Ontological Duplicity
(or) feeling the fire and guiding the burn

to alternate between unbridled skybound hubris and (hypersubordinational?) "critical self reflection" is to balance passion and information (see certain oscillational dynamics explicated in metamodernist discourse, namely between passionate, directed naivete and informed disillusionment)

The Principle of the constant escape
(as enabled by "general incomensurability?)

this is the dynamic that allows the subject to transition from the mode of critical self reflection ~~back~~ to the mode of hubris: ~~the~~ the hubristic impetus is curbed/sidelined by the activation of critical self-reflection. ~~the~~ the same impetus is snuffed by the establishment of an airtight structure from which it cannot escape. The trick is to find where the cracks are, for to construct something absolutely airtight is, in this sense, to construct something from the grounds of omniscience - which, for the time being, shall be posited as impossible.

critical self reflection serves to disarm the subject at the cost of their potential perfection(?). fire, in this sense, burning unguided can be said to be delusion (naivete), while too much "guidance" (self critique) amounts to the snuffing (disillusionment) of the flame. thus an Ontological Duplicity (?) is required of the subject: to be both the flame and the hearth-tender.

- an unbended flame will masturbate into combustion
- ontologically comparable to the puppet/ventriloquist relationship, although the latter relation is recursive.
- the hearth tender leaves enough of a path to sustain the fire -OR- when critiquing yourself, you grant yourself increasingly narrow "escape routes" which are comparable to excuses/reprieves/abdications.
- the fire is less hearth-bound than world-bound, thus hearth tender is a misleading title: perhaps merely fire tender will do.

ITEM
20