

We are making the shift from the treatment of time in *Love of Knowledge* to the presentation in *Dynamics of Time and Space*, which will continue to follow for the rest of the program. In the first week, we looked at the relation between the self's intentions (and descriptions and the way in which linear time is constituted. DTS does not use the same language, but basically starts from the same analysis (For instance, look at the brief mention of the self's 'concerns' on p. 78). The chapter has two main themes: the ways in which we cut ourselves of the dynamic and presence of time (time's present body) and the difficulties to which this distancing leads.

We take time so much for granted that it can be hard to question at this level, and of course this is just the point. To help us go in this direction, much of the chapter concepts of an analysis of concepts. The TSK vision often proceeds in this way: starting from concepts and then encouraging us to go beyond concepts to the direct experience of what is at stake. The second step is important, because we can prove something to ourselves intellectually without understanding its significance. For instance, we all know that we are going to do, but it is rare that people really experience and act accordingly. Still, the conceptual analysis is equally important. We all operate all the time with a 'conceptual' understanding of our own experience that limits what this experience can be, and those limits must first be expanded or set aside.

In the present reading, the analysis deals with the work that past and future do. For instance, if something occurs in the past but has no effect, it is as though it does not exist. This may require some more reflection. Does the existence of a mountain in one moment affect its existence in the next? If the answer is yes, then it seems we have reinstated an 'ordinary' understanding of the past. If the answer is no, aren't we going against common sense? By extension, we can ask the same question about linear time. If the past affects the present, then it seems the linear model holds true. If it does not, where does experience come from?

Typically we might try to explore this question by distinguishing subjective and objective time, and that can be useful. But it is not quite the approach that will be taken here. Instead, the reading starts to explore the dynamic of time, the way in which it is always 'presenting', as well as the positioning of the self. The discussion of time's dynamic anticipates a similar discussion that will come up a bit later (see page 99). To explore this experientially, try following the suggestion on p. 99: "To rediscover the immediate feel of [time's dynamic], we can go directly to . . . the point in each experience where the future could be said to come into being." This is an exercise that can be done formally, for perhaps 10-20 minutes at a time, but it can also be done at various moments during the day, when nothing else is 'going on'.