Ockham's Razor and the Deductive Process: Simplifying Assumptions for Robust Reasoning

B.S.M. Mendis

Department of Secondary and Tertiary Education, Faculty of Education, The Open University of Sri Lanka, Nawala, Nugegoda, Sri Lanka

DOI: https://doi.org/10.51244/IJRSI.2026.1307000189

Received: 24 July 2026; Accepted: 29 July 2026; Published: 06 August 2026

ABSTRACT

Ockham's Razor, commonly expressed as the principle that entities should not be multiplied beyond necessity, has remained one of the most influential methodological principles in philosophy, science, and logical reasoning. This paper critically examines the relationship between Ockham's Razor and the deductive process, arguing that the principle functions not merely as a heuristic for theory selection but also as an epistemic guide that strengthens deductive reasoning by eliminating unnecessary assumptions. Drawing upon the philosophical writings of William of Ockham and contemporary scholarship in logic and philosophy of science, the study employs qualitative philosophical analysis to investigate the historical development, conceptual foundations, and practical applications of the Razor. The discussion demonstrates that while Ockham's Razor does not determine the truth of a conclusion, it enhances the coherence, clarity, and explanatory power of deductive arguments by favouring logically economical premises. The paper further explores the significance of the Razor in scientific model construction, hypothesis evaluation, artificial intelligence, and interdisciplinary research, highlighting both its strengths and its limitations. It concludes that Ockham's Razor remains an indispensable methodological principle for robust reasoning, encouraging intellectual discipline through conceptual simplicity without sacrificing explanatory adequacy. The study demonstrates that Ockham's Razor continues to provide a valuable methodological framework for philosophical inquiry, scientific reasoning, and contemporary computational research.

Keywords - William of Ockham; Ockham's Razor; Deductive Reasoning; Logical Parsimony; Philosophy of Science

INTRODUCTION

The pursuit of simplicity has long occupied a central place in philosophical inquiry and scientific investigation. Throughout Western intellectual history, philosophers have sought principles that distinguish essential explanations from unnecessary complexity (Borowski 2026). Among these principles, Ockham's Razor has become one of the most enduring and influential. It is commonly summarized by the maxim *entia non sunt multiplicanda praeter necessitatem* (entities should not be multiplied beyond necessity). The principle favors explanations that use the fewest assumptions (Sober 2015: 9-12). These assumptions must remain sufficient to explain the available evidence. William of Ockham never expressed this formulation verbatim. Nevertheless, it accurately reflects the methodological spirit of his philosophical writings. It has become a foundational heuristic in philosophy, science, and logic (Maurer 1999: 297).

The philosophical roots of explanatory economy extend well beyond the fourteenth century. Elements of methodological simplicity appear in Aristotle's *Posterior Analytics*. Aristotle emphasized demonstration, causality, and scientific explanation through necessary causes. He rejected the unnecessary multiplication of explanatory principles (Wallace 1981: 53-54). During the medieval period, Scholastic philosophers inherited and refined Aristotelian logic within a Christian intellectual framework. Their method emphasized rigorous dialectical reasoning, conceptual precision, and systematic analysis of competing arguments (Wallace 1981: 22-23).

ISSN No. 2321-2705 | DOI: 10.51244/IJRSI |Volume XIII Issue VII July 2026

The philosophical importance of this tradition extends beyond its historical development. The principle of explanatory economy has continued to influence debates concerning rational explanation, scientific methodology, and logical analysis across diverse disciplines. Understanding these historical foundations therefore provides an essential framework for appreciating why Ockham's methodological insights continue to shape contemporary discussions of deductive reasoning, theory selection, and computational modelling.

Within this intellectual environment, William of Ockham (1287–1347) developed a distinctive preference for ontological economy (Leff 1977: 77). He was a Franciscan theologian and philosopher. Ockham did not present simplicity as an absolute rule. Instead, he argued that unnecessary entities and assumptions should be eliminated whenever simpler explanations were sufficient (Adams 1987: 46-47). His nominalist philosophy challenged the proliferation of abstract universals. It redirected philosophical inquiry toward conceptual economy and logical clarity (Maurer 1999: 6).

Ockham himself repeatedly emphasized the elimination of unnecessary explanatory assumptions. In his *Quaestiones de Virtute, Bonitate, et Voluntate*, he writes, *Pluralitas non est ponenda sine necessitate* (plurality must never be posited without necessity), expressing the methodological principle that later became known as Ockham's Razor (William of Ockham 2021: 10). Although the familiar formulation *entia non sunt multiplicanda praeter necessitatem* does not occur verbatim in his writings, this statement accurately reflects the methodological orientation that characterizes his philosophical work (William of Ockham 2021: xxvii).

Ockham's Razor subsequently developed far beyond its original medieval context. Initially employed in theological and metaphysical debates, the principle gradually became an important methodological guide (Gauch 2010: 53-54). It influenced scientific reasoning, philosophy of science, epistemology, and formal logic. Modern philosophers generally interpret Ockham's Razor as a heuristic rather than a law guaranteeing truth. It assists rational inquiry by discouraging explanatory excess. As Sober (2015: 9-12) argues, simplicity possesses epistemic value. Theories with fewer independent assumptions are often easier to test, compare, and refine. Contemporary philosophy of science also recognizes parsimony as an important criterion in theory selection (Hoefer & Smeenk 2019: 115-116). However, it must always be balanced against explanatory adequacy and empirical evidence (McFadden 2023: 9).

The significance of Ockham's Razor becomes particularly evident in deductive reasoning. Deductive arguments derive conclusions that necessarily follow from accepted premises (Lycan 1975: 226-227). Consequently, the quality of deductive reasoning depends on logical validity and careful premise construction. Superfluous assumptions often obscure logical relationships. They complicate explanatory structures and reduce argumentative transparency (Grim 1991: 82). By encouraging the elimination of unnecessary premises, Ockham's Razor strengthens deductive reasoning. It promotes greater conceptual economy and logical coherence (Sher 2012: 36-37). Nevertheless, simplicity should not be confused with oversimplification. In many philosophical and scientific contexts, additional assumptions remain indispensable for adequate explanation. These contexts include quantum mechanics, ethics, metaphysics, and complex computational systems (Cartwright et al. 2022: 6-7).

The continuing relevance of Ockham's Razor is especially apparent in contemporary scientific research and artificial intelligence. Machine learning, statistical modelling, computational inference, and algorithm design frequently employ principles related to parsimony (Muhammad Khan 2025: 68-84). These principles guide the selection of competing models. Simpler computational models often improve interpretability, reduce overfitting, and enhance predictive efficiency. However, excessive simplification may compromise accuracy when modelling highly complex phenomena (Grünwald 2004: 3, 36). Consequently, Ockham's Razor influences both philosophical methodology and modern scientific practice. Balancing simplicity with explanatory adequacy remains a central methodological concern.

Despite extensive literature on Ockham's Razor, limited attention has been given to its role in strengthening deductive reasoning. Existing scholarship often examines the principle from historical, metaphysical, or scientific perspectives (McFadden 2023: 8). Its contribution to deductive argument structure and evaluation has received less systematic analysis. Furthermore, the growing use of parsimony in artificial intelligence raises new philosophical questions. These concern the relationship between simplicity, explanatory power, and rational justification (Ippoliti 2023: 1-8). Addressing these issues offers an opportunity to reconsider the continuing significance of Ockham's methodological insights. Consequently, this study seeks to bridge this gap by integrating medieval philosophical analysis with contemporary discussions in philosophy of science, logic, and artificial intelligence, thereby offering a more comprehensive interpretation of Ockham's Razor as a methodological principle of rational inquiry.

Accordingly, this paper investigates how Ockham's Razor strengthens deductive reasoning by simplifying assumptions without sacrificing explanatory adequacy. Using qualitative historical, conceptual, and philosophical analysis, the study examines the principle's historical development. It evaluates the role of Ockham's Razor in deductive reasoning. The study also analyses its strengths, limitations, and contemporary applications in computational and artificial intelligence research. By situating Ockham's Razor within its medieval origins and modern interdisciplinary influence, this study presents a broader interpretation. It argues that the principle is not merely a preference for simplicity. Instead, it is a methodological framework promoting logical rigor, conceptual clarity, and responsible philosophical inquiry.

Unlike previous studies that primarily interpret Ockham's Razor within metaphysics or scientific theory selection, the present study argues that its most significant philosophical contribution lies in strengthening deductive reasoning through disciplined explanatory economy. In doing so, the paper provides a broader interdisciplinary framework that connects medieval philosophy with contemporary debates in logic, philosophy of science, and artificial intelligence.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This study adopts a qualitative philosophical research methodology to examine Ockham's Razor and its contribution to deductive reasoning through explanatory parsimony. Rather than using empirical or quantitative methods, the research employs historical, conceptual, and analytical approaches. These approaches are widely recognized within philosophical scholarship. The study investigates the philosophical foundations, logical implications, and contemporary relevance of Ockham's Razor. Therefore, qualitative philosophical inquiry provides the most appropriate framework. It examines the principle's development, interpretation, and application across different intellectual traditions.

The research begins with a historical-philosophical analysis of William of Ockham's intellectual context within the medieval Scholastic tradition. Primary sources include Ockham's philosophical and theological writings. These are examined alongside authoritative secondary scholarship. The analysis traces the historical emergence of the principle of parsimony. Particular attention is given to Aristotelian logic, Franciscan intellectual traditions, and medieval nominalism (Spade 1999: 27-28). These influences shaped Ockham's methodological approach. This historical analysis establishes the philosophical background needed to understand Ockham's Razor. It also explains the principle's original purpose and subsequent development (King 1999: 224-227).

The second methodological component employs conceptual analysis, a principal method of philosophical investigation. Conceptual analysis clarifies key concepts, including parsimony, simplicity, deductive reasoning, logical necessity, explanatory adequacy, and heuristic methodology. Rather than treating these concepts as interchangeable, the study distinguishes their philosophical functions. It examines how they contribute to sound deductive arguments. This approach clarifies the methodological role of Ockham's Razor. It moves beyond the popular interpretation of the principle as merely "the simplest explanation".

The study further employs analytical and argumentative methods to evaluate competing philosophical interpretations of Ockham's Razor. The analysis compares medieval philosophers, contemporary philosophers of science, and modern logicians. It examines their views on simplicity and explanatory power. Areas of agreement and disagreement are critically examined. The analysis determines whether Ockham's Razor is a logical principle, an epistemic guideline, or a methodological heuristic. Through comparative philosophical analysis, the study identifies the strengths and limitations of parsimony in deductive reasoning.

A comparative case analysis demonstrates the practical application of Ockham's Razor across different disciplines. Illustrative examples are drawn from philosophy of science, scientific theory construction, artificial intelligence, machine learning, and logical inference. These examples are philosophical illustrations rather than empirical case studies. They demonstrate how explanatory economy influences theory selection, hypothesis formation, and algorithmic design. The comparison also shows that simplicity often enhances explanatory clarity. However, different disciplines require varying degrees of theoretical complexity (Grünwald 2004). The required complexity depends on the nature of the subject under investigation.

To ensure analytical balance, the study critically evaluates alternative perspectives. Particular attention is given to criticisms that excessive reliance on simplicity may produce reductionism. Such reliance may also overlook essential explanatory variables. Discussions in quantum physics, metaphysics, ethics, and philosophy of science are examined. They illustrate situations where explanatory adequacy requires greater theoretical complexity (Cartwright et al. 2022). This critical perspective prevents an overly simplistic interpretation of Ockham's Razor. It also situates the principle within broader debates on scientific realism, epistemic justification, and rational explanation.

The research relies primarily on documentary analysis. It draws upon peer-reviewed journal articles, scholarly monographs, critical editions of William of Ockham's writings, and contemporary philosophical studies. These studies include philosophy, logic, philosophy of science, and artificial intelligence. Sources were selected for scholarly authority, relevance to the research objectives, and contribution to discussions of explanatory simplicity. Classical studies by Adams (1987), Maurer (1999), Sober (2015), King (2001), and Panaccio (2019) provide the main theoretical foundation. Recent interdisciplinary research further strengthens the analysis. Because the study is interpretive rather than empirical, its conclusions depend upon philosophical analysis of primary and secondary sources rather than experimental verification.

Finally, the findings are synthesized through philosophical argumentation. The synthesis integrates historical interpretation, conceptual clarification, logical analysis, and contemporary applications. Together, they provide a coherent evaluation of Ockham's Razor. Rather than seeking empirical verification, the study demonstrates the continuing philosophical significance of explanatory parsimony. It presents parsimony as a methodological principle that strengthens deductive reasoning. The study also recognizes the importance of contextual judgment in complex fields of inquiry.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Ockham's Razor has been discussed extensively for more than seven centuries. It has generated scholarship in medieval philosophy, logic, epistemology, philosophy of science, and artificial intelligence. Scholars generally acknowledge its significance as a principle of explanatory parsimony. However, they differ in interpreting its philosophical status, methodological function, and practical applications. Some regard Ockham's Razor as an ontological principle that minimizes unnecessary entities. Others interpret it as an epistemological or methodological heuristic guiding rational inquiry without guaranteeing truth. This literature review critically examines these perspectives through the historical development of Ockham's Razor. It also explores the principle's role in parsimony, deductive reasoning, scientific methodology, and artificial intelligence. The review further examines major criticisms surrounding its use. This thematic analysis identifies the research gap addressed by the present study.

The Historical Development of Ockham's Razor

The intellectual origins of Ockham's Razor are deeply rooted in the medieval Scholastic tradition. Philosophical inquiry sought to reconcile Aristotelian logic with Christian theology. The famous maxim *entia non sunt multiplicanda praeter necessitatem* is traditionally associated with William of Ockham. It means "entities should not be multiplied beyond necessity (Schaffer 2014: 645)."[1] However, scholars generally agree that the exact

[1] Schaffer, J. (2014). What Not to Multiply Without Necessity. *Australasian Journal of Philosophy*, *93*(4), 644–664. https://doi.org/10.1080/00048402.2014.992447 - In Ockham's own writings, one instead finds maxims such as *Numquam ponenda est pluralitas sine necessitate* (Plurality should never be posited without necessity). As Jonathan Schaffer observes, the well-known formulation *Entia non sunt multiplicanda praeter necessitatem* (Entities are not to be multiplied without necessity) does not appear in Ockham's works. Rather, it was first stated by John Punch in 1639, while the English expression "Ockham's razor" was introduced by William Hamilton in 1852.

phrase does not appear in his surviving writings. Instead, it emerged as a concise summary of Ockham's preference for explanatory economy. This preference appears consistently throughout his philosophical works (Adams 1987: XV-XVIII).

William of Ockham (1287–1347) was an English Franciscan philosopher and theologian. He consistently defended methodological economy throughout his philosophical writings. In the *Summa Logicae*, he maintains that " *Frustra fit per plura quod potest fieri per pauciora* (It is futile to do with more what can be done with fewer), emphasizing that philosophical explanation should avoid unnecessary conceptual multiplication (William of Ockham 2011: 11).[2] Although expressed in different forms throughout his writings, this methodological commitment became the foundation of the principle of parsimony later designated as Ockham's Razor. He developed the principle during debates on universals, metaphysics, and theological explanation. Rejecting elaborate metaphysical systems, Ockham favored explanations with fewer ontological commitments (Thorndike 1975: 195-197). Simpler explanations were preferred whenever they adequately explained observable reality. This position became a defining feature of medieval nominalism. It also marked a significant shift toward conceptual economy within Scholastic philosophy (King, 1999: 227–244).

However, Ockham's methodological preference did not emerge in isolation. Aristotle had already emphasized explanatory economy through scientific demonstration in the *Posterior Analytics (*Schaffer 2014: 244-245). Genuine knowledge depended on identifying necessary causes rather than multiplying explanatory principles. Medieval philosophers inherited this Aristotelian framework. They interpreted it within Christian theological discourse. Ockham's originality lay not in inventing simplicity itself. Instead, he systematically applied it as a criterion for philosophical analysis (Thorburn 1918: 350). Consequently, modern scholars increasingly view Ockham's Razor as the culmination of a broader intellectual tradition. They do not regard it as a completely novel philosophical invention (Panaccio 2023: 47-52).

Ockham's Razor as a Principle of Philosophical Parsimony

One central debate concerns the philosophical status of Ockham's Razor. Some scholars regard it as an ontological principle. Others interpret it as an epistemological or methodological guideline (Klima 1999: 134-135).

Maurer (1999: 215) argues that Ockham's philosophy consistently promotes explanatory economy. It rejects unnecessary metaphysical entities without sacrificing logical coherence. Adams (1987: 24) similarly argues that Ockham did not value simplicity for its own sake. Instead, he emphasized explanatory sufficiency based on rational justification.

Elliott Sober (2015: 61-63) extends this discussion by distinguishing simplicity from truth. According to Sober, Ockham's Razor does not claim that simpler theories are inherently true. Instead, simplicity functions as a methodological preference. Theories with fewer independent assumptions are generally easier to explain and empirically evaluate. In this interpretation, parsimony becomes an epistemic virtue rather than an ontological guarantee.

Kelly (2007: 225-228) reaches a similar conclusion. He argues that simplicity supports scientific inquiry by reducing unnecessary theoretical complexity. It also improves hypothesis testing. Together, these scholars show that Ockham's Razor primarily functions as a methodological principle. It guides rational inquiry rather than serving as an infallible criterion of truth.

Ockham's Razor and Deductive Reasoning

The relationship between Ockham's Razor and deductive reasoning has received less attention than its application in scientific methodology. Nevertheless, several philosophers have examined how explanatory economy contributes to logical analysis and argument construction.

[2] William of Ockham. (2011). *Summa of Logic* (p. 11; P. V. Spade, Trans.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

ISSN No. 2321-2705 | DOI: 10.51244/IJRSI |Volume XIII Issue VII July 2026

Grim (1988: 73-76) argues that deductive reasoning gains greater logical transparency when unnecessary premises are removed. According to his concept of the "economy of premises," fewer assumptions reduce opportunities for contradiction. They also strengthen logical validity. Sher (2012: 130-140) similarly argues that conceptual clarity is essential for sound deductive inference. Ambiguity in premises frequently leads to invalid conclusions.

These scholars do not treat Ockham's Razor as a formal rule of deductive logic. However, they suggest that parsimony indirectly strengthens logical rigor through careful premise selection. This interpretation extends the significance of Ockham's Razor beyond metaphysics and philosophy of science. It positions the principle as a methodological guide for rational argumentation.

Despite these contributions, few studies have systematically examined how explanatory simplicity shapes deductive reasoning. Most discussions focus on scientific explanation. This emphasis leaves an important gap concerning the philosophical relationship between parsimony and deductive inference.

Ockham's Razor in Scientific Methodology

Perhaps no field has adopted Ockham's Razor more extensively than modern science. Philosophers of science often regard explanatory simplicity as an important criterion for choosing between theories with comparable explanatory power.

Sober (2015: 268-271) argues that simpler scientific hypotheses often provide greater predictive efficiency. They reduce unnecessary theoretical assumptions. However, he carefully distinguishes simplicity from empirical confirmation. He emphasizes that evidence, not simplicity alone, ultimately determines scientific validity.

Similarly, McFadden (2023: 13) associates Ockham's Razor with Karl Popper's philosophy of falsifiability. He argues that parsimonious theories are generally easier to test and potentially falsify. Scientific progress therefore benefits from methodological simplicity. Fewer assumptions create clearer opportunities for empirical evaluation.

Nevertheless, critics caution against excessive reliance on simplicity. Cartwright et al. (2022: 6-7) argue that complex scientific phenomena often require equally complex theoretical explanations. Biological evolution, quantum mechanics, and climate science illustrate this challenge. Explanatory adequacy cannot always be achieved through the simplest available model. Consequently, contemporary philosophy of science increasingly treats Ockham's Razor as one evaluative criterion among several. It is not regarded as an absolute methodological rule.

Contemporary Applications in Artificial Intelligence

The continuing relevance of Ockham's Razor extends beyond philosophy into computational science and artificial intelligence. Modern machine learning algorithms frequently apply principles closely related to parsimony when selecting predictive models.

Grünwald (2004: 33-34) argues that simpler computational models often generalize more effectively. They reduce overfitting and improve interpretability. Likewise, Nisbet (2018: 377–391) shows that parsimonious algorithms often achieve comparable predictive performance. They also require fewer computational resources. These findings demonstrate that Ockham's methodological insights continue to influence technological innovation centuries after their formulation.

However, artificial intelligence also reveals the limitations of simplicity. Contemporary deep-learning systems often require highly complex architectures for accurate performance. These applications include natural language processing, autonomous reasoning, and image recognition. Consequently, simplicity must remain subordinate to explanatory adequacy and predictive accuracy.

Critical Evaluation and Research Gap

The literature broadly agrees that Ockham's Razor remains one of philosophy's most influential methodological principles. Nevertheless, significant differences remain concerning its interpretation, scope, and application. Medieval scholars primarily viewed the Razor as protection against unnecessary metaphysical entities. Therefore, Gernert (2009: 133-138) points out that modern philosophers increasingly interpret it as an explanatory economy that promotes heuristics in scientific reasoning.

Although extensive scholarship examines Ockham's Razor, limited research addresses its contribution to deductive reasoning. Most studies focus on its historical origins, ontological implications, or scientific applications. Few studies integrate its medieval philosophical foundations with developments in artificial intelligence and computational reasoning. McFadden (2023: 8) points out that this omission creates an important gap in the existing literature.

The present study addresses this gap by examining Ockham's Razor as a methodological framework for strengthening deductive reasoning through explanatory parsimony. It also evaluates the principle's philosophical limitations in contexts requiring theoretical complexity. By integrating medieval philosophy, logic, philosophy of science, and artificial intelligence, the study offers a broader perspective. It provides a more comprehensive account of Ockham's continuing significance than previous research.

PHILOSOPHICAL ANALYSIS: OCKHAM'S RAZOR AND THE DEDUCTIVE PROCESS

Having examined the historical development and contemporary interpretations of Ockham's Razor, this section advances the central philosophical argument of the present study. While previous scholarship has established the importance of explanatory parsimony in metaphysics and scientific methodology, comparatively less attention has been given to its contribution to the structure of deductive reasoning itself. This analysis argues that Ockham's Razor is not merely a preference for simpler explanations but a methodological principle that enhances deductive reasoning by regulating the relationship between logical necessity, explanatory adequacy, and conceptual economy. At the same time, the discussion acknowledges that the value of simplicity depends upon its ability to preserve explanatory completeness. Accordingly, the following analysis examines the philosophical significance of parsimony, its role in deductive reasoning, its limitations in complex domains of inquiry, and its continuing relevance within contemporary scientific and computational research.

Parsimony as a Principle of Deductive Reasoning

Deductive reasoning seeks to derive conclusions that follow necessarily from accepted premises. The strength of a deductive argument therefore depends not only upon its formal validity but also upon the quality and necessity of its premises (Ratner 2003: 155-156). Ockham's Razor contributes to this process by encouraging philosophers and scientists to eliminate assumptions that do not strengthen explanatory or logical force (Sober 2015: 9-11). Rather than advocating simplicity for its own sake, the principle functions as a methodological discipline that distinguishes essential premises from those that unnecessarily complicate an argument. This interpretation is consistent with the view that explanatory economy enhances rational inquiry by eliminating unnecessary theoretical commitments while preserving logical sufficiency (Panaccio, 2019: 186-187).

This understanding reflects Ockham's broader philosophical commitment to conceptual economy. Ockham's methodological commitment is evident in his repeated insistence that unnecessary explanatory entities should not be introduced where simpler conceptual analysis is sufficient. As he states, *Pluralitas non est ponenda sine necessitate* (Plurality should never be posited without necessity), a principle that encourages philosophers to justify every additional explanatory assumption (William of Ockham 2021: 10). Within deductive reasoning, this methodological discipline promotes logically economical premises without compromising explanatory adequacy. Within his nominalist framework, unnecessary universals and abstract entities were regarded as philosophically unjustified unless supported by compelling reasons (Adams 1987: 73-74). Consequently, the Razor promotes a disciplined form of reasoning in which explanatory adequacy is achieved with the minimum number of assumptions required by the evidence. Ockham's nominalist methodology has been widely interpreted

ISSN No. 2321-2705 | DOI: 10.51244/IJRSI |Volume XIII Issue VII July 2026

as emphasizing conceptual precision and ontological restraint rather than indiscriminate simplification (Adams 1999: 262-263). Such methodological restraint improves deductive arguments by reducing ambiguity, limiting opportunities for contradiction, and increasing logical transparency.

Modern philosophy of science similarly recognizes that deductive arguments become more robust when their premises are carefully justified rather than unnecessarily multiplied. Simpler arguments are generally easier to evaluate, replicate, and challenge through rational criticism (Novaes 2020: 10). Nevertheless, simplicity does not replace logical validity; rather, it complements validity by encouraging the construction of arguments that are both coherent and epistemically responsible. In this sense, Ockham's Razor serves as an important methodological guide rather than an infallible rule of deduction.

Consider the following deductive argument:

Premise 1: All mammals are warm-blooded.
Premise 2: Dolphins are mammals.
Conclusion: Therefore, dolphins are warm-blooded.

Logical Economy and Explanatory Adequacy

One of the most significant philosophical contributions of Ockham's Razor lies in its ability to balance logical economy with explanatory adequacy. Philosophers of science increasingly argue that explanatory adequacy should remain the primary criterion in theory evaluation, while simplicity functions as a secondary methodological virtue (Sober 2015: 272-273). Although these concepts are closely related, they are not identical. Logical economy concerns the efficient organization of premises, whereas explanatory adequacy concerns the ability of an argument or theory to account satisfactorily for the phenomenon under investigation (Kelly 2007: 226-227). An explanation may be logically economical yet insufficiently comprehensive, just as a highly detailed explanation may sacrifice clarity through unnecessary complexity.

The principle of parsimony therefore requires careful philosophical judgment. Elliott Sober (2015: 97-101) argues that simplicity should never be regarded as evidence of truth in itself. Instead, simpler explanations are methodologically preferable only when they explain the available evidence as effectively as more complicated alternatives. This distinction is crucial because it prevents the misunderstanding that Ockham's Razor demands the simplest possible explanation regardless of explanatory power (Cunff 2019).

Within deductive reasoning, logical economy enables philosophers to identify the premises that genuinely contribute to the conclusion while removing those that merely repeat or obscure the argument (Grünwald 2004: 69). The resulting arguments are more transparent, internally consistent, and logically persuasive. Similar conclusions have been reached in contemporary discussions of scientific reasoning and theory selection, where parsimony contributes to explanatory efficiency without determining truth independently (McFadden 2023: 11). Consequently, explanatory economy strengthens philosophical inquiry not by reducing intellectual depth but by eliminating conceptual redundancy that distracts from the essential logical structure.

Ontological and Methodological Simplicity

A sophisticated understanding of Ockham's Razor requires distinguishing between ontological and methodological simplicity. Although closely related, they represent different dimensions of explanatory economy. These dimensions have been interpreted differently throughout the history of philosophy. Clarifying this distinction is essential for understanding Ockham's original thought and the contemporary application of the principle.

Ontological simplicity concerns the number and nature of entities assumed within an explanatory framework (Adams, 1987: 163-164). In medieval philosophy, William of Ockham employed the principle of parsimony to challenge unnecessary abstract entities, especially in debates concerning universals. As a leading figure of nominalism, he argued that universal concepts do not possess independent existence apart from individual objects (Panaccio, 2019: 2). Therefore, explanations should avoid positing additional entities when observable individuals are sufficient to explain the phenomena under investigation. From this perspective, ontological simplicity seeks to minimize commitments to unnecessary forms of existence (Maurer, 1999: 103). It also reflects Ockham's broader concern with metaphysical economy.

Methodological simplicity, by contrast, refers to a preference for theories that rely on fewer assumptions, principles, or explanatory mechanisms. Rather than asking what exists, it examines how explanations are constructed and evaluated. Contemporary philosophy of science commonly applies Ockham's Razor in this methodological sense. Scientists often prefer theories with comparable explanatory power but fewer auxiliary hypotheses or theoretical assumptions (Sober, 2015: 58-60). Such simplicity facilitates theory comparison, empirical testing, and logical analysis. However, it does not necessarily make claims about the ultimate nature of reality (Kelly 2007: 225-228).

The distinction between these forms of simplicity is especially important. Modern applications of Ockham's Razor usually emphasize methodological rather than ontological concerns. For example, researchers in scientific modelling and artificial intelligence compare competing models using predictive efficiency, interpretability, and explanatory economy (Okasha, 2002: 82). Their objective is not to reduce the number of presumed entities Instead; they seek explanations that achieve their purpose with minimal unnecessary complexity. Methodological simplicity therefore serves as a practical criterion for rational inquiry. Ontological simplicity, by contrast, addresses questions concerning the structure of reality itself (Grünwald, 2007: 11).

Despite their differences, both forms of simplicity share a common philosophical foundation. Each seeks to eliminate unnecessary complexity and promote explanatory clarity. Nevertheless, neither should be treated as an absolute principle. A theory may be ontologically simple yet methodologically complex. Conversely, it may be methodologically elegant while requiring a rich ontology. The value of Ockham's Razor therefore lies in ensuring that every explanatory commitment is adequately justified, whether ontological or methodological. This includes both ontological and methodological commitments. Such a balanced interpretation preserves the enduring relevance of Ockham’s Razor while avoiding the misconception that simplicity alone determines philosophical or scientific truth. Rather, simplicity functions as a methodological virtue whose value depends on its contribution to explanatory adequacy, logical coherence, and rational inquiry.

The Limits of Simplicity

Although Ockham's Razor remains one of philosophy's most influential methodological principles, its application is neither universal nor unconditional. Simplicity becomes problematic whenever it sacrifices explanatory completeness (Gernert 2009: 134). Complex phenomena frequently require multiple interacting causes, and excessive reduction may produce explanations that are elegant but inadequate. This criticism has been developed particularly within contemporary philosophy of science, where scholars argue that many scientific explanations require multiple interacting causal mechanisms (Cartwright 1994: 38).

This limitation is evident within contemporary philosophy of science. Quantum mechanics, evolutionary biology, neuroscience, and climate science frequently investigate systems whose complexity cannot be fully represented through minimal assumptions alone (Kriger 2025: 67-74). Philosophers such as Nancy Cartwright argue that scientific reality often resists overly simplified theoretical models because natural phenomena involve numerous causal interactions that cannot legitimately be ignored (Cartwright 1994: 38).

A similar challenge appears within ethics and metaphysics. Human moral decision-making, for example, frequently involves competing principles, cultural contexts, and practical consequences that resist reduction to a single explanatory framework (Crombie 1962: 167-168). Likewise, metaphysical questions concerning existence, causality, and identity often require conceptual distinctions that appear complex yet remain philosophically necessary. Accordingly, explanatory complexity should be accepted whenever it provides greater theoretical coherence and empirical adequacy (Sober 2015: 61-63). Consequently, Ockham's Razor should not be interpreted as an invitation to oversimplify philosophical problems but as a reminder that every assumption included within an argument must be rationally justified.

This balanced interpretation preserves the methodological value of explanatory parsimony while acknowledging that explanatory adequacy remains the ultimate criterion of successful philosophical reasoning.

Contemporary Relevance in Scientific and Computational Reasoning

The influence of Ockham's Razor extends far beyond medieval philosophy. Contemporary scientific methodology continues to employ principles of parsimony when evaluating competing hypotheses, constructing theoretical models, and interpreting empirical evidence (Gernert 2009: 134). Researchers frequently prefer theories that explain observed phenomena through fewer assumptions because such theories are generally easier to test, refine, and falsify (Kriger 2025: 2). Nevertheless, scientific practice also recognizes that simplicity must always remain subordinate to empirical adequacy.

The growing field of artificial intelligence provides one of the clearest modern illustrations of Ockham's methodological legacy. Machine learning algorithms commonly seek models that achieve high predictive accuracy while minimizing unnecessary computational complexity (Dresp-Langley et al. 2019: 5-6). Modern computational research frequently employs parsimony as an important criterion in model selection, optimization, and hypothesis generation (Grünwald 2004: XXV). Simpler models often demonstrate greater interpretability, reduced overfitting, and improved generalization across different datasets. These characteristics closely parallel the philosophical objectives of Ockham's Razor by favouring explanatory efficiency without sacrificing predictive performance.

However, advances in deep learning also reveal the limitations of absolute simplicity. Contemporary neural networks frequently require millions of interconnected parameters to solve problems involving language, vision, and autonomous decision-making (Ekundayo & Ezugwu 2025: 17). These developments demonstrate that complexity may sometimes be indispensable for accurate explanation and prediction. Accordingly, Ockham's Razor remains relevant not because it always favours the simplest solution, but because it continually challenges researchers to justify every element of theoretical complexity (Cunff 2019). Consequently, contemporary artificial intelligence reflects the same methodological balance between simplicity and explanatory power that has characterized philosophical discussions of Ockham's Razor for centuries (McFadden 2023: 9).

From this perspective, Ockham's Razor continues to function as a living methodological principle that bridges medieval philosophy with contemporary scientific reasoning. Its enduring contribution lies in promoting intellectual discipline, conceptual clarity, and rational justification while recognizing that genuine understanding often requires a careful balance between simplicity and explanatory completeness.

Illustrative Applications of Ockham's Razor

The practical significance of Ockham's Razor especially evident when examining in scientific discovery and computational reasoning. Although the principle originated in medieval philosophical debates, its emphasis on explanatory economy continues to guide theory selection and problem-solving. Numerous examples demonstrate how explanatory parsimony support rational inquiry while preserving explanatory adequacy.

One frequently cited example is the transition from the Ptolemaic to the Copernican model of the cosmos. The Ptolemaic system explained planetary motion through a complex arrangement of epicycles, deferents, and auxiliary mechanisms. Although it accounted for many astronomical observations, the model became increasingly complex over time. Additional assumptions were introduced to preserve its explanatory power (Okasha, 2002: 22). By contrast, Nicolaus Copernicus proposed a heliocentric model with a more unified explanation of planetary motion. The early Copernican system was not immediately more accurate than its predecessor. Nevertheless, many scholars considered it methodologically superior because it reduced theoretical complexity. It also provided a more coherent explanatory framework (Sober, 2015: 12-14). This historical development illustrates how Ockham's Razor helps evaluate competing theories that explain similar observations.

A second example appears in Newtonian physics. Isaac Newton's theory of universal gravitation explained diverse phenomena through a single principle. These included planetary motion, falling of terrestrial objects, and tidal behaviour. Rather than proposing separate mechanisms, Newton formulated a unified law with broad explanatory scope (Thompson & Cuff, 2012: 11). This approach reduced theoretical fragmentation while strengthening explanatory coherence. Newtonian physics exemplifies the methodological value of parsimony. The theory increased explanatory power without multiplying unnecessary assumptions. It demonstrates that simplicity enhances scientific understanding when combined with empirical adequacy (Newton-Smith, 2003: 6-7).

Ockham's Razor also influences contemporary research and machine learning. Modern predictive models are evaluated by balancing accuracy with complexity. Models containing an excessive parameter may fit existing data exceptionally well (Bargagli Stoffi, Cevolani, & Gnecco, 2022). However, they often perform poorly on new datasets. This problem is commonly known as overfitting. Researchers therefore prefer simpler models when predictive performance is comparable. Simpler models are generally easier to interpret, test, and validate (Grünwald, 2007: 11). This preference reflects the Ockham's methodological principle. Unnecessary complexity should be avoided unless it improves explanatory or predictive success

These examples demonstrate that Ockham's Razor is more than an abstract philosophical principle. It serves as a practical guide for theory selection and rational decision-making. Whether applied to astronomy, physics, or artificial intelligence, the principle promotes explanations that balance simplicity with explanatory adequacy. However, simplicity alone is insufficient. A simpler theory is preferable only when it explains the available evidence effectively. The enduring value of Ockham's Razor therefore lies in promoting explanations that are both intellectually economical and epistemically robust.

CRITICAL DISCUSSION

The preceding analysis has demonstrated that Ockham's Razor functions as more than a medieval principle of explanatory simplicity. Rather, it serves as a methodological framework that strengthens deductive reasoning through conceptual economy, logical clarity, and epistemic discipline (Bargagli Stoffi, Cevolani & Gnecco 2022: 14, 16). However, the philosophical significance of the principle extends beyond its practical application. Its continuing relevance depends upon how simplicity is understood in relation to truth, explanatory adequacy, and rational justification. This discussion critically evaluates these broader philosophical implications by examining the strengths and limitations of Ockham's Razor and its contribution to contemporary philosophical and scientific inquiry (Saunders, Lewis & Thornhill 2023:132-134).

Simplicity and Truth: Are They Philosophically Equivalent?

One of the most persistent misconceptions surrounding Ockham's Razor is the assumption that the simplest explanation is necessarily the correct one. Although this interpretation has become widespread in both scientific and popular discourse, it represents an oversimplification of Ockham's original methodological insight. Ockham never argued that simplicity guarantees truth. Instead, he maintained that unnecessary assumptions should be avoided unless they are required for an adequate explanation (Kriger 2025: 95-101).

Modern philosophers of science support this interpretation. Elliott Sober (2015: 264-266) argues that simplicity functions as an epistemic virtue rather than as a criterion of truth. Similar interpretations are found in Kelly (2007: 226), who argues that simplicity facilitates rational theory choice without functioning as an independent source of epistemic justification. A simpler theory is preferable only when it explains the available evidence as effectively as more complex alternatives. Consequently, simplicity facilitates rational inquiry by improving the evaluation of competing hypotheses rather than determining their truth independently.

This distinction is particularly important within deductive reasoning. A deductively valid argument remains valid regardless of whether its premises are simple or complex. Ockham's Razor therefore contributes to the construction of better arguments by encouraging conceptual discipline, but it does not replace logical validity or empirical verification (Dutilh Novaes 2021). Recognizing this distinction prevents the methodological principle from becoming an unwarranted philosophical doctrine.

Ockham's Razor Beyond Medieval Nominalism

Historically, Ockham formulated his methodological principle within debates concerning universals, metaphysics, and theological explanation. Nevertheless, its philosophical significance has expanded far beyond the medieval context (Panaccio 2019: 3). Historians of medieval philosophy note that Ockham's methodological insights have been progressively reinterpreted within modern philosophy of science, logic, and epistemology (Freddoso 1999: 329). Contemporary philosophy increasingly understands explanatory parsimony as a general methodological strategy applicable across numerous disciplines.

This transition illustrates the remarkable adaptability of Ockham's philosophical thought. Whereas medieval nominalism primarily challenged unnecessary metaphysical entities, contemporary applications extend to scientific modelling, logical analysis, economic theory, computational reasoning, and artificial intelligence (Francisco 2023: 1-10). The principle therefore represents not merely an historical doctrine but an enduring philosophical methodology that continues to influence diverse forms of rational inquiry.

At the same time, this expansion raises important philosophical questions. Can a principle develop within medieval metaphysics legitimately guide modern scientific investigation? The evidence suggests that it can, provided that explanatory simplicity remains subordinate to empirical adequacy. In this respect, Ockham's Razor functions as a methodological guide rather than a universal law, allowing it to remain relevant despite profound changes in scientific knowledge since the fourteenth century (Francisco 2023: 1-10).

Balancing Parsimony and Explanatory Adequacy

Perhaps the most significant contribution of this study is its argument that explanatory simplicity should never be pursued independently of explanatory adequacy. Throughout the history of philosophy, excessive complexity has frequently obscured rational analysis. Conversely, excessive simplification may eliminate essential explanatory factors.

This tension is particularly evident within contemporary philosophy of science. Quantum mechanics, systems biology, ecological modelling, and artificial intelligence demonstrate that many natural and computational phenomena possess levels of complexity that cannot be reduced without sacrificing explanatory accuracy (Kriger 2025: 84-94). Consequently, Ockham's Razor should not be interpreted as demanding the simplest conceivable explanation but rather the simplest explanation capable of accounting for all relevant evidence (Cunff 2019).

This balanced interpretation resolves many criticisms directed against the principle. Critics often reject Ockham's Razor because they associate it with reductionism or oversimplification (Riesch 2010: 75). However, such criticisms misunderstand the methodological purpose of parsimony. Ockham did not advocate simplicity at the expense of truth; he advocated the elimination of unnecessary complexity (Carroll 2013: 199-201). The distinction between necessary and unnecessary assumptions therefore remains central to responsible philosophical reasoning (Mesel 2012: 750-756). This balanced interpretation closely reflects Sober's (2015: 268-271) analysis of simplicity as a methodological preference rather than an ontological guarantee, while also acknowledging contemporary criticisms of reductionism (Cartwright 1999: 124).

Contemporary philosophers of science continue to debate the epistemic status of simplicity. Bas van Fraassen (1980; 87) argues that scientific theories should primarily be evaluated according to their empirical adequacy rather than their simplicity alone. Similarly, Samir Okasha (2002: 112-114) maintains that parsimony functions as one theoretical virtue among many and must be balanced against explanatory power, predictive success, and evidential support. Kevin Kelly (2007: 225-228) further contends that simplicity is valuable because it facilitates efficient inquiry rather than because it guarantees truth. These perspectives reinforce the view advanced in this study that Ockham's Razor should be understood as a methodological guide that promotes rational theory selection without functioning as an infallible criterion of correctness.

Implications for Contemporary Artificial Intelligence

One of the most significant contemporary applications of Ockham's Razor appears within artificial intelligence. Machine learning algorithms frequently employ principles closely related to explanatory economy when selecting among competing predictive models (Bargagli Stoffi, Cevolani & Gnecco 2022: 15). Simpler models often demonstrate greater interpretability, reduced computational cost, and improved generalization across new datasets. These observations correspond with recent research demonstrating that parsimonious computational models often improve interpretability while maintaining predictive performance (Kriger 2025: 1).

Nevertheless, recent developments in deep learning illustrate that computational complexity is sometimes indispensable for achieving accurate prediction, autonomous reasoning, and robust decision-making. (Ekundayo & Ezugwu 2025: 2). Large language models, autonomous reasoning systems, and neural networks achieve remarkable performance precisely because they incorporate highly sophisticated computational architectures. These developments demonstrate that simplicity alone cannot determine methodological superiority.

From a philosophical perspective, this observation reinforces the central argument of the present study. Ockham's Razor should guide the justification of theoretical complexity rather than prohibit complexity altogether. Every additional explanatory assumption should contribute meaningfully to understanding the phenomenon under investigation. Complexity is therefore philosophically acceptable when it enhances explanatory adequacy rather than merely increasing theoretical sophistication.

Contribution of the Present Study

The present study contributes to existing scholarship in several important respects. First, it reinterprets Ockham's Razor primarily as a methodological framework for strengthening deductive reasoning rather than solely as a principle of scientific theory selection or medieval nominalism (McFadden 2023: 9). Second, it integrates historical philosophy, deductive logic, philosophy of science, and artificial intelligence within a single analytical framework, thereby demonstrating the interdisciplinary relevance of explanatory parsimony (Rao Mandavilli 2025: 32). By bringing together historical philosophy and contemporary philosophy of science, the present study extends discussions initiated by Adams (1987: XVI-XVII), Maurer (1999: 377-380), and Sober (2015: 286-290), while incorporating recent developments in computational reasoning. Third, the study emphasizes the philosophical balance between simplicity and explanatory adequacy, arguing that neither should be considered independently of the other.

This interpretation extends previous scholarship by showing that Ockham's Razor is not simply a historical doctrine inherited from medieval Scholasticism but an enduring methodological principle capable of informing contemporary philosophical inquiry. Its value lies not in reducing every explanation to its simplest form but in cultivating intellectual discipline, logical precision, and rational justification throughout the process of deductive reasoning.

Future Directions for Philosophical Research

Although this study has focused primarily on deductive reasoning, future philosophical research could explore the role of Ockham's Razor within inductive reasoning, abductive inference, Bayesian epistemology, explainable artificial intelligence, and computational ethics (Abe 2025: 3-17). Comparative studies involving other medieval thinkers, such as Thomas Aquinas, John Duns Scotus, and Albertus Magnus, may also provide valuable insights into the development of methodological reasoning during the Scholastic period (Gracia & Newton 2006). Such investigations would further illuminate the continuing contribution of medieval philosophy to contemporary debates concerning rationality, scientific explanation, and technological innovation.

CONCLUSION

The present study reflects Ockham's methodological commitment that "plurality should never be posited without necessity," a principle that continues to guide rational inquiry across philosophy, science, and computational research. Ockham's Razor has remained one of the most influential methodological principles in the history of philosophy because it offers a disciplined approach to rational inquiry based on explanatory economy and conceptual clarity. This interpretation is consistent with both medieval scholarship on Ockham (Adams 1987: XVI-XVII; Maurer 1999: 377-380) and contemporary analyses of explanatory parsimony in scientific reasoning (Sober 2015: 286-290). This study has examined the historical origins of the principle within medieval Scholasticism and demonstrated its continuing relevance to deductive reasoning, philosophy of science, and contemporary computational research. Through qualitative philosophical analysis, the paper has argued that Ockham's Razor should not be understood merely as a preference for the simplest explanation, but as a methodological framework that encourages the elimination of unnecessary assumptions while preserving explanatory adequacy and logical coherence.

The analysis has shown that explanatory parsimony strengthens deductive reasoning by improving the organization of premises, enhancing conceptual precision, and reducing unnecessary complexity within philosophical arguments. At the same time, the study has emphasized that simplicity cannot be regarded as an independent criterion of truth. Rather, its philosophical value depends upon its capacity to support explanations that remain logically valid, empirically adequate, and intellectually responsible. Consequently, Ockham's Razor functions not as an inflexible rule but as a heuristic principle requiring careful contextual judgment in different fields of inquiry.

The study has further demonstrated that the influence of Ockham's Razor extends well beyond its medieval origins. Its methodological insights continue to shape contemporary philosophy of science, scientific theory construction, and artificial intelligence, where the balance between explanatory simplicity and predictive accuracy remains a central concern. Recent studies in philosophy of science and computational modelling continue to demonstrate the enduring methodological value of explanatory economy (Bargagli Stoffi, Cevolani & Gnecco 2022: 15). Although modern computational systems often require considerable theoretical complexity, the principle of parsimony continues to provide an essential criterion for evaluating whether such complexity is genuinely necessary. In this respect, Ockham's Razor remains an indispensable guide for both philosophical reasoning and scientific investigation.

A significant contribution of this paper lies in reinterpreting Ockham's Razor as a methodological principle that strengthens deductive reasoning rather than viewing it solely as a historical doctrine of medieval nominalism or a tool for scientific model selection. By integrating perspectives from medieval philosophy, logic, philosophy of science, and artificial intelligence, the study has presented a broader understanding of explanatory parsimony as a unifying principle of rational inquiry. This interdisciplinary perspective demonstrates that Ockham's methodological insights continue to provide valuable guidance for contemporary philosophical reflection and scientific practice.

Nevertheless, this study has certain limitations. Its primary emphasis has been on deductive reasoning and qualitative philosophical analysis, without examining empirical applications of parsimony in detail. Future research may extend this investigation by exploring the role of Ockham's Razor in inductive reasoning, abductive inference, Bayesian epistemology, explainable artificial intelligence, computational ethics, and decision theory. Comparative studies involving other medieval thinkers, including Albertus Magnus, Thomas Aquinas, and John Duns Scotus, may also contribute to a deeper understanding of the development of methodological reasoning within the Scholastic tradition.

In conclusion, Ockham's Razor continues to demonstrate remarkable philosophical vitality more than seven centuries after its formulation. Its enduring significance lies not simply in advocating simplicity but in promoting intellectual discipline, conceptual precision, and rational justification. When applied with appropriate philosophical judgment, explanatory parsimony enables scholars to construct arguments that are both logically rigorous and sufficiently comprehensive to account for the complexity of reality. For this reason, Ockham's Razor remains an indispensable methodological principle that continues to inform philosophical inquiry, scientific reasoning, and interdisciplinary research in the twenty-first century. As contemporary scholarship increasingly recognizes, the lasting significance of Ockham's Razor lies not in reducing complexity for its own sake but in promoting explanations that are simultaneously rational, coherent, and sufficiently comprehensive. In this way, Ockham's Razor continues to demonstrate that disciplined simplicity, when balanced with explanatory adequacy, remains an enduring foundation of philosophical reasoning and scientific inquiry.

REFERENCES

1. Abe, H., Ando, R., Morishita, T., Ozeki, K., Mineshima, K., & Okada, M. (2025). Abductive Reasoning with Syllogistic Forms in Large Language Models. In J. Baratgin, B. Jacquet, E. Brochier, & H. Yama

(Eds.), *Human and Artificial Rationalities. Advances in Cognition, Computation, and Consciousness*. Heidelberg, Germany: Springer Nature.

2. Adams, M. M. (1987). *William Ockham*. Notre Dame, Indiana: University of Notre Dame Press.
3. Adams, M. M. (1999). Ockham on Will, Nature, and Morality. In P. V. Spade (Ed.), *The Cambridge companion to Ockham*. Cambridge, U.K; New York: Cambridge University Press.
4. Bargagli Stoffi, F. J., Cevolani, G., & Gnecco, G. (2022). Simple Models in Complex Worlds: Occam's Razor and Statistical Learning Theory. *Minds and Machines*, *32*(1), 13–42. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11023-022-09592-z
5. Borowski, S. (2026). *The Origin and Popular Use of Occam's Razor | American Association for the Advancement of Science (AAAS)*. American Association for the Advancement of Science (AAAS). https://www.aaas.org/membership/scientia/origin-and-popular-use-occams-razor
6. Carroll, R. T. (2013). *The Critical Thinker's Dictionary: Biases, Fallacies, and Illusions and what you can do about them*. Morrisville, North Carolina: Lulu.com.
7. Cartwright, N. (1994). Mill and Menger: Ideal Elements and Stable Tendencies. In B. Hamminga & N. De Marchi (Eds.), *Idealization VI: Idealization in Economics*. Warsaw, Poland: Poznań Studies in the Philosophy of the Sciences and the Humanities.
8. Cartwright, N., Hardie, J., Montuschi, E., Soleiman, M., & Thresher, A. C. (2023). *The tangle of science: Reliability beyond method, rigidity, and objectivity*. New York: Oxford University Press.
9. Crombie, A. C. (1962). *Robert Grosseteste and the origins of experimental science*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
10. Cunff, A.-L. Le. (2019, December 4). Occam's razor fallacy: The simplest solution is not always the correct one. Retrieved July 9, 2026, from Ness Labs website: https://nesslabs.com/occams-razor
11. Dresp-Langley, B., Ekseth, O. K., Fesl, J., Gohshi, S., Kurz, M., & Sehring, H.-W. (2019). Occam's Razor for Big Data? On Detecting Quality in Large Unstructured Datasets. *Applied Sciences*, *9*(15), 1–27. https://doi.org/10.3390/app9153065
12. Dutilh Novaes, C. (2021, July 16). Argument and Argumentation (E. N. Zalta, Ed.). Retrieved July 9, 2026, from Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy website: https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/argument/
13. Ekundayo, O. S., & Ezugwu, A. E. (2025). Deep learning: Historical overview from inception to actualization, models, applications and future trends. *Applied Soft Computing*, *181*(1), 1–95. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.asoc.2025.113378
14. Francisco, A. B. (2023). Contribution of Ockham's logic to fourteenth century's philosophy. *Revista de Filosofia Aurora*, *35*(1), 1–10. https://doi.org/10.1590/2965-1557.035.e202330419
15. Freddoso, A. J. (1999). Ockham on Faith and Reason. In P. V. Spade (Ed.), *The Cambridge companion to Ockham*. Cambridge, U.K; New York: Cambridge University Press.
16. Gauch, H. G. (2010). *Scientific Method in Practice*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. Retrieved from https://archive.org/details/scientificmethod0000gauc/mode/2up?q=Razor
17. Gernert, D. (2009). Ockham's razor and its improper use. *Cognitive Systems*, *7*(2), 133–138. Retrieved from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/200493040_Ockham's_razor_and_its_improper_use
18. Gracia, J., & Newton, L. (2006, April 14). Medieval Theories of the Categories. Retrieved July 10, 2026, from Stanford.edu website: https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/medieval-categories/
19. Grim, P. (1991). *The Incomplete Universe: Totality, Knowledge, and Truth*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: MIT Press.
20. Grünwald, P. D. (2007). *The minimum description length principle*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: The MIT Press.
21. Hoefer, C., & Smeenk, C. (2019). Philosophy of the Physical Sciences. In P. Humphreys (Ed.), *The Oxford handbook of philosophy of science*. New York: Oxford University Press.
22. Ippoliti, E. (2023). Parsimony. In T. Teo (Ed.), *The Palgrave Encyclopedia of Theoretical and Philosophical Psychology*. Berlin, Germany: Springer Nature.
23. Kelly, K. T. (2007). Simplicity, Truth, and the Unending Game of Science. In S. Bold, B. Loewe, T. Rasch, & J. van Benthem (Eds.), *Foundations of the Formal Sciences V: Infinite Games*. London: College Publications.
24. King, P. (1999). Ockham's ethical theory. In P. V. Spade (Ed.), *The Cambridge companion to Ockham*. Cambridge, U.K.; New York: Cambridge University Press

25. Klima, G. (1999). Ockham's Semantics and Ontology of the Categories. In P. V. Spade (Ed.), *The Cambridge companion to Ockham*. Cambridge, U.K.; New York: Cambridge University Press.
26. Kriger, B. (2025). *Beyond Occam's razor: Why the world refuses to be simple (science and cosmos)*. Independently Published.
27. Leff, G. (1977). *William of Ockham: The metamorphosis of scholastic discourse*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
28. Lycan, W. G. (1975). Occam's Razor. *Metaphilosophy*, *6*(3/4), 223–237. Retrieved from https://www.jstor.org/stable/24435155
29. Maurer, A. A. (1999). *The philosophy of William of Ockham: In the light of its principles*. Toronto: PIMS. Retrieved from https://archive.org/details/philosophyofwill0000maur/page/n5/mode/2up?q=verbatim
30. McFadden, J. (2023). Razor sharp: The role of Occam's razor in science. *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences*, *1530*(1), 8–17. https://doi.org/10.1111/nyas.15086
31. Mesel, T. (2012). The necessary distinction between methodology and philosophical assumptions in healthcare research. *Scandinavian Journal of Caring Sciences*, *27*(3), 750–756. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1471-6712.2012.01070.x
32. Muhammad Khan, N., Baldi, I., Vittoria Chiaruttini, M., & Gregori, D. (2025). *Classical and Bayesian Statistical Approaches in Infectious Disease Data Analysis*. Cham, Switzerland: Springer Nature.
33. Newton-Smith, W. H. (2016). *The rationality of science*. Taylor & Francis.
34. Nisbet, B. (2018). *Handbook of Statistical Analysis and Data Mining Applications* (2nd ed; R. Nisbet, G. Miner, & K. Yale, Eds.). Amsterdam, Netherlands: Academic Press.
35. Novaes, C. D. (2020). The Philosophy of Deduction. In *The Dialogical Roots of Deduction Historical, Cognitive, and Philosophical Perspectives on Reasoning*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
36. Okasha, S. (2016). *Philosophy of Science: A Very Short Introduction* (2nd ed.). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
37. Panaccio, C. (2023). *Ockham's Nominalism: A Philosophical Introduction*. New York: Oxford University Press.
38. Rao Mandavilli, S. (2025). *Repurposing epistemology for the twenty-first century and beyond: A natural accompaniment for the advancement of knowledge*. Google Books.
39. Ratner, L. W. (2003). Philosophy and Logic of Physical Theory. In *non-linear theory of elasticity and optimal design: How to build safe economical machines and structures: How to build proven reliable physical theory*. Amsterdam; Boston: Elsevier.
40. Riesch, H. (2010). Simple or simplistic? Scientists" views on Occam's razor. *Theoria*, *25*(1), 75–90. https://doi.org/10.1387/theoria.489
41. Saunders, M., Lewis, P., & Thornhill, A. (2023). *Research Methods for Business Students* (9th ed.). Harlow, United Kingdom: Pearson.
42. Schaffer, J. (2014). What Not to Multiply Without Necessity. *Australasian Journal of Philosophy*, *93*(4), 644–664. https://doi.org/10.1080/00048402.2014.992447
43. Sher, G. (2012). *The bounds of logic: A generalized viewpoint*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: The MIT Press.
44. Sober, E. (2015). *Ockham's razors: A user's manual*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
45. Thompson, C. L., & Cuff, J. M. (2012). *God and Nature: A Theologian and a Scientist Conversing on the Divine Promise of Possibility*. New York: Continuum.
46. Thorburn, W. M. (1918). The Myth of Occam's razor. *Mind*, *XXVII*(3), 345–353. https://doi.org/10.1093/mind/xxvii.3.345
47. Thorndike, L. (1975). *University Records and life in the Middle Ages*. New York: Norton.
48. Wallace, W. A. (1981). *Causality and Scientific Explanation*. University Press of America.
49. William of Ockham. (2011). *Summa of Logic* (P. V. Spade, Trans.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
50. William of Ockham. (2021). *Questions on Virtue, Goodness, and the Will* (E. W. Hagedorn, Ed. & Trans.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.