According to the theory, the time relation as we generally think of it [simplified philosophy] is a great leap or a jump. Something does not truly belong to it. That comes in from the existence of the space-relation. According to the class of all points in space, the purpose of the instant is time. The each object has its own limit (progress to be called).

Barrmore, Lady Margaret Road, Cambridge.

Sunday Sept 3

Dear Beth,

I hope to post the proofs of this at the same time as this letter, viz, before 5 or 6 o'clock while the mail departs. But last night when I should have finished them, the idea suddenly flashed on me that time could be
I know not what to write or what to say.

I'm stuck from lack of loose. Do you think, the fruit is lost if the leaf is cut off? The leaf always adheres to its own nature. But if the fruit resembles the fruits of success, how important is it that the leaf is cut off? Yet, it is the fruit that is important in the long run.

With admiration, the writer.

Be well, [name].

P.S. After writing this, I've changed my mind.
treated in exactly the same way as I have now got space [which is a picture of beauty by the bye].

So till the small hours of the morning, I was employed in making notes of the various reminiscences.

The result is a relational theory of time, exactly on four legs with that of space. As far as I can see, it gets over all
According to the theory, the time relation as we generally think of it [simplified philosophy] is a great cock-up. Something does not keep belong to it. That comes in from the existence of the space relation. According to the class of all points in space sever the purpose of the instant is time. Also each object runs its own train (properly so-called).

Fenley Sept 3
Dear Beth:

I hope to post the proofs of this at the same time as this letter. My brother 5 or 6 o'clock when the mail departs. But last night when I should have finished them, the idea suddenly flashed on me that this could be
I don't pretend that this is an explanation of the theory. But I got them their notes down to let you see that the theory is rather far-reaching. The fact is that with large objects—i.e., extended things, long times, and large spaces—their mutual relations are the scientific universe arise from the research for objects which are always true parts of yet greater objects. The general result seems to me to help a naive realism.

A. N. Whitehead
After becoming too complicated for simple logical statements, we break them up into well enough objects, as relatedness of a sufficient logical simplicity begins to appear. We push this to its process of pairing away at the objects to its ideal limit [marked off-course] class of things tucked away in each other.
and [with some caution] we reach the ideal logical simplicity of time and space as equally conceived.

My root idea is that an object has essential extension in time as well as in space, and that parts of an object, just as these are space-parts.

In fact, the time of space extension...
I don't pretend that this is an explanation of the theory. But I got these
ideas rather far to see that the theory is rather far-reaching.
The fact is that with large objects—i.e., extended through
log times and large spaces—their mutual relations