

The Philosophical Future of the World: towards a philosophy of life

Masoud Omid 

Associate Professor of Philosophy, University of Tabriz, Tabriz, Iran. E-mail: Masoud_omid1345@yahoo.com

Article Info

Article type:

Research Article

Article history:

Received 02 December
2025

Received in revised form
25 December 2025

Accepted 05 January 2026

Published online 14
February 2026

Keywords:

Futures Studies, Life,
Objective Background,
Philosophical Context,
Neglect of Life,
Problematic of Life,
Objectivity of Life,
Problem of Life,
Philosophy of Life.

ABSTRACT

Today, it is very difficult to talk about the past and its history, let alone talk about the future, especially the philosophical future. However, since the futures studies movement has been formed in non-philosophical fields and has achieved relative success, it now seems that the time has come to address futures studies in the field of philosophy and test it in this area. This article acknowledges and addresses the availability of the objective ground and scientific background for the possibility of forming and developing a philosophical branch called the philosophy of life (of course, in a general sense and not solely focused on the purpose and meaning of life). The article's view is that life has gone beyond the limits of a scientific, social, economic, and cultural concept and has reached the level of a theoretical and philosophical concept. Also, due to the emergence of specific fields and the existence of a specific philosophical background in the last century, life has gone beyond the problematic level and has found the capacity to be at the level of a philosophical problem. Therefore, in the world of philosophy and philosophical discussion of life, it should be written with a capital L, meaning: Life, and we should wait for the emergence of a philosophical branch called philosophy of Life and also a tendency called Lifeism for it. Philosophy of Life is a reflection on life for the philosophical interpretation and expression of my life or I of life (my life/ego-life) or the subject of life, which in a way can be considered an idea for the sum of subject and Dasein. Philosophy of Life/Lifeism is distinct from realism, subjectivism, philosophy of life, vitalism, pragmatism, and existentialism. Philosophy of Life is philosophizing in the form of topics and categories such as understanding/defining life, distinguishing the subject of life from the pure subject and the dissolved Dasein in the world, important levels of life: "states", situations, conditions", my life among lives, interaction, language, the embodiment of life, acting and spectating in life, the authenticity and inauthenticity of life, ethics, meaning, success, model, health, livelihood, death, happiness, pleasure, style, consumption, well-being, life as a perspective, etc.

Cite this article: Omid, M. (2026). The Philosophical Future of the World: Towards a Philosophy of Life. *Journal of Philosophical Investigations*, 20(54), 125-154. <https://doi.org/10.22034/jpiut.2026.70909.4386>



© The Author(s).

Publisher: University of Tabriz.

Intruduction

In traditional life, the past plays a prominent role in all areas and even the future plays a role in its hand and heart. It is as if the movement of the line of the future is a gradual curvature and curvature towards the past. But in modern and new life, the future thinks of freedom from the past as much as possible and gradually shows a tangible independence from itself. The leaps, creativity, speed and evolution of new life and modern new phenomena and phenomena provide the grounds for the future so that the boundaries of the future with the present and the distant and/or near past gradually become more pronounced and the future slowly emerges either free from the distant past or perhaps even outside the framework of the past and near tradition. And that is why in new life, the future plays a prominent, effective and different role. Some philosophers of contemporary science acknowledge and emphasize the independent and different role of the future from the past in the field of modern science:

Popper's main philosophical ideas and the guide to the themes of all three volumes of the footnote [on the logic of scientific discovery] and everything related to the foundation of its theme is that something can come from nothing. Scientific theories produce new forms in this world and cannot be reduced to observations [reduced to mere observations]. There is no such thing as scientific induction. The future is not included in the present or in the past ([Popper, 2025, 21 Editor's Preface](#)).

Explain that the detachment and break of a scientific theory from the past does not mean the lack of historical background and background for that theory (for example, in physics), but rather, first of all, it means a meaningful and tangible break of the content of a theory from previous theories (such as the break of relativity and quantum theory from Ptolemaic, Aristotelian, and Newtonian theories) and also the impossibility of reducing a theory to mere observations preceding it. A physicist like Einstein has become familiar with the subject, issues, and aspects of physics through previous physical theories such as Newton's theories and... (historical aspect) on the other hand, he has taken into account observations and experiments (observations), but the theory he has presented is never exactly reducible to either of the two sources mentioned and goes beyond them! Now, is this also the case in the world of philosophy? That is, for example, is the relationship between Aristotle's philosophy and Plato or between Sadra's philosophy and Suhrawardi and Avicenna? Never. But in some cases, the issue of continuity and discontinuity in the history of philosophy is not so simple. For example, is the relationship between Kant's philosophy and Greek and medieval philosophies completely continuous or is it more of a sign of discontinuity? Or what about the relationship between Wittgenstein's philosophy and Greek and medieval and even modern philosophy? Also, what about the relationship between Heidegger's and Sartre's philosophy and the philosophies of the distant and recent past?

It is worth considering and noting that the flow of philosophy has entered new leaps and innovations since the emergence of modern philosophies. This has led to the emergence of

new philosophies that have little relation to their past, and this flow has continued and continues. Today, the situation in the world of philosophy is such that if we look at philosophical groups and studies, while there are a similarity or similarities between all philosophical research, we are dealing with a multitude of philosophies and philosophical tendencies today, and not a specific philosophical system or a specific philosophical super-narrative. The existence of this philosophical plurality, on the one hand, is a sign of the flow of innovation in our current philosophical field, and on the other hand, it is the basis for the emergence of new philosophies and future philosophical innovations. Accordingly, today, the future of philosophy cannot be determined and defined simply and precisely based on the past, otherwise what would be the need to raise the question of the future of philosophy among philosophers? If the future of philosophy is exactly the continuation of the philosophy/philosophies of the past, why should the question of the philosophical future of the world be raised? If the future of philosophy is the same as the philosophy of the past, then education is the result; and why should such a question be seriously addressed? In the following, the idea is to review the history of foresight in philosophy, and then address the issue of the future of philosophy through three stages of analysis, prediction, and suggestion, and present its results.

1. History of Philosophical Futures

It seems that at least the prominence of the future of philosophy and its more than that, its being an issue for philosophers, dates back to the period of modern philosophy. The beginning of the idea of the future of philosophy can be found in the works of Hume. In his exploration of human understanding, he distinguishes two types of philosophy: complex philosophy and simple philosophy. Simple philosophy means a philosophy based on common sense. He considers the future to be one of those simple philosophies. (Hume, 1395, 7) But the culmination of posing this question and answering it can be found in Kant. When he dedicates the title of his book *Preparations to this sentence: An introduction to every future metaphysics that is presented as a science*. In this work, in an address to the future of philosophy, he reproaches future metaphysics by saying,

Therefore, all practitioners of metaphysics, as long as they have not given a satisfactory answer to the question of how authorial identifications prior to experience are possible, are officially and legally suspended from their positions. For if they have brought us something from pure reason, the only credential they have to offer lies in this answer. Otherwise, they should expect nothing more than that the rational people who have been so deceived by them will all turn their backs on them without commenting on their achievements (Kant, 2005, 114).

It is as if Kant divides future philosophies into dogmatic and non-dogmatic metaphysics, and among them he criticizes dogmatic metaphysics.

The philosophical foresight of Hume and Kant culminates in one prediction: the decline of classical and scholastic metaphysics. In the Humean division, metaphysics is classified as a complex and obscure philosophy, and in the Kantian division of philosophy, metaphysics is classified as a dogmatic philosophy that will not be considered in the future.

If there is a kind of philosophical futurism in Hume and Kant, and it is mostly negative, and in the positive aspect, they show a kind of path-opening in the future through their own philosophies, but something called futurism is meaningless in Hegel because Hegel believes that every philosophy is the culmination and end of the history of philosophy in that period and the narrative of the philosopher's time and not beyond it. Accordingly, the philosopher cannot go beyond the horizon of time and predict the philosophy of the future and the future time. Hegel's famous expression is that the owl of Minerva spreads its wings in the evening and takes flight (Bontempo and Odell, 2006, 9). The allusion is to the occurrence of events, thoughts, and trends and the lateness of the emergence of philosophy, following and after them, and not before them or even in the next time. In fact, this Hegelian expression is considered an allusion to the end of a philosophical period and era, in which the emergence of a philosophical system means the old age and completion of a historical-philosophical period. (Ibid., footnote) According to Hegel, philosophy is the history of philosophy as a whole, which is in change and evolution within itself (Hegel, 2008, 70 and 29). Accordingly, every era, as a stage of this historical whole, has its own philosophy. So, if we want to know what philosophy is, we must address the time and its philosophical necessity. And no philosophy can go beyond its time and is locked in its time. (Hegel, 2010, 512). Hegel considered his philosophy to be the philosophy of his time. Of course, sometimes it is attributed to him that he called his philosophy the end of philosophy, but what he meant was philosophy up to his time or the philosophy of his time, not the end of the history of philosophy (Zakerzadeh, 2009, 307). It is worth mentioning that Hegel's conception of philosophy is a broad and long system, as a philosophical system such as his own philosophy. It is such a system that completely reflects the time in itself and leaves nothing to go beyond it. Ludwig Feuerbach was also concerned with the future of philosophy and for this reason he wrote a work entitled *Principles of Future Philosophy*. Describing the nature of future philosophy and its future path, he writes:

New philosophy is the complete and absolute abolition of theology in favor of anthropology... Art, religion, philosophy and science are only manifestations or manifestations of the true existence of man... New philosophy, as the philosophy of man, is inherently a philosophy for man and has a practical tendency and is practical in the highest sense. New philosophy takes the place of religion. In itself, it has the essence of religion and is in fact religion itself... All attempts to reform old philosophy are not so much different from old philosophy as they are varieties of the same kind [they are considered parts of old philosophy]. The most indispensable condition for a truly new and independent philosophy,

corresponding to the needs of humanity and the future, is to essentially separate ourselves from old philosophy (Feuerbach, 2009, 87-82).

Today, the question of the future of philosophy has become one of the philosophical issues, so that in the contemporary period this issue is specifically addressed and works are published on this subject in the form of magazines and books. For example, Oliver Lyman is the editor of a book entitled *The Future of Philosophy*, in which ten philosophers, each in their own field, are responsible for answering it. It is worth mentioning that the fruitfulness of the world of philosophy is such that not only is there a title called *The Future of Philosophy* and the *Philosophy of the Future* being contemplated in it, but we are also dealing with different works entitled: *The Philosophy of the Present* or *Philosophy Between the Present and the Future*.

First stage: Analysis of principles and foundations

At the very beginning of the research, it is necessary to reflect on the principles and analyze the elements and other characteristics of the issue in question, namely the philosophical future of the world. These reflections include determining the limits of attention to this issue, paying attention to the meaning and intent of the issue, paying attention to the distinctions in the issue, paying attention to the theoretical and philosophical principles effective in the issue, etc.

2. The term future of philosophy in philosophical dictionaries

At the same time, in recent decades, the future of philosophy has been one of the topics that philosophical thinkers have addressed, but the question can be raised as to whether philosophical dictionaries have prepared an entry for this title or similar titles (such as philosophy of the future, etc.)? Can an entry or description be found in philosophical dictionaries for this amendment? In Paul Edwards' dictionary, the titles future, future of philosophy, and philosophy of the future do not appear under the word philosophy, even in the fifth volume, which is its supplement and is related to new philosophical terms. (Borchert, 1996, 403-444 Edwards, 1967, 216-300,) Lalande's philosophical dictionary also lacks these titles (Lalande, 1998, 578-576) Some philosophical dictionaries have only included the title and entry for the future (Bonke, 2016, 229). The future in these dictionaries has a philosophical meaning and they deal with theories about the future from a philosophical perspective and not from a historical and futurological perspective regarding the state of philosophy in the future.

3. The question of the future of philosophy; the meaning and subject of the question?

It seems that at the beginning of the research, the question of the future of philosophy itself should be questioned by philosophical thinkers. First, the question of the future of philosophy from the perspective of philosophical thinkers should be considered as an alternative to the question of the future of philosophy and addressed. In other words, it should be seen what meaning and subject matter the researchers who have studied the future

of philosophy have in mind under this question. Here, the meaning and subject matter of some philosophical futurists are mentioned: Oliver Leaman, under the future of philosophy, has addressed the question: Will the nature of philosophy change in the future? Will philosophy be a reaction to the materialism of everyday life? What will be the relationship of philosophy to the increasing homogeneity of world culture? (Leaman, 1998, 5-10) Harry Lesser addresses the issue of what the future state of the study of ancient philosophy, and especially Aristotelianism, will be? Catherine Wilson addresses the issue of the history of philosophy, considering questions such as: Is there a future for the survival of philosophical ideas related to the history of philosophy, such as the philosophical views of Plato and Kant, among philosophers and thinkers? Will the history of philosophy be just an academic discipline pursued by a few enthusiasts as an intellectual pursuit and for fun? Peter Edwards points to issues such as the future of virtue ethics and the future of Strawson's descriptive metaphysics. Len Goodman considers the future of political philosophy and sees its precise understanding in referring to the intellectual blind spots of the 1920s and 1930s (i.e. the rise of positivism). Sean Hand discusses the future state of philosophy through attention and reflection on postmodern philosophy and its important role. Others have addressed issues such as the state of applied philosophy at the beginning of the third millennium, feminist philosophy and the issue of gender and philosophy, the state of philosophy of language at the end of the twentieth century, and hope for changes and advances in the philosophy of mind in the 21st century (Leaman, 2002, 7, 81, 92, etc.).

However, the issue that this article considers under the question of the future of world philosophy is whether the time, context, and background for the formation and establishment of a branch of philosophy called the philosophy of Life, in which the subject of study and research is Life itself, has arrived? Can we speak of something called the philosophy of Life or Lifeism, with the focus on Life in the general sense and with a capital L meaning Life, in such a way that Lifeism is a separate and distinct branch from realism, subjectivism, Bergson's philosophy of life, pragmatism, existentialism, and vitalism? In this way, in addition to the philosophical branches that have theories and teachings on their different subjects, namely existence, subject, inner intuition, practical wisdom, existence, and transcendence of the material mechanism of the living being, we also deal with a set of philosophical theories and teachings focused on Life.

4. The Future of Philosophy

Among the first issues that should be considered is whether the world today is fundamentally involved in something called philosophy or not? If we cannot talk about something called philosophy in the world today, then consequently we cannot ask what the future philosophy of the world will be. Regarding the philosophical situation of the world, three points of view can be mentioned:

- A. Philosophical pessimism: Some believe that philosophy is something that occurred in the origins of Greece itself and has reached completion and completion, and the rest of history has nothing to say. Philosophy has a past but no future. (Like the

philosophers of the Middle Ages regarding Aristotle). Or it is said that all existing philosophies are nothing but the children of ideologies such as capitalism and liberalism; therefore, they all have an ideological nature and not a philosophical one. (Like Marxism and philosophy and the Frankfurt School). Or some believe that philosophy is the history of the course of existence, and that at present existence has sunk into the abyss and has no meaning, and even we are ignorant of existence, and therefore everything that emerges in the name of philosophy is not philosophy. In other words, our era is the era of nihilism and nihilism, and in this land and context, nothing called philosophy grows. (Such as Nietzsche and Martin Heidegger)

Based on all three views, there is no future for philosophy.

- B. Optimism:** Some believe that philosophy has objectivity and independence, and even, as in the past, it is still considered the mother of sciences and arts. Philosophy, like its past, can also influence the field of new thought and practice in the modern era, and continue to play an effective role alongside science, economics, art, and new politics to the same extent (such as Cassirer and Husserl).
- C. hopefulness:** Since modern culture is philosophy of foundation and philosophy of construction, philosophy is present in this culture (of course, in some important countries). This world and its culture have more or less provided a space for philosophy and philosophizing. In many countries, such as developing or partially developed and even advanced countries such as China and Russia, despite the existence of groups and perhaps even philosophical faculties, philosophy does not have a very effective presence; that is, it does not provide consistency and even systematization to their thought and practice! And sometimes they even engage in ideological abuses or engineering thoughts through philosophies. In general, it can be said that philosophy is considered to be one of the effective actors in the new way of life and its path. In the new world, philosophy is constantly updating itself and increasing its capacities. However, its scope, influence, and position should not be exaggerated. (Like Russell and Popper)

Based on this, and to this extent, it is possible to speak of the existence of promising philosophical grounds and backgrounds for the gradual emergence of specific philosophies in the future. For example, it is known that François Mitterrand met with philosophers and was an intellectual president, but it is not known how much of this gathering and publication influenced his political thought and action:

French President François Mitterrand was famous for inviting philosophers to the Élysée during his presidency to discuss political and social issues. He thus placed himself in a long tradition in which enlightened power approaches philosophers and thereby gains legitimacy. We do not know whether these meetings influenced Mitterrand's political decisions, but at least he remains in our memory as an enlightened president ([Žižek and Badiou, 2014, 57, editor's note](#)).

5. Distinguishing non-philosophical futures studies from philosophical ones

One of the new branches of research is studies related to possible futures or futures studies (the word future is coined because of the acceptance and possibility of futures, not a single future). This type of study is from the category of futurology and is an attempt to be placed alongside sciences such as sociology, psychology, and other logy. Futures studies is the research and drawing of patterns, capacities, and possibilities of the future using sources, statistics, scenarios, and scientific methods. Futures studies are from the category of prediction, insight, and guesses based on sources and based on calculation and accuracy, and not prediction based on imagination and without calculation and comparison.

Futures studies are either based on forecasting or based on foresight. Another division also refers to three types of futures studies: predictive, interpretive, and critical. The goal of futures studies may not only be focused on drawing a future that is or can be and is probable, but also on a future that should be, that is, it should be prepared and realized. In fact, futures studies are both about foresight and future-making, based on the past and present situation. One of the goals of futures studies is to predict future opportunities, risks, and possibilities (Mardukhi, 2012, Chapter 1, 225-237).

We can talk about two other types of futures studies: non-philosophical and philosophical. Non-philosophical futures studies are research on political, economic, cultural, technological, etc. situations that are carried out with scientific methods and in a quantitative, statistical, limited, and field-based manner, and based on patterns.

Philosophical futures studies are research on the philosophical future. This research is basically based on guesswork and insight, and is done in a descriptive and analytical manner, using some sources, evidence, contexts, and historical backgrounds. Understanding and guessing the future of philosophy can be included in this type of futures studies, which can also be called *futures understands*. For example, works such as: *The Future of Philosophy* by Oliver Lyman or *The Future of Religion and God in Christianity* by Richard Rorty and Gianni Vattimo or the book *Religion After Metaphysics* by a group of such philosophical thinkers.

On the other hand, there is another type of looking at the future that can be called *divination*. Futures do not rely on conventional human methods and sources and are part of the category of prophecy and not prediction; such as what is done through religious prophets or the prophecies of specific individuals.

In another division, futures studies can be divided into two types: comprehensive and case-specific. The scope and scope of comprehensive futures studies is greater than case-specific futures studies. It seems that philosophical futures research should be case-specific and specific in order to increase its probability of occurrence. For example, futures research on a branch of philosophy, such as moral philosophy, is more reliable than futures research on all branches, currents, and philosophical tendencies. It is worth mentioning that the research in this article is also case-specific and limited to a specific field.

6. Distinguishing Future Studies from Futurism

There are two definitions of futurism. First, going beyond conventional methods and innovation and creativity in the field of methods: “The search for unconventional methods and ahead of time for various intellectual, artistic, economic, social and technical matters” (Mardukhi, 2012, 228). The second meaning is independence and giving importance to future issues and topics (and not the past) and accepting the possibility of an event in the future that is not exactly in the past and is more or less different from it and cannot be directly interpreted and referred to the past. Future studies or future understanding in the field of philosophy as a field of study is something different from futurism (in the second meaning), as a point of view. Future studies/philosophical understanding does not necessarily imply futurism. Future studies do not necessarily lead to futurism. A futurist can be past-oriented (for example, traditionalist) or futurist. Because a philosophical future may either consider all future issues and events exactly in accordance with the distant and near past and refer to it and not attach any value to it or not accept this adaptation and reference.

7. The distinction between philosophical futurism and philosophical endism

Endism is divided into two general parts: philosophical and non-philosophical. Philosophical endism, which has a philosophical approach and content, is mainly related to philosophical branches and studies and is based on the idea that some philosophical branches or a philosophical movement or the entire history of philosophy ends at a point. For example, Kant believed that metaphysics in the classical sense or something like it (and not philosophy or non-metaphysical philosophy) has reached the end of its path. (Kant, 2005, 84-85) Or in Heidegger, we are faced with a work entitled *The End of Philosophy and the Task of Thought*. In this work, “the phrase ‘end of philosophy’ refers to the completion of metaphysics, because metaphysics can be considered the first beginning of thought in its entire history, from Plato to Nietzsche. A philosophy that provides another beginning is no longer a continuation of metaphysics, but rather tests the truth of existence as an abyssal foundation that no longer relies on a being. So, in a limited sense philosophy can be identified with metaphysics, in a broader sense philosophy, which should be considered the task of thought, does not end at the hands of metaphysics” (Weiss, 2018, 245).

However, non-philosophical finitism refers to the proposal of an end to other matters such as: history, property, humanism, modernity, ideology, man, the world, the author. (Moradkhani, 2013, 8) For example, after the fall of the Soviet Union, Francis Fukuyama believed in his book *The End of History* that “liberal democracy constitutes the end point of the evolution of human ideology and also the final form of human government, which in this way establishes the end of history in the strict sense of the word” (Fukuyama, 2014, 27).

It should be added that there is a difference between philosophical futurism and philosophical endism. Philosophical futurism is either endism or philosophical endism, and can be combined with both. The basic view in philosophical futurism is that in the history of philosophy so far, the philosophical future is appropriate for independent issues, answers,

arguments, and analyses, and not that all philosophy is simply in the philosophical past. And even in raising philosophical issues and producing philosophical work and the birth of a new philosophical theory, the future is more important and more noteworthy than the past. For this amount of history, whether philosophy has a future or not, and whether the future of philosophy is about to end or not, has always been and will always be the main issue of its future.

8. The difference between the philosophy of the future and a philosophy for the future

The philosophy of the future is different from the philosophy for the future. The philosophy of the future can be considered as one of the additional philosophies whose subject is the future and it can be dealt with like other philosophical branches such as the philosophy of history, the philosophy of art, the philosophy of ethics, etc. In this case, one should look at the studies, analyses and reflections of philosophers on the definition of the future and the relationship of the past and the present with the future, etc. and try to plan, compare and evaluate them. For example, in the definition of the future, it is said that the set of events that will occur after the present. Also, because the present is constantly advancing and changing, the future will also be changing. Or there is a future present corresponding to each specific situation (Bonke, 2016, 229). Or some, like Minkowski, believe that future events are also present in the present in a time-space chain and continuity. But Bergson and Whitehead believe that future events have not yet come into existence and must be awaited. Mead also believes that past and future events are transformed by relying on present events.

But a philosophy for the future seeks to define, describe, and determine or establish a specific philosophy for the future, such as Hume, who strives to establish knowledge of human nature (understanding, passions, and ethics) for future generations. He writes: “I do not pursue these vein [naive or metaphysical] hopes in the philosophy I wish to cultivate, for if I were to think that the access to truth was so easy and clear, such a desire would be nothing but a bold audacity to its extent... The only suitable option for hoping for success in philosophical research is to abandon the tedious methods we have followed up to now, and instead of contenting ourselves with occasionally occupying a castle or a village on the border, we should attack the capital or center of these sciences, that is, human nature itself” (Hume, vol. 1, 2016a, 16).

Furthermore, and in the field of philosophy of the future (and not a philosophy for the future), that is, regarding the relationship of the past to the present and the future, several opinions can be mentioned:

1. The source of the present and the future is simply the past, and the events of the present and the future come from the reservoir and basket of the past. The present is only pregnant with the past and is the tip of a line that has extended from the past to the present and in this direction is heading towards the future. Between the past and the present and then the future there is a necessary metaphysical or mechanical cause-effect relationship. The relationship of the present and the future with the past is necessary in the status of proof (in fact), and in the status of proof (in the mind and in

the status of cognition) and also in the status of action, it is both necessary and predictable. Active causality and ultimate causality coincide. In the status of ultimate causality, the ultimate goal of the agent of the world coincides with the goal and result of the movement of the world itself.

2. The source of existing events and flows is the future. Necessity is the description of the future and its will, whether the past and the present require it or not, whether it wants it or not. It is the future that decides what will ultimately happen. Even some of the events of the present are numerical and temporary causes for the achievement of a specific future. The necessity of the past and the present is ultimately numerical, preparatory, and temporary. This is why we see in some cases that despite the insufficiency of causes and grounds in the past and present (i.e. the existence of fundamental grounds for non-occurrence), some events have occurred and are occurring. In fact, all events are like this and we are unaware of the intervention of the future in their formation and regulation.
3. The source of the present and future is the past, and the direction of events is from the past to the present and future. The present and future are pregnant with the past, but the flow of the past is not a single, precise, clear, and mathematical line, but rather curved, uncertain, and flexible. The causality of the past is not definite, but probabilities. The past is like a line that becomes multiple lines along its length and finds several tips and directions.
4. The source of the present and future is the past, but both the flow of the past is indefinite and uncertain, and on the other hand, the future is open and not closed. Even if the world is closed from the past and governed by necessities, it is open from the future. In this case, indeterminacy rules the future, and the future cannot be bound by the past.
5. We have three different sections of the past, present and future, and the section of the present is the dialectical meeting point of the past and the future and the synthesis of the two. Therefore, the present is in its core, constantly in a state of collision of the past and the future, and then it goes beyond both.
6. The section and section of the present are the meeting point of two different flows of the past and the future, both. The past, whether necessary or unnecessary, is one of the flows that constitute the world of the present. But the future is in an independent, unnecessary and unpredictable way in the process of entering the homeland of the present. In other words, the present is the section and place of collapse of two flows of events and incidents, etc.: the flow of the past (determined and predictable or indeterminate and unpredictable) and the flow of the future (indeterminate and unpredictable). In this case, the past is constantly exposed to finding its way, opening, passing and turning away by the present and the future.

The result is that in the metaphysics of time (past, present, and future), in the first theory, which is based on the peak of continuity and brotherhood of the past, present, and future, neither the past violates the present and future and overwhelms them, nor does the present

do so to the past and future, nor does the future mock the present and past and abandon them and transcend them.

However, in the last five theories on the metaphysics of time, the present and/or future are pregnant with transition, deviation, change, and transformation, etc., in relation to the past. In these last five metaphysics, in different ways and degrees, the present and future are not defeated and condemned and slaves of the past, the present and future are not exact copies, representations, repetitions, and imitations of the past.

It is worth mentioning that in discussing and examining the future of world philosophy, taking each of the above theories is effective in drawing conclusions about it.

9. Distinguishing philosophies from a philosophy

Based on this philosophical view and capacity that "the special privilege of philosophers is to philosophize or extract philosophical conclusions about almost everything. Therefore, there can be many additional philosophies in which the additional matter can be art, law, politics, religion, science, technology, or many other things" (Bunke, 2016, 371), it is possible to define and establish numerous additional philosophies in the philosophical future of the world. Therefore, in order to determine the scope of commenting on the philosophical future of the world, a distinction must be made between predicting all philosophies and one philosophy. Therefore, in philosophical futurology, determining the desired philosophical field will be more realistic and humbler.

10. Distinguishing a philosophical branch from a philosophical theory

Another point about respecting the limits of research and observing the principle of humility and caution regarding the philosophical future of the world is to pay attention to distinguishing a philosophical branch from a specific theory or perspective in the same field. For example, the philosophical branch of moral philosophy includes numerous theories such as the theory of virtue or duty or consequentialism. Or in the branch of philosophy of knowledge (epistemology), we are faced with perspectives such as empiricism and rationalism, etc. Now, in the matter of future research regarding the future of philosophy in the world, we must be aware of the scope of our prediction. That is, we must be aware of the inclusion of future research at the level of a complete philosophical branch or a philosophical theory in a branch.

11. Philosophy of the *history of philosophy*

It seems that proposing a perspective on the future of philosophy is also influenced by our philosophical view of the history of philosophy or a field of study called the philosophy of the history of philosophy. In this way, a researcher's philosophical conception and understanding of the history of philosophy is effective in his future understanding of philosophy. For example, in the philosophy of the history of philosophy, we are faced with questions related to the future of philosophy, such as: What is our general and philosophical definition or view of the history of philosophy? Is the history of philosophy a single

philosophical movement or a collection of movements and philosophies? Can we speak of something called progress in the history of philosophy? What are the relations between studies within the history of philosophy (dialogue between philosophies)? Tradition with tradition, tradition with modernity, modernity with tradition, modernity with modernity, modernity with postmodernity, postmodernity with modernity? What are the relations among philosophies in the history of philosophy: dialectical, dialogical, or of the type of difference or...? Can we have a paradigmatic understanding of the history of philosophy, like the history of science? If so, what paradigms does the history of philosophy have? What is the future paradigm of the history of philosophy? And...

Stage Two - Explanation and Prediction

This stage is about explaining or discovering historical factors and causes through historical reflection on the level of specific historical contexts and background, and then predicting the formation and birth of a specific philosophical branch related and proportionate to those factors. The independent philosophical branch that is predicted in the light of this historical reflection is the philosophy of life, of course with a capital L (philosophy of Life) to distinguish it from the philosophy of life in the sense of researching the purpose, end, and meaning of life. It seems that one of the philosophies that is likely to emerge in the future is the philosophy of life in the sense of philosophizing in the dimensions, levels, and concrete categories of life. Of course, it is clear that, like other philosophical branches, the philosophy of life can also have multiple and diverse theories and perspectives within itself. Next, we will discuss the contexts and background of the formation of the philosophy of life in the last two decades. It is through paying attention to these specific contexts and background that the prediction and acknowledgement of the birth of such a branch is made possible and facilitated.

A. Historical or objective background of the philosophy of Life

The historical or objective background refers to the historical realization of the subject and is related to concrete matters, circumstances, contexts, historical events, whether social, political, military, natural, etc., that affect the development of the philosophical subject or issue. The birth, establishment, multiplicity, diversity, and direction of philosophies have historical backgrounds. This is a point that historians of philosophy, especially in the case of contemporary philosophies, have emphasized (Asghari, 2010, 14). Therefore, the question of whether there is a historical background for what we call a philosophical approach to life has a positive answer. Accordingly, the question of the historical background of the philosophy of life is a question of the situations, contexts, and objective and historical phenomena (economic, military, political, medical, natural, etc. crises and problems) involved in its development and birth. So, our question is, what are the historical circumstances and the affairs of the historical researcher (historical realization, not historical research) in the last century that have led to the birth of new philosophical thinking? Some of the important events that can be considered as the basis for the development and birth of philosophical biography in the future are as follows:

1. World Wars I and II: The twentieth century was a century of great shock to all of humanity. The great hope that had been formed in the shadow of rationalism and science in the previous two or three centuries was shattered with the emergence of two world wars, with a short interval of three decades. World War I (1914-1918) and World War II (1939-1945) were the end of the spiritual capital that had been prepared over three centuries. On the one hand, the two world wars destroyed the greatest pillars of human life, namely hope, peace, happiness, security, etc. during the war, and on the other hand, they questioned the sustainable achievement of these pillars for the future. (Zare Company, 2013, 32) World wars had threatened not only the pillars and principles of life but also the normal form of life on a global level and had given it a critical and unusual situation. The shock of war to human life continued not only during the war but also after it.
2. The creation and explosion of the atomic bomb: The world war led to an event that raised the level of threat to human life from a conventional or severe threat to a catastrophic and unprecedented level. This event was the invention of the atomic bomb, the use of which, as demonstrated in Hiroshima and Nagasaki, could have led to the total destruction of life on earth! In the future, the creation of unconventional weapons of mass destruction and the arms race continued at that level and became a potential and permanent threat to life. The above two events placed human life in the horizon of death and destruction and plunged thinking about life into the horizon of death!
3. The decline of Marxist and non-Marxist ideologies (nationalist, Nazi, fascist, religious, etc.) that claimed to produce a new level of human life and life.
4. Globalization: The idea of globalization sought to blur the borders of countries, at least at the level of economic borders. But it also included the idea of globalization of life and the approximation of cultures and lives.
5. The dominance of specific levels and aspects of life over contemporary life, namely science, technology, economics and politics: This dominance has led to the definition and calendaring of contemporary life based on these four components. In the meantime, the generality and influence of the technological landscape and language in contemporary life are of particular prominence. One of the most important questions today is the adequacy of life in relation to these levels and dimensions.
6. The invention of artificial intelligence: The birth and tangible leap in the field of artificial intelligence and the prediction of its fruitful and tense future and, further, the possibility of the birth of artificial life alongside natural life (human, animal and plant) in the future is a challenging and problematic matter.
7. Tourism: The unprecedented emergence of tourism as one of the pillars of communication between nations, cultural interactions, the global economy, etc., is in a way an emphasis on the subjectivity, interactive aspect, dynamism, etc. of life.

8. Accelerating the program of life in space and extraterrestrials: Space programs to expand life in space and other planets are in a way an expansion of the concept of life and its non-extension to life on earth.
9. Global Corona Crisis: If we consider world wars as threats and suspension of life for military reasons, we should also consider the global Corona crisis as threats and suspension of life for medical and biological reasons. The Corona crisis has raised important philosophical questions such as death, meaning, and health about life (Omid, 2021, 100-73).
10. Medical advances: Medical advances both affect the content of our lives and create a kind of idea of guaranteeing life, guaranteeing recovery from diseases and a long life. One of the results of these advances is the idea of death as a disease! Dying is a type of illness that can be treated and more or less postponed, and may even not occur, unless the person wishes!

B. philosophical context of the philosophy of Life

Philosophical and study context refers to historical research (not historical realization) on the subject in question and is related to abstract, scientific, and epistemological matters and refers to reviewing past ideas, studies, and research and research history on the subject in question, i.e. life or concepts and ideas related to it. Accordingly, our question at this point is whether there were any discussions about life in the past in terms of its word, meaning, concept, and instance or its definition and confirmation or other related discussions, as scientific background? In the following, we will discuss some discussions about the historical background of the philosophy of life.

12. The question of Life in the history of philosophy

During what stages has the history of philosophy reached the stage of the subjectivity of Life? In other words, in what period of the history of philosophy has Life been determined and accepted as a philosophical subject? The discussions of classical, modern, and contemporary philosophy are not and have not been related to life, but the question is whether, like other philosophical topics such as existence or being or matter, becoming, cognition, history, ethics, etc., in Greek, medieval, and modern philosophy, has a topic called Life also been a philosophical topic for philosophers to research, or is this something that is only happening in the contemporary period? In response, we can consider three periods or historical stages for the objectivity of Life in the history of philosophy: the period of neglecting the objectivity of Life, the period of paying attention to the objectivity of Life, and the period of giving it philosophical objectivity and the possibility of philosophical theorizing about it.

12-1. Period of neglect: neglect of the objectivity of Life

The meaning of neglecting Life in philosophizing is that life as a philosophical topic was not raised in any of the three philosophical periods of Greece, the Middle Ages, the Modern Period, and even the contemporary period until the early twentieth century. In the contemporary period, life is not considered a theoretical concept, nor a philosophical term

such as the second philosophical rational, nor a philosophical category. Also, until the contemporary period, it has not been considered a topic for philosophy at the level of such matters as matter, process, cosmos, focus, being, example, pleasure, phronesis, God, existence, ideal, etc., and has not even been allocated an independent topic. A look at the discussions of the Pre-Socratics, Socrates, Plato, Aristotle, Neoplatonists, Augustine, Aquinas, Scotus, Abelard, Ibn Sina, Suhrawardi, Mulla Sadra, rationalists, empiricists, Kant, Hegel, Bergson, etc., shows this claim.

For example, none of Plato's dialogues has a specific title with the subject matter of Life; the same is true of the treatises and writings of Aristotle, Ibn Sina, etc. Of course, it is clear that Life-related issues are raised in the midst of philosophical issues, but not as an independent subject. The way Life-related issues are raised in the midst of philosophies is like the way logical and epistemological issues were raised before they were raised and formulated independently. In this way, logical and epistemological issues were raised to some extent in the midst of previous philosophical issues; but not as two independent branches called logic and epistemology. The history of philosophy needed the passage of time and the raising of more philosophical issues, as well as the emergence of innovative philosophers such as Aristotle and Kant, in order for distinct philosophical branches with a specific and independent subject called logic and epistemology to emerge.

To be more precise, the history of philosophy has not witnessed the emergence of a philosophical branch called philosophy of Life among other philosophical branches such as philosophy of art, philosophy of existence, philosophy of ethics, philosophy of politics, philosophy of law, philosophy of knowledge (epistemology), philosophy of logic, philosophy of history, philosophy of religion, philosophy of phenomena (phenomenology), philosophy of man, philosophy of technology, etc.

Explain that the Greek period was involved in natural (Thales, Anaximander, etc.), human (Sophists), metaphysical-supernatural (Heraclitus, Parmenides, Plato, Aristotle), and ethical (Epicureans, Stoics) topics and issues. In general, in this period, the concept of Life never had a philosophical subject matter, and if there was even a little attention to it as a subject matter, it was never on the level and stature of concepts such as matter, becoming, existence, cosmos, phronesis, ideal, God, ethics, etc.!

But regardless of the centrality of the concept of life itself for philosophy, two important and key concepts that were related to life in Greece were: *paideia* and *polis*. Looking at life, with regard to *paideia*, has been about life with manners and culture. Greek *paideia*, on the other hand, has been about education and shaping human character in the context and process of culture. On the other hand, in terms of the *polis*, it has been observed that life based on citizenship or the life of citizenship. Of course, in Greek thought, the three elements: city, monarchy and citizenship, were interconnected (Ross, 2018, 375-370). It should be added that in Greek thought, and at its peak with Plato and especially with Aristotle, life is introduced in two ways: civic life (*bios politicos*) and theoretical or speculative life (*bios theoreticos*) (Weiss, 2018, 185).

In the Greek period, the groundwork for the turn in philosophy from non-human subjects, i.e. the world/system (cosmos) to human-social issues (such as success, authority, virtue, conventional social knowledge, relative knowledge, etc.) dates back to the emergence of the Sophists. With the emergence of the Sophists, the period of a century and a half of pre-Socratic cosmology came to an end. The Socratic period (5th century BC) is the period of correction and consolidation of the approach to human categories, especially the issue of ethics, virtue, and moral knowledge.

In the post-Socratic period, that is, with Plato and Aristotle (4th century BC), we witness the emergence of systematic and academic metaphysics. The main and immediate subject of this metaphysics was not man, but human issues were raised and explained in the following and, consequently, their topics and issues. The Hellenistic period (3rd BC) was a renewed departure towards ethical issues from the Stoic, Epicurean, and Cynic schools. The period of the Roman Empire can be considered the period of combining Greek philosophy with Eastern philosophy and mysticism, or the Neoplatonic period. This philosophical movement also investigated the issue of man in the following and context of mystical metaphysics (Tesler, 2016, 52-50).

But the Middle Ages were the period of dominance of Neoplatonic, Platonic and Aristotelian thought with a religious reading of their teachings, and the problem of man was resolved under the problem of theology and the problem of origin. Modern philosophy, in its rationalist branch, is also a kind of processing and new narration of metaphysics, in the eyes of Descartes, Spinoza and Leibniz. However, the empiricist trend in modern philosophy values the problem of knowledge, ethics and politics. However, the important point in modern philosophy was the change of the points of departure and the beginnings of philosophical thought. Descartes' starting point and departure was man in terms of consciousness and the internalization of metaphysical elements. David Hume also addressed the nature of man, but in terms of his phenomena and psychological capacities. The result of the new philosophical trend was the disruption of metaphysical reason and the emergence of epistemology and philosophical psychology, the emergence of the subject, and the birth of subjectivity, whether rational or empirical. The turning point in turning to human issues can be found in Immanuel Kant. By showing the depth of the disruption in metaphysical reason, Kant announced the end of metaphysics and psychology and turned to philosophical research in the field of epistemology and practical reason in a transcendental way. All three questions of Kant's philosophy are, by their own definition, related to transcendental anthropology: what can I know, what should I do, and what can I hope for. Kant addressed the problem of man under theoretical reason and especially under practical reason, and even later wrote a work entitled *Pragmatic Anthropology* (Anthropology from a Pragmatic Perspective).

In a way, Fichte sought to continue Kant's path by addressing issues such as religion, knowledge, history, politics, and law. One of Fichte's most important works is considered to be the *Mission of Man* (Fichte, 2016, 13-20). Hegel's philosophy has been a reference to human issues under the absolute and reasonable. Hegel's philosophizing in the field of

human issues is not completely concrete, but under its special rationality and logic, that is, the historical dialectic of ideas, and in a semi-abstract (abstract-concrete) manner and according to the principle: the reasonable is real. The most important human aspect of Hegel's philosophy is the entry of human history, of course, as manifestations of the spirit (spirit in history), into the field of philosophy.

12-2. Concrete Anthropology Project

The starting point of approaching the problem of man in a concrete way can be found in four philosophers of the 19th century, namely Schopenhauer with his proposal of the wisdom of life and the will-centeredness, Kierkegaard with his proposal of *human individuality* and its position in contrast to the Hegelian totality, Nietzsche with his proposal of a *life-centeredness* based on will and power and the affirmation of good, and Marx with his proposal of the theory of *praxis* and *economic man*. Among them, Bergson's *philosophy of life* should also be mentioned, which is a kind of philosophy based on human inner intuition. The American movement of philosophy, which began with Peirce and William James under the title of pragmatism and reached its operational peak at the level of education and the context of society by John Dewey in paying attention to *human experience*, was another important philosophical movement focused on concrete anthropology but completely related to the field of Life.

Considering the above historical process that led to the achievement of abstract and then concrete anthropology, the emergence of concrete anthropology can be considered the basis for attention to the subject of Life and the boundary of philosophical approach to it.

12-3. Period of attention: attention to Life and philosophical approach to its subjectivity

The general topics and discussions related to Life that were raised in European philosophy in the 19th and early 20th centuries include: Wilhelm Dilthey's idea of *the human world*, Cassirer's *philosophy of culture*, Husserl's *lifeworld*, followed by Heidegger's *Dasein* and Merleau-Ponty's *embodied subject*, and in parallel with them is the problem of conventional understanding in J. A. Moore and *conventional language* and *the form of life* in Wittgenstein.

Heidegger's main work, *Being and Time*, can be considered a kind of discussion of Life and even a deep attention to Life, but: first, its main title is not related to Life, second, it lacks a chapter dedicated to Life, and third, there is no attempt to give centrality to something called Life and to extract and deduce philosophical conclusions from it. The centrality in this work is with *Dasein* and the phenomenology and hermeneutics of *Dasein*. Some Heidegger scholars have included the term *life* in that collection when compiling Heidegger's dictionary of terms (Weiss, 2018, 185-188). However, it seems that this is not because this term is key in Heidegger's philosophy, but because of his general and implicit attention, as well as the increasing trend of thinking about life in contemporary philosophy, and the need to highlight new concepts in the philosopher's thinking. With all these characteristics, Heidegger believes that in order to understand life, we must inevitably and ultimately address the question of the existence of *Dasein* and the analysis of *Dasein* in its phenomenological sense, which is the hermeneutics of the life of beings (Heidegger, 2010,

64 (No. 47)). It seems that in Heidegger we are faced with the delivery and reference of life or the giving of meaning to life in terms of the concept of Dasein or the life of Dasein.

Also, in the last two centuries, we have been dealing with philosophers who believe that philosophy is lived philosophy; that is, philosophy should be such that it can be lived according to it. Such a view can be found in philosophical thinkers such as Schopenhauer, Kierkegaard, Jaspers, Marcel, Sartre, Camus, de Beauvoir, Merleau-Ponty, Levinas, Simon Way, Murdoch, and... (Bikol, 2016, 306) For example, in Merleau-Ponty's view, philosophy and life are one and the same (Bikol, 2016, 366). Iris Murdoch speaks of the term inhabited philosophy, meaning that

we should be able to look into a [existing and lived] philosophy through the lens of it and see how people have inhabited it, how they move around in it, and how they manage their affairs (Bikol, 2016, 56).

That is, philosophy should be related to life in its content and within itself. Also, Luke Fry's work entitled *A Brief History of Thought: A Philosophical Guide to Living* is a work about thinking about life and teaching and practicing life or a guide to life through the history of philosophy, but not a definition and determination of a philosophical branch called the philosophy of life (Frey, 2016, Introduction). A number of philosophers have also specifically addressed the issues and topics of life in some of their works: Thomas Nagel with *Mortal Questions*, Hannah Arendt with *The Human Condition*, especially Chapter 6 entitled: *Life Dedicated to Action and the Modern Age*, Karl Popper with the book *All Life Is Problem Solving*, especially Chapter 2, Robert Solomon with *The Big Questions*, especially Chapter 2 entitled *The Meanings of Life*, David Kishik with *The Power of Life*; Agamben and the *Politics of the Future*, Hans Kung with *What I Believe*, Singer, Nussbaum, Žižek and... with *Examined Life: Excursions with Comparative Thinkers*, and... .

Some of the most important topics and issues that have been raised at this stage that have led to attention to life as an independent subject for philosophizing include: *the human world* (Dilthey), *lifism* (Nietzsche), *the lifeworld* (Husserl), worldliness and *being-in-the-world* (Heidegger), meaning and meaninglessness (Camus), attention to the issue of health (Gadamer and Habermas), and *The theory of communicative action* (Habermas). The conclusion is that, considering the above points, at this stage, while we are faced with the presentation of important issues of life in a scattered manner and under various titles, life has not yet been raised as an independent subject for philosophical thought. Therefore, this stage can be considered a stage of attention to the subjectivity of life and not to giving independent subjectivity to life in the field of philosophical research. This point can be clearly understood by referring to two works: 1- Paul Edwards' *Encyclopedia of Philosophy* and 2- Jean Wall's *Traite de Metaphysique*. This means that these two important works lack an entry or topic titled "Life" or "About Life" in their collection of philosophical topics!!

12-4. Period of presence: The presence of Life in the context of philosophizing and its subjectivity and importance

At this stage, Life is gradually opening its way to being present in the field of philosophy and philosophy turning towards it. Some of the signs of this presence and turn can be stated as follows:

The first movements in the subjectivity of Life for contemporary philosophy can be found in some dictionaries and in determining entries for the title of Life. The approach to the issue of Life also shows itself more or less in the entries of recent dictionaries of philosophy. (Awani (editor), 2010, 656 under human life) Of course, in philosophical cultures such as Lalande and especially Bunke, this concept has a biological and scientific rather than a philosophical meaning! (Lalande, 1998, 895 under VIE and Bunke, 2016, 300 under life) It is worth mentioning that André Lalande, in his *Philosophical Culture*, regrets the lack of content in the concept of life and the lack of distinction between the two biological and scientific concepts and the ethical and cultural concept (as had happened in Greece), in the field of literature and contemporary philosophical thought (Lalande, 1998, 897). In other words, in his opinion, in contemporary philosophical thought, while proposing the title of life in it, the concept of life is not yet fruitful and has not reached the level of a precise philosophical concept and term.

But on the other hand, the traces of the gradual and slow presence of the problem/problems of Life in contemporary philosophy can be observed in the answers of philosophers to the nature of philosophy. By examining the answers of fifty-one contemporary philosophers who have given the question of what philosophy is, it is observed that at least six of their definitions have directly (each in its own way) addressed the relevance of life-related issues for philosophy (such as: lifestyle, the necessities of life, happiness, overcoming the world, wise living, the impact of ontology and anthropology on life, etc.) (Edmonds & Warburton, 2016, 20-7). The following are examples of these descriptions:

Claire Carlyle:

We find ourselves in a world that we have not chosen. There are many different ways to interpret this world and find meaning in it and in the life we have. The subject of philosophy is to understand the situation in which we find ourselves (Edmonds & Warburton, 2016, 9).

John Donne:

Philosophy is the study of how people should live (Edmonds & Warburton, 2016, 11).

Walter Sinnott Armstrong:

The problem of philosophy is the relationship of different aspects of life, such as psychology with philosophy, mind and body, aesthetic values with economic values, and so on. So, the problem of philosophy is how do we reconcile the different aspects of our lives? (Edmonds & Warburton, 2016, 18)

Raymond Nellis:

My dream in philosophy is to make the world we live in something portable in the mind, so that instead of the world owning us, we own it [what mental interpretation of the world we have that will come to be ours] (Edmonds & Warburton, 2016, 19).

Tzotán Todorov:

Philosophy is a way of seeking wisdom, a way of living wisely (Edmonds & Warburton, 2016, 20).

Keith Ward:

Philosophy is a search for wisdom, and this includes spiritual wisdom. That is, to ask about the nature of the human self and the nature of reality and how this reality affects our lives in practice (Edmonds & Warburton 2016, 20).

On the other hand, it should be added that many works have been published under the title of philosophy of life or something close to it, which have established the subjectivity of life for philosophical thinking today, such as:

On the Wisdom of Life (Schopenhauer), Philosophy of life (Tolstoy), Philosophy of life (Hamilton), Philosophy of life and death (Kamath), Questions of life (Sawater), A Philosophy for life (Irwin), Philosophy and the Good life (Cases), Views of Real life (Gurdjieff), and...

Another important and final point is that one of the great contemporary philosophers, Georg Gadamer, has pointed out the subjectivity of Life for philosophical thinking of the twentieth century and not the philosophical thinking of previous centuries: "It is only in the twentieth century that the concept of Life has found a place at the center of philosophical research (Gadamer, 2015, 217).

As a result, the turn towards the subjectivity of Life for philosophical thinking is gradually taking place and is heading towards the future. At this stage, contemporary philosophical thought is looking at Life as a philosophical concept and accepting its relevance for philosophizing, but no important and comprehensive work or works have yet been written or compiled in this area. The future will be pregnant with appropriate and important reflections and research in this area. Therefore, it seems that philosophical awareness in the late twentieth and early twenty-first centuries has vaguely achieved the discovery of something called Life and seeks to address it and, along with other philosophical studies, to advance the flow of philosophy in the twenty-first century in this direction and direction, and in this way determine the future of philosophy.

13. Moving towards a *philosophy of Life*

Considering the above background and background on the philosophy of Life, it is important to note that while Life is entering the field of philosophical research, no independent and comprehensive philosophical research or work has been published on the new philosophical branch called philosophy of Life that deals with the definition and history of new philosophical awareness and its course in the last one or two centuries. In other words, in the world of philosophy, up to this point, no research has been published under the title philosophy of Life that systematically and thoroughly addresses all or most of the topics and issues and classifies and reports philosophical ideas and thoughts on Life. Of course, as mentioned, scattered, numerous and diverse works have been published on this topic. But these works can only be considered as the background of what is called philosophy of Life and not itself! In short, in the meantime, we are not dealing with a research work that is rich in content, detailed, independent, structured, disciplined and divided into chapters on this topic. In other words, while in the last hundred years, we have more or less witnessed the trend of philosophical biographical studies among philosophers in certain fields, we cannot refer to a precise and comprehensive study under the title of philosophy of Life. In fact, at this stage, no work on the philosophy of Life has been published on the level of epoch-making works such as Aristotle's *Organon* or *Metaphysics*, Bacon's *Tapestry*, Descartes' *Meditations*, Hume's *Treatise on Human Nature*, Kant's *Critique of Pure Reason*, Husserl's *Crisis in European Sciences*, Russell's *Foundations of Mathematics*, Wittgenstein's *Tractatus*, Heidegger's *Being and Time*, and...!

14. Stage Three: Proposal

This stage includes a proposal and thesis to express the general characteristics of the branch of philosophy of Life or an image of a philosophy of Life with regard to its context and historical background in contemporary philosophical thought in the world.

14-1. Using a hybrid approach: continental topics and issues with an analytical approach

In continental thought and philosophy, concrete topics such as issues related to life are addressed, and in analytical philosophy, abstract studies such as analysis and classification, refinement and clarity of topics, theories and teachings are addressed. The hybrid approach in the philosophy of Life is the selection of issues within the horizon of continental topics and thinking and their analysis and examination within the horizon of the analytical approach. In other words, in the philosophy of Life, we can benefit from a hybrid approach, that is, a concrete-abstract approach.

14-2. Distinguishing realism, subjectivism, vitalism, pragmatism, existentialism with Lifeism

There is a thematic distinction between conventional philosophies and schools and the philosophy of Life. There are philosophies and schools that seek to examine and understand the aspects, structure, phenomena, and requirements of their specific subject, namely, existence, subject, inner intuition, the immaterial aspect of the organism, practical expediency, and existence, but none of them have been organized and formulated on the

axis of Life. Realism seeks theoretical reality based on a theory of existence, subjectivism seeks a theory about the structure of the subject in relation to the object and the delineation of the subject-object relationship, pragmatism pursues a theory about practical wisdom, and... But in the meantime, Lifeism, in a thematic distinction from the previous branches, seeks to provide a description or theory (and not ideology) for Life. On the other hand, it should be noted that in terms of abstraction and concreteness, the subject and discussions of classical realism are very abstract, and the subject of subjectivism is on the border of concreteness, but the subject of philosophies such as pragmatism and existentialism is completely concrete. It is worth mentioning that the philosophy of Life is different from vitalism, which means the insufficiency of physiology and material mechanism in the life of a living being, and the philosophy of life of the likes of Bergson, which means the objectivity of inner intuition based on the eternal, while being concrete.

14-3. The position of the philosophy of Life and basic divisions in philosophy

In the world of philosophy, several basic divisions have been proposed regarding philosophies or philosophical studies, such as: theoretical or applied, unrestricted (including ontology, epistemology) or additive or bound (including philosophy of ethics, philosophy of art, etc.), abstract or concrete. In explaining the relationship of the aforementioned divisions to the philosophy of Life, it should be said:

- A.** In the division into theoretical or applied, the philosophy of Life has both aspects. That is, it includes both theoretical and philosophical discussions and can provide grounds for action (potential or actual).
- B.** In dividing philosophies into unrestricted and bound, it should be said that this division is more based on the application and restriction of subjects, and some believe that in the world of philosophy, the only absolute and unconditional subject is existence or existent, and the rest of the subjects are restricted. For this reason, a branch called philosophy of Life is placed in the field of bound philosophies. Hence, there will be no substantive and semantic difference in the use of the word philosophy on philosophical subjects such as ethics, knowledge, and Life with the existent/existence.
- C.** In the division into abstract and concrete, it can also be said that abstract philosophies deal with abstract and mental subjects such as being, existence, ideal, necessity, becoming, power and action, and abstract issues and discussions about them, such as what is the relationship between existence and necessity or what is the relationship between power and action. However, the topics, issues and discussions of concrete philosophies are related to life and practical and existential matters, such as ethics, law, politics, existential matters, etc. Accordingly, the philosophy of Life is considered one of the concrete studies in philosophy.

14-4. Problem or problematic?

Another division has been proposed in recent decades, not regarding branches and fields of study, but regarding the nature of general and theoretical issues, under the title of whether the issue under study and research is a philosophical problem or a philosophical problematic?

Based on a general perspective, in the division into problem or problematic, the meaning of a problem is basically a theoretical issue arising from intellectual and abstract studies and reflections, for example, such as the issue of existence, induction, causality, necessity, subjectivity, etc. However, problematic is an issue arising from a concrete, problematic situation. The origin of problematic is a problematic and problem-making situation; A situation that is the origin of a widespread, general, and fundamental practical and concrete difficulty and is the subject of theoretical discussion and study, such as the problem of identity (cultural), gender crisis, civilizational crisis, nihilism crisis. (However, limited social problems such as addiction, traffic, unemployment, poverty, war, etc. in a society are not considered a problematic).

Considering this division, it should be said that Life in recent decades, due to specific historical contexts such as the crisis of world wars and Corona, etc., and also in the continued emergence of specific crises such as the crisis of meaning, style, health, etc., has been raised as a problem and difficulty, that is, problematic. But further and currently, it has emerged as a specific philosophical issue and a problem such as the nature of Life and its problems, and is becoming a philosophical branch called the philosophy of Life with its own problems. In other words, the problematic of Life, in the process of becoming a problem of Life, gradually leads to the establishment of a branch called the philosophy of Life.

Explain that the history of philosophy has witnessed the transformation of problematics into problems and vice versa, problems into problematics, and the general circulation between them. For example, Kant's transcendental philosophy and the first and second Critiques, as Kantian problems (What can we know? What should we do? And what should we hope for?), were the products of the general problematic of the Enlightenment that began in the 17th century. Even the second Critique, which was written after Kant's Enlightenment treatise, should be considered a product of the general problematic of the Enlightenment before Kant. But on the other hand, these same critiques and problems of Kant laid the groundwork for another specific Enlightenment problematic that showed itself in Kant's Enlightenment treatise. That is, Kant, continuing and based on his problem, also proposed his own specific problematic in his Enlightenment treatise. Kant was the designer of a problematic based on the need to free himself from the theoretical and practical limitations resulting from the dominance of tradition, authority, and superstition, which he addressed in his Enlightenment treatise with a concrete approach.

Another example of moving from problematic to problematic can be found in Husserl. Towards the end of Husserl's life, the birth of the problem of transcendental phenomenology in the book *The Crisis of European Sciences and Transcendental Phenomenology* was a continuation of the problematic of the crisis in European civilization:

The manuscripts belonging to the last years [of Husserl's life] ... are all somehow connected with the problematic of the crisis [of European civilization] ... Hence the work of the crisis, which should thus show the foundations of the real European crisis of life [as a problematic], is

simultaneously conceived as an introduction to transcendental phenomenology. [In this case and as a problem,] phenomenology must prove itself in addressing this set of questions truly, as a fundamental philosophy, that is, as a realisation of the claim to general knowledge, as a general science (Husserl, 2025, 31 editor's note).

In other words, Husserl had moved from the problematic of the crisis of European civilization to the problem of European sciences and then to the problem of the phenomenology of sciences (civilization stage-science stage-phenomenology stage).

The result is that, considering the relationship between problematic and problem, with the emergence of crises related to Life in the last century, the subject of Life first appeared as a problematic, but subsequently, and with the development and strengthening and promotion of philosophical discussions about it, Life is becoming a problem.

14-5. Life is a multifaceted and multidisciplinary subject

Life is a subject that, due to its different aspects and aspects, can be the subject of research in various fields and branches, such as physics and chemistry (in terms of discussing the atoms and molecules of life), biology (in terms of the characteristics of living beings and the issue of the emergence and evolution of living beings), psychology (in terms of a healthy mental life or a life with the mental health of the individual or a good life), sociology and anthropology (in terms of examining social life in terms of its institutions and characteristics and its results and effects, cultural anthropology and sociology of everyday life), metaphysics (in terms of the nature, emergence and destiny of the soul), moral philosophy (in terms of the moral values of life and happiness), and philosophy of Life (in terms of the nature, meaning, style, pattern, originality, etc. related to life). Accordingly, life is a subject for multidisciplinary studies.

In short, it is worth mentioning that the difference between the philosophical study and investigation of Life, that is, the philosophy of Life, and most of the above fields of study is that, firstly, the approach of the philosophy of Life to Life is not merely descriptive, but also has a recommendatory aspect. That is, it also has the ability to recommend a specific type and type of Life. Second, it involves conceptual analyses and theoretical reflections. Thirdly, it deals with the analysis and description (and even recommendation) of specific aspects such as desirability, meaning, ultimate value, and purpose in Life that are not necessarily considered or prominent in other fields.

14-6. Multi-disciplinary or interdisciplinary?

The relationship of branches of study on a subject such as Life can be across and have cross-syntax (like rooms next to each other) or along, that is, be in the form of a comprehensive theory and their synergy is in the form of inclusion in a theory (like rooms in a building or a tower). Therefore, the philosophy of Life can be studied both in a multidisciplinary manner and, if possible, in an interdisciplinary manner.

14-7. Definition of the philosophy of Life

The philosophy of Life is a theoretical attempt to link philosophy with Life as an immediate matter and as it flows in its immediacy. The philosophy of Life is a theoretical attempt in a philosophical mood and in terms of philosophical language, to understand the aspects of Life based on Life itself. It is a kind of transformation of immediate, pre-reflective, non-mental, non-linguistic or non-methodical linguistic truths into a methodical, mental and linguistic reflection, that is, the reflection of the immediate truths of Life through the mediation of the mind and language and in the world of philosophy. It is the reflection of the truths and philosophical dimensions of Life in the mind and language of philosophy. It is the covering of the objectivity of life with the garment of philosophical subjectivity. It is a philosophical and distant look at a truth without distance and immediate. It is a transition from an objectivity that is not distant, ordinary, common and tangible to an epistemological and distant subjectivity. It is the discovery of philosophical categories and theoretical frameworks of Life and a kind of theorizing and philosophical formulation of Life. The basic and fundamental matter and the point of departure in the philosophy of Life is Life itself, in its flow, objectivity and fulfillment, by the individual and the collective and among ourselves. The philosophy of Life is the introduction of a theoretical impulse and theoretical projection on Life so that its theoretical horizons are opened up to the person. From this perspective, philosophy of Life is philosophizing about Life but in the form of concrete categories (as opposed to abstract categories such as Aristotelian categories) and concrete topics (as opposed to purely abstract topics); that is, discussion and examination in the form of topics and categories such as understanding/definition of Life, distinguishing the self/subject of Life from the pure subject and Dasein dissolved in the world, important levels of Life: "states", situations, conditions", interlives: Life is something between lives, interaction, language, the embodiment of Life, acting and spectating in Life, the authenticity and inauthenticity of Life, ethics, meaning, success, pattern, health, livelihood, death, happiness, pleasure, style, consumption, well-being, life as a perspective, meaning-making surprises in Life, and... .

14-8. Distinguishing the Philosophy of Life from Other Similar Studies

The intended distinctions are the comparison of the Philosophy of Life with other fields of study or similar philosophical terms. For this reason, the Philosophy of Life is distinct from fields such as self-awareness, self-knowledge, philosophical anthropology (philosophical psychology), philosophy of Life (Bergsen), philosophy of culture (Cassirer), philosophy of the city (Lefebvre), phenomenology of consciousness (Husserl), existential phenomenology (Heidegger), cultural anthropology, semiotics (Saussure), cultural and intercultural psychology, etc., and its issues and discussions do not exactly coincide with them.

14-9. I of Life/subject of Life

In the history of philosophy, two non-being-centered and being-centered currents came together in Hegel's philosophy and under the concept of dialectics. It seems that in the contemporary period, we also need a philosophy to bring together the two subject-centered and Dasein-centered currents. That philosophy can be considered the philosophy of Life.

The concept of Life can be the intersection of the two subject-centered and Dasein-centered currents. The key philosophical concept for this purpose is my Life or ego-Life or subject of Life. In this philosophical term, the I corresponds to and is inspired by (and not in accordance with) the Kantian I with characteristics such as being active, spontaneity, autonomy, self-reflection, life-making, management, etc. in relation to Life and the world of Life, and Life is inspired by and corresponds to (and not in accordance with) the being-in-the-world and groundedness of the I in Heidegger's philosophy. From this perspective, Life is a two-faced coin, that is, it is a data and a context that has a focus of activity, spontaneity, Life-making and management and occurs in that focus. This duality is contained in the terms of my Life or I of Life or the subject of Life.

14-10. Some philosophical images about Life

Some of the images and signs of the philosophy of Life in question can be considered as follows:

Every Life is an I of Life and the subject of Life. On the one hand, there is a focus as an I in it. On the other hand, this I is involved in a flow of life and through it is an I of Life. Every subject and I is a Life. I am without Life if it is not in connection with Life. And Life without I is either every Life or Life in the general sense and therefore is not my Life! The difference between Life and the subject of Life or I of Life or my Life is that this connection of I with Life determines a specific Life and not every Life or Life in the general sense.

Every Life is a Life among. That is, it is a Life among Lives. Life is the product of other Lives and among them, and therefore cannot be cut off from them. We have no pure, separate, and isolated Life. Private Life, in the sense of Life cut off and disconnected from other Lives, is meaningless, just as private language is meaningless. We can say that we have a world of Lives.

Life is the subject of events, not phenomena. Life is a flow of events and happenings, personal, social, political, philosophical, scientific, artistic, etc. Hence, life is the subject of eventism and requires eventology rather than phenomenalism (Hume) or phenomenology (Husserl and Heidegger). Events can be joined together in terms of meanings, ends, values, etc. and emerge from multiplicity.

Life is a texture, not an essence or existence or essence or... Life occurs continuously and events are intertwined according to meanings and values, etc., and a texture (homogeneous or heterogeneous or semi-homogeneous) called Life is formed. In this sense, Life is a texture that is being woven.

Life is embodied. Life occurs through and through the body. The Lived and Living body does not simply mean the scientific body. The embodiedness of Life is the result of the sum of scientific (physical, physiological, biological, mathematical, etc.) and non-scientific (philosophical, artistic, moral, legal, spiritual, etc.) actions in a center called the body. The body is the center of scientific and non-scientific (and not supernatural) events of Life.

Everything that happens in Life enters Life (my Life) and is woven into it and forms a small or large part of it. All thoughts, words, states, actions, works, incidents, experiences, exercises, etc. enter the context of Life.

The world is understood and interpreted through the context of life. Our perspective on the world is our life.

Conclusion

After Kant and especially Hegel, criticism found its way into the meaning of philosophy and the world of philosophy, and even penetrated its depths, as if it had become its constituent. But alongside it and gradually, the concept of the future also became important for philosophy and philosophizing when both philosophers spoke of the future of metaphysics and philosophy. And today, both criticism and futurism are synonymous with philosophy and philosophizing. Today, with the birth of every philosophical or philosophical issue and theory, the question of whether or not there is a future or whether or not it is a philosophy of the future is also raised. Today, it is expected that the world of philosophy will also guess the philosophical horizon of the future within its own limits and open its way towards it. Philosophy is responsible for reflecting, analyzing, and describing the issues of the present and the future. That is why, alongside non-philosophical future studies, philosophical future studies are also expected to be addressed. Futures studies and philosophical future understanding are based on research in objective and subjective fields (philosophical ideas) to obtain philosophical guesses about the philosophical future. This article sought to present guesses for the future of philosophy by proposing three stages.

From the perspective of this article, in order to understand the future of philosophy, in the first stage, that is, in the position of analysis, we must pay attention to the theoretical and philosophical foundations (basic concepts and principles) and our own assumptions, starting points and expectations. This stage was responsible for analyzing, explaining and distinguishing between the concepts and principles governing a philosophical future study and determining the path by proposing topics such as: the meaning of the future of philosophy, the meaning and types of future studies, the relationship of the future with the past and the present, the distinction of future studies from futurism and finitism, the meaning of philosophy and the distinction between the problem and the theory and the philosophical branch in it, the teachings and tendencies in philosophy, the history of philosophy, and...

In the second stage, the stage of explanation and prediction, the article was responsible for discovering the specific direction of the course of contemporary philosophy through the study of specific fields and philosophical debates and issues or philosophical background. The historical study of philosophical issues, debates and branches shows that the subject of Life has gradually emerged as a philosophical concept during three historical periods, namely the period of neglect, attention and presence, and with its presence in the field of philosophical research, it is being raised as a philosophical branch.

To be more precise, the history of philosophy in its initial period at this stage (the period of neglect of life) was concerned with topics such as the world, material matter, becoming, stability, focus, etc. Then a limited turn from sophism to anthropology, of course in its social sense or social or customary anthropology, occurred and reached the level of moral anthropology with Socrates. Subsequently, metaphysical anthropology was established on

the axis of the example of man with Plato and the natural universal of man, as well as philosophical psychology with Aristotle. Then, moral anthropology gained breadth and depth with Epicurus, the Cynics, and the Stoics. While the discussions of abstract and concrete classical anthropology had a more or less tangible relationship with Life, Life itself was not yet considered a philosophical concept or an independent subject for philosophy. The emergence of the subjectivity movement and the projection of man as a subject marked the modern abstract anthropology movement with Descartes, Kant, Fichte, and Hegel. Subsequently, the modern concrete anthropology movement took shape with Schopenhauer, Kierkegaard, Nietzsche, and Marx. However, the concrete anthropology of the 19th century is considered only as a background and a suitable threshold for paying attention to the subjectivity of Life for philosophy.

It is in the second period of the second stage (the period of attention) that a special and tangible attention to the issue of Life is formed through topics, discussions, and fundamental theories related to life, namely by proposing topics such as: Wilhelm Dilthey's idea of the human world, Cassirer's philosophy of culture, Husserl's bioworld, followed by Heidegger's Dasein and Merleau-Ponty's embodied subject, and in parallel with them, the issue of conventional understanding in J.E. Moore and conventional language and the form of Life in Wittgenstein. But in this same stage, we are mainly dealing with the element of attention and attention to Life, and not necessarily its independent subjectivity for philosophizing!

In the third period of the second stage (the period of presence), considering the recent contexts and backgrounds and considering the philosophical activities that have taken place in recent decades, Life is gradually raised as a rich and fruitful philosophical concept, and we are witnessing its elevation to the level of an independent philosophical branch called the philosophy of Life.

Finally, in the third stage (the proposal stage), after determining the future direction of philosophy based on the subjectivity and independent issue of Life for it, the article, taking into account the specific philosophical contexts and background in the last two centuries, seeks to present a scheme and perspective of a possible philosophy of Life for the future.

With this description, the article's opinion is that the future direction of philosophy is focused on the formation of a general branch entitled philosophy of Life and its consolidation stage. Of course, philosophy of Life contains philosophies of Life within itself, that is, it includes numerous and diverse theories and reflections on Life. But the main direction of any philosophy of Life is focused on drawing a philosophy of Life for an I involved in Life or the philosophy of my Life.

References

- Asghari, M. (2010). *An introduction to contemporary Western philosophies (from Husserl to Rorty)*. Tehran, Institute for Humanities and Cultural Studies. (in Persian)
- Avani, G. (Ed.). (2010). *Philosophical dictionary*. Tehran, Institute for Research on Wisdom and Philosophy. (in Persian)
- Badiou, A., & Žižek, S. (2014). *Philosophy in the present age* (J. Mahmoudi, Trans.). Tehran, Naqsh-e-Negar. (Original work published 2004). (in Persian)
- Bikol, S. (2016). *In the Existentialist Café* (H. Dehghan, Trans.). Tehran, Payam-e Emrooz. (in Persian)

- Bonke, M. (2016). *Philosophical Dictionary* (A. A. Ghasemi, Trans.). Tehran, Akhtaran. (in Persian)
- Bontempo, C. J., & Odell, S. J. (2006). *Philosophy according to philosophers* (M. Oliya, Trans.). Tehran, Qognoos. (in Persian)
- Borchert, D. M. (Ed.). (1996). *The encyclopedia of philosophy: Supplement*. Macmillan.
- Edmonds, D., & Warburton, N. (2016). *Let's go philosophy* (M. M. Amini, Trans.). Tehran, Kargadan. (in Persian)
- Edwards, P. (Ed.). (1969). *The encyclopedia of philosophy* (Vols. 5–6). Macmillan.
- Feuerbach, L. (2009). *Principles of the philosophy of the future* (A. Jazdi, Trans.). Tehran, Cheshmeh. (in Persian)
- Fichte, J. G. (2016). *Foundation for the comprehensive teaching of knowledge* (M. Hosseini, Trans.). Tehran, Hekmat. (in Persian)
- Frey, L. (2016). *Philosophical guide to living* (A. Khakbaz, Trans.). Tehran, Farhang Nashr-e No. (in Persian)
- Fukuyama, F. (2014). *The end of history and the last man* (A. Arabi & Z. Arabi, Trans.). Tehran, Sokhankadeh. (in Persian)
- Gadamer, H.-G. (2015). *Mystery and health* (N. Tajik Neshatiyeh, Trans.). Tehran, Rouzgar-e No. (in Persian)
- Hegel, G. W. F. (2008). *History of philosophy* (Vol. 1, Z. Jabali, Trans.). Tehran, Shafiei. (in Persian)
- Hegel, G. W. F. (2010). *History of philosophy* (Vol. 3, Z. Jabali, Trans.). Tehran, Shafiei. (in Persian)
- Heidegger, M. (2010). *Being and time* (A. Rashidian, Trans.). Tehran, Ney. (in Persian)
- Hume, D. (2016a). *A treatise of human nature: Book one* (J. Peykani, Trans.). Tehran, Qoqnos. (in Persian)
- Hume, D. (2016b). *An inquiry into human understanding* (K. Lajvardi, Trans.). Tehran, Markaz Publishing House. (in Persian)
- Husserl, E. (2025). *The crisis of European sciences and transcendental phenomenology* (T. Jaber, Trans.). Tehran, Qoqnos. (in Persian)
- Jaeger, W. (1997). *Paideia: The ideals of Greek culture* (Vol. 1, M. H. Lotfi, Trans.). Tehran, Kharazmi. (in Persian)
- Kant, I. (2005). *Prolegomena to any future metaphysics* (G. Haddad Adel, Trans.). Tehran, University Publishing Center. (in Persian)
- Lalande, A. (1998). *Scientific and critical culture of philosophy* (G. Vasigh, Trans.). Tehran, Ferdowsi Publishing Institute of Iran. (in Persian)
- Lehman, O. (Ed.). (1998). *The future of philosophy: Towards the 21st century*. Routledge.
- Lehman, O. (2002). *The future of philosophy* (D. Qarayagh Zandi & M. B. Ali, Trans.). Tehran, Dadar Publishing. (in Persian)
- Mardukhi, B. (2012). *Methodology of futures studies*. Tehran, Ney. (in Persian)
- Mead, G. H. (2014). *Philosophy now* (H. Khayati, Trans.). Tehran, Ban Publishing. (in Persian)
- Moradkhani, A. (2013). *The end of history in the view of modern and postmodern philosophers*. Tehran, Institute for Humanities and Cultural Studies. (in Persian)
- Omid, M. (2021). *Philosophy of the Corona crisis*. Tehran, Sumer. (in Persian)
- Popper, K. R. (2025). *Quantum theory and the schism in physics* (R. Jabbari, Trans.). Tehran, Publishing Company. (in Persian)
- Rattal, M. (Ed.). (2019). *Religion after metaphysics* (R. Dehghani, Trans.). Tehran, Qognoos. (in Persian)
- Rorty, R., & Vattimo, G. (2015). *The future of religion and God in Christianity* (K. Hosseinzadeh & N. Nasiri, Trans.). Tehran, Alam. (in Persian)
- Ross, D. (2018). *Aristotle* (M. Ghavam Safari, Trans.). Tehran, Fekr-e Rooz. (in Persian)
- Tesler, E. (2016). *General history of Greek philosophy* (H. Fathi, Trans.). Tehran, Hekmat. (in Persian)
- Weiss, J.-M. (2018). *Heidegger's dictionary* (S. Oliyai, Trans.). Tehran, Qoqnos. (in Persian)
- Zakerzadeh, A. (2009). *Hegel's philosophy*. Tehran, Elham. (in Persian)
- Zeimaran, M. (2010). *Philosophy between the present and the future*. Tehran, Payan Publishing. (in Persian)