Papers

The laws of hospitality

As leis da hospitalidade

Las leyes de la hospitalidad

Luiz Octávio de Lima Camargo[1]

[1]University of São Paulo (USP), São Paulo, SP, Brazil

Abstract

In an ever-growing mobile society, which is replacing the predominantly sedentary one, the contact with strangers/foreigners/outsiders increases rapidly, changing basic institutions of society such as home, neighborhood, family, work. Expecting a welcome everywhere we go becomes a need and a right. Urbanity, polite but impersonal treatment, is no longer enough. Demands for a hospitality more filled with human warmth are growing. Even in commercial exchanges, terms such as customization or loyalty signal the desire for a more personal service encounter. The discussion of these themes is the background for this article which draws on the reflections of Jacques Derrida, Marcel Mauss, Julian Pitt-Rivers, and Anne Gotman, to unveil the four basic laws of hospitality: unconditionality, reciprocity, asymmetry, and compensation. Additionally, the article intends to raise other issues at the fringes of the current discussion, especially the case of tourism.

Resumo

Na sociedade de mobilidade crescente, que vem substituindo a sociedade à dominante sedentária, o contato com estranhos/estrangeiros/desconhecidos aumenta velozmente, alterando instituições basilares da sociedade como casa, vizinhança, família, trabalho. A garantia de ser bem recebido em todos os lugares para onde vamos torna-se uma necessidade. A urbanidade, o tratamento polido, mas impessoal não é mais suficiente. Crescem as reivindicações por uma hospitalidade mais carregada de calor humano. Mesmo no comércio, termos como customização, fidelização são marcas da aspiração de pessoalidade no encontro. A discussão desses temas é o contexto para o propósito deste artigo de, com base nas reflexões de Jacques Derrida, Marcel Mauss, Julian Pitt-Rivers e Anne Gotman, desvelar as quatro leis básicas da hospitalidade: a incondicionalidade, a reciprocidade, a assimetria e a compensação. Adicionalmente, pretende levantar outras questões que surgem à margem da atual discussão, em especial o caso do turismo.

Resumen

En la sociedad de movilidad creciente que há estado sustituyendo a la sociedad por el dominante sedentario, el contacto con extraños / extranjeros / extraños aumenta rápidamente, cambiando las instituciones básicas de la sociedad, como el hogar, el vecindario, la familia y el trabajo. La garantía de ser bienvenido donde quiera que vayamos se convierte en una necesidad. La urbanidad, el trato cortés pero impersonal ya no es suficiente. Las demandas de una hospitalidad más cargada de calor humano están creciendo. Incluso en el comercio, términos como personalización, fidelización son marcas de la aspiración de personalidad en el encuentro. La discusión de estos temas es el contexto para el propósito de este artículo, basado en las reflexiones de Jacques Derrida, Marcel Mauss, Julian Pitt-Rivers y Anne Gotman, para revelar las cuatro leyes básicas de la hospitalidad: incondicionalidad, reciprocidad, asimetría y compensación. Además, tiene la intención de plantear otros problemas que surgen fuera de la discusión actual, especialmente el caso del turismo.

1 INTRODUCTION

In rural areas and small cities, where most Brazilians lived until the 1960s, people were able to establish some mutual knowledge. In addition, they moved little, could live their entire lives in the same house, with the same neighbors for generations. Traveling was a luxury, an event that required days or weeks of preparation. Despite these being historical platitudes, they show that contact with strangers was less common then now.

Over the past 70 years, mobility and speed, as categories of space and time, have grown together. Space shrank and speed accelerated. Transportation and communication technologies evolve at a breakneck pace. We still do not have a Star Trek transporter but space tourism is already knocking on our door. It is paradoxical that the stranger no longer exists on the globe, but the number of strangers grows alarmingly in everyday contacts.

One can say that today, for those who work outside the home, relationships marked by familiarity are exceptions. These are interactions where we sometimes observe human warmth amid dominant inhospitality and hostility (Camargo, 2015). And we sure do come across strangers! Immigrants, refugees, tourists are the most obvious and increasingly frequent strangers. The most disconcerting stranger, however, is the one we come across on public transport, in companies, in public offices. These interactions can even be polished, but they are more formal, impersonal.

Viard (2005) summarizes the discussion: we are leaving a predominantly sedentary world, where there was less need to think about hospitality, to a society of increasing mobility where the assurance of being well received everywhere is a matter of urgency. Viard himself says that in France in 1970, people moved a maximum of 7 km a day; in 2000, that number rose to over thirty. One can imagine the growth since then. In the areas of commerce and services, the art of hospitality is a competitive advantage.

In this text, the notion of hospitality is directly related to welcoming the stranger, which justifies the boldness to think about phases and historical periods different from those recognized by historians. In the longest phase of the human adventure – the Paleolithic – interactions with strangers were sporadic and the notion of hospitality was not justified. Only after the invention of agriculture and livestock, different peoples began to distinguish between locals (human beings) and foreigners (barbarians) and, as Benveniste (1975) suggests, every stranger started to be asked the question: are you a guest or an enemy? From the growing hostility emerged hospitality and its laws.

The second moment happened at the dawn of modernity with the rural exodus that grew even more with the Industrial Revolution when European cities swelled and spilled out of the walls. The advent of urbanity (Elias, 1994), of polite and impersonal interaction, became the rule for interpersonal relationship.

The third moment began in the 1950s, with the increase in international and regional migration and rising mass tourism. It is another world, more frantic and bustling where the advance of the media contributed the current hypermobility (Urry, 2001; Augé, 2010). In this context, urbanity is already compromised. Today an original claim arises: more human warmth. At this point, a caveat is in order: expressions used here as human warmth, authenticity, and even conviviality, without due psychological foundation (which is beyond the purpose of this text) do not mean the same as the cordiality of Buarque de Holanda (1989) and only make sense here as opposed to formal urbanity as conceptualized here or to the opposition individual/badge or, ultimately, to the I-It Buber (1979) used against the objectification of the Other and his or her transformation into a number or, as Guattari (1991) says, serialized subjectivity. In this overpopulated world, the desire to be welcomed as unique individuals grows.

The purpose of this text is to discuss and deepen these reflections as a background to extract what is here called the laws of hospitality. To this end, we present some well-known views of leading authors who have already addressed the problem, namely the philosophers Immanuel Kant (1995), Jacques Derrida (1999),

and anthropologists Conrad Lashley (2015), Julian Pitt-Rivers (2012), and Anne Gotman (2011). We also revisit Mauss (1974) and the concept of hospitality as a gift and the laws that follow from it.

We address the three moments of hospitality. Then, we present the unwritten laws of hospitality, their application to the field of tourism and, finally, we try to extract from the authors presented what we consider here as the laws of hospitality.

2 HOSPITALITY AND URBANITY

Demographer Hervé Le Bras (2005) says that we are facing a change similar to that faced by Paleolithic hunters-gatherers with the arrival of agriculture and livestock in the Neolithic. If we realize what that passage was and if Le Bras's intuition about the impact of the change is correct, at the very least one must stop to think about it. A significant change is happening or will happen.

It was in the transition from the Paleolithic to the Neolithic period that some hunters-gatherers become sedentary (Léroi-Gourhan, 1966) to take care and protect their crops and cattle, abandoning their nomadic life, always depending on food needs. Such a simple decision and with such irreversible consequences! The oldest allusions in Western thought to the impact of this change are found, in a metaphorical way, in Greek Mythology and the Book of Genesis.

How did these sources portray the change? For the Bible, the change meant the expulsion of man from Paradise; for Greek Mythology the advent of human miseries. In the Bible, the first couple dared to try the fruit of the Tree of Knowledge and were punished with the expulsion from Eden where they lived. Outside paradise, they can no longer live off the benefits of nature. They were obliged to eat bread by the sweat of their brow. Work, understood as a set of daily tasks to accomplish, emerges. To protect their crops and livestock, they needed a fixed house as well as more hands to help and, consequently, women. These women, who previously gave birth at random intervals and had long breastfeeding periods, become breeders. More: they lose the role they played before, in which they performed the most important family tasks – feeding, procreating, taking care of the young – and now, because of the need for more hands for work, they were forced to accept male polygamy (Engels, 2002). With the accumulation of goods, patriarchy replaces matriarchy. The war replaces hunting as an opportunity to discharge adolescents and young men' testosterone.

Greek mythology is no less cruel in examining the implications of change. The demigod Prometheus stole fire from Mount Olympus and gave it to mankind to help them in their work. Unable to reverse the damage, Zeus condemns him to be chained to a rock where each day an eagle would torn out his liver, which would regenerate overnight to be devoured again the next day. It is the ultimate metaphor for the torment of work, it is also inscribed in the tragedy of Sisyphus, condemned forever to roll a boulder up a hill during the day only to have it roll down again and start over the next day. Or, always: because of Prometheus' boldness, the tragedy of Pandora happens when she opens the fateful box releasing into the world work, disease, madness, old age, falsity, greed, passion.

The introduction of work in the Neolithic paved the way for the arrival of patriarchy, class struggle, slavery of the weak, accumulation of goods, and militias to protect those goods, from hordes that moved willing to survive the carnage they caused. Biblical fratricide (Eliade, 2010) is symbolic of change: the first farmer, Cain, killed the first shepherd, and founded the first city. To regulate a world of unknown operation, humanity had to learn over five millennia to create rules of coexistence so that larger groups of people could be brought together, thus emerging institutions necessary to its functioning: cities and armies to protect them, a clergy to support them ideologically, a monarchy to govern them, a written language to record facts and values, and thus history begins.

Benveniste (1975), studying the vocabulary of the Indo-European institutions, places hospitality among those institutions and semantically defines it as the formula used as a strategy in the face of the unknown: how to behave toward a stranger, a foreign, or an outsider? Will he be a friend, who will become *hospes*, or will he be the enemy, quite simply, *hostis*? Derrida (1999) registered this tension when suggested that the term hospitality should change to "hostipitality", that is, exactly the enigma that every stranger, foreigner, or outsider poses us.

This situation changes with the advent of modernity, with cities taking center stage. Even if their appearance occurred in the Neolithic period, only with the Industrial Revolution cities have become sustainable, placing themselves as the preferred space for human grouping. But the rules of living in the city had to be different from those in the countryside. Then, a need for a hospitality code that brought together strangers, but in a more restricted way, arose.

Therefore, it can be said that it was a civilizing process (Elias, 1994) that involved the adaptation of migrants from the countryside to city ways, namely to varied protocols that addressed, table manners, dress codes, conversation topics, what to eat, what habits to avoid, etc. Civilization becomes synonymous with repression, formalism, and this how the so-called modern etiquette is born. In fact, etiquette is now a derogatory term for designating formal and innocuous – as well as outdated – behaviors.

As Simmel (1973; 2004) shrewdly observed, in the city individuals are always on the defensive in the face of the stranger they encounter. They establish superficial relationships, keep a distance, or are even repulsed, which, if shared, can degenerate into conflict. The increase in interactions creates a hierarchy of sympathy, disinterest, and aversion. The established ritual rests on a logic: to be at ease but without embarrassing the other; be discreet; distant politeness; not talking to strangers; not exposing one's intimacy, not being a cause for concern to others.

This set of rules is here called urbanity, the form that hospitality took in the advent of the modern city. Urbanity, etiquette, civility are almost similar terms examined from this perspective. It is a way of relating socially that is based on aseptic attitudes and manners, devoid of human warmth.

Thus, there is a staged hospitality, especially in welcoming the public. Quality service guidelines are developed, translated into gestures, phrases, attitudes, and today's abhorred commercial laughter.

This formula of urbanity was successful as long as, even in large cities, a network of primary relationships existed. These are relationships marked by intimacy occurring in close and extended family and in the wider circle of neighbors and friends, which helped to cope with impersonality in daily life.

In the transition to a mobility society, what changes are the most feared by Hervé Le Bras at work, at school, in the family? Where is the reference that will replace the house, the neighborhood, the welcoming environment, the company where one has always worked, the network of lifelong friends that have supported us in an inhospitable world? Where do we live? In a house, in an apartment, in a hotel room, in an airplane cabin? Nuclear families tend to disappear and those based on different arrangements between partners and children arise. Who are the neighbors nowadays? They are the co-workers, always provisional in filling in WhatsApp groups.

3 FROM URBANITY TO HOSPITABLENESS

To be perfectly clear, the central starting point of this reflection is: if people in a way adapted to the first wave of collective life in Modernity, with a concept of urbanity that valued cordial relations, now it seems that demands are greater. On the one hand, polite and aloof interactions are exhausting. On the other hand, the dynamics of the modern city and the increasing mobility destroy our places – anthropologically, the spaces of intimacy, especially the neighborhood. As a result, isn't there a fatigue with formal urbanity, an aspiration for more authentic, convivial relationships?

Even in commercial interactions, the standardized way of receiving is now frowned upon. Commercial laughter is less and less tolerated. Terms such as loyalty, customization reflect the search for a more personal relationship with the customer. Polite utterances are increasingly ridiculed for the suspicion that they involve only a desire for non-involvement. A warm welcome even becomes a competitive advantage.

But what is, then, a proper welcome? What is the best way of welcoming? The word hospitality seems inadequate because it covers all forms of receiving/being received. In addition, it also designates an industry. That is why the British coined the term hospitableness, the capacity, the skill. As Lashley says:

> hospitality can be seen as a fundamental and ubiquitous feature of human life, and hospitableness indicates the willingness to be hospitable for its own sake, without any expectation of recompense or reciprocity (2015, p. 82).

Lashley also established what can be called steps of hospitality: the first, the most elementary and negative and the last the most positive. According to the author, "there are situations where hospitality is offered with

the hope of ensuing gain, to situations whereby hospitality is offered merely for the joy and pleasure of hosting" (2015, p. 82). Thus, we can organize hospitality in an axis from the most corrupted form by external interests to the most altruistic one, explained by the author as follows:

- hidden motivation hospitality, which involves any ulterior motives;

- restrictive hospitality, typical of ancient kings, motivated by fear of the stranger, as the current proverb says: "keep your friends close and your enemies closer";

- commercial hospitality, which comprises a financial transaction, whether it is true hospitality: if selling hospitality is an issue, there are people who invest in businesses that involve true hospitality;

- reciprocal hospitality, offered within contexts in which hosts become guests and guests become hosts, continuously.

- redistributive, charitable hospitality, offered without immediate expectation of return, refund or reciprocity.

- altruistic hospitality – the offer of hospitality as an act of generosity and benevolence or of giving pleasure to others.

A possible criticism of this Lashley scheme, which is otherwise well explained and substantiated, is that it involves only the host, leaving aside the guest. The outcome of a scene is a consequence of the performance of these two actors. And it is clear here that, unlike positive law, whose violation is sanctioned with imprisonment and fines, in the case of the unwritten laws of hospitality, non-compliance leads to inhospitality and hostility, as illustrated in the Figure 1 below:

Figure 1 – Hospitality from hostility to hospitality

Source: Camargo (2020)

The figure suggests that the encounter between someone who receives and someone who is received can happen with greater, lesser, or no interaction at all.

- **neutral hospitality**

It refers to the most current way of (not) receiving and (not) being received, mainly in the metropolises. In the hustle and bustle of everyday life, we come across an infinity of people in the streets, in public transport, in stores, with whom we do not exchange glances, gestures, words. Looking without seeing, speaking without saying anything, asking and answering mechanically set the tone for even impossible relationships, as illustrated by that joke of a hick who comes to São Paulo and could not get out of a busy corner because he wanted to greet everyone that passed. Neutral hospitality marks the isolated individual in the crowd.

But when a relationship is established, the interaction can be unsuccessful or successful, depending on the willingness of the actors in the scene. If unsuccessful, the interaction moves towards inhospitality and, depending on the circumstances, towards hostility.

- **inhospitality**

An encounter in which, on the part of the one who receives or is received, the interlocutor is not recognized or, quite simply, is ignored. Ignoring the other is not a violent act in itself, but it demonstrates unfriendliness, a desire not to establish contact with the other or, worse, has a secret agenda. Therefore, it paves the way for the last negative step.

- **hostility**

It is the result of aggressive actions that lead to the deterioration of human relationships. Hostility is not just the result of noncompliance with the laws of hospitality. It has various sources. But there is no doubt that flawed interpersonal encounters make up a large part of the universe of human hostility.

But the encounter can be successful and on the virtuous side, in this case the result can be either considered staged (urbanity) or genuine (hospitableness) hospitality.

- **urbanity**

It is a pleasant encounter that leaves the impression of an efficient professional performance. It encompasses contacts in which good positive interaction takes place but with an explicit interest from both parties. It is the rule in commerce and in all face-to-face and virtual areas of public service, that Anne Gotman calls staged hospitality (2008). As Lashley pointed out, commercial hospitality can only be utilitarian, but sometimes it also has a touch of hospitableness or tries to create an environment more conducive to human contact. Genuine hospitality (described below) stems from staged hospitality and a good part of these actors can also be placed on the upper level, that of hospitableness.

- **hospitableness**

Genuine hospitableness is the seal that marks the encounter between people who know and like to host and be hosted, who know and practice, instinctively or through training, the laws of hospitality. These moments are frequent among volunteers of all sorts, the clergy, and even among service professionals. Hospitableness refers to genuine hospitality and marks the most memorable encounters of everyday life.

It is not our intention here to define the profile of those who master the art of hospitality. Rather than saying that someone is hospitable, it is worth saying that their interactions tend to be hospitable. Hospitality is organized, as in a play, into often watertight scenes. We can act with hospitableness in a scene where we receive or are received and, in the next scene, we are hostile, however, it cannot be emphasized enough the essential trait of the personality of those who like to be hospitable, a taste for service. If, in general, people like to be served, there are – supposedly, a minority – those who, on the contrary, like to serve.

As Guimarães (2019) confirmed, hospitableness is the result of an intrinsic and extrinsic motivation for the pleasure of meeting people. In this category, people define the act of serving as their vocation and an important aspect of their personality. Those gifted with hospitableness are like those characters quite represented in fiction who, when faced with the choice between protocol – the most comfortable attitude – and the essence of their missions, choose this more difficult and riskier path.

4 UNWRITTEN LAWS

When talking about laws, law codes and manuals are not the only sources. There are other forms of law and, among these, those referring to hospitality. Receiving someone in one's space, whether at home or on the street when being approached, or at work in the interpersonal relationship with coworkers, bosses, and customers, whether answering emails or, conversely, entering another person's space under the same circumstances are rituals that obey strict rules, authentic laws.

However, hospitableness is paradoxical. It is free, i.e., without any interest other than welcoming/being welcomed. It does not demand, but presupposes reciprocity and compensation on the part of the other. In other words: it is free and mandatory at the same time. Or even, you are free to obey, but if you do not, you will be punished with hostility.

These are unwritten laws, similar to those of Marcel Mauss's (1974) gift: they are not part of the positive law, but an ancestral right that has crystallized over time into an ethics. Where do such laws come from? Under which authority are they formulated? Speaking exactly about the nature of the laws of hospitality, Innerarity (2001, p. 15) writes that: "there exists a sort of wisdom without arguments in the practices of human life, in its customs and institutions [which leads us to] know what is right before knowing the rule from which this all might derive".

Marcel Mauss (1974), rereading research by anthropologists of his time, formulated the concept of gift exchange (all hospitality is an exchange) based on the formula that became a mantra for anthropologists: give-

receive-reciprocate. This ancestral system coexists today with the most well-known system of commercial exchange. In the case of the gift, the exchange is personal, infinite, each protagonist being successively attached to the exchange for the gift received, alternating the positions of donor and recipient. The commercial exchange has a different logic: a symmetrical contract between equals, impersonal, finite.

Julian Pitt-Rivers speaks of hospitality as an ambivalence because "it does not eliminate the conflict altogether, but places it in abeyance and prohibits its expression" (2012, p. 513). It is understood, therefore, that solving the roots of the problems that lead to hostility is a mission that surpasses the institute of hospitality. Is this not the meaning of the ritual verbal expressions of hospitality? Isn't this the meaning of "good morning", "good afternoon" that we address to people when they come to an environment? The words do not refer to the beauty of the day, but only to the desire to tell the other that everything is fine and to wait for their answer in the same terms to ensure that the contact can be made. But the hospitable scene is ephemeral and the hospitality in it can only be studied as a scene linked with the previous and the following ones. In fact, it is upon this symphony of everyday life in which hospitableness, inhospitality, and hostility scenes take place that literary, dramaturgical, and cinematographic fictions are built.

After all, what are the laws of hospitality? The first reference, perhaps, is literary, at least because it bears the same title as this article. In it, the novelist Pierre Klossowski (1995) exposes the erotic ritual of hospitality, with a palette full of irony: if hospitality is the desire to make guests happy, nothing more natural than offer them total hospitality, access to all the delights of the house, including the beautiful hostess. In fact, this ritual was part of several cultures (Gotman, 2009).

But it is not in literature but in philosophy that the greatest references about this duty are found. The first to be remembered is Kant (1995) for whom hospitality is a moral and not a legal problem. It is a duty and has nothing to do with pity or compassion. Everything happens as if, for Kant, like other categorical imperatives, treating the guest well is the awareness that we are all guests and this is a law that everyone must enjoy to the point of making it universal.

This pioneering approach by Kant expanded in the second half of the twentieth century. From the existing studies, four laws can be listed:

First: UNCONDITIONALITY: the hospitality request must be accepted

As Perez (2007) notes, if, for Kant, the obligation to receive others has limits, for Levinas – who Derrida revered as a master – there is no limit to openness towards the other. He or she should not be asked the name. According to Levinas (1988), it is the other that constitutes us and that is why we are responsible for him or her, even if we do not know who the other is and no matter what their positive or negative characteristics are. He goes beyond the law and proposes an "ethics of responsibility", which is linked to the issue of undocumented foreigners. Hospitality is an ethical and not a legal problem.

In line with Levinas, Jacques Derrida insists on the importance of the other. For him, hospitality is unconditional and he establishes the extent and limits of that unconditionality. At first, he shows how the notion of tolerance is more than a narrow imitation of hospitality. As he stated in an interview (Borradori, 2004):

> Hospitality is the opposite of tolerance. This says: I grant you the right to continue living. Hospitality is unconditional. It does not consist in the invitation: I invite you, I welcome you into my home, on the condition that you adapt to the laws and norms of my territory, according to my language, tradition, memory, etc. (on the contrary) hospitality opens or is in advance open to someone who is neither expected nor invited, to whomever arrives as an absolutely foreign visitor, as a new arrival, nonidentifiable and unforeseeable, in short, wholly other (2004, p. 138).

But Derrida, with this law, was thinking especially of hospitality between nations, showing himself against all restrictive rules on the movement of people, exactly where the violation of this law has more perverse consequences, as the current waves of refugees show. Along the same lines, René Scherer (1993) must also be remembered. He sought in the history and philosophy of history the bases of a cosmopolitical right respectful of hospitality, considering it a key feature in the human condition, defining the attribute of humanity that characterizes Homo sapiens and, therefore, must be universal. Also, from a philosophical perspective, we must mention Louis Massignon (1987) and his reflections on hospitality as a sacred duty and Edmond Jabés (1991), who speaks of hospitality as "good news" – the semantic similarity with the word gospel is intentional – the rainbow that symbolizes the pact for host/guest quality to be transmitted from generation to generation.

The law of unconditionality is Derrida's seminal contribution to hospitality studies. Throughout the human adventure (and who knows since its inception) the idea that refusing to welcome others is a violation of the human condition, whoever they may be, wherever they come from, whatever their characteristics of gender, age, ethnicity, and even their intentions are.

And the limits of this unconditionality? First, Derrida recognizes that it does not fall within the statute of positive law. As Perez recalls (2007, p. 25) it could not be addressed in terms of the application of a moral or legal law. More: as he stated in another interview:

> Yet, a cultural or linguistic community, a family, a nation, can not not suspend, at the least, even betray this principle of absolute hospitality: to protect a 'home', without doubt, by guaranteeing property and what is 'proper' to itself against the unlimited arrival of the other; but also to attempt to render the welcome effective. (Derrida, 1997)

How can these laws be violated? The host may be aloof, someone who is not even interested in knowing the guest's name. You can be dysthymic and just think about the expense he or she is having. The guest can also manifest the same syndrome and not even care about who is the host.

In addition to the limits of absolute hospitality mentioned by Derrida himself, the problem of unconditionality in virtual hospitality must be mentioned. It is not even the case to mention spam, mass communication and that is not specifically addressed to anyone and that, therefore, does not expect an answer from everyone, but the volume of personal requests has increased considerably. With technology moving from phone to email and social media in general, the volume of daily interactions has increased significantly. What does unconditionality mean in this situation?

Answer: exactly the same thing that happens face-to-face. Not responding to a personal e-mail from someone who asks us for feedback has the same effect as face-to-face denial. What is the penalty? How is this law enacted? Both virtually and face-to-face, it is assumed that the individual who receives, the host, has the exact notion that something happens when they do not say "no" to others or when they do not surround themselves with the due guarantees that such an attitude will not be understood as a violation of this law. This is true for the stranger who approaches us on the street and we do not even consider his or her request, whether due to haste, fear, or prejudice. It applies to the individual who approaches us late at night at our home or to the individual who seeks a hotel and hears that he or she can only stay if the established price is paid, etc. This paves the way for hostility.

If sanctions place limits, incentives for the practice of unconditionality are powerful, especially for religions. What if the unknown is an angel or a god? As Richard Martin writes in the introduction to Homer's Odyssey (2014):

> It is not surprising that, in a preliterate, archaic culture, where there were no recognized international institutions or norms, the correct behavior toward outsiders was made into a sacred obligation. (...) This was in effect the only way in which individuals could survive beyond the bounds of their local community. Zeus had a special title, Xenios, to denote his role as protector of strangers. Any infraction was thus an offense against the chief god.

The Bible says that Abraham, after sacrificing his firstfruits to welcome three strangers, hears from them at the end that they were angels and that, for the hospitality received, they rewarded him with the late pregnancy of his 90-year-old wife Sara. On the same trip, in Sodom, the angels became guests of the only virtuous man, Lot, Abraham's nephew and rewarded him with the flight from Sodom before the its destruction. Likewise, Zeus and Hermes, traveling through Phrygia in the Metamorphoses by the Latin poet Ovid, are received only by an old couple, Baucis and Philemon. Grateful, the two travelers introduce themselves and are ready to answer a request from their hosts that was quite simple: they wanted to die and be buried together. Revenge on the city that did not accept them was cruel: the water in a lake devoured it. Thus, he who receives the unknown welcomes a divine being and is largely rewarded.

More than an example of hospitableness, the Greek myth refers to something that is common in many different societies. Hospitableness should be encouraged and it is a virtue because it is rare, as is the case with virtues in general (Camargo, 2015). Unconditionality is equally valid for hosts and guests, although the host was very much in the mind of Derrida. The other laws clearly state the guest's obligations.

Second: RECIPROCITY – host and guest should honor each other

One of the major contributions to hospitality literature is Julian Pitt-Rivers' (2012) study of the codes of nobility in Andalusia. According to him, in that society the private sphere encompassed a network of sociability infinitely more extensive than in societies based on the salary institution. Social relations were the main breeding ground for the individual's reputation and honor. At the heart of these relationships, the author found a code which he called the law of hospitality. Indeed, a society built upon honor as a criterion in social relations is a fertile ground for observing hospitality in place, both ethically and aesthetically. If the ethical aspect of hospitality is well studied, the aesthetic aspect is less so. But the honor that Pitt-Rivers' informers spoke of was placed at the same level as elegance. The intrinsically hospitable gesture is an elegant gesture, which denotes nobility that does not come from blood but from a deep sense of respect for the other, reminding the Greek ethical and aesthetic principle of *kalokagathia*, the good and the beautiful together.

Host and guest must honor each other. How to translate this law today? The host honors the guest by offering their house, giving him the wi-fi password, offering small gifts and tokens, especially food and beverages, interacting with pleasure, especially during the conversation. The guest honors the host by accepting his invitation, bringing gifts and tokens, bringing joy, honoring him with words.

This law can be violated by excess or default. By excess, the host becomes a kidnapper. The host takes advantage of the guest's obligation to accept all his gifts and, thus, whether intentionally or not, makes him feel imprisoned. This kidnapping may be the product of a certain naivety of the host who, inadvertently, smothers his guest with overwhelming generosity, but it may also be part of a secret agenda, as in the case of the fairy tale in which Hansel and Gretel are received by the evil witch that imprisons them to fatten them up and then devour them.

Incidentally, with different forms, sometimes more and sometimes less clear, this transgression remains in our daily lives. After all, who among us, as guests, has never felt imprisoned in a situation, being forced to live it against our will until the end?

The guest transgresses by excess when he tries to upstage the host or the one being honored or when in some way highlights the material value of the gift offered to the hosts.

The transgression by default occurs when the host makes it clear that he does not receive people, but résumés. Feeling discredited by a host for not having the desired status can mean different things: if it occurs when a generous host decides that he wants to receive a lot of people and each extra visitor is an extra point in his self-esteem, we know we are just an extra. One enjoys the scene and its firstfruits and, in the end, one just has a feeling of gratitude. But when the host does not adopt the correct attitude on the scene (of satisfaction for the presence of that guest specifically) or if he simply ignores the guest, obviously, the feeling will not be of gratitude. The "thank you" at the end is just a formality. The guest violates by default when he forgets, without a good reason, a "little token" of appreciation to the hosts or does not show his gratitude for the invitation.

In short, for the guest, obeying this law is synonymous of an interaction whose outcome will be a balanced feeling regarding the host's care of him: neither excessive to the point of embarrassment, nor deficient to the point of making the guest feel neglected. In turn, the host feels he had provided the guests with a pleasant interaction. Therefore, the guest's greatest tribute is to show satisfaction with being there and, who knows, of being a protagonist of what Lugosi (2008) calls meta-hospitality – the ability to live a moment, fleeting as it may be, in which the threshold separating host-guest is diluted thus creating collective joy.

Can the host also play a leading role in meta-hospitality? Yes, but, it seems, this is never as visible as the one the guest provides. The bar in Budapest examined by Lugosi and the encounters he describes at certain parties demonstrates this.

Without going into details, we must also mention the paid guest, a currently popular figure. Promoters (producers and party animators) know that one way of improving a reception or a party is to have guests that provide additional motivation for other guests. Hence the appearance of paid guests to brighten up a party becomes commonplace in high society.

The other laws mean the imbrication of two dimensions: that of hospitality and of gift. As Godbout (1997, p. 35) says, hospitality is not just about giving, but whether we can talk about hospitality without the dimension of giving.

Third – ASYMMETRY - the guest must respect the host's right to space

Pitt-Rivers was the first to bring about the guest as co-protagonist and to remember the asymmetry that permeates the hospitable scene: the guest is subject to the host's rules. The same law happens in the gift. Hospitality, like any gift, is asymmetrical. The receiver accepts the donor's superior position, including as owner of the space. It is natural for the host to pronounce the ritual phrase "make yourself at home", but it is not for the guest to take it literally, but as a courtesy.

The sovereignty of the host and the resulting asymmetry are also reflected by the territorialization of the guest and the establishment of the borders on which he can move. There is a barrier, even invisible, situated between the space of the host and that assigned to the guest. Any and all guest's actions, including the use of any device in the house, are dependent on consultation with the host. The territorialization of the guest also occurs in the case of tourists and immigrants or refugees. In the case of tourists, when we just want to show them what can be seen. Transposed to the law of States, territorialization is imposed on undesirable foreigners.

According to Gotman (2011), the logic of asymmetry takes place in several ways. First, in the conditions of entry imposed on the newcomer whose qualities are carefully considered, especially when he is an outsider. If a stranger unexpectedly appears at the door, he will undergo a careful evaluation, an observation phase during which the host will assess his eligibility for hospitality. A simple glance can suffice to read his profile and to open or close the door.

The guest must take every precaution and, even if invited or authorized to enter, he must hesitate on the threshold (material or immaterial of the scene) and wait for a second invitation to enter and then move to the place indicated by the host and ask for permission for any and all movements around the space or to use any service in the house. The word "please" becomes central to the ritual.

If the hospitable scene is full of traps, it is in the intricacies of this law that the biggest ones hide. If the host oversteps it can be considered hijacking, if it is the guest overstepping it is intrusion;

The figure of the intruder can be understood as one who invades the host's space both physically and figuratively. The person commonly called freeloader is the one who violates the limits of physical space instituted by the host. But it can also be the one trying to get all the attention or stealing someone's thunder, as if wanting to take that person's place, etc. Intrusion is the form of transgression most feared by the host, which forces him to adopt another function, that of watching the guest and adopting all strategies to prevent this from happening.

Fourth: COMPENSATION: The guest must receive and reciprocate the hospitality

As Gotman recalls, in addition to asymmetry, the guest feels the need to compensate the host, which is also a minefield issue, a source of countless misunderstandings and accumulated grudges (2011, p. 20), especially important when staying with someone.

The first expected compensation is for the guest to accept the host's invitation and gifts. How to say no without being considered hostile? By accepting, the guest will be giving a yes to a friendship or a promise of future friendship or forgetting past grievances and conflicts.

The second compensation is to attend. Who of you has never been waiting, with a ready-to-eat dinner, for guests who did not show up or, worse, forgot the "appointment"? How to justify such an absence? To appear is to fully accept the gift. More: it is a sign of cease fire. Escaping this rule requires ingenious solutions. In Alexandre Dumas' novel, Edmond Dantès, the Count of Monte Cristo, saved the life of his enemy's son, Fernand, the Count de Morcerf (who had stolen his bride-to-be Mércèdes), and even accepted the invitation to visit his home, but used a ploy. By appearing, he sealed his friendship with the boy, but by refusing even a glass of water with the excuse he had digestive problems, he kept, according to the customs of the time, his project of revenge intact.

The third way is to act accordingly. The "souvenir" to the lady of the house – she will always say "how kind! You shouldn't have!", but the guest knows he should, yes! – the clothes and props that allow women all kinds of favorable or unfavorable comments, all are additional forms of retribution, not to mention the less explicit (although today there are plenty of parties and meetings where each guest brings food and/or beverages) that lies in the participation, however small, in the economy of the event.

If all decisions in this regard are delicate, the most difficult, according to Anne Gotman, is the one that limits the generosity of both sides. The exercise of hospitality requires time and money on the part of the host, not to mention breaking the comfortable daily routine to which the guest is more or less invited to participate (2011, p. 22). The worst thing is that none of this can be explained and it is up to the guest to literally guess what kind of compensation to offer. This may be material or symbolic. A guest who can liven up a conversation or a party becomes a permanent guest and, even without an additional gift, is always remembered.

The contumacious guest, in return, will soon be labeled a parasite. In case of accommodation, if you limit yourself to behaving like a stranger, you will be immediately criticized for acting as if in a hotel, without any obligation, even paying the cost of hospitality.

Material gifts and retributions can also be pitfalls. One has to do with exaggeration, either by its smallness or largeness. They must never be exaggerated, as the words of the crazy philosopher Quincas Borba recall in response to the desolate deputy Brás Cubas, in the novel by Machado de Assis. Brás Cubas spoke of the ingratitude of his brother-in-law Cotrim, who, complaining about financial difficulties, received a fantastic help in the form of a millionaire contract with the Government and, later, publicly disowned him. As the philosopher said, at first, the giver feels he has done a good deed and, thus, he becomes aware of his capacity for good deeds; then he experiences a sense of superiority, even from a material point of view. For the receiver, the initial thanks will be proportional to the donation received and this should be inversely proportional to the receiver's memory. The greater the gift, the greater the initial relief and gratitude, but as the gift tends to be forgotten, the recipient, in the impossibility of reciprocating, may even turn against the donor.

Second, as Pierre Bourdieu (1996) recalls, retribution should never be immediate, otherwise it will nullify the effect of the donation received. To this end, all languages have a repertoire of expressions to promise and postpone retribution. But, as Jean Lauand (2019) points out, languages differ as to the extent of retribution. In the English language, *to thank* and *to think* are, in their origin, and not by chance, the same word; likewise, in German, *zu danken* (to thank) is originally *zu denken* (to think). After all, the worst ingratitude is not remembering the gift received. Only those who think about the gift received are truly thankful.

In keeping with Lauand, the Latin formulation of gratitude, *gratias ago*, which translated into Italian, Castilian (*grazie, gracias*) and French (*merci*) recognizes the importance of the gift received, including praising the donor. But only the formula of the Portuguese language (*obrigado/a*) deepens the notion of gratitude for talking about the bond, the need for retribution. *Obrigado/a* [Thank you] is nothing more than the result of the ellipse of a longer sentence: you did me a favor and I am obliged to repay you.

Finally, there is another pitfall in this gift-giving, receiving, and reciprocating dance. Hospitality shows its hidden face here: it appears under the heading of solidarity but it is agonistic, competitive. One wants to beat the other. The potlatch – a ceremonial feast of indigenous tribes who compete in a demonstration of generosity until the total loss of goods on both sides – has always attracted the attention of Anthropologists. Even though the potlatch is not the rule in everyday life, in the hospitality scene we can easily think of those who try to outshine others in terms of generosity, refinement, rhetoric, elegance, beauty... or even by the absence. Going unnoticed at a party is the worst result for the guest.

Likewise, the sociology of hospitality, when examining the topic of conversation, will reach other themes forgotten in that discipline. Gossip and a certain hypocrisy embedded in the so-called white lies are constitutive elements of the interpersonal relationship that serve as a basis for hospitality and a survival strategy in the urban jungle.

Is it different to host/be hosted at home, in the city or in the country? The laws may be the same, but there are nuances that a broader study could clarify. Here, we consider the case of tourism.

5 TOURISM AND THE LAWS OF HOSPITALITY

Gotman (2008) speaks of tourists and ethnologists as nosy visitors, who have their blind spot in hospitality, as they do not ask for permission to invade the intimacy of a group. In the case of anthropologists, there are already clear protocols for hospitable admission within the group to be studied. In the case of tourists, one can imagine that an open border is an open doorway, almost an invitation. Furthermore, cities' websites tirelessly boast about local hospitality, which is also an explicit invitation to visit. But there is always a deficit in the relationship, almost always on the side of the host, the weakest link in the tourist chain. In any case, tourists and ethnographers benefit from what Miguel (2016, p. 527) calls the right to know the world and to acquire the instruments to think for oneself.

Currently, the economic benefits of tourism put it on the agenda of the economic priorities of nations, regions, and municipalities. Tourists are desired, they are king-customers, and their visit is encouraged. But the hospitality offered by the tourism industry is, once again in the words of Gotman (2008), staged, a metaphor for true hospitality, or even a mere disguise of its commercial nature, which does not eliminate mutual restrictions.

For residents, well-heeled tourists act, still according to Gotman, as conquerors in scorched earth. For tourists, locals are profiteers waiting for the right moment to rob their wallets. The expression "this is for tourists" reveals the territorialization and the distinction made by locals between authentic, fair pricing establishments for them, and those for tourists, where everything is fake and expensive.

If tourists can be intrusive guests what to think when a crowd suddenly takes over the most enjoyable spots in the local landscape? This is overtourism and the protest movement of tourism-phobia (Camargo, 2019).

It seems that tourists – when their level of visibility in the local landscape is high – cease to be king-customers and become intruders, violators of the law of asymmetry and, consequently, allowing urbanity to degenerate into hostility. Finding out what the optimal level is perhaps the great current challenge for tourism studies, maybe extending the use of the concept of carrying capacity – commonly used in the protection of fragile physical environments – to the entirety of the tourism field.

Moreover, in the midst of the revolution promised by Hervé Le Bras due to the dramatic increase in human mobility, the Covid-19 pandemic appears, as well as the prediction of new similar epidemics, whose cause seems to lie precisely in human mobility. Suddenly, a sedentary life was imposed again and all mobility seems a source of virus dissemination. In this context, overtourism and tourism-phobia exit the stage and the spotlight shifts to the future of post-pandemic tourism.

Where are we heading? Predictions about the future are risky, since the nature and effects of the virus are not entirely known and its impact on the future even less. Here is the question: has the mobility revolution ended? Apparently not, because, as Nietzsche said, real changes come on doves' feet, "it is the stillest words which bring the storm" (1981, p. 158) and not triumphantly as when talking about political revolutions. Hypermobility is the result of two hundred years of gradual development of transportation systems. During this period, the desire for a change of scenery, rhythm, and lifestyle that underpins the taste for travel has grown rapidly. Thus, this almost permanent excitement in search for novelty gives rise to a menu of alternatives tailored for every taste, see for example recent trends such as traveling to places made popular by cinema or the case of dark tourism. And it is highly doubtful that this will end...

One can imagine that, initially, people will travel less, will favor local tourism, but it is also likely that old habits will be gradually taken up. On the Grand Tour, the English aristocracy wanted to see new landscapes and meet new peoples; thus, the journey itself, with all the stopovers, and the views, was more attractive than reaching the destination. Today, the journey disappears with the speed of the means of transport and, according to Krippendorf (1989), people travel because they cannot withstand daily life. Has isolation taught people how to cope with the routine of everyday life, thus abandoning the desire to travel?

On the other hand, advances may occur in virtual travel, with the help of simulators, artificial intelligence, and augmented reality. It is not difficult for virtual tourism to take root in this market, in the same way as local tourism. It should be noted that, even before the pandemic, Krippendorf (1989) recommended travelling to closer places and to the same destination repeatedly, in order to form a bond with it.

If little can be suggested in terms of social practice, the current moment is a good opportunity for the theoretical thinking in tourism to redeem itself from its original sin, i.e., excessive link to the tourist trade to the point of, until some time ago, even those who traveled without resorting to the trade and stayed with relatives and friends were not included in tourism figures. A quick glance shows that the agenda of one of the leading tourism journals – the *Annals of tourism research* – addresses almost exclusively the business dimension. Something very different happened with leisure studies which, from Paul Lafargue (2000) and Thorstein Veblen (1965), still in the nineteenth century, to Georges Friedman (1972), David Riesman (1975), Joffre Dumazedier (1995), have always excelled in criticizing the market effects on leisure, such as alienation, inequality, conflict, etc.

The problem with tourism studies is that they grew up in the shadow of the industry and, therefore, initially little attention was paid to the relationship between visitors and visited. Even contributions from anthropology of tourism with Smith's group (1970) were not able to change the situation. Their views coincide with those of the former International Social Tourism Bureau (today Organization), which value the laws of hospitality: full use of the educational potential of tourism, harmonious relationship between visitors and visited and with nature. It is difficult to understand why these ideas are so little known, neglected, and labelled as tourism for the poor or as cheap tourism.

Likewise, in tourism, the staged hospitality recipe seems exhausted. The current appreciation of tourism as an experience and not just sightseeing shows the desire of tourists to enjoy the trip more, including interacting more with residents. Undoubtedly, the pandemic break can be an opportunity to rethink and re-study the bases of tourism at the local, regional, national, and international levels. The hope is that tourism, by observing the laws of hospitality, will one day confirm the ideal of peace between peoples and nations, which has long been an aspirational goal.

6 CONCLUDING REMARKS

The study of hospitality in different societies can provide useful insights into the study of another form of meta-hospitality, different from that of Lugosi. It is about welcoming the theories applied to hospitality. It is natural that in every field of knowledge there are divergent and even opposing theories but that at least dialogue with each other. This is not the case today when studying hospitality. There is a theoretical divide that is also geographical. For Anglo-Saxons, especially Americans, hospitality was something that existed in the past and that today has been replaced by the tourism industry. For Francophones, hotels and tourism are not even genuine expressions of hospitality. Lashley's British team have loosened the more rigid American perspective, but even for them hospitality as a gift has been completely overlooked, while for Francophones commerce and consumption seem off-limits as, therefore, the concept of tourism itself. The English Channel seems an insurmountable ideological distance between these countries. This text is expected to have welcomed all theories.

Would hospitableness be an innate quality of a privileged few? Guimarães (2019) found some positive evidence, although not conclusive, on this issue. His analysis showed that women have a greater ability to be hospitable. Another point is the fact that people who are more logical and rational or more organized and detail oriented are less likely to be hospitable.

The current of thought that values the idea of natural substrate, of a biological type, in human behavior, which, incidentally, is not the majority, the temptation to accept this hypothesis is great. After all, the biological sciences are loaded with terms almost symmetrically associated with those of the social and human sciences. Hospitality, commensality, parasite have as their counterpart hospitalism (syndrome of individuals abandoned in hospitals), commensalism (when two species associate for the benefit of one but without prejudice to the other), parasitism (when a species invades other to its benefit to detriment of the other). In another line, there is the bond between baby and mother during breastfeeding, the domestication of animals (by offering food) similar to the way the indigenous tribes were enticed (by offering gifts). Would the laws of hospitality be universal?

What seems to work against this universality is the case of China, a country of ancient culture that has only recently opened to the world and, therefore, has developed under different paradigms from other peoples, whom it has always considered barbaric. As the sinologist Rainier Lanselle (2011, p. 221) points out, no

notion, no term, no category constituted of social thought or practice corresponds to this context of hospitality that is part of the tradition of the other nations studied, mainly Western ones. He did not find in any source allusions to hosting as a duty. On the contrary, even the pleasure of hosting/being hosted is riddled with interdictions. There is no concept of attachment. It is clear that the Chinese value good hosting practices, but the idea that underpins hosting is not duty, but order against chaos, through obedience to rituals. Whether it is an outsider – with whom one communicates ritually, without getting involved – or a friend from whom I do not distinguish myself (the one who was in me without me noticing).

More important than explaining theoretical frameworks of hospitality is to show that there are reactions, now cultural, to these laws. Take, for example, the thesis of Bessone (2015), for whom there is a need to de-ethicize (*déséthiciser*) the notion of hospitality to deal with the challenges of immigration in the world. Moreover, as predicted by Derrida himself, unconditionality hardly fits into a political statute. It should be noted, however, that reducing hospitality to an administrative problem, forgetting all the ethical context involved, is a comfortable and ideologically committed way of (not) solving the human problem of current refugees.

For many, also, the notion of asymmetry in the hospitable scene, the host dominance over the guest, as pointed out by Gotman (2013) regarding the French context, is politically incorrect, an inequality that goes against the goals of equality in modernity.

Another reaction, this time regarding the obligation to reciprocate, can be seen in the growing trend of replacing *obrigado* [Portuguese for thank you] with *gratidão* [gratitude]. The first reaction was against a kind of grammatical dysfunction. As we have already discussed with the help of Lauand (2019), in the expression *obrigado*, the recipient declares that he or she is obliged to repay, which is absent in the expression *gratidão*.

Even without the supposed universality, the unwritten laws of hospitality continue to apply, at least among us. What perhaps does them justice, is the image of hospitality as the rainbow, under which – as imagined by Jabès (1991) – lies the beam of light that summarizes humanity in all its colors.

REFERENCES

Augé, Marc (2010). *Por uma antropologia da mobilidade*. Ed.UNESP

Benveniste, E. (1975). *O vocabulário das instituições indo-europeias*. *Economia, parentesco, sociedade.* Campinas: UNICAMP.

Bessone, Magali (2015). Le vocabulaire de l'hospitalité est-il républicain? *Ethique Publique,* 17(1), s/p https://doi.org/10.4000/ethiquepublique.1745

Borradori, Giovana (2004). *Filosofia em tempo de terror: diálogos com Habermas e Derrida.* Zahar.

Bourdieu, Pierre (1996). *Razões práticas. Sobre a teoria da ação*. Papirus, 1996.

Buber, Martin (1979). *Eu e Tu*. Cortez & Moraes, 1979

Camargo, Luiz, O.L. (2015). Os interstícios da hospitalidade. *Revista Hospitalidade.* 12 (especial), p. 48-69.

Camargo, Luiz, O.L. (2019). Hospitalidade, turismo e lazer. *RBTUR*, 13 (3), p. 1-13 https://doi.org/10.7784/rbtur.v13i3.1749

Derrida, Jacques. (1999) *Manifeste pour l´hospitalité*. Grigny: Paroles d´Aube.

Derrida, Jacques. (1997) Il n´y a pas de culture ni de lien social sans um principe d´hospitalité. *Le Monde,* mardi 2 décembre 1997(Horizons-entretiens).

Dumazedier, Joffre (1995). *A revolução cultural do tempo livre.* Studio Nobel, 1995

Éliade, Mircéa (2010). *História das crenças e das ideias religiosas: Volume 1: Da Idade da Pedra aos mistérios de Elêusis.* Zahar.

Elias, Norbert (1994). *O processo civilizador*. 2 vols. Zahar

Engels, Friedrich (2002). *A origem da família, da propriedade privada e do Estado*. Bertrand Brasil.

Dumazedier, Joffre. *A revolução cultural do tempo livre*. Studio Nobel, 1995

Friedman. Georges (1972). *O trabalho em migalhas*. Perspectiva

Godbout, Jacques (1997). Récevoir c´est donner. *Communications,* 65, p. 35-48. https://doi.org/10.3406/comm.1997.1985

Gotman, Anne (2008). O turismo e a encenação da hospitalidade. *In*: Bueno e Camargo. *Cultura e consumo: estilos de vida na contemporaneidade.* Senac, p. 115-134

Gotman, Anne. (2009) O Comércio da Hospitalidade é Possível? *Revista Hospitalidade*, v. 6 (2), p. 3-27

Gotman, Anne. (2011) Les perils de l´asymétrie. La mondialisation et la fin de l'étranger. *Collège des Études juives de l'Alliance universelle*, p.15-36

Guattari, Felix (1991). *As três ecologias.* Papirus.

Guimarães, Gilberto A. (2019) *Hospitabilidade: avaliação das características e motivações que determinam a capacidade de ser hospitaleiro*. Tese (Doutorado) - Universidade Anhembi Morumbi - Programa de Pós-Graduação em Hospitalidade.

Homero (2014). *Odisséia.* Cosac Naify. https://doi.org/10.1515/9783050095530

Jabès, Edmond (1991). *Le livre de l´hospitalité.* Gallimard.

Kant, Immanuel (1995). *Fundamentação da metafísica dos costumes*. Ed.70

Klossowski, Pierre (1995). *Les lois de l´hospitalité*. Galimard

Krippendorf, Jost (1989). *Sociologia do turismo*. Civilização Brasileira

Jabès, Edmond (1991). Le livre de l´hospitalité. Gallimard.

Lafargue, Paul (2000). *O direito à preguiça.* São Paulo: Hucitec

Lanselle, Rainier (2011). A hospitalidade como o impensado. In: Montandon, A. (Org.) *O livro da hospitalidade: Acolhida do Estrangeiro na História e nas Cultu*ras. Senac, p. 221-245.

Lashley, Conrad (2015). Hospitalidade e hospitabilidade. *Revista Hospitalidade*, 12 (especial), p. 70-92.

Lauand, Jean (2019). "Obrigado","Perdoe-me": a Filosofia de S. Tomás de Aquino Subjacente à nossa Linguagem do Dia-a-Dia*. Revista Hospitalidade,*16(2), p. 138-148 https://doi.org/10.21714/2179-9164.2019.v16n2.007

Le Bras, Hervé (2005). *La démographie*. Odile Jacob.

Leroi-gourhan, André (1964). *O gesto e a palavra*. 2 v. Ed.70.

Levinas, Emmanuel (1996). *Autrement qu'être: au-delà de l'essence*. Le livre de poche

Lugosi, Peter (2008). Hospitality spaces, hospitable moments: consumer encounters and affective experiences in commercial settings. *Journal of Foodservice*, 19, p. 139–149 https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1745-4506.2008.00092.x

Massignon, Louis (1987). *L´hospitalité sacrée*. Paris: Nouvelle cité

Mauss, Marcel (1974). Ensaio sobre a Dádiva - forma e razão da troca nas sociedades arcaicas. In: *Sociologia e Antropologia*. EPU/Edusp.

Nietzsche, Friedrich (1981). *Assim falou Zaratustra.* Civilização Brasileira

Perez, Daniel O. (2007). Os significados dos conceitos de hospitalidade em Kant e a problemática do estrangeiro. *Konvergencias: filosofia y cultura en dialogo*, 4 (15), p.23-34

Pitt-rivers, Julian (2012). The law of hospitality. *HAU: Journal of Ethnographic Theory*. 2(1), p. 501-517. https://doi.org/10.14318/hau2.1.022

Sanselle, Rainier (2011). A hospitalidade como o impensado. In: Montandon (org). *O livro da hospitalidade.* Senac, 2011, p.221-245

Schérer, René (1993). *Zeus hospitalier: l'éloge de l'hospitalité*. Armand Colin

Simmel,Georg. A metrópole e a vida mental. In: VELHO, Otávio (org.). *O fenômeno urbano*. Zahar Editores.

Simmel,Georg. 2004. *Fidelidade e Gratidão e Outros Textos*. Relógio D'Água.

Smith, V. (1977). *Hosts and Guests: The Anthropology* of Tourism. Oxford Basil Blackwell.

Urry, John. (2001) *O olhar do turista*. SESC/Studio Nobel

———

Informations about the author

Luiz Octávio de Lima Camargo
Graduation Program in Tourism/USP-EACH.
E-mail: loctavio@usp.br
ORCID: http://orcid.org/0000-0002-2387-7214