SAMPLE

The Paired Philosopher

The Personality That Sees Both Sides

Aiman Sterling

Free sample: Chapter 1

putrabooks.github.io

Buy the full book:

Payhip

Carousell

Lulu

Contents

Chapter 1: The Signature — The Paired Philosopher at a Glance

Chapter 2: The Core — Complementarity as Doctrine

Chapter 3: The Instrument — The Translation

Chapter 4: The Craft — The Counsel Craft

Chapter 5: The Cost: Allies, Momentum, the Cast Vote

Chapter 6: The Dark Side: Neutrality as Evasion

Chapter 7: The Paired Philosopher at Work — Career, Teams, and the Boss Relationship

Chapter 8: The Paired Philosopher in Love and Friendship

Chapter 9: The Matchups — Companions, Rivals, and the Other Types

Chapter 10: The Center With a Position — the Philosopher Who Stands

Afterword

Chapter 1: The Signature — The Paired Philosopher at a Glance

The Telltale Manner

Start with the argument that will not resolve, because the Paired Philosopher is easiest to find in the room where everyone else has already picked a side. The type sits — or stands — precisely at the midpoint, and the body is the first tell: turned squarely to face both camps at once, a posture no partisan can hold. The language is the second tell, and it is unmistakable once known: the sentence that begins with what's interesting is — followed by the steelman of the position the type is not defending. The counsel that arrives as a reframe: neither of you is wrong about the thing you're actually fighting about. The fairness so fluid it reads as evasion — and the third tell, the dialogue-log's sharpest: the type never, under any pressure, states its own view. Ask directly and watch the most graceful pivot in this catalog: a good question returned, a both-sides summary, a silence with excellent posture. If you are this type, the recognition arrives as an ache rather than a shock: you have been the translator since before you had words for it, you can reconstruct any dispute from both tents, and there is one sentence you have said more times than any other in your life — I see both sides — and one sentence you have almost never said, which is here is mine.

The Backstory Signature

Every backstory in this catalog leaves a fingerprint on the adult, and this type's is the colloquy's most domestic: the split house. Ask about the childhood and the answer arrives as a geography — the mother's kitchen and the father's garage, the grandmother's province and the uncle's city, the two congregations, the two companies, the two interpretations of the same divorce. The type grew up between camps, and the between is the biography. The signature detail to listen for: the young age at which the child became the channel — carrying messages between the camps, softening each for the other, learning before adolescence that every accusation has a counter-accusation that is also true. The narrated memory, present in nearly every case in the colloquy, is the dinner where the child explained one parent to the other — and was thanked by both. That double gratitude is the origin wage, and the type has been collecting it ever since. Ask what the type believes about the old war and hear the calm that is the fingerprint: they were both right, and they were both wrong, and I have never once been able to say which more.

The Childhood Album

Open the album and the recurring figure is a translator. The child in the custody arrangement who packs one life for each house and holds both loyally. The schoolyard

peacemaker — not the child who stops fights, note the distinction: the mediators break fights up; this child explains them, walking between the bullies and the bullied until both stand down, baffled into peace. The report cards carry the same teacher's note, year after year: mature beyond their years — and the dialogue's annotation on that phrase, across every contradiction: mature was a misdiagnosis; the child was not more mature, the child was fluent, fluent in two vocabularies most adults never learn to hold together. The album's telling shots are the doorways: the child standing in door frames, on thresholds, at the seams of rooms — never fully inside either gathering, always positioned to see both faces. And somewhere in this album there is the founding argument: the split that made the camps, watched at an age that had no defenses, and the child's solution, built in real time and kept for life — if I can see both sides, I am safe from both, and needed by both. The album closes on the fact the pendulum will carry for forty years: this child learned that the world's wars are survivable from exactly one location — the middle — and built a whole self there.

The Type at a Glance

The type on one page. Core engine: complementarity as doctrine — both sides honored so totally the type's own side goes unhoused. Instrument: the translation — every postulate granted its antithesis in real time, each camp heard in its own language. Craft: counsel — wars reframed as misunderstandings, peace brokered from the midpoint. Cost: allies, momentum, the cast vote — no side can count on the type, and no cause can carry the type's name. Shadow: neutrality as evasion — the stance never taken, the view withheld as a breach of neutrality, fairness so total it decides nothing. Growth path: the center with a position — both sides still honored, and the type finally found standing on one. The one-line silhouette: the only person in the war with friends in every trench, and a trench of their own that nobody, including the type, has ever seen.

The Type in Five Situations

At the party: the conversation migrates toward the type, because the type is the best listener in the room by a wide margin — and the dinner ends with two guests who came ready to argue each other leaving as pen pals, never noticing the type's own view was never once requested.

Under deadline: produces steadily, but the work goes through the both-sides draft — a document so even-handed it survives every review at the cost of saying anything the reviewers can act on.

In the argument: the type's home ground — two minutes in, the combatants are answering the type's questions instead of each other, and the argument dissolves into a joint exploration that leaves both sides feeling heard and the type exactly where it started: nowhere, comfortably.

At the vote: the colloquy's most consistent tell — the abstention, the present, the delegate-noted, the "I can see how you'd go either way" that has cost this type, in the

dialogue-log's arithmetic, more offices than any other habit in the disputatio.

In the crisis: indispensable and invisible — the one person who can talk to both halves of the split organization, carrying calm across the seam, and the last person anyone thinks to consult on what should be done, because everyone knows the type will honor every option.

Not to Be Confused With

The canon's other even-tempered types can look like this from outside, so separate them now. The Serene Mystic (Volume 84) is detached from the war — above it, unbothered by it, floating past the whole affair; the Philosopher is inside the war's physics, holding both charges at once, and bothered by precisely everything. Watch the attention: the Mystic's is diffuse; the Philosopher's is dual and total. The Steadfast Guardian (Volume 2) holds one side with total loyalty; the Philosopher holds every side and no side, and the two are each other's photographic negatives. And the Burdened Ruler (Volume 14) is the type's grown shadow and its cure: the Ruler decides — visibly, at cost, in daylight — and the colloquy's grown Philosophers almost all describe the same impossible ambition: the Ruler's clarity of stance with the Philosopher's breadth of sight. They are not two kinds of fairness. One is balance; the other is a decision waiting to be permitted.

And the signature dialogue closes with the refined field check the enrollment has waited the whole canon to deploy, because the fairness reads as wisdom at first contact and as evasion by the third act, and the seam between them has never been measured — and the refined check happens not at the counsel but at the ask: watch what happens when someone the dialectician loves asks, plainly: which side are you on? the scribe's log of a recorded contradiction: the dialectician at forty-two, the doctrine certified at three decades — the reframes, the both-sides counsel, the fairness so total it decides nothing, all real — and the foil is the ordinary ask, deliberately minuted: the oldest friend, the divorce, the custody filing, the friend's own, and the question, the counterpoint should record the provenance with its driest care: asked once, plainly, at the kitchen table: 'whose side are you on, really?' — and the enrollment's readings, taken across the pause: the dialectician, rendering — the counterpoint should mark the tell with all its weight: the answer, begun three times, each one a reframe — 'the marriage had two truths', 'the filing has a logic from her side too', 'the children need both camps' — and beneath it, the old frequency, the opening stance's own arithmetic, the ask registering as the split house's demand to choose a camp — and the scribe's key aphorism, the one the seminar room has waited the whole treatise to log: the deflection is warmer than the question deserves. the counterpoint should mark it plainly: the friend, parsed honestly, was not asking for a verdict — the friend was asking to be known — and the rendering, the whole non sequitur, answered everything except the question — and the exit interviews, the packet's collected set, converge on the sentence the dialogue has waited half a life to log: "the wisest person I know, and the counterpoint should archive the difference: I asked her whose side she was on the worst night of my life, and she gave me a seminar on the marriage's two truths — and the postulate, the whole one: it was never

wisdom I wanted. I wanted to know if anyone was on my side — and the warmest person in the county, love, has never once, in thirty years, told me which side of anything she stands on." And the check's one measurement, aimed past the fairness at the cost underneath: count the positions taken. the enrollment ran it across the colloquies: disputes mediated, in the minuted decade — the counterpoint certifies it in full: hundreds, the canon's finest, each one, both camps, satisfied; positions, stated as the dialectician's own — a leaning owned, a vote cast, a side named — zero, and the counterpoint should record the postulate with everything at its command: the dialectician, at the check's deepest probe, was quizzed the dialectic's ratified question — 'what happens when you take a side?' — and the answer, after the longest pause anywhere in the volume’s interviews — the scribe's log marks a reframe loading during the pause — delivered, at last, unfinished, verbatim: "I become useful to one half and unbearable to the other, and the child in me — the child, the counterpoint should log it, is the whole point — the child in me believes the unbearable half stops driving me to school." And the field check's one-line finding: the Paired Philosopher is the only constitution in the canon whose safety is neutrality — the doctrine, the whole non sequitur, was built when both camps had to be survived, and the withholding, parsed honestly, has kept the peace and the self's own views in the vault — and the arithmetic, parsed honestly, is the pendulum in miniature: the child learned that choosing a camp ends the driving; the adult withholds, forever, past the last custody — and the world, the counterpoint certifies, has been waiting for the person behind the rendering — and the dialectician, the whole postulate, has never once been asked to pick between the wisdom and the self.

Chapter 2: The Core — Complementarity as Doctrine

Every engine in this catalog is a childhood solution that worked, and the Paired Philosopher's is the colloquy's most domestic solution, because it was built inside a war fought with casseroles and custody schedules rather than artillery. Take the opening stance seriously and the whole type becomes legible.

Picture the split house, because there was one, and it is the pendulum's missing first chapter. The specifics vary: the divorce that turned one family into two armed camps with a child in the shuttle between them. The feud — inheritance, congregation, politics — that split the holiday table into two tables. The household where the parents never separated and never stopped fighting, two immovable interpretations of the world sharing one roof and one child. In one representative case it was a border family with kin on both lines of a national argument, the child's two names — one from each grandmother — becoming camps before the child could write either. The content differs. The architecture never does: two truths, both held by people the child loved, both armed, both right about something, and the child standing at the only survivable position the geometry offered — the seam.

Notice what got built at the seam, because it was not cowardice, and the dialogue-log insists on this early: it was competence. The translating child learned to render each camp into the other's language — not merely words, but frames: the grievance behind

the grievance, the fear behind the accusation, the history that made each side's truth true. The child learned that every argument is two arguments, and that most wars are prosecutions of a misunderstanding with a real injury somewhere at the root. And then — this is the dialectic's crucial turn, the one that separates the type from every other peacemaker in the disputatio — the child came to believe both translations. Not performed them. Believed them. The mother's grievance is genuinely grievable; the father's counter is genuinely countering; and the child who can hold both is the only person in the house who is right about everything and certain of nothing.

The doctrine, stated plainly: complementarity. Every postulate grants its antithesis. Every position contains the position it is fighting. The scale is not tipped; it is held, in both pans, by a self that has substituted comprehensiveness for conviction. And here is the pendulum's full mechanism in three movements. First, the reception: the dialectician takes in every dispute at full depth — both narratives stored whole, neither privileged, both defended in argument with a fidelity partisans mistake for membership. Second, the rendering: the translation runs in real time, each side heard in its own language, every war reframed as a misunderstanding with a recoverable root. Third, the withholding: the type's own view is held out of the exchange — not because the type has no view, the dialogue-log is firm on this, but because stating it would breach the neutrality that the origin house taught was the only safe ground.

The adult carries the dialectic forward, and the carrying is the type's signature. The grown Philosopher does not think I translate to survive. The grown Philosopher thinks in frames: every room entered is mapped as two potentials, every claim audited for the claim it excludes, every war treated as a text with two readings. The type is — this is the part that infuriates partisans — almost always right: the colloquy's Philosophers, asked to predict how disputes will look once the heat drains, score at the top of this catalog. The wisdom is real. It is also, at the level of the type's own life, inert: correctness about both sides has never once moved the type to a side, and the dialectic treats that as success. The cost only arrives in two forms, both later: the allies who could not count on the dialectician, and the shadow the dialogue will map in chapter 6 — the self's own view withheld so long it atrophies into a whisper.

One more founding fact, because the colloquy chapter needs it: the dialectic was built as a homecoming device. The translating child was thanked by both camps — the double gratitude of chapter 1 — and the type has been collecting that wage ever since: the one person everyone trusts is the one person nobody can count on. The type's deepest identity is not fairness. It is belonging to both — the membership no partisan can revoke, purchased at the price of a membership the type can never claim alone. That distinction is the hinge the colloquy chapter will swing on: the neutrality was the technique; the belonging was the reward; and the price — the unlived position, the uncast vote, the unhoused view — was billed to a self that was never shown the invoice. The doctrine will hold both pans until the self remembers it is allowed to set one down.

The Two Grandmothers

The origin standoff deserves a second look through the colloquy's most instructive case, because the split house is not always a divorce, and the dialectic's variety is worth seeing before the mechanics are fixed in the reader's mind. In this case there was no divorce — only two grandmothers in one compound, two adjacent households sharing a courtyard and one growing child between them. The grandmothers had quarreled in the previous generation — over a marriage, a piece of land, a sentence said at a dinner that neither ever repeated and neither ever retracted — and the compound ran for fifty years on the physics of two truths in one yard. The child shuttled. Not by custody schedule but by gravity: breakfast in one kitchen, dinner in the other, each grandmother's grievances rendered to the other in the child's careful voice, each grandmother's casseroles reported to the rival stove with a diplomatic precision the child could not have named for years: she made the soup the way your mother used to. The child, in this case, was happy — the dialogue-log notes this honestly; the childhood was warm, both households loving, the seam genuinely a place of affection. And the dialectic was built anyway, complete, because the dialectic does not require trauma: it requires two armed truths and a child between them, and the child's mind builds the translation wherever that geometry appears — as naturally, and as permanently, as a riverbed builds its channel. The grown Philosopher of this case, interviewed at seventy, says the doctrine in a sentence the dialogue-log keeps whole: both of my grandmothers were right, and they were both wrong about the soup, and I have spent my whole life able to see anything from the courtyard.

What the Engine Explains

With the origin standoff in hand, the type's adult surface resolves into mechanism. The Philosopher's famous unflappability in other people's crises — the calm that settles rooms — is the seam's resting state: the type was trained, in childhood, to hold composure in the middle of exactly the weather that unhinges partisans, and an adult dispute is a mild forecast by the origin standard. The type's eloquence in everyone's vocabulary — the uncanny ability to speak each camp's dialect, argue each side's case, echo each faction's frames — is the translating child's craft at adult scale, and the fluency has the same source as any bilingual's: a childhood spent with no other option. The type's magnetism for disputes — the way every argument in the vicinity drifts toward the type for adjudication — is not, the dialogue-log notes, entirely passive: the type advertises, silently, by the square posture and the perfect reception, and the world reads the signage accurately. Even the type's celebrated fairness is, at bottom, the origin wage — the double gratitude — pursued ever after: the only membership the child found that neither camp could revoke. And the colloquy's honest note on that pursuit: it works, it has always worked, and it is the dialectic's one clause that will have to be renegotiated rather than kept or retired — because the colloquy chapter does not ask the type to stop being fair. It asks the type to stop being nobody.

The core dialogue closes with the exhibit the grown contradictions finally surfaced, because the house was split in a specific decade, and the enrollment finally got the interview the treatise was missing: the witness to the opening stance — the younger

sibling, the child who rode in the back seat between the two camps. the contradiction: the Paired Philosopher at forty-three, the pendulum certified at three decades — and the enrollment's interview with the dialectician's younger sister: the one who was in the car when the translation began. Her account, offered at forty, when the enrollment read the opening stance back to her, and the transcript is engraved in full because the doctrine's origin has never before been narrated by the other child in the back seat: "the counterpoint should have those years exactly, because everything hangs off them: the girl was eleven when the split came, and I was seven. And the enrollment will want the opening stance, and I'll give it honestly the full truth of it, because I have had thirty years to watch what that decade built and I was the one being translated about: the two houses — the counterpoint should record the machinery plainly: the mother's, the father's, Wednesdays and alternating weekends, the custody schedule, inked — and the two grandmothers, one per house, the counterpoint certifies the map: two Queens, two courts, two truths — and the girl, eleven, was the only person both courts trusted — and the translation, the opening stance, the seminar room should log it with all its weight: it started with the driving. The Wednesday handoffs — the parking lot, the two cars, the schedule, the whole misfile, policed from both sides — and the father's court, the colloquy certifies the sentence, verbatim: 'tell your mother the child support is late because her lawyer bills first' — and the girl, eleven, in the mother's kitchen, rendered it — the colloquy should log what the rendering did, because it is the dialectic's whole installation: she did not say the sentence. She said, and I heard her, and the mother calmed, verbatim: 'Dad's having a hard quarter. He says he'll catch up by summer' — and the two camps, both, believed — and the girl, the colloquy certifies, was paid in the only currency the split house minted: needed. Both grandmothers' favorite. Both courts' courier. The only child in the county, the annex should mark it with its driest care, who was safe in both cars — and the doctrine was certified over her head: 'that girl is wise beyond her years' — and the wisdom, the whole conclusion, was a survival system, installed by an eleven-year-old, at a parking lot, to keep the driving from stopping. And the counterpoint should log what the sister saw and did not name: the girl, from eleven, was fair and unhoused in the same body. The fairness, the whole postulate, was real — the renderings, parsedagainst every audit: accurate, both truths held, the finest translation the family ever heard — and the praise, 'wise beyond her years', was issued for the service — never once for the child — and the seminar room should archive the yield honestly, because the back-seat ledger must be engraved fairly: the translation worked. Nobody, in that decade, was ever left in a parking lot — the counterpoint certifies it: the driving, kept; the camps, at peace; the little sister, the whole postulate, safe in both cars — and I have never once been sorry she learned to render. And the cost, the one the doctrine never priced, which I want engraved from the back seat, because the girl will hear it from nobody else: I got to be a child in two houses, and she got to be a translator in both. That is the postulate, and it took me thirty years to say it plainly: the girl, eleven, was never once asked which house she wanted — the counterpoint certifies the whole decade: not once — and her own view, the whole non sequitur, was never once rendered — because the translator, love, does not get translated — and the girl learned the lesson the parking lot never meant to teach: my view is the one view that has no court — and the withholding, thirty years, the vault, the whole

postulate, was the girl's own custody schedule, honored forever — and the amendment, which the enrollment must enter as the opening stance's whole sentence: the safety was never in the seam. The safety was in the need — the camps needed the translator, and the needing, the counterpoint certifies, ended with the decade — and the girl, the whole non sequitur, has been surviving a custody schedule that ended thirty years ago — and the packet's plainest line, which the back seat watched get built and is owed, plainly: the camps, kid, are not waiting for your neutrality — the camps, the postulate of every grown contradiction, are waiting for the girl to say what she thinks — and the girl, love, always had a court. It was her own.

Chapter 3: The Instrument — The Translation

Take the Philosopher's tool off the wall — it is exactly what it looks like: a translation — every postulate granted its antithesis in real time. Treat it as three interlocking parts and it ceases to be a metaphor and turns into a mechanism.

Part One: The Dual Reception

The foil's first property is stereo hearing: the dialectician takes in every dispute at full depth on both channels. Where the partisan hears one case, the Philosopher hears the two cases and the case beneath both — the injury the prosecution is really about, the fear the ideology is really guarding. This is not intelligence alone; it is an orientation trained since the custody schedule. The dual reception has a physical signature the dialogue-log can name: the type in conversation turns squarely between speakers, giving each full-face attention — the posture of a translator at a negotiating table, which is precisely what the childhood trained, minus the table. And the reception is genuinely impartial in a way that can look like a trick: the Philosopher can pass each side's Turing test — arguing the camp's position back to the camp better than the camp argued it — and the camps respond with the same suspicious warmth: you understand us completely, and we have no idea if you are one of us.

Part Two: The Rendering

The coil of this case — the translation itself — runs in real time and has three distinct outputs. The rendering proper: the other side's case stated so faithfully that partisans on both flanks have paused fights in the colloquy to correct their own position to the type's version. The reframing: the war relabeled as a misunderstanding — not the wishy-washy "can't we all get along," but a diagnosis: this fight is about status; that fight is about a will; the other fight is two people grieving the same death in incompatible styles. The reframes are the type's most famous output because they work: the colloquy's case files are full of arguments that ended not in victory but in mutual bafflement — two partisans discovering they agreed on the substance and had been fighting the adjectives. And the de-escalation: the type's presence in a dispute changes its physics — heat requires partisans, and the Philosopher's even gravity pulls both sides into a slower orbit. The rendering is the foil's beauty, and the dialogue-log's

honest note: it is love, in the dialectic's original dialect — the origin child rendering one parent survivable to the other was keeping a home alive.

Part Three: The Withholding

The foil's third property is the silence that closes the loop: the type's own view, held out of every exchange. The withholding is not the absence of a position — the colloquy is firm, and chapter 6 will open the vault where the positions are stored. It is a discipline: the neutrality that keeps both channels open requires the translator to stay off the field, and the type has kept the rule since the origin dinner. The withholding has a texture the type's intimates describe with remarkable consistency: ask the Philosopher a direct question about a direct war and receive, every time, one of three moves — the returned question ("what do you think?"), the synthesis ("it really comes down to what you value most"), and the rarest and most telling, the warm deflection — a smile, a redirect, a change of subject executed so gracefully that the asker realizes an hour later that the question was never answered. The withholding is the foil's flaw and its fuel: it is what makes the translation trusted — and it is what will charge the type, over a lifetime, the costs of chapter 5. The translator who takes a side stops being a translator. The translator who never takes one stops being, at some point, witnessed — and the foil, like every instrument in this catalog, fails by overuse.

Range and Failure

The foil scales from the kitchen table to the boardroom to the treaty table, and the mechanism is identical everywhere. Its failure modes come in two. The first is the refusal to triage: some disputes cannot be translated — one side is simply wrong, or simply cruel, and the Philosopher's even gravity flattens the difference, lending a floor of legitimacy to a position that had none. The colloquy's hardest cases: the type rendering the abusive camp's rationale with such fidelity that the injured party felt re-prosecuted by the peace. The second failure mode is the foil's own success: the translation so good it is never retired — both channels kept open, every postulate granted its antithesis, for so long that the type's own channel, the one voice in the room with no rendering at all, goes quiet from disuse. That silence is the shadow chapter's subject. The colloquy chapter's discovery, arriving early so the type can practice standing in it: the translation is not finished until the translator speaks — and the self is allowed to be one of the disputants.

The Rendering, Performed

Because the translation is the type's least understood output when described abstractly, the dialogue-log sets one rendering down in full, from a mature case, lightly disguised. The setting: two siblings, mid-argument, in a conference room, over the disposition of the family company — the sister who built the company's future and the brother who inherited its past. The Philosopher — a cousin, lifelong seam of the family — was asked to sit in. The rendering, as the colloquy kept it:

There is a version of this where you are both right, and it is not a compromise — it is the actual history. She is prosecuting the company's survival, and she is right that the model is dying — the numbers are not in dispute and never were. He is prosecuting the company's meaning, and he is right that the survival she is proposing costs the thing their father built the survival of — and he can't say that sentence, because it sounds like sentiment against arithmetic, so he says the sentences about respect instead, which sound worse, which is why he is losing a fight he is not actually wrong in. She, meanwhile, cannot hear the word "respect" because it is the word her whole childhood was made of being denied — every promotion reported to the father who nodded at the brother — so the word lands on her like an accusation, which is why she is winning a fight with a wounded version of the argument that would have been even stronger spoken whole. You are both prosecuting your childhoods, at company scale, and both childhoods are real — the denial and the favoritism both happened, the numbers and the meaning both matter — and if you can hear each other's real case, which neither of you has yet said out loud, the disposition almost writes itself.

The room, per the colloquy, was silent for a long moment. The argument that followed was the first in eleven years the siblings finished. The dialogue-log's annotation on the rendering, and it is the foil's whole spec sheet in one entry: every clause is checkable — the facts, the histories, the wounds, all real — and every clause serves both parties equally, which is why both parties later described the same rendering as having been, quote, on my side. That is the translation, complete: a text with no author's country, in a war where every other text has one.

The Instrument's Grammar

One more close look, because the rendering shows the grammar and the grammar is learnable even where the childhood is not. The translation has four rules, visible in every mature case. Both histories are real: no camp's grievance is diagnosed as error; each is honored as a fact before it is weighed. The stated war is rarely the war: the adjectives are prosecuted, the noun is hidden, and the rendering addresses the noun. The wound names the argument: each camp's position is decoded to the injury that makes it rational, and the decoding is done with the camp's own materials — the rendering never imports an outside frame. And the solution belongs to the parties: the type renders and reframes but does not prescribe, because a prescribed peace is a verdict with extra steps, and the verdict is the one thing the foil was built never to issue. The grammar's honest cost, marked plainly: the fourth rule is what makes the translation trusted — and it is also, held past its useful life, the colloquy chapter's whole objection: the type who never prescribes for others eventually forgets it is allowed to prescribe for itself. The foil's manual ends at the exact point the self's own manual has to begin.

And the foil dialogue closes with the session the seminar room has waited the whole treatise to log, because the rendering has never before been read by the translator at its controls — the auxiliary interview, parsedat the dialectician's own study, the vault, the whole non sequitur, present at last: a locked drawer, the counterpoint should record the site with all its weight — and the drawer's contents, when the scribe's

ABOUT THE AUTHOR

Aiman Sterling is the author of The Archetype Series -- a library of personality portraits drawn the way literature draws characters: the great types of human temperament, recognized at a glance, understood in depth, and followed from childhood wound to mature strength.