

**Sergei Komarov, PhD in Philosophy, Habilitat, Professor of Management and Marketing Department**

*Perm National Research Politechnical University*

## **STRATEGIES OF STRUGGLE AGAINST TIME: EVENTFULNESS AND HISTORY**

For the modern person control strategy over the time associated with three possible manifestations of timely/untimely: time of history, time politics of time and poetry of time. On the basis of reading Derrida texts Heidegger revealed as present as timeless ground of being. Other horizon or another beginning of the time is the event (das Ereignis). In this case the present is constituted in the difference between proper and improper modus of historicity: the Past and the Stuck Time, the Future and Stiffen Future, Etern Time and Running Time.

**Key words:** time, being, publicity, timeless, event, historicity, existence, Stuck time, Stiffen Future, Running Time.

The theme of this article is concerned with understanding of our finitude. Our being is final, i.e temporal, and, therefore, negotiation with finitude is associated with the time struggling. This subject is repeated in the history of philosophy, revealing the same ontological structure: time-eternity, event-history. This "tetraktys" is a recurring semantic frame related to the structure of our being, our Dasein. Certainly, every era assumes its specific understanding of the structure of human existence, its own methods of acquirement and negotiation with time, understanding of eventfulness and history. However, the twentieth century brings something fundamentally new and significant in its "structure", namely the "reduction" of eternity. Opening of mundanity (*die Alltodlichkeit*) reveals our fundamental finitude and the reduction of "tetraktys" does - time-eternity-event-history - to the "trinity" of temporality<sup>1</sup>. The point is not only to change the content of these concepts, but in a fundamental change of the modern's man attitude to his *own* time. In fact only with the opening of its own finitude and temporality we can state historicity and eventfulness of anthropological.

Here, however, we must make a fundamental observation. Our existence is attitude to its being. Understanding is the modus of our finite existence<sup>2</sup>. It grows from the certain temporality of being, and it is its manifestation. In this understanding as ontological structure of our existence does not mean necessarily conscious representation of its being; misunderstanding, myth, fairytale (*die Sage*) is the same fundamental, constitutive structure of our existence, as well as personal self-willed determination and value choices. We should note, however, that conscious awareness is a fundamental change in the existence because it observes not only reality of our existence, but also its non-reality. Our existence is not just given, but *also assigned*. And this predetermination of our existing, coming out of its understanding, as constitutive of our time as its reality emanating from Point of factuality. In other words, understanding as a mode of existence is not only determined but also defines our finite existence. This point was missed by Heidegger in his fundamental ontology, but understanding is a "machine" of being, which is processing something in us, changing our determinate being, including - understanding of our own time, historicity and eventfulness<sup>3</sup>.

**1. A nine-day wonder.** Time is running out ... For a man of the twentieth century, there is nothing new about it. Fundamentally new is the desire to be modern.

Modernity encompasses imperative: to be with time. What does this imperative mean? Society replaces this imperative by the requirement "to keep pace with the times." In this sense, "comply with the time" means responding of nine-day wonder. What is modern is important. In this sense, the ecstatic time horizon ceases to set orientation in the world, but it is replaced by the sum of the social orientations. Provocation of a nine-day wonder resists normal ecstasies of time. Captured by actuality we get into deadlocks time, because horizon time structures cannot now turn around in a spatial manner. The time

---

<sup>1</sup> Гайденок, П.П. (2006). *Время, длительность, вечность. Проблема времени в европейской философии и науке*. Москва: «Прогресс-Традиция», 2006.

<sup>2</sup> Heidegger, M. (2001). *Sein und Zeit*. Tubingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag, 142-143.

<sup>3</sup> Мамардашвили, М.К. (2000). *Эстетика мышления*. Москва: «Московская школа политических исследований», 353, 368.

horizon is narrowed to the point of presence here. And in this sense we do not live in time, trapped by the flux of present, we are trying to hold on in it. This is evident not just in the striving to "be aware" of existing events. Permanent receiving of the news, presence in social networks, updating messages, which amounts to not even read them, and to the message of their receipt, finally putting "moments" of everyday life in Instagram, all of these are signs of the syndrome "to be late". Horror of nine-day wonder is that it does not pass. Strictly speaking, therefore, it is present.

And being this one, a nine-day wonder makes time in being impossible, that is, actually change, passing, ecstasies. Because eventually to be with time means to be timely, relevant, real, a nine-day wonder makes a ghostly existence in our history, our past and our future. There is no escape, and for the past and future in relation to a nine-day wonder it is impossible for our existence. The past and the future are fatally infected by a nine-day wonder. This is timeliness of publicity. Only what is relevant to the present takes part in semantic horizon of time. In the past and the future it only makes sense when it "reads" from the present. Moreover, in two ways. That took place in history as the actuality that "reads" in the past as the present; everything else is "read" from the past simply as past. In the future there will be a something that can be 'read' in the present; but that is not "read" is true, although it may take place as the future, strictly speaking, it will be only accidentally happened. But maybe we can go beyond timeliness of publicity in late sphere of privacy, and there will we open our own time? Opening of time can be modified into a new horizon of our present being. Freedom of private life is manifested in its inherent syndromes "fidelity to itself", "duty", "affairs of my life," etc. This first-round of our existence hermeneutically separated from molestation of publicity.

However, this circle of our own being (Cartesian tightness) is constantly outraged by modernity and seduced by it. How is it possible to realize in a private way, if the border of our privacy is originally captured by publicity? Strategies of insular existence in society are not helping<sup>1</sup>. But the thing is much deeper: in fact, often for ourselves, our private life is to be anonymous, and its presentation

involves publicity. We can try to live a private life, but our very existence is initially ecstatic. Intention to the edges of the first-order circle existence is inevitable.

In other words, the private sphere of our existence is contaminated by a nine-day wonder. We can realize our "mission" , practice «life-work», but the train of time is flying somewhere away by itself ...

In a sense, for the modern man to be is always late. We constantly postpone things for "later" because of «lack» of time in order always to be late. Modern man does not live, because his whole life is ahead, or already behind; or we run after the train time, or watch it late. The train rushes past time, and we always run the risk not to have time to jump on the bandwagon, to be late, to fall behind. And conservativeness of privacy creates boredom, and behind it - melancholy and despair<sup>2</sup>.

Therefore, the question of the timeliness of existence is the key issue in the everyday existence.

**2. Strategy of struggle with time.** Therefore, the manifestation of modernity is located between the poles of delays / timeliness, and publicity / privacy. Attitude to them determines control strategies over time in everyday life. These strategies serve as its transcendence and going beyond the circle of first-order existence, and therefore perceive as direct "treatment» (sich wenden an) to being as it is.

**1). The first strategy** is attempt to neutralize the everyday life by detecting its temporary border. Contemporary acts as present only in the horizon of revealing the temporal structure of things and phenomena. Then releasing the tension of modernity emerges as calm gaining meaning of their existence as transient. Modernity is the horizon of our stay, but it loses its significance here, stay, opening as historic. Calm is acquired here as openness to the past: it gives real meaning of what has come. Current is a border of past. Historical reveals the true sense of the present: the present is like the horizon "here", but it loses its significance. It does not make sense in itself, but only as the acquisition in history. Everything what takes place, opens in its present as already held, as defined in history as happened.

Reconciliation with modernity is possible only on the basis of its modus of passing. Here, everyday is always present, untimely and inappropriate; it is in a sense – not current. It is the *convolution* of the past; it is not simply a product of the past, but its prolongation and preservation in itself; bearing on himself past of Modern is not a passing moment as such, but in this moment, which opens already happened as a truly existential, truly present. Therefore, modern by itself does not have its own sense; it is only a sense of historical packaging of rootedness.

---

<sup>1</sup> Уэльбек, М. (2006). *Возможность острова*. Москва, 2006.

<sup>2</sup> Хайдеггер, М. (2013). *Основные понятия метафизики. Мир – Конечность – Одиночество*. Санкт-Петербург: «Владимир Даль», 133-254.

Here finding authentic existence can be found by distinguishing historical as temporary and extra historical as timeless. In this case, there is no real historical as every past, but one that opens in the present as its own. This is modernity as a historical eventfulness. Every becoming transient and not yet a historical, it only needs to become one, if it finds itself as a manifestation of the past.

This strategy of "In search of lost time" by M.Proust, or "hem" philosophy to history. It is a life of history, or "revival" (resuscitation) of history.

**2). The second strategy** is the transcendence of everyday life, based on the very border of modernity. This is a strategy of publicity, i.e. timeliness for the present. What does it mean to be modern? This is not to try to keep "every moment of its existence; it is simply impossible. It means to be timely, i.e. conform to the current moment of time, every time to identify the dominant tendency in everyday life, to catch the "moment" of the time, waiting for the best "toe" of natural forces.

Publicity does not mean to be hidden, for it is the openness of the nine-day wonder allows to "be with the times." Such publicity, of course, opposed to the captured "historic" and is the only form of time. Currently there are "transformed forms" of the future, the fold of the future, which sweep in ecstatic horizon acts as expanse: opening the way for action. Here to be modern means to have a chance to make history, to be realized in the current as realized future.

Be timely - to have power over their time, to manage it. No time (leaving train time) dictates to me my actions, and I manage time, defining its direction. The present is the modern as the train of time; progress in the future and there is a shift of the border, oncoming of what has not yet happened. The present is the boundary of the future, which is flattened as possible. This requires a force (*die Macht*), to stand on the border of coming, and courage to look beyond its horizon. This means do not depend on time, and to assign meanings yourself. We need strength to stand on the border of being and set the rules of the game in the present. It's a question of power / freedom to dispose of being itself.

In fact, this strategy is the "hem" philosophy to politics; expression of pure subjectivity, pure will-to-power. In this struggle with time there is rapture (pathos) of willfulness. But, in addition, it has the charm of Nothing: "there" Nothing, all being here in our power. This "standing" on the border is looking into the abyss: "... There is rapture in the battle, and on the edge of the abyss of wild and furious ocean ...". It is the policy of timeliness has a strategy of denying the power of time through its creation or participation in the creation. Here, "to be with the times" means: openness of the future.

**3). Finally, the strategy** can be **stoic gaining of time** relying on its finite being. Horizon of modernity remains unrecoverable abroad, but because it is an attempt to existence in "here" without finding "there." This transcendence of time acts as a detection event structures of our existence, a kind of encapsulation circle first-order existence in itself. This discovery supports the suspension of time. Therefore, the existence of such a form is the "*aestheticization*" of everyday life: the ecstatic horizon reveals a net present eventfulness of present. Presence then acts as the contemplation of pure form of things and phenomena. This space watchful peace in which things and phenomena lose your inhibitions, revealing its pure form of stay. Contemplation of pure form of stay gives aesthetic pleasure. Therefore, this strategy is a strategy of the poetics of time.

Here to be modern - means to be untimely and listen to existence. It is the intention to withdraw from the circle to the everyday meaning of life; this first-order staying the circle of life, whose horizons are ecstatic structure of being, not only the horizon of modernity itself. This experience is in the full sense of the "conversion" of the subject and the neutralization of his consciousness, to discover the semantic structure of being. This suspension of time: the train of modernity runs, but we just look, do not see him off, and do not despair catch up, but only watch. Where can escape "modernity" when it is just ecstatic horizon? However, other control strategies over time - the history and politics of time - always a possibility, since they rely on the horizon of modernity that as ecstatic structure of being always the place to be. And therefore there is the possibility of "returning" to the strategy of delays or publicity. So there are three control strategies over time, constituting our different modernity. However, not modernity constitutes the horizon of time, on the contrary, the time horizon outlines means modern. Modernity is ecstatic by its structure and essence. It opens the horizon of time distance, which is determined relative to our "here" available. "Being with time" means the opening of its own finite existence in the meaningful horizon of time. This involves understanding the essence of time, and therefore - and our historicity and event.

**3. The "essence" of time: Derrida reads Heidegger.** To analyze the nature of time we use one text of Derrida containing comments to the texts M.Heidegger. This text is «*Ousia and grammē*». *Remarks to*

one of "Sein und Zeit"»<sup>1</sup>. How does Derrida read M. Heidegger?

Slacking "vulgar notion of time (during the past-present-future) associated with lightening "essence» (ουσια) of time. What is it? Derrida reading of Heidegger indicates: the essence of being in his presence there is a temporal order (*die Anwesenheit*), ie a reference to a specific modus of time - this (*Gegenwart*). However, this privilege of this set in a chain of related concepts (ουσια, παρουσία, Gegenwart, gegenwärtigen, Vorhandenheit) and immediately postponed. Why? Yes, because "... from Parmenides to Husserl privilege present <this> has never been questioned. It could not be delivered. It is the very obvious, and no thought seems possible outside its elements"<sup>2</sup>.

To define the "essence" of the time, it must itself be put in-you present evidence. Time unfolds as something more than the mere presence of beings. If things are on-worth, while there is a transient; truth in his time meonality non-presence; it is the essence of the negative.

We find ourselves in a difficult position: as an element of time nun moment itself is not temporal; but it becomes temporal, only ceasing to be a shift to non-beingness in the form of things-things-past or future. While there is a mere moment of "now", it is not time-when he becomes a temporary (time element), it is

not-there. In short, to be (that exists), we must not be affected by the time required does not become (past or future). Perhaps to avoid this by resorting to an understanding of meonality as moment of the same. And in fact, the moment of "now" as something that is, only those acts and that in relation to the establishment, that is not the (past and future), and vice versa.

Consequently, he has his other things (time). In this case, it is obvious that we need to think dialectically about time: time is otherwise being (existence); it is becoming everything. Derrida points out that Hegel's dialectical thinking time is the "highest" form of his understanding, contains a double paraphrasing of time by Aristotle<sup>3</sup>. The *first point* is a paraphrase of time by reducing the time to the moment "now" as a sentient being, i.e. horizon or absolute boundary of which is thought other times as his own. In this case own negative time happens. The *second point* is that the negative time is not expressed in the inner and the outer self opposites - the deployment time as space (in the "Philosophy of Nature"). Time denying itself must unfold itself as the opposite - as a line; opposite line - the surface, etc. Time becomes space, losing itself and denying their original absolute insensibility. But only in this way it is as discriminating time; space is a phenomenon, or the truth of time<sup>4</sup>.

But what conclusion follows from this dialectical analysis of the phenomenon of time (the unfolding of time in the outside, from a point in space)? The conclusion here is: it's too late to raise the question of time. Why? Yes, because the Hegelian *Aufhebung*, expressing negativity time, builds itself an understanding of the present time as non-temporal presence. Pure presence in present causes the dialectical movement of thought as the unfolding of time. This is not the essence of negative abstraction of time, and a permanent presence, i.e. eternity<sup>5</sup>.

Only in the light of this constant as the horizon of the possible understanding of time as a transition, change, changing, becoming. However, as Derrida notes, anything that in Hegelianism is a predicate of eternity, should not be thought out of time. Historical time there is only the unfolding of eternity. Eternity as another name for the moment carrying the "real" and the essence of the essence of the historical. Now it can be a reposed a previous question of the essence (ουσια) of the time. But now is the presence of meaningful horizon for finding the essence of time. It is defined by the presence carrying non-existent through existent. If you have previously determined that exists through time, now is the time determined by things (this also true with Aristotle and Heidegger).

What does this mean? This means that the existence and the time differences are meaningful horizon of each other, "read by" each other as horizons presence<sup>6</sup>.

1). If being given as an existence, then time is revealed as *ex-tasis*. Here time is the condition of

<sup>1</sup> Деррида, Ж. (2012). Ousia и граммѐ. Примечание к одному примечанию из "Sein und Zeit". *Поля философии*. Москва: «Академический проект», 52-94.

<sup>2</sup> Деррида, Ж. (2012). Ousia и граммѐ. Примечание к одному примечанию из "Sein und Zeit". *Поля философии*. Москва: «Академический проект», 55.

<sup>3</sup> Гегель, Г.В.Ф. (1975). Энциклопедия философских наук. Т. 2. Москва: «Наука», 51-58.

<sup>4</sup> Деррида, Ж. (2012). Ousia и граммѐ. Примечание к одному примечанию из "Sein und Zeit". *Поля философии*. Москва: «Академический проект», 61.

<sup>5</sup> Деррида, Ж. (2012). Ousia и граммѐ. Примечание к одному примечанию из "Sein und Zeit". *Поля философии*. Москва: «Академический проект», 68-69.

<sup>6</sup> Heidegger, M. (2001). *Sein und Zeit*. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag, 437.

being. If being here acts as existence of being, while detected as ecstasy "historicity" or "project of coming." Time in this sense is the event (*mit*). Delays and the presence of appropriate publicity ecstasies of history and politics of

time. Ecstasies of time is a linear scan of the course of events when *Zeit zeitigt*. Here time unfolds as passing of present, changing moments of his stay as the past - present - future. And because time is an event: it produces, displays being a presence. You could say that time is a "display" of being. Being is "decomposed" into a temporal sequence of events.

2) But if the wrapping given as a time horizon of meaning, it "translates" ecstatic circuit time in spatial horizons; ex-tasis goes in-tasis, in «turned" while being as at-presence. Here is the condition for the existence of time. If the time is given in their ecstatic horizons, existence exists (*Sein west*) as a "status", i.e., modern. What does in-tasis time mean? This means that the time when both present, absent; it is under-appropriation (*sich er-eignen*) itself as a co-temporary. In-tasis is the real "stop" of time. Or rather - scan time as ecstatic as the structures of the space being as accommodating events. Here, time itself becomes a presence (or being present to emphasize the dynamic nature of the implementation of existence). You could say that being here is a «fold» of time. While the presence of "folds" in the event-line of fate. Thus, the analyst ecstatic time horizons as the meaning of existence and analyst existential horizons of meaning as time presupposes mutual "transitions" and back wrenching ecstatic time schemes in spatial horizons of being. All existential of existence have meaningful correlates in ecstasy time<sup>1</sup>. *Zeit zeitigt*, and *Sein west*.

However, here, according to Derrida, and there is a major problem in understanding the essence of time. The fact that such a formulation of the problem is bypassed the question of how to understand the very being (presence). If the presence of a semantic horizon of time, how it is that time acted as a time? The thing is that there occurs a peculiar Эрпчз of existence: the reduction of life to beings, which is understood as any inventory that exists, exists at all. Only with respect to such available being time acts as a modification of this presence. Why? Yes, because it is thus tacitly understood already predetermined by its relation with time as things-present-in-present<sup>2</sup>.

All metaphysics is connected with this gesture. Strictly speaking, therefore, Being and Time can "be read" in each other. Dialectical negativity remains within a metaphysics of presence in the present. However, such a decision cannot now be considered as satisfactory. Here, according to the French philosopher, is necessary to change the horizon. The fact that such an existence is not defined, it is all that exists, exists as such. The question is not how to think differently and to think ontologically different. Here lies the difference not only between Hegel and Heidegger, but also between Heidegger and Derrida. Decision of M.Heidegger is known. What metaphysics has missed is precisely the fundamental difference between the mere presence of the substance and with existence of the subject. To think otherwise things (being) - means to think not just exist as such, or any available, but such things, the presence of which is a method in his attitude (*Beziehung*) to its existence.

It does not have any object (substance), the presence of which could be simply reduced to the present moment as timeless. In other words, it is like that exists, which is the mode of existence of prolongation of their presence, i.e., time itself<sup>3</sup>. That is why only a relatively *Dasein*, «which is ourselves," can be questioned about their own eventfulness and historicity.

**4. Event as the beginning of another time. Own history.** Thus, the change of the horizon is to think of his own presence. In this case, the time was called as an event (*das Ereignis*). As already mentioned, the whole mystery of existence and the turnover time is that they cannot now be regarded as essentially based on formal horizon. "The core essence" of being and time is their "co-existence", or "co-beingness"<sup>4</sup>. Each of the two terms is just that it is not, and each of them consists only in that the mutual

---

<sup>1</sup> See analysis of time circles by Heidegger: Комаров, С.В. (2009). Опыт реконструкции времени в работе «Бытие и время» М.Хайдеггера. *Личность. Культура. Общество. Международный журнал социальных и гуманитарных наук*, Т.IX, Vol. 4, № 51-52, 377-384.

<sup>2</sup> Аристотель (1981). *Физика*. Соч. в 4-х т. Т.3. Москва: «Наука», 146.

<sup>3</sup> «This is crawled in question Heidegger reintroduces to the game ... time then would be the one, on which basis being of things declares itself, and not to the one whose opportunity you need to try to withdraw from already predetermined (and implicitly temporally predefined) being as real being (in indicative mood in *Vorhandenheit*), whether in the form of a substance or object». Деррида, Ж. (2012). *Ousia и grammē*. Примечание к одному примечанию из «*Sein und Zeit*». *Поля философии*. Москва: «Академический проект», 71.

<sup>4</sup> Деррида, Ж. (2012). *Ousia и grammē*. Примечание к одному примечанию из «*Sein und Zeit*». *Поля философии*. Москва: «Академический проект», 71.

co-phenomena. Being-together is the very presence as production of time<sup>1</sup>.

Co-existence (*das Ereignis*) has a twofold presence/absence of one and the same time, i.e. simultaneously. In the event there is something that has come and there is no fact that has ceased to be or something else can not be. Therefore, the event is the presence of absence or lack (or have not already) is present. It is the place where the present existence and nonexistence, the present and not-present. If the event is output in the presence of what should be, it is both the presentation of what is not to be given. In other words; single have as transitory or coming true.

This means that we must understand the event as the beginning of another (*die andere Anfang*) time. Now, beginning with the time-joint residence that same time (simultaneously), and is, and is not, and is identical and different. The event, however, and have the distinction of being both the simultaneous presence and absence, and as of this time and not real. Event there is a difference, which immediately disappears, on the one hand, relying as determinate being and its opposite (other), on the other hand, deploying both the presence and present something that no longer exists or has yet to happen. In other words, the event disappears in the very act of distinguishing the nature of existence and the absence of time and non-temporary. The opposition in this case acts as aspace of "one hand" ... "the other side" ... Time - a *place* of being.

It is what exactly in a small Greek word «*ημα*», which means both "together», and "simultaneously", and that, and another time, "at one and the same time"<sup>2</sup>. This expression originally is neither spatial nor temporal; it just evinces the co-occurrence of the condition of all phenomena of existence. Since Parmenide existence cannot be questioned, and it expresses *μείον* of time. To think time only in accordance with its modus - past and future, but now they are nothing modes of presence, but also modes of absence, to be exact - modi events. Understanding of time "in the act" and not "present", opens the meaning of time, based on the present as a non-time. In ecstatic horizon *Ereignis-Zeit* modus of time has a different content: unity ecstasies of presence / absence.

**Past** now acts as the former or fulfilled, i.e. that is definitely over. What does it mean: definitely over? This means: ceased to be. This is something that has already carried out; it belongs passed his ex as that as is gone, stopped, and does not last, does not continue, is not present in the present. It is really a history. It's just the past, and as such it belongs to the past. This is not own past. This is the past that takes place in the present ("stretches" and "can not finish"), there is an unfinished history. It is a moment of presence, the present of the past. Not the past in the present, and the reality of the past. This means that it is, although it was in the past, in this sense not yet been. It is not decided, and not allowed as its past. It is worthwhile to on-standing history "live"; it "does not go" and "is hurted" Such unsolved past is infinitely repeating wraith. It is a "stuck time." Only the concept of the present moment as your own, it opens up a chance to resolve both the past and become the former, i.e. history.

**Future** as the forthcoming, i.e. something that can come and be true. What do you mean "maybe"? This means it will come, will be real. However, not all of the possible may come to be as present. There is a future that may never come or materialize. It is only coming once the future as something that serves the horizon of the present. And as such it is "forever" future. In this sense, it is simply the future, i.e. in that the non-equipped. In other words, it is improper future. A future that is, it is the upcoming future. It is a future that is coming, that is, carried out in the present reality, and not a possible future. As such, it is their future. What it means: own future? This means: a future that stands ecstasy present being. In other words, linked to the understanding of his life here, like this. Without it, the future is not only coming future; in other words, a future that really is not. He is not, because it is not capable, unable to come to pass and pass; Future, "is not likely to be» (*seinskynnen nicht*). Time never coming true.

**The present "now"** is now to be understood not as eternity or compresses in the presence of a point, and there are passing (*Untergang*), or running time (*die Zugehenzeit*). This move is the essence of the spot in available present in which it is time itself (*Dasein west die Zeit*). As such, it is the scene of presence as a "movement" itself time horizons. This "place" horizons distinction of being ("Left Behind" / Found ", " Position "/" cash ", " open "/" closed ") and the time horizons (" passed "/" happened ", " occur "/" present ""coming" / "come"). This place themselves gaining meaningful horizon cash here-being (*Dasein*). "Movement" is their horizons with its coming true event as being present. In it we find the time itself as what we have come to pass and not as something that we oppose.

<sup>1</sup> Хайдеггер, М. (1993). *Время и бытие: Статьи и выступления*. Москва: «Республика», 391-406.

<sup>2</sup> Аристотель (1981). *Физика*. Соч. в 4-х т. Т. 3. Москва: «Наука», 146.

However, this finding appears as eventfulness understanding of our presence. The question arises: how can we conceive of being and time differently than starting from the present, from which it escape no experience can escape? For the experience of thought and the thought experiment we always have to deal with the fact that refers to the presence. Even Heidegger could not evade the question<sup>1</sup>. Therefore, Derrida writes: "... For Heidegger, the question is not whether to offer us to think differently, to think if it means something else. Rather, the question is to think what neither could neither be nor be thought otherwise. In thoughts opportunities otherwise, this not-otherwise made some difference"<sup>2</sup>.

Own innovations of Derrida himself in thinking temporality are to distinguish and keep your distance. Following the gesture, you need to think a certain *Wesen*, and encourage him to think the idea through an *Anwesen*. Time is not *пхуйб*, *пхуйб* itself does not possess. Overcoming temporality is precisely this difference in thinking, in which we keep the distance between the presence and the one which present. Holding such elusive distinction, we grasp it temporality finite beings as its phenomena or eventfulness. This transition is the very existence while<sup>3</sup>.

The presence of *Dasein* itself still does not detect *our own eventfulness* and historicity. It is done as such only by determination (*die Entscheidungkeit*), according to Heidegger, or event differences (*différance*), according to Derrida. This means striving desubjectivate. But the thing is that this is completely desubjectivated time is still only exists for us as what we are coming true. But for us, it exists as its own, only by understanding their being. After all, the experience is just personal meditation of being (whether in the mode of privacy or publicity). Our presence there is always a trace of discrimination, it is really so. But *even "fit" into the structure being modified existential era* and reveals its "neutrality", our experience is the action of understanding (intention and choice) of the subject. On the one hand, event-experience opens his "neutralization", but this eventfulness life has meaning only in relation to the very subject. On the other hand, the very existence of eventfulness raises the question about the strategy of the subject. Present only in the presence of on the basis of their relationship (distinction) to this presence.

Understanding our existence is the fundamental point of his ontological design (*ontologische Aufbau*)<sup>4</sup>. So there existing determination is mediation (distinction) of being itself, but it always opens as an existential determination to be ourselves as own who are called *Dasein*. The following distinction of being itself and manifests in us as the difference of the presence and presence of *being* and *existence*, *Sein* and *Dasein*. As this distinction and we are being present; understanding of the differences and sets our being. Ecstatic horizons have time horizons of historical destiny and eventfulness refers to a personal sense of being.

Only within the past events this distinction before us we are presented with our existence as a problem of choice in our life and its meaning. Ecstatic horizons of improper historicity can be designated as a simple *Gegenwartigkeit*; only from the judgment of the presence of both simple presence. Own historicity appears as *Präsenz*; It is also a judgment of this presence as the presence of understood; This decision is

---

<sup>1</sup> «Sein heißt Anwesen. Dieser leicht hingesagte Grundzug des Seins, das Anwesen, wird nun aber in dem Augenblick geheimnisvoll, da wir erwachen und beachten, wihin dasjenige, was wir Antwesenheit nennen, unser Denken verweist. Anwesendes ist Währendes, das in die Unverbogrenheit herein und innerhalb ihrer west. Anwesen ereignet sich nur, wo bereits Unverbogrenheit waltet. Anwesendes ist aber, insofern es in die Unverbogrenheit hereinwährt, gegewährtig. Darum gehört zum Anwesen nicht nur Unverbogrenheit, sondern Gegenwart. Diese im Anwesen waltende Gegenwart ist ein Charakter der Zeit. Deren Wesen läßt sich aber durch den überlieferten Zeitbegriff niemals fassen». Heidegger, M. (2000). Was heißt Denken?. Gesamtausgabe. Bd. 7. Frankfurt am Mein: Vittorio Klosterman, 142.

<sup>2</sup> Деррида, Ж. (2012). Ousia и граммѐ. Примечание к одному примечанию из "Sein und Zeit". *Поля философии*. Москва: «Академический проект», 60.

<sup>3</sup> «...If being has always meant only existence, then, perhaps, the difference is older than the very being. It must be even more incredible difference than the difference between being and existence. ... On the other side of life and being this distinction, incessantly distincted, would drawn this difference, would be the first and last track, if here we could talk about the beginning and the end". Деррида, Ж. (2012). Ousia и граммѐ. Примечание к одному примечанию из "Sein und Zeit". *Поля философии*. Москва: «Академический проект», 94. The end of the verbs in brackets in this sentence just expresses the difference between the presence and action of existing , time and event.

<sup>4</sup> M. Heidegger found out that understanding is an existential of our presence; but he didn't note that conscious determination fundamentally changes our attitude to our being itself. It's not just an existential, but its fundamentally constitutive existential of our presence. See: Мамардашвили, М.К. (2000). *Эстетика мышления*. Москва: «Московская школа политических исследований», 375.

presence. Therefore, the strategy of delays or publicity acquires real meaning in the parallel detection of eventfulness.

## References

---

1. Aristotle (1981). *Phisika. Soch. in 4 tt. T.3.* Moskva: «Nauka».
2. Gaydenko, P. P. (2006). *Vremya, dlitelnost, vechnost. Prjblema vremeni v evropeyskoi filosofii I nauke.* Moskva: «Traditsiya-Progress».
3. Hegel, G.W.F. (1975). *Entsiklopedia filosofskich nauk. T.2.* Moskva: «nauka».
4. Derrida, J. (2012). *Plya filosofii.* Moskva: «Akademicheskii projekt».
5. Komarov, S. V. (2009). *Opit rekonstruktsii vremeni v rabote «Bytie I vremya» M.Heideggera. Lichnost. Kultura. Obschestvo. Mezhdunarodnii zhurnal sotsialnich I gumanitarnich nauk, T.IX, V. 4, 377-384.*
6. Mamardashvili, M. K. (2000). *Estetika myshlenia.* Moskva: «Moskovskaya shkola politicheskich issledovaniy».
7. Uelbek, M. (2006). *Vozmozhnost ostrova.* Moskva.
8. Heidegger, M. (2013). *Osnovnie ponyatia metafisiki. Mir – Konechnost – Odinochestvo.* Sankt-Peterburg: «Vladimir Dal».
9. Heidegger, M. (2001). *Sein und Zeit.* Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag, 142-143.
10. Heidegger, M. (2000). *Was heißt Denken. Gesamtausgabe. Bd.7.* Frankfurt am Mein: Vittorio Klosterman,.
11. Heidegger, M. (1993). *Vremya I bytie: Statyi I vystupleniya.* Moskva: «Respublika.