

SYNTHESIS OF THE REFEREE'S REPORT

TITLE: *Subordinating Trust to Text: A Hermeneutic Reversal*

1. What is the aim of the paper?

The aim of the paper is to reverse a common assumption concerning trust and suspicion. It is common wisdom that the way in which we trust or suspect texts is derivative from the way in which we trust or suspect people. According to the Author, it is the other way around. The fundamental attitude is the second, not the first; it is the way in which we read and interpret text that orients the way in which we interact with other human beings. The Author takes his/her bearings from Dilthey's and Heidegger's "extensions" of hermeneutics to the understanding, respectively, of History and of Dasein. The Author maintains, following Heidegger, that human beings are constitutively hermeneutic in their understanding of themselves and the world. In his/her view, whether we trust human beings or not depends on our fundamental interpretive stance.

2. Do you think it is an interesting and successful project?

The main thesis of the paper is interesting and can represent a valid contribution to the current debate on trust. However, the way in which the Author articulates the argumentation is not always clear and exhaustive. There are some points which would require a richer explanation; at times, the writing appears fragmented. For example, some observations should be confined to footnotes, in order to make the argumentation more fluent. Moreover, the Author refers to many different philosophers and philosophical schools, but this great variety could give an undeserved impression of superficiality to the reader. The project is quite ambitious and could be considered fully successful if framed differently.

1. You believe that: the paper should in principle be accepted as long as certain revisions are made

PLEASE ADD YOUR SPECIFIC COMMENTS (WHICH WILL BE FORWARDED TO THE AUTHOR) ON SEPARATE PAGES. THANK YOU.

The Author should “unpack” the main thread of the argumentation; if possible, I would recommend the following solution. The bulk of part II (the “sketch of post-structuralist counterpoints”) should be reframed in the form of footnotes, in order to expand part I, III, and IV. In this way, the Author would strengthen the argumentation which connects Heidegger’s hermeneutics to Blumenberg’s *Lesbarkeit*. Similarly, the final considerations on Annette Baier and Philip Pettit should either be integrated more smoothly in the broader picture or confined to footnotes.