

This chapter continues a careful discussion meant to show time is not what we think. Again the starting point is the linear model of time, with the present as the point that separates past from future. There is an emphasis on the sense in which the future is inherently unlimited, in contrast to the past. One might think of this in terms of causality: we can only make sense of the past in cause and effect terms (the present is caused by the past.) But the same does not hold for the future. It may seem natural to say that the future will be caused by the present, but this way of putting it ignores what is special about the future: it has not yet taken form, and in fact will never take form.

Another way to say this is that past, present, and future are inherently different from each other. The usual temporal model leads us to think that one moment of time is like every other moment of time, and in terms of *measuring* time out, that may be accurate. But in terms of experience, past and future and present are like three different realms. What is more, two of them are inaccessible. We are bound to the present, and we cannot move out of the present.

But this is also too limited an understanding. The future is available to us in terms of time's dynamic. Here we are led back to the notion of intentional knowledge. What we know is the self's intentions, and intentionality has its own dynamic. But that dynamic is a highly limited version of the temporal dynamic that manifests most clearly in the future. This distinction between two different versions of time's dynamic is related to another distinction emphasized in the reading, between subjective time and objective time.

So we are juggling a lot of ideas here. We need to be careful that they don't just become ideas. We are looking in our practice right now at the point where the future arrives at the present (p. 99 of DTS). But we can also just look in a more informal way. Right now, our experience is alive and active. What is the 'source' of this activity, not its *cause*, but the quality that we identify as the aliveness of being alive, or the awareness of being aware? That is where we find time. And as the reading suggests, it is only when we get concrete and immediate about our experience that we are able to get a sense of what this involves.

Interestingly, the reading asks us to choose as a specific 'concrete' moment the moment at the beginning of time. Do you see why this move is made? Do you find it convincing? Or by specifying such a moment, do we lose sight of the concrete and immediate? If we run that risk, how can we counter it? Or perhaps the point is that we cannot counter it, which is why time as we investigate it invariably turns into past time.