sup>[5]</sup>

## **III. The A2R Structure in Abrahamic Hospitality**

Reading these three traditions through the triad Call–Response–Resonance, what appears is remarkable in its coherence. The Call is always that of the stranger as potentially bearing a transcendence that surpasses him. The Response is characterised by prior generosity — one gives before knowing whether the other deserves it. The Resonance is epiphanic and transformative — what hospitable encounter produces always exceeds what the host had foreseen in opening his door. The Mahoukou Law is confirmed: Abraham becomes more fully himself — father of the promise — through the encounter with the three strangers.

## CHAPTER 2 — UBUNTU: HOSPITALITY AS ONTOLOGICAL CO-CONSTITUTION

*"Umuntu ngumuntu ngabantu." ("A human being is fully human only through other human beings.") — Zulu-Xhosa proverb"*

---

### I. Ubuntu as an Ontology of Relation

Ubuntu philosophy is not first a philosophy of hospitality — it is an ontology of relation. But because it is an ontology of relation, it is necessarily a philosophy of hospitality: if the human being constitutes himself only in and through his relations to the other, then welcoming the other is not a charitable act added on to existence — it is the very condition of authentic human existence.<sup>[6]</sup>

If I am fully human only through other human beings, then welcoming the other — making room for him, entering into relation with him, enabling him to constitute his humanity through me as I constitute mine through him — is not optional generosity. It is what I must do in order to be myself. To refuse hospitality is not only to wound the other — it is to wound oneself.

### II. The Palaver: A Ritual of Dialogal Hospitality

One of the richest expressions of Ubuntu philosophy in its hospitable dimension is the *palaver* — the *palabre* — which the African philosopher Bénézet Bujo has analysed as the African model par excellence of communal ethical deliberation. The *palaver* is a deliberative assembly in which each person is welcomed in his right to speak, to be heard, to have his word taken seriously. It is hospitality granted to the speech of each. The A2R structure is transparent: the Call is the question posed to the community, the Response is multiple (each member responds from his singularity), and the Resonance is the common decision that emerges from their encounter.<sup>[7]</sup>

### III. Ubuntu and the Hospitality of the Stranger

In the Ubuntu tradition, the stranger who arrives in a community must be welcomed not despite his strangeness but through it. For the stranger brings something the community does not possess. This dimension is illustrated incomparably by Desmond Tutu in the

context of post-apartheid reconciliation: forgiveness is not merely an individual moral virtue — it is a communal act of restoring the social fabric. The perpetrator needs the forgiveness of his victim to become fully human again. This is the Mahoukou Law in its most extreme form: even in the most difficult encounter, hospitable Resonance can produce a transformation that renders both partners more fully themselves.<sup>[8]</sup>

## CHAPTER 3 — BUDDHISM AND TAOISM: HOSPITALITY AS HARMONY WITH THE FLOW

"The sage does not accumulate. The more he does for others, the more he possesses." — Lao-Tzu, *Tao Te Ching*, ch. 81

### I. Emptiness as Space of Welcome: Taoist Wisdom

Taoism approaches hospitality from its condition of possibility: emptiness. Chapter 11 of the *Tao Te Ching* is one of the most philosophically dense texts on hospitality: "Thirty spokes converge upon a hub, but it is the central emptiness that makes the wheel useful. Clay is shaped into a vessel, but it is the inner emptiness that makes the vessel useful." This text says something essential: one can welcome only if one has made room. Hospitality presupposes emptiness — available space, receptive capacity, the absence of prior saturation.<sup>[9]</sup>

The *wu wei* — unconstrained action — is the form this activity of emptiness takes in Taoist philosophy. In the context of hospitality, it means: welcoming the other without imposing on him what he must be in my home, without asking him to conform to my categories, without constraining him to enter into my pre-established forms.<sup>[10]</sup>

### II. Buddhist Karuṇā: Universal Hospitality

Buddhism proposes a form of hospitality that might be qualified as universal or cosmic: *karuṇā* — compassion — as the fundamental disposition to welcome the suffering of the other into one's own interior space. Buddhist compassion is co-suffering — a capacity to let the other's suffering enter into oneself, to let it resonate in one's own interior space. What makes it philosophically remarkable is its dimension of *pratītyasamutpāda* — of originary co-dependence. The suffering of the other is, in a profound sense, also my suffering. The A2R structure is here internalised: the Call is the suffering of the other, the Response is *karuṇā*, the Resonance is *bodhicitta* — the awakening of consciousness to its own interdependence.<sup>[11]</sup>

## CHAPTER 4 — GREETINGS AND LIBATION: PHENOMENOLOGY OF TRANS-INDIVIDUAL HOSPITALITY

*"In Africa, when an elder dies, a library burns." — Amadou Hampâté Bâ*

---

### I. A Common Practice, an Unsuspected Philosophical Depth

There exists in West Africa — in Senegal, Mali, Guinea, Burkina Faso, throughout the Sahelian region and beyond — a practice so commonplace that it seems self-evident, and whose philosophical depth has perhaps never been entirely measured by Western phenomenology: greetings.

When two Senegalese or two Malians meet — whether they know each other or not, whether the encounter is expected or fortuitous — the greetings seem interminable to the foreign eye. One inquires about mother, father, children, brothers and sisters, uncles and aunts, neighbours, mutual friends — known and unknown persons, present and absent, living and dead. The encounter does not begin with the two persons present. It begins with all those they carry.

And when this encounter takes place within the framework of domestic hospitality, the first gesture — before any substantive exchange, before even sitting down — is the offering of a glass of water. Not an elaborate meal, not a costly gift: water. The simplest, most vital, most universal thing. And before drinking together, before sharing the glass, the host pours a few drops on the ground — or in a dedicated place — in honour of the ancestors. He implores their goodwill upon the encounter that is beginning.

### II. The Guest Is Never Alone: Hospitality as Welcome of the Lineage

The first philosophical revelation of these greetings is this: in African hospitality, one never welcomes an individual — one welcomes a lineage. This assertion must be heard in all its ontological radicality. The guest who crosses the threshold of the home does not cross it alone. He arrives with his mother and father, with his children and siblings, with his ancestors and their ancestors — with the entire chain of the living and the dead who preceded him and who continue to inhabit him. Greetings are not superfluous politeness:

they are the ritual act by which the host acknowledges this multiple presence in the single body of his guest.<sup>[12]</sup>

This structure overturns the Western phenomenology of hospitality from top to bottom. In Derrida, in Lévinas, in Marion, the hospitable relation is a relation between two — a host and a guest. But Senegalese and Malian hospitality says something radically different: the encounter is never between two. It is always between two communities — two networks of relations, two lineages of the living and the dead, two histories that cross in the bodies of those who meet.

### **III. Ancestors as Active Partners: The Trinitarian Temporality of Hospitality**

The libation — those few drops of water or palm wine poured on the ground before drinking — is the most philosophically dense gesture in this entire phenomenology. This gesture simultaneously says three things. It says first that the ancestors are present — not symbolically but really, as full participants. It says next that the encounter is placed under their gaze — their goodwill is implored, which means they can grant or withhold it. It says finally that the time of hospitality is a time inhabited by three simultaneous dimensions: the past of the ancestors, the present of the encounter, the future of the Resonance. This trinitarian temporality — past/present/future woven together in the gesture of libation — is one of the most original and profound structures of African hospitality.<sup>[13]</sup>

### **IV. The Glass of Water: Cosmological Gesture and Phenomenology of the Essential**

Offering water before anything else — to the chance passer-by as to the expected guest — says several things at once. It says: you are thirsty, and your thirst precedes everything. It says: I acknowledge your bodily necessity before acknowledging your social or intellectual necessity. It says: hospitality begins with the body — with the flesh — and not with the spirit or with courtesy. But the glass of water preceded by a libation says something more. It says that the body of the guest is inhabited — that it is a site of passage between generations, a point of contact between the living and the dead. This phenomenology of the glass of water rejoins what the Malian philosopher Amadou Hampâté Bâ formulated incomparably: in Africa, the dead do not truly die as long as the living remember them and invoke them.<sup>[14]</sup>

## CHAPTER 5 — MAUSS, HENAFF AND THE ANTHROPOLOGY OF THE GIFT: HOSPITALITY, RECIPROCITY AND SUPERABUNDANCE

*"The gift is the rock upon which our societies are built." — Marcel Mauss, *The Gift**

---

### I. Mauss and the Triple Obligation

Marcel Mauss did not write about hospitality — he wrote about the gift. But hospitality is the most immediate and universal form of the gift. Mauss's fundamental contribution was to show that the gift — and therefore hospitality — is never gratuitous in the sense of unilateral. In all the societies he studies, the gift is caught in a triple obligation: the obligation to give, the obligation to receive, the obligation to give back. This triple obligation has a direct implication for hospitality: the guest too is in a position of obligation. Maussian hospitality is a structure of reciprocity — not the mercantile reciprocity of equivalent exchange, but a symbolic and deferred reciprocity that maintains the social bond.<sup>[15]</sup>

### II. The Potlatch: Superabundance and Extreme Hospitality

The potlatch — a practice of the Native American tribes of the Pacific northwest coast — is the most spectacular form of hospitality-as-gift. The chief distributes, even destroys, a considerable portion of his wealth. The logic is paradoxical: one impoverishes oneself materially to enrich oneself symbolically. What makes the potlatch a paradigm of hospitality in the sense of the Mahoukou Law is its superabundance: the host gives more than he can measure, and it is precisely this excess that produces the most fertile Resonance.<sup>[16]</sup>

### III. Hénaff and Ceremonial Gift: Hospitality as Mutual Recognition

Marcel Hénaff, in *Le Prix de la vérité* (Seuil, 2002), proposes a reading of the gift that considerably enriches the Maussian understanding. For Hénaff, the ceremonial gift is not first a transfer of goods. It is an act of mutual recognition: the donor recognises the value of the one to whom he gives, and the recipient recognises the value of the one who gives.

This structure of mutual recognition is directly applicable to hospitality: hospitality is a reciprocal acknowledgement of the other's value. And this reciprocal acknowledgement is one of the richest forms of what the Mahoukou Law calls Resonance.<sup>[17]</sup>

PART TWO

## **PHILOSOPHIES OF HOSPITALITY**

*Derrida, Lévinas, Marion, Kearney*

## CHAPTER 6 — DERRIDA: UNCONDITIONAL HOSPITALITY AND ITS APORIA

*"Absolute hospitality requires that I open up my home and that I give not only to the foreigner (provided with a family name, with the social status of being a foreigner, etc.) but to the absolute, unknown, anonymous other, and that I give place to them, that I let them come, that I let them arrive, and take place in the place I offer them, without asking of them either reciprocity (entering into a pact) or even their names." — Jacques Derrida, *Of Hospitality**

---

### I. Context: Derrida and the Question of Hospitality

Jacques Derrida came to the question of hospitality late — in the 1990s, at the moment when Europe was debating migration policies. *Of Hospitality* (Calmann-Lévy, 1997) is one of the densest and most important texts of his late period. What strikes one immediately is his refusal to begin with a definition. Derrida does not first ask *what is hospitality?*; he asks: "is hospitality possible?"<sup>[18]</sup>

### II. The Fundamental Aporia: Conditional and Unconditional Hospitality

Conditional hospitality poses conditions on the welcome: the stranger must have a name, a status, a verifiable identity. Unconditional hospitality welcomes the other without conditions, without asking for his name, before posing any condition on his presence. The aporia arises in the relation between these two regimes: unconditional hospitality is the only one that truly deserves the name of hospitality — but it is practically impossible. One cannot welcome anyone, at any time, in any manner, without endangering the dwelling itself.<sup>[19]</sup>

Derrida formulates this aporia: pure or unconditional hospitality is not a hospitality, it is an invitation. It invites without pre-inviting, without pre-invitation. It disinvites, so to speak, in order to invite authentically.<sup>[20]</sup>

### III. Hostis and Hospes: Etymology and Paradox

Derrida draws on Latin etymology to show that the aporia is inscribed in the language itself. The Latin word *hospes* — from which come both "host" and "hospitality" — is related to *hostis*, from which "hostile" derives. Host and enemy share the same root. Derrida coins

the neologism *hostipitality* – a contraction of hostility and hospitality – to designate this originary indissociability of welcome and threat.<sup>[21]</sup>

#### **IV. What Derrida Sees — and What He Does Not See**

Derrida's contribution is irreplaceable: he formulated with incomparable rigour the fundamental aporia of hospitality. But his thought has an internal limit that the A2R triad allows us to identify: Derrida remains within the dual structure Call/Response without thematising Resonance. The Derridian aporia arises precisely from this absence: by not asking what hospitable encounter produces between the two partners, Derrida can think hospitality only as a tension without resolution. What the Mahoukou Law reveals: real hospitality – imperfect, conditioned, risky – can nonetheless produce an authentic Resonance. The perfection of the Call is not the condition of the fertility of the Resonance.

## CHAPTER 7 — LEVINAS: HOSPITALITY AS INFINITE RESPONSIBILITY

*"The subjectivity of the subject is responsibility for the other, being-for-the-other." — Emmanuel Lévinas, *Otherwise Than Being**

---

### I. The Face as Absolute Call

The philosophy of Lévinas is, in its entirety, a phenomenology of hospitality. His work is traversed throughout by one and the same question: what happens when the face of the other looks at me? And his answer is this: the face of the other calls me into question before I have been able to constitute myself, puts me in question before I have been able to posit myself, assigns me to an infinite responsibility before I have been able to decide to be responsible. The Call of the Lévinassian face is not a message that someone addresses to me — it is an interpellation that constitutes me in the very act of interpellating me.<sup>[22]</sup>

### II. The Dwelling and Welcome

In *Totality and Infinity*, Lévinas maintains a thesis of remarkable elegance: one can welcome the other only if one has a dwelling of one's own. The dwelling is not first a place of possession — it is the place from which one can offer hospitality. But Lévinas adds that the dwelling is itself originally inhabited by the other. What constitutes me in my dwelling is the presence of the other who welcomes me there. Hospitality is always inherited before it is offered.<sup>[23]</sup>

### III. Radical Asymmetry

For Lévinas, I am infinitely responsible for the other — but the other is not infinitely responsible for me. This asymmetry is not an injustice — it is the very structure of ethics. Authentic hospitality does not calculate its resources, does not measure what it risks, does not pose conditions on its own generosity. The feminist critique of this asymmetry — notably by Tina Chanter and Luce Irigaray — has shown that Lévinas's phenomenology of the dwelling carries implicit gender presuppositions that deserve to be questioned.<sup>[24]</sup>

#### **IV. What Lévinas Sees — and What He Does Not See**

Lévinas saw — better than anyone — that authentic hospitality begins with a dispossession of self, that the Call of the face precedes all decision, that this assignment is infinite. But he does not thematise Resonance. In Lévinassian philosophy, the ethical relation remains fundamentally unilateral. What the Mahoukou Law reveals: Lévinassian asymmetry is a partial truth of hospitality — the truth from the side of the host. But fully accomplished hospitality also requires the truth from the side of the guest: that the guest not be merely the passive beneficiary of the host's responsibility, but an active partner who co-produces Resonance with him.

## CHAPTER 8 — MARION: HOSPITALITY AS DONATION WITHOUT CALCULATION

*""The gift is what gives itself without expected return, without condition imposed, without measure assigned. It is the originary structure of what happens when something truly arrives." — Jean-Luc Marion, Being Given"*

---

### I. Marion and Hospitality: An Implicit Relation

Unlike Derrida and Lévinas, Marion has not devoted a specific work to the question of hospitality. But hospitality is contained in his description of the gift, of donation, of the gifted. One of the original contributions of this chapter is precisely to draw out the philosophy of hospitality that Marion's phenomenology contains in germ.

### II. The Gifted as Host: Receiving Before Giving

The figure of the gifted (l'adonné) — one of Marion's most original anthropological contributions — offers a phenomenology of the host of unprecedented richness. The gifted is the one who receives before giving — who is constituted by what is given to him before he has been able to decide anything about himself. This structure is exactly what the host lives in authentic hospitality: before offering anything to the guest, the host has already received — he has received his own dwelling, his own life, his own capacity for welcome. Hospitality is not first an act of sovereign generosity — it is the acknowledgement that what one offers, one has first received.<sup>[25]</sup>

### III. Flesh and Icon: Forms of Phenomenological Hospitality

Flesh — saturated phenomenon according to relation — is what I am without having ever chosen it. In the context of hospitality, flesh is what makes possible the true encounter with the other: it is because I am carnal — vulnerable, mortal, hungry, tired — that hospitality is necessary to me.<sup>[26]</sup>

The icon — saturated phenomenon according to modality — is what looks at me before I look at it. In the context of hospitality, the icon is a figure of the face of the guest: the

arriving guest looks at me before I have been able to decide how to look at him. His Call precedes my Response — and it is this Call that constitutes me as potential host.<sup>[27]</sup>

#### **IV. What Marion Sees — and What He Does Not See**

Marion philosophically grounded the possibility of a hospitality that exceeds the economy of exchange. He described the structure of the gifted with a phenomenological rigour that neither Derrida nor Lévinas attained on this precise point. But Marion's limit is that the asymmetry of donation leaves dialogue in suspense. In Marionian phenomenology, donation goes in one direction — from the phenomenon to the gifted. What happens next between the donor and the recipient? What the Mahoukou Law reveals: Marionian donation is the beginning of hospitality. But accomplished hospitality requires that what gives itself in the encounter become inter-given — something that belongs to the space between the two, and that transforms them both.

## CHAPTER 9 — KEARNEY: RADICAL HOSPITALITY AS ANATHEISM

*"Hospitality begins where I do not yet know whether I am welcoming a god or a beggar, an angel or a refugee. It is in this ignorance that its greatness lies." — Richard Kearney, Anatheism"*

---

### I. Kearney and the Anatheist Wager

Richard Kearney is the philosopher who comes closest to Resonance — without quite naming it. His central concept — anatheism — designates a third way between dogmatic theism and militant atheism: the wager of an encounter with the sacred after the death of God, in the very gesture of hospitality to the stranger. The formula of the wager is at the heart of his philosophy: to welcome the stranger is to bet that what arrives with him is a possibility of encounter with something greater than oneself.<sup>[28]</sup>

This hospitable wager is illustrated by three paradigmatic scenes: the scene at Mamre, the Annunciation, and the pilgrims of Emmaus. In each case, radical hospitality is a Call welcomed in ignorance of what it is, a Response given without guarantee, and a Resonance that surges after the fact — in the deferred recognition of who the guest was and what the encounter produced.<sup>[29]</sup>

### II. Narrative Imagination as Mediation of Hospitality

Kearney's most original contribution is the introduction of narrative imagination as an indispensable mediation of welcome. We need stories for the encounter to be truly an encounter. Narrative hospitality makes room not only for the body of the other but for his stories — for the account of who he is, where he comes from, what he has traversed to arrive at my door.<sup>[30]</sup>

This narrative hospitality enters into direct dialogue with the Ubuntu *palaver*. And in the context of the A2R triad, narrative imagination is the mediation that allows the Response to be just — adequate to the Call of the other in his singularity.<sup>[31]</sup>

### III. What Kearney Sees — and What Remains to Be Formalised

Kearney is, among the four philosophers, the one whose thought is closest to dialogal phenomenology. He has seen the transformative reciprocity of hospitable encounter, the narrative dimension of hospitality, and the essentially wagering character of every authentic welcome. What is missing is the phenomenological formalisation of what he describes so richly. It is precisely this gap that the third part fills by giving to what Kearney has narratively seen the phenomenological rigour that the A2R triad and the Mahoukou Law make possible.

PART THREE

**TOWARD A DIALOGAL PHENOMENOLOGY OF  
HOSPITALITY**

*"The unconditioned gives itself. And in its giving, it calls. In its call, it awaits a response. In the response, it gives itself fully — as inter-given, as co-appearance, as Resonance."*

— Mahoukou Law

## **CHAPTER 10 — HOSPITALITY AS A2R STRUCTURE: PHENOMENOLOGY OF THE THRESHOLD**

### **I. Phenomenology of the Threshold: The Site of Encounter**

There is a physical site that concentrates the entire philosophy of hospitality — a site so commonplace that Western philosophy has largely neglected it: the threshold. The threshold — the doorstep, the boundary between inside and outside — is the phenomenological site par excellence of the hospitable encounter. It is there that the Call of the stranger presents itself for the first time. It is there that the host must decide — or rather discovers that he has already been assigned to a response before deliberating. The phenomenology of the threshold reveals from the outset something that the philosophy of hospitality tends to underestimate: hospitality is not first a decision — it is a situation.<sup>[32]</sup>

### **II. The Call of the Stranger: Phenomenology of Presentation**

The Call — the first moment of the A2R triad — may be declined in three dimensions. The bodily dimension: the Call of the stranger is first a Call of flesh — he presents himself with a body that has travelled, that is hungry and thirsty. This is why the first gesture of African hospitality is the glass of water. The relational dimension: the Call of the stranger is never only his own — it is the Call of his entire lineage. The temporal dimension: the Call arrives from a past I do not know and moves towards a future that neither he nor I can yet see.<sup>[33]</sup>

### **III. The Hospitable Response: Prior Generosity and Engaged Freedom**

The Response — the second moment of the A2R triad — unites two dimensions that are distinguishable but inseparable. Prior generosity: one gives before knowing whether the other deserves it, one opens before knowing who knocks. This prior generosity suspends judgement in order to let the Call unfold in all its depth. Engaged freedom: the host who welcomes does so freely — a hospitality that is not freely offered is not hospitality. This is

why Kearney's wager is philosophically sound: to welcome the stranger is to bet freely that this welcome is worth the risk it entails.<sup>[34]</sup>

#### **IV. Hospitable Resonance: The Inter-Given as Space of Encounter**

Resonance — the third moment of the A2R triad and the heart of the Mahoukou Law — is what emerges between host and guest in and through their encounter. This something, dialogal phenomenology calls the inter-given: what belongs to the space between the two partners, and is the fruit of their reciprocal co-constitution. Hospitable Resonance manifests in three forms according to its intensity: the Resonance of recognition (each recognises the other as fully human), the Resonance of transformation (the two partners leave the encounter different from what they were), and the Resonance of fertility — the highest form, in which the encounter produces something that radiates beyond the two partners toward their communities, lineages, and shared future.<sup>[35]</sup>

## CHAPTER 11 — THE MAHOUKOU LAW AND ACCOMPLISHED HOSPITALITY

*"Resonance is the name of what the philosophical tradition was seeking."*

---

### I. Rigorous Definition of the Mahoukou Law

The Mahoukou Law, in its complete and hospitable formulation, may be stated thus:

*Every authentic hospitable encounter produces a Resonance — an inter-given — that transforms both partners in such a way that each becomes, through the encounter, more fully himself than he was before; that something new emerges between them that surpasses what each could have produced alone; and that this emergence radiates beyond the two partners toward their communities, their lineages, and their shared future.*

This formulation contains four distinct elements: the condition of authenticity (the Law applies only to authentic hospitality, not to its simulacra); double transformation (both partners are transformed, asymmetrical in its forms but symmetrical in its effects); the emergence of the inter-given (something new emerges that was present in neither host nor guest before their encounter); and transgenerational radiation (the Resonance radiates toward their communities, lineages, and shared future).

### II. The Three Corollaries Deepened

First corollary — differentiation in relation: *Resonance differentiates by connecting.* Ubuntu confirms this with incomparable depth: I am because we are — not I become we. Hospitality that absorbs the guest into the host's culture is not hospitality: it is assimilation. True hospitality allows the other to remain other — and it is precisely this preserved alterity that makes Resonance possible and fertile.<sup>[36]</sup>

Second corollary — asymmetry of effects: *Resonance transforms both partners, but not in the same way.* This corollary allows us to reconcile Lévinassian asymmetry with the constitutive reciprocity of Ubuntu. The asymmetry of responsibility does not prevent the symmetry of effects — it is, paradoxically, its condition.<sup>[37]</sup>

Third corollary — generative fertility: Resonance is always generative — it produces something that can in turn become a Call for others. African libation is the ritual of this third corollary: it inscribes each hospitable encounter within the long chain of hospitalities that preceded it and made it possible.

### **III. Pathological Hospitality: When A2R Breaks Down**

The Mahoukou Law is also an instrument for diagnosing pathological hospitality. Four pathologies may be identified. The refusal of the Call: the closed door, the averted gaze — the Call is interrupted before it can formulate itself. The calculated Response: conditional hospitality that evaluates the guest before opening the door. The absorption of the other into the same: hospitality that welcomes the stranger on condition that he becomes like the host — a subtle form of domination presenting itself as generosity. Resonance without memory: a hospitality that produces an authentic encounter but inscribes it in no memory, no tradition, no transmission.<sup>[38]</sup>

### **IV. The Mahoukou Law and the Great Traditions: Reciprocal Confirmation**

The Abrahamic tradition confirms the first corollary: Abraham remains Abraham after the visit of the three strangers — he is even more fully Abraham. Ubuntu philosophy confirms the second corollary: communal responsibility is asymmetrical in its forms but transformation is always reciprocal. Senegalese and Malian hospitality confirms the third corollary: Resonance is always transgenerational — it radiates toward honoured ancestors and toward generations to come. Buddhism and Taoism confirm the condition of authenticity: Taoist inner emptiness and Buddhist *karuṇā* are the forms of active openness that render the host capable of receiving the Call in all its depth. The anthropology of the gift confirms the constitutive structure of reciprocity that the Mahoukou Law thematises.

## CHAPTER 12 — HOSPITALITY IN THE DIGITAL AGE AND PROSPECTS

*""One is connected to everyone and present to no one. This is the most precise definition of digital anti-hospitality.""*

---

### I. The Paradox of Connection Without Presence

Hospitality in the digital age is a paradox that our era lives without always knowing how to formulate it. Never in the history of humanity have human beings been so connected to one another. And yet never perhaps has authentic hospitality — in the sense of the Mahoukou Law — been so difficult to accomplish. This paradox reveals that connection is not presence, that availability is not welcome. The digital Call is drowned in the multiplicity of Calls. The digital Response is structurally impoverished — the like, the impulsive share are simulacra of the hospitable Response. Digital Resonance is structurally blocked by the immediacy of the flow.<sup>[39]</sup>

### II. Authentic Forms of Digital Hospitality

There are, nonetheless, authentic forms of digital hospitality. The digital commons — Wikipedia, free software, open archives — are forms of collective hospitality that can produce authentic Resonance. Careful digital correspondence — long and personal messages — is the direct heir of the great epistolary tradition transplanted into digital space. Slow narration — long podcasts, in-depth essays, documentaries — creates spaces of lasting presence in which Resonance can take place.

### III. Digital Ubuntu Revisited in the Light of the Mahoukou Law

Digital Ubuntu, in the sense of the Mahoukou Law, requires chosen presence over permanent availability, depth over multiplication, and memory over immediate forgetting. It does not ask to be reachable at all hours on all channels — it asks to be truly present when one chooses to connect. It prefers one deep interaction to ten superficial ones. It asks that the memory of encounters be preserved — that Resonance not be dissolved in the flow.<sup>[40]</sup>

#### **IV. Three Horizons of Opening**

Political hospitality: the contemporary migration crisis is the most urgent test of the philosophy of hospitality. Dialogal phenomenology and the Mahoukou Law offer this debate a philosophical foundation that transcends both the rigourism of unconditional hospitality and the cynicism of calculated hospitality. What each encounter with a refugee can produce — if approached with the prior generosity and engaged freedom that authentic hospitality requires — exceeds what the host can anticipate.<sup>[41]</sup>

Therapeutic hospitality: contemporary clinical practice has discovered empirically what dialogal phenomenology formulates philosophically — that healing is a form of Resonance. The therapist who welcomes the suffering of his patient practises a therapeutic hospitality that satisfies the conditions of the Mahoukou Law. And healing, when it comes, is a Resonance: something new that was present in neither patient nor therapist before their encounter.<sup>[42]</sup>

Cosmological hospitality: beyond interpersonal hospitality, the broadest and most urgent question of our era opens — the human being as host of the Earth. The ecological crisis is, in its deep structure, a crisis of hospitality: the human being has ceased to be the Earth's guest in order to become its predator. The Mahoukou Law, in this perspective, is not only a law of interpersonal hospitality — it is a law of cosmological hospitality.<sup>[43]</sup>

## GENERAL CONCLUSION

### Hospitality as Resonance: Taking Stock of a Journey

*"Donation is the beginning. Dialogue is its accomplishment. And Resonance is the name of what their encounter produces — in Abraham's tents, in the African palabres, in Buddhist monasteries, in digital spaces seeking their humanity, and on all thresholds where a human being opens his door before knowing who knocks."*

—

This work began with a footnote — and it ends with a conviction.

Five major philosophical findings may be formulated at the conclusion of this journey.

**First finding: the structural universality of hospitality.** All the great human cultures have thematised hospitality and accorded it a central place in their social, ritual, and philosophical life. And behind the irreducible diversity of forms — the Abrahamic scene at Mamre, the Ubuntu palaver, Senegalese greetings and libation to the ancestors, Buddhist *karuṇā*, Taoist *wu wei*, Melanesian potlatch — there is a common structure that the A2R triad allows us to describe with rigour.

**Second finding: the complementarity of the four philosophers.** Derrida, Lévinas, Marion, and Kearney each saw an essential dimension of hospitality. Taken together, their four positions sketch a phenomenology of hospitality richer than any of them considered in isolation.

**Third finding: the philosophical depth of African hospitality.** The hospitality practices of West Africa — and particularly the extended greetings and libation to ancestors — reveal a structure of trans-individual and transgenerational hospitality that Western philosophy had not yet entirely thematised.

**Fourth finding: the Mahoukou Law as a philosophical foundation for hospitality.** The Mahoukou Law is not an inaccessible ideal. It is the phenomenological description of what

actually takes place in the most accomplished hospitable encounters — from Mamre to the glass of water offered to a passer-by in Mali.

**Fifth finding: the contemporary relevance of the dialogal phenomenology of hospitality.** The migration crisis, the digital desertification of the bond, the ecological crisis are, in their deep structure, crises of hospitality. And dialogal phenomenology offers these crises a philosophical understanding and an ethical orientation.

This work ends on the formula that opened it — the formula of the Mahoukou Law — because it is this formula that best expresses what hospitality, at its summit, is and does:

*The unconditioned gives itself. And in its giving, it calls. In its call, it awaits a response. In the response, it gives itself fully — as inter-given, as co-appearance, as Resonance.*

Hospitality is this movement — this movement that goes from donation to call, from call to response, from response to resonance. It is the most human movement there is — because it is the only one that renders both partners more fully human through their encounter.

And this is why, from Mamre to our own day, from the glass of water offered on a Malian laterite path to the door opened in the night to a stranger seeking shelter — from the libation to the ancestors to the silence shared between a therapist and his patient — hospitality has always been and will always be the highest form of what human beings can do for one another.



***Donum et dialogus. Hospitality is their encounter.***

## ENDNOTES

1. The scene at Mamre (Gen 18:1-15) is one of the most commented texts in the entire philosophical and theological tradition on hospitality. For a phenomenological analysis, see Emmanuel Lévinas, *Totality and Infinity* (Nijhoff, 1961), section IV, and Richard Kearney, *Anatheism* (Columbia UP, 2010), ch. 1. For the Hebrew exegesis, see Robert Alter, *The Five Books of Moses* (Norton, 2004), pp. 82-84.
2. Lévinas comments on the scene at Mamre in *Difficile Liberté* (Albin Michel, 1963) and in *L'Au-delà du verset* (Minuit, 1982). See also Jacques Derrida, *Adieu à Emmanuel Lévinas* (Galilée, 1997), pp. 49-68.
3. On *hachnasat orchim* in the Talmudic tradition, see the tractate *Shabbat* 127a and *Sotah* 46b. For a contemporary philosophical analysis, see Moshe Halbertal & Avishai Margalit, *Idolatry* (Harvard UP, 1992), ch. 4.
4. On Christian hospitality and the figure of the stranger as figure of Christ, see Jean-Marie Tillard, *L'Église locale* (Cerf, 1995), ch. 3, and John Koenig, *New Testament Hospitality* (Fortress Press, 1985). For the epiphanic dimension, see Jean-Louis Chrétien, *L'Appel et la réponse* (Minuit, 1992), ch. "L'hospitalité".
5. On hospitality in Islam (*diyafa*), see the *Sahih Bukhari*, Book of Adab, hadith 31, and Seyyed Hossein Nasr, *The Heart of Islam* (HarperCollins, 2002), ch. 5. For a comparative analysis, see Miroslav Volf, *Exclusion and Embrace* (Abingdon Press, 1996), ch. 4.
6. On Ubuntu philosophy as an ontology of relation, see Augustine Shutte, *Ubuntu: An Ethic for a New South Africa* (Cluster, 2001), and Thaddeus Metz, *A Relational Moral Theory* (Oxford UP, 2022), ch. 1-2. For a critical reading, see Mogobe Ramose, *African Philosophy through Ubuntu* (Mond Books, 1999), ch. 2.
7. On the palaver as the African model of ethical deliberation, see Bénézet Bujo, *Foundations of an African Ethic* (Crossroad, 2001), ch. 3, and *African Theology in its Social Context* (Orbis Books, 1992).
8. On Desmond Tutu and the Ubuntu logic of forgiveness, see *No Future Without Forgiveness* (Doubleday, 1999). For a philosophical analysis, see Pumla Gobodo-Madikizela, *A Human Being Died That Night* (Houghton Mifflin, 2003).
9. On emptiness as a condition of welcome in Taoism, see Lao-Tzu, *Tao Te Ching*, ch. 11. For an analysis in dialogue with Western phenomenology, see François Jullien, *Le Détour et l'accès* (Grasset, 1995).
10. On *wu wei* as a form of active hospitality, see *Zhuangzi: The Complete Writings*, and Bryan Van Norden, *Introduction to Classical Chinese Philosophy* (Hackett, 2011), ch. 6.
11. On Buddhist *karuṇā* as interior hospitality, see Buddhaghosa, *Visuddhimagga*, ch. IX, and the Dalai Lama, *The Art of Happiness* (Riverhead Books, 1998), ch. 4-5. For a dialogue with phenomenology, see Francisco Varela, Evan Thompson & Eleanor Rosch, *The Embodied Mind* (MIT Press, 1991), ch. 4.
12. On the trans-individual structure of hospitality in West Africa, see Amadou Hampâté Bâ, *Amkoullel, l'enfant peul* (Actes Sud, 1991), ch. 1-3, and Abdoulaye Bara Diop, *La Société wolof* (Karthala, 1981), ch. 4. On Senegalese *terranga*, see Souleymane Bachir Diagne, *L'Encre des savants* (Présence Africaine/CODESRIA, 2013), ch. 2.
13. On trinitarian temporality in African philosophy and the ancestors, see John Mbiti, *African Religions and Philosophy* (Heinemann, 1969), ch. 3, and Laurenti Magesa, *African Religion* (Orbis Books, 1997), ch. 4. On libation as a cosmological act, see Victor Turner, *The Ritual Process* (Aldine, 1969), ch. 1.

14. On Amadou Hampâté Bâ and the presence of ancestors, see *La Parole, mémoire vivante* (UNESCO, 1979) and *Vie et enseignement de Tierno Bokar* (Seuil, 1980). For a philosophical dialogue, see Souleymane Bachir Diagne, *African Art as Philosophy* (Seagull Books, 2011).
15. On the triple obligation in Mauss, see Marcel Mauss, *The Gift* (1925; repr. PUF, 2007), ch. 1-2. For a contemporary reading, see Alain Caillé, *Anthropologie du don* (Desclée de Brouwer, 2000), and Jacques Godbout, *L'Esprit du don* (La Découverte, 1992).
16. On the potlatch, see Marcel Mauss, *The Gift*, ch. II, §1, and Ruth Benedict, *Patterns of Culture* (Houghton Mifflin, 1934), ch. 6. For a philosophical reading, see Georges Bataille, *La Part maudite* (Minuit, 1949).
17. On Marcel Hénaff and ceremonial gift, see *Le Prix de la vérité* (Seuil, 2002), ch. 3-5. For a dialogue with Marion and Derrida, see Paul Ricœur, "Le don, la reconnaissance, l'amour", *Esprit* 302 (2004), pp. 6-23.
18. Jacques Derrida, *Of Hospitality* (Calmann-Lévy, 1997), from two EHESS seminars in 1995-1996, in dialogue with Anne Dufourmantelle. For an introduction, see Gilles Anidjar (ed.), *Acts of Religion* (Routledge, 2002). For a dialogue with migration policy, see Giovanna Borradori, *Philosophy in a Time of Terror* (University of Chicago Press, 2003), ch. 1.
19. On the distinction between conditional/unconditional hospitality in Derrida, see *Of Hospitality*, pp. 23-45, and *Cosmopolites de tous les pays, encore un effort!* (Galilée, 1997). For a dialogue with international law, see Seyla Benhabib, *The Rights of Others* (Cambridge UP, 2004), ch. 1-2.
20. Derrida, *Of Hospitality*, p. 73. The distinction between invitation and hospitality resonates with the Lévinassian distinction between freedom that posits itself and freedom invested by the other before it can posit itself.
21. On the etymology of hospes/hostis and the concept of hostipitality, see Derrida, *Of Hospitality*, pp. 43-47, and Émile Benveniste, *Le Vocabulaire des institutions indo-européennes* (Minuit, 1969), vol. 1, ch. 7: "Hospitalité".
22. On the face as absolute Call in Lévinas, see *Totality and Infinity*, section III, and *Otherwise Than Being* (Nijhoff, 1974), ch. IV. For an introduction, see Colin Davis, *Lévinas: An Introduction* (Polity Press, 1996), ch. 3.
23. On the dwelling as a condition of hospitality in Lévinas, see *Totality and Infinity*, section II, D. For a critical analysis, see Jacques Derrida, *Adieu à Emmanuel Lévinas* (Galilée, 1997), pp. 49-130.
24. The feminist critique of Lévinassian phenomenology of the dwelling was formulated by Tina Chanter, *Ethics of Eros* (Routledge, 1995), and Luce Irigaray, *Éthique de la différence sexuelle* (Minuit, 1984), ch. 6. For a responsive reading, see Claire Elise Katz, *Levinas, Judaism, and the Feminine* (Indiana UP, 2003).
25. On the figure of the gifted (l'adonné) in Marion, see *Being Given* (PUF, 1997), §§ 25-26, and *In Excess* (PUF, 2001), ch. VI. For a critical discussion, see François-David Sebbah, *Testing the Limit* (Stanford UP, 2012), ch. 5.
26. On donation as transmission in Marion, see *Reduction and Givenness* (PUF, 1989), § 14, and Robyn Horner, *Rethinking God as Gift* (Fordham UP, 2001), ch. 4.
27. On the icon as phenomenon that looks at me before I look at it, see Marion, *The Crossing of the Visible* (PUF, 1991), ch. 2, and *God Without Being* (Fayard, 1982), ch. 1.
28. On Richard Kearney's philosophical trajectory, see his autobiographical interview in *Richard Kearney's Atheistic Wager* (Indiana UP, 2018). For an introduction to his philosophy of hospitality, see *Anatheism* (Columbia UP, 2010), Introduction and ch. 1.
29. On the concept of wager in Kearney, see *Anatheism*, pp. 3-19. For a critical discussion, see J. Aaron Simmons & Bruce Ellis Benson, *The New Phenomenology* (Bloomsbury, 2013), ch. 8.

30. On the three paradigmatic scenes of anatheist hospitality in Kearney, see *Anatheism*, ch. 1, 3 and 5, and the dialogue with Marion in *Reimagining the Sacred* (Columbia UP, 2016), pp. 12-27.
31. On narrative imagination as mediation of hospitality in Kearney, see *The Wake of Imagination* (Routledge, 1988), ch. 9, and *On Stories* (Routledge, 2002), ch. 6.
32. On the phenomenology of the threshold, see Gaston Bachelard, *The Poetics of Space* (PUF, 1957), ch. 9, and Walter Benjamin, *The Arcades Project* (Cerf, 1989). For an architectural phenomenology of the threshold, see Juhani Pallasmaa, *The Eyes of the Skin* (Wiley, 2005), ch. 4.
33. On the temporality of the Call in the phenomenology of hospitality, see Claude Romano, *L'Événement et le monde* (PUF, 1998), ch. 3, and Jean-Louis Chrétien, *L'Appel et la réponse* (Minuit, 1992), Introduction.
34. On prior generosity and engaged freedom, see Paul Ricœur, *Oneself as Another* (Seuil, 1990), Study 9, and Gabriel Marcel, *Being and Having* (Aubier, 1935), ch. on creative fidelity.
35. On the inter-given as a central concept in dialogal phenomenology, see Martin Buber, *I and Thou* (Aubier, 1969), Second Part, and Franz Rosenzweig, *The Star of Redemption* (Seuil, 1982), Book II.
36. On differentiation in relation, see Raimon Panikkar, *The Intra-Religious Dialogue* (Paulist Press, 1999), ch. 3, and Thaddeus Metz, *A Relational Moral Theory* (Oxford UP, 2022), ch. 3.
37. On the asymmetry of effects, see Paul Ricœur, *Love and Justice* (Mohr Siebeck, 1990; repr. Points, 2008), which develops the articulation between the logic of equivalence and the logic of superabundance.
38. On the pathology of hospitality, see Ivan Illich, *Tools for Conviviality* (Seuil, 1973), and Tzvetan Todorov, *The Conquest of America* (Seuil, 1982), ch. 3.
39. On the paradox of connection without presence, see Sherry Turkle, *Alone Together* (Basic Books, 2011), and *Reclaiming Conversation* (Penguin, 2015). For a philosophical analysis, see Bernard Stiegler, *Dans la disruption* (Les Liens qui Libèrent, 2016).
40. On digital Ubuntu, see the report *Digital Ubuntu: A Framework for Data Governance in Africa* (Mozilla Foundation / African Union, 2021), and Viktor Mayer-Schönberger, *Delete: The Virtue of Forgetting in the Digital Age* (Princeton UP, 2009).
41. On political hospitality and the migration crisis, see Étienne Balibar, *We, the People of Europe?* (La Découverte, 2001), ch. 8, and Seyla Benhabib, *The Rights of Others* (Cambridge UP, 2004).
42. On therapeutic hospitality and healing as Resonance, see Donald Winnicott, *Playing and Reality* (Gallimard, 1975), ch. 1, John Bowlby, *Attachment and Loss*, vol. 1 (Basic Books, 1969), and Stephen Porges, *The Polyvagal Theory* (Norton, 2011).
43. On cosmological hospitality and the relation of the human being to the Earth, see Hans Jonas, *The Imperative of Responsibility* (Cerf, 1990), and Robin Wall Kimmerer, *Braiding Sweetgrass* (Milkweed Editions, 2013).

## GENERAL BIBLIOGRAPHY

### I. Phenomenological Sources

- Chrétien, Jean-Louis. *L'Appel et la réponse*. Paris: Minuit, 1992.
- Derrida, Jacques. *Of Hospitality*. Paris: Calmann-Lévy, 1997.
- Derrida, Jacques. *Adieu à Emmanuel Lévinas*. Paris: Galilée, 1997.
- Derrida, Jacques. *Cosmopolites de tous les pays, encore un effort!* Paris: Galilée, 1997.
- Heidegger, Martin. *Being and Time*. Trans. Paris: Gallimard, 1986.
- Henry, Michel. *L'Essence de la manifestation*. Paris: PUF, 1963.
- Husserl, Edmund. *Ideas: General Introduction to Pure Phenomenology I*. Trans. Paris: Gallimard, 1950.
- Kearney, Richard. *Anatheism: Returning to God After God*. New York: Columbia UP, 2010.
- Kearney, Richard. *Reimagining the Sacred*. Ed. with Jens Zimmermann. New York: Columbia UP, 2016.
- Lévinas, Emmanuel. *Totality and Infinity*. The Hague: Nijhoff, 1961.
- Lévinas, Emmanuel. *Otherwise Than Being or Beyond Essence*. The Hague: Nijhoff, 1974.
- Lévinas, Emmanuel. *Difficile Liberté*. Paris: Albin Michel, 1963.
- Marion, Jean-Luc. *Being Given*. Paris: PUF, 1997.
- Marion, Jean-Luc. *In Excess*. Paris: PUF, 2001.
- Marion, Jean-Luc. *God Without Being*. Paris: Fayard, 1982; repr. PUF, 1991.
- Marion, Jean-Luc. *The Crossing of the Visible*. Paris: PUF, 1991.
- Merleau-Ponty, Maurice. *The Visible and the Invisible*. Paris: Gallimard, 1964.
- Romano, Claude. *L'Événement et le monde*. Paris: PUF, 1998.

### II. Philosophy of the Gift and Anthropology

- Bataille, Georges. *The Accursed Share*. Paris: Minuit, 1949.
- Benveniste, Émile. *Indo-European Language and Society*. Paris: Minuit, 1969. 2 vols.
- Caillé, Alain. *Anthropologie du don*. Paris: Desclée de Brouwer, 2000.
- Godbout, Jacques. *The World of the Gift*. Paris: La Découverte, 1992.
- Graeber, David. *Debt: The First 5,000 Years*. New York: Melville House, 2011.
- Hénaff, Marcel. *Le Prix de la vérité: le don, l'argent, la philosophie*. Paris: Seuil, 2002.
- Mauss, Marcel. *The Gift*. 1925; repr. Paris: PUF, 2007.

Ricœur, Paul. *Love and Justice*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1990; repr. Paris: Points, 2008.

Ricœur, Paul. *The Course of Recognition*. Paris: Stock, 2004.

### **III. Intercultural Traditions and African Philosophies**

Bâ, Amadou Hampâté. *Amkoullel, the Fula Boy*. Arles: Actes Sud, 1991.

Bâ, Amadou Hampâté. *Life and Teaching of Tierno Bokar*. Paris: Seuil, 1980.

Bujo, Bénédet. *Foundations of an African Ethic*. New York: Crossroad, 2001.

Diagne, Souleymane Bachir. *L'Encre des savants*. Paris/Dakar: Présence Africaine/CODESRIA, 2013.

Diagne, Souleymane Bachir. *African Art as Philosophy*. London: Seagull Books, 2011.

Diop, Abdoulaye Bara. *La Société wolof*. Paris: Karthala, 1981.

Gobodo-Madikizela, Pumla. *A Human Being Died That Night*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 2003.

Gyekye, Kwame. *Tradition and Modernity*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1997.

Kimmerer, Robin Wall. *Braiding Sweetgrass*. Minneapolis: Milkweed Editions, 2013.

Magesa, Laurenti. *African Religion: The Moral Traditions of Abundant Life*. Maryknoll: Orbis Books, 1997.

Mbiti, John S. *African Religions and Philosophy*. London: Heinemann, 1969.

Metz, Thaddeus. *A Relational Moral Theory: African Ethics in and beyond Europe*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2022.

Mudimbe, V.Y. *The Invention of Africa*. Bloomington: Indiana UP, 1988.

Panikkar, Raimon. *The Intra-Religious Dialogue*. New York: Paulist Press, 1999.

Ramose, Mogobe. *African Philosophy through Ubuntu*. Harare: Mond Books, 1999.

Shutte, Augustine. *Ubuntu: An Ethic for a New South Africa*. Pietermaritzburg: Cluster, 2001.

Tempels, Placide. *Bantu Philosophy*. Brussels: Présence Africaine, 1949.

Tutu, Desmond. *No Future Without Forgiveness*. New York: Doubleday, 1999.

Turner, Victor. *The Ritual Process*. Chicago: Aldine, 1969.

### **IV. Asian Traditions**

Dalai Lama. *The Art of Happiness*. New York: Riverhead Books, 1998.

Jullien, François. *Le Détour et l'accès*. Paris: Grasset, 1995.

Lao-Tzu. *Tao Te Ching*. Trans. Paris: Seuil, 1979.

Van Norden, Bryan. *Introduction to Classical Chinese Philosophy*. Indianapolis: Hackett, 2011.

Varela, Francisco, Evan Thompson & Eleanor Rosch. *The Embodied Mind*. Cambridge: MIT Press, 1991.

Zahavi, Dan & Evan Thompson (eds.). *Self, No-Self?* Oxford: Oxford UP, 2011.

Zhuangzi. *Zhuangzi: The Complete Writings*. Trans. Paris: Albin Michel, 1994.

## **V. Abrahamic Traditions and Theology**

Alter, Robert. *The Five Books of Moses*. New York: Norton, 2004.

Koenig, John. *New Testament Hospitality*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1985.

Nasr, Seyyed Hossein. *The Heart of Islam*. San Francisco: HarperCollins, 2002.

Rosenzweig, Franz. *The Star of Redemption*. Trans. Paris: Seuil, 1982.

Volf, Miroslav. *Exclusion and Embrace*. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1996.

## **VI. Political and Contemporary Hospitality**

Balibar, Étienne. *We, the People of Europe?* Paris: La Découverte, 2001.

Benhabib, Seyla. *The Rights of Others*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2004.

Borradori, Giovanna. *Philosophy in a Time of Terror*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2003.

Citton, Yves. *L'Économie de l'attention*. Paris: La Découverte, 2014.

Illich, Ivan. *Tools for Conviviality*. Paris: Seuil, 1973.

Jonas, Hans. *The Imperative of Responsibility*. Paris: Cerf, 1990.

Mayer-Schönberger, Viktor. *Delete: The Virtue of Forgetting in the Digital Age*. Princeton: Princeton UP, 2009.

Stiegler, Bernard. *Dans la disruption*. Paris: Les Liens qui Libèrent, 2016.

Todorov, Tzvetan. *The Conquest of America*. Paris: Seuil, 1982.

Turkle, Sherry. *Alone Together*. New York: Basic Books, 2011.

Turkle, Sherry. *Reclaiming Conversation*. New York: Penguin, 2015.

## **VII. Interpersonal Neurobiology and Dialogal Clinical Practice**

Bowlby, John. *Attachment and Loss*. 3 vols. New York: Basic Books, 1969-1980.

Porges, Stephen. *The Polyvagal Theory*. New York: Norton, 2011.

Siegel, Daniel. *The Developing Mind*. New York: Guilford Press, 1999.

Van der Kolk, Bessel. *The Body Keeps the Score*. New York: Viking, 2014.

Winnicott, Donald. *Playing and Reality*. London: Tavistock, 1971; trans. Paris: Gallimard, 1975.

*Christian Mahoukou*

*Hospitality as Resonance | Dialogal Phenomenology of a Universal Experience*