The Bridging of Ancient Intuition and Modern Methodology: Anaximander's Apeiron as a Lakatosian Research Programme

Larry Ebikekeme WADA, Soalatiem Ibieneye

Faculty of Arts, Department of Philosophy, Niger Delta University, Nigeria

DOI: https://doi.org/10.68050/JAMS.2026.365

Received: 02 Sept 2026; Accepted: 03 Sept 2026; Published: 17 September 2026

ABSTRACT

This paper proffers a comparative interpretation of the cosmology of Anaximander through the methodological framework developed by Imre Lakatos in his Methodology of Scientific Research Programmes. Although Lakatos' model has been applied to several disciplines, including theology, political theory, and the social sciences, it has rarely been used to interpret early Greek cosmological thought. The study proposes that Anaximander's concept of the *apeiron* (the Boundless) may be understood as the hard core of a structured explanatory programme. Around this foundational principle, a series of cosmological, astronomical, and biological explanations function as auxiliary hypotheses comparable to the protective belt described in Lakatosian methodology. Interpreting Anaximander's system in this way highlights how his explanations of cosmic generation, celestial structure, and the origins of life form an interconnected framework guided by implicit methodological principles. By bringing Lakatosian philosophy of science into dialogue with Pre-Socratic cosmology, the article provides a new perspective on the systematic character of Anaximander's thought and contributes to broader discussions on the development of rational inquiry in early Greek philosophy.

Keywords: Ancient Philosophy, Apeiron, Auxiliary Hypotheses, Cosmology, Heuristics, Research Programmes

INTRODUCTION

The philosophy of science underwent significant transformation in the twentieth century. Karl Popper's falsificationism maintained that scientific theories must remain open to empirical refutation, yet subsequent philosophers recognized that scientific theories are rarely abandoned immediately in the face of anomalies. Imre Lakatos developed his Methodology of Scientific Research Programmes as an attempt to reconcile Popper's emphasis on rational criticism with Thomas Kuhn's historical account of paradigm change. In Lakatos' framework, scientific inquiry proceeds within research programmes consisting of a relatively stable set of core theoretical commitments surrounded by a series of revisable auxiliary hypotheses. As Lakatos explains, the fundamental assumptions of a programme are treated as methodologically "irrefutable" by its proponents, while empirical difficulties are addressed through modifications in surrounding hypotheses (Lakatos 48).

Lakatos' model has proven highly adaptable and has been applied to diverse intellectual fields including theology, Marxism, nursing science, and strategic management. Scholars have shown that the framework clarifies how theoretical systems develop through the interaction between foundational assumptions and evolving explanatory models. As one analysis notes, Lakatos' approach highlights the important role that metaphysical principles often play in guiding scientific research programmes ("From Kuhn to Lakatos to Laudan" 3). Despite the breadth of these applications, however, the model has rarely been applied to the cosmological thought of the early Greek philosophers who first attempted systematic explanations of the natural world.

This article addresses that gap by offering a Lakatosian reconstruction of the cosmology of Anaximander of Miletus, who lived approximately between 610 and 546 BCE. A member of the Milesian school and a student of Thales, Anaximander made important contributions to early Greek cosmology, geography, and biology. His central concept, the *apeiron*, traditionally translated as the Boundless or the Indefinite, has been interpreted primarily within metaphysical or historical frameworks. Yet recent scholarship suggests that Anaximander's ideas form a remarkably coherent system of explanation. Andrew Gregory, for example, argues that Anaximander's theories can be understood as mutually supportive components of a unified worldview grounded in observation and rational speculation (Gregory 15). Building on this insight, the present study proposes that Anaximander's cosmology may be interpreted as a structured explanatory programme organized around the concept of the *apeiron*.

LAKATOS' METHODOLOGY OF SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH PROGRAMMES

Lakatos developed his methodology to resolve tensions between Popperian falsificationism and Kuhnian paradigm theory. Against Popper, he argued that scientists do not and should not abandon theories upon encountering counterevidence, because all theories are born into an ocean of anomalies. Against Kuhn, he sought to preserve normative standards for evaluating scientific progress without reducing theory choice to irrational conversion. The central innovation of Lakatos' model is its reconceptualization of the unit of scientific appraisal. Rather than evaluating isolated theories, Lakatos proposed evaluating research programmes: temporal sequences of theories sharing a common core of fundamental assumptions (Lakatos 47).

These programmes possess four interrelated components. The hard core is the set of most basic theoretical principles that define the research programme. In Newtonian physics, the hard core comprised the three laws of motion and the law of universal gravitation. The protective belt surrounds the hard core and consists of auxiliary hypotheses that bear the brunt of empirical testing. When anomalies arise, scientists modify these auxiliary hypotheses to shield the hard core from refutation. As one educational resource on Lakatos explains using the example of Aristotelian cosmology, the core assumptions that the earth is motionless at the center and that all celestial motions are circular were protected for nearly two thousand years by a series of auxiliary hypotheses including epicycles, eccentrics, and equants ("Imre Lakatos: Scientific Research Programs" 3). The negative heuristic prohibits directing logical falsification at the hard core, requiring scientists to redirect critical attention toward the protective belt. The positive heuristic provides a partially articulated set of suggestions about how to develop the programme, defining problems and outlining the construction of increasingly sophisticated models. As Niaz notes in his exposition of Lakatosian methodology, the positive heuristic represents the construction of a protective belt consisting of a partially articulated set of suggestions on how to change and develop the refutable variants of the programme, thereby saving the scientist from becoming confused in the ocean of anomalies (Niaz 7).

Lakatos distinguished progressive from degenerating problem shifts. A programme exhibits a progressive problem shift when it successfully predicts novel facts not used in constructing the theory. A programme exhibits a degenerating problem shift when it merely accommodates anomalies after they arise through ad hoc adjustments. The history of science, on this view, is the history of rival research programmes competing for empirical and theoretical progress (Lakatos 86). This framework has been applied to numerous historical cases, from Copernican astronomy to Einsteinian relativity, and in recent times, planetary systems demonstrating its utility for understanding scientific change across diverse contexts (Wada 292-302).

Methodological Approach

This paper agreed to a method of **philosophical reconstruction combined with comparative conceptual analysis**. The aim is not to suggest that Anaximander consciously employed a methodology comparable to that later articulated by Imre Lakatos. Rather, Lakatos' framework is used as an interpretive tool for examining the internal structure of Anaximander's cosmological thought. By applying Lakatosian categories, the study reconstructs the organization of Anaximander's explanations in order to determine whether they exhibit patterns analogous to those found in scientific research programmes.

Lakatos' methodology is particularly suitable for this analysis because it focuses on the relationship between a stable theoretical **hard core** and a surrounding set of revisable **auxiliary hypotheses**. This structure provides a useful lens for interpreting philosophical systems organized around a central explanatory principle. Alternative approaches such as **Popper's falsificationism**, **Kuhn's paradigm theory**, and **Feyerabend's methodological pluralism** offer important insights into scientific change but provide fewer analytical tools for reconstructing the internal structure of a single explanatory framework. For this reason, Lakatos' model offers the most appropriate methodological basis for the present study.

Anaximander and the Concept of the apeiron

Anaximander of Miletus was active during the mid-sixth century BCE as a student of Thales and teacher of Anaximenes. Ancient sources attribute numerous intellectual innovations to him, including the composition of an early philosophical prose work commonly titled *On Nature*, the construction of one of the earliest maps of the inhabited world, and the development of explanations for various astronomical and meteorological phenomena. Charles Kahn's influential study of Anaximander provides a detailed examination of the surviving fragments and testimonia, demonstrating that despite the limited evidence, a reasonably coherent philosophical system can be reconstructed (Kahn 11).

Most of what is known about Anaximander's thought derives from later authors within the doxographical tradition, particularly Aristotle, Theophrastus, and Simplicius. These sources preserve both paraphrases and, in the case of Simplicius, a brief fragment widely considered to be a direct quotation from Anaximander's original text. The fragment describes the cyclical process through which things arise and return to their origin, "rendering justice and reparation to one another according to the ordering of time." Kirk, Raven, and Schofield emphasize the historical significance of this fragment as the earliest surviving piece of philosophical prose in the Western intellectual tradition (Kirk, Raven, and Schofield 100).

In recent times, researchers have further discovered the intricacies of these sources. Pavel Hobza has argued that differences between Aristotelian and Theophrastan reports reflect distinct interpretive frameworks through which later philosophers attempted to classify Anaximander's ideas. According to Hobza, Aristotle never explicitly attributes the concept of the *apeiron* to Anaximander, while Theophrastus presents it as the fundamental originating mass of the cosmos (Hobza 24). These differences highlight the interpretive challenges involved in reconstructing early Greek philosophy, although they do not undermine the central role traditionally assigned to the *apeiron* in Anaximander's cosmology.

The Hard Core: The Apeiron as First Principle

Within a Lakatosian reconstruction, Anaximander's concept of the *apeiron* can be interpreted as the hard core of his explanatory programme. In Lakatos' methodology, the hard core consists of the fundamental theoretical principles that define a research programme and are protected from direct refutation by methodological commitment (Lakatos 48). These principles provide the conceptual foundation from which other explanatory hypotheses are developed.

The *apeiron* performs precisely this foundational role in Anaximander's cosmology. It functions as the ultimate explanatory principle from which the origin, structure, and processes of the cosmos are derived. Kahn's analysis emphasizes that the concept serves as the metaphysical basis for the entire cosmological system, grounding explanations of celestial motion, meteorological phenomena, and biological generation (Kahn 158).

Anaximander's argument for the *apeiron* rests on the observation that the traditional elements such as water, air, or fire exist in continual opposition to one another. If any single element were the ultimate source of all things, it would eventually eliminate its rivals. From this reasoning Anaximander concluded that the first principle must be something boundless and indeterminate, capable of generating opposing elements without itself being exhausted. The *apeiron* is therefore described as eternal, ungenerated, and imperishable, characteristics that mark it as a trans-empirical explanatory principle rather than an empirically testable hypothesis.

The Protective Belt and Auxiliary Hypotheses

Surrounding the hard core of the apeiron is a protective belt of auxiliary hypotheses that bear the brunt of empirical testing and adjustment. These include cosmogonic hypotheses about the generative seed separating from the apeiron and producing opposites. They include astronomical hypotheses about celestial rings, their ordering by distance from earth, and eclipses as temporary blockages of openings. Geophysical hypotheses concern the cylindrical earth suspended freely at the center and its stability through equal distance from celestial rings. Biological hypotheses address the origin of animals in moisture, emergence of land animals from aquatic precursors, and human origins requiring gestation within fishlike creatures. Meteorological hypotheses explain wind, rain, lightning, and thunder through interaction of elements rather than divine agency.

The protective belt exhibits precisely the characteristics Lakatos described. It consists of refutable variants that can be modified without threatening the hard core. If astronomical observations had contradicted the ring theory, the programme could adjust by modifying ring configurations while retaining the hard core of the apeiron. As Lakatos explains using the example of Prout's programme in chemistry, a research programme can progress for decades in an ocean of anomalies, with its proponents modifying auxiliary hypotheses to accommodate counterevidence while preserving the hard core (Lakatos 53). The Ptolemaic programme similarly protected its geocentric hard core through nearly two millennia by adjusting its epicycles, eccentrics, and equants ("Imre Lakatos: Scientific Research Programs" 3). Couprie's detailed analysis of Anaximander's astronomy demonstrates how the ring theory, while speculative, was a rationally constructed model based on available observations and logical inference (Couprie 78).

Freudenthal's analysis of Anaximander's theory of opposites provides additional support for this reconstruction. Examining what he calls the "physics and metaphysics" of Anaximander's system, Freudenthal shows how the interaction of opposites generates cosmic order through a self-regulating equilibrium (Freudenthal 198). This theoretical structure aligns precisely with Lakatos' conception of a positive heuristic that generates increasingly sophisticated models across multiple domains. The theory of opposites functions as a productive research tool, generating explanations for phenomena ranging from seasonal cycles to biological generation. Gregory extends this insight, showing how Anaximander's theory of opposites provides a unified framework for understanding celestial, meteorological, and biological processes (Gregory 98).

The Positive Heuristic and Progressive Problem Shifts

The positive heuristic in Anaximander's programme is perhaps its most remarkable feature. Lakatos described the positive heuristic as a partially articulated set of suggestions on how to develop the refutable variants of the research programme. Anaximander's programme exhibits such a heuristic that can be reconstructed as a core directive to explain all natural phenomena through differentiation of opposites from a single transcendent first principle and through interaction of these opposites according to cosmic justice. The heuristic dictates a specific order of inquiry: first explain the origin of the cosmos itself, how opposites emerge from the apeiron; second explain the large scale structure of the cosmos, the earth's position, the celestial rings; third explain specific celestial phenomena, eclipses, solstices, planetary motions; fourth explain terrestrial phenomena, meteorology, geography; fifth explain living things, their origin, development, and diversity.

This problem sequence corresponds closely to the actual development of Anaximander's thought as reported in the doxography and generates a chain of ever more complicated models simulating reality. As Altuğ notes in his study of heuristic in research programmes, the heuristic can be understood as the interrogative tools that an inquirer uses to construct theories and solve problems (Altuğ 45). Anaximander's interrogative tools include questions about cosmic origins, celestial mechanics, biological generation, and meteorological phenomena, all framed within the core commitment to explanation through the apeiron and the opposites. McKirahan's survey emphasizes how this systematic approach to inquiry distinguished the Milesian philosophers from their mythological predecessors, who offered isolated explanations without any unifying framework (McKirahan 56).

The positive heuristic also anticipates anomalies and provides resources for accommodation. The special explanation for human origins, gestation within fishlike creatures, can be seen as anticipation of the anomaly posed by human infant helplessness. The programme's commitment to explaining all life through emergence from moisture encounters an apparent counterexample in humans, who seem ill suited to such an origin. The positive heuristic generates a modification of the protective belt that turns this potential anomaly into confirmation of the programme's explanatory power. Gregory's analysis of Anaximander's zoogony demonstrates how this explanation draws on empirical observation, possibly including observation of the life cycle of insects or aquatic creatures (Gregory 142). This anticipatory capacity is precisely what Lakatos identifies as a mark of progressive research programmes: they not only accommodate known facts but generate predictions about novel domains.

Evaluating progressivity, Anaximander's programme exhibits theoretical progress relative to Thales. Thales identified the archē with water but left the mechanism of cosmic generation unspecified. Anaximander's programme adds substantial empirical content: specific predictions about the earth's shape, its mode of suspension, the structure of the heavens, the origin of life, and numerous other phenomena. These are novel facts in Lakatos' sense, not used in constructing the programme's hard core but generated by its positive heuristic. Empirical corroboration, given the limitations of sixth century BCE observational capabilities, is more complex. However, as Lakatos allows, programmes may remain progressive if they continue to generate novel predictions even when some remain uncorroborated (Lakatos 92). By the standards of ancient cosmology, Anaximander's programme was strikingly progressive, initiating explanatory strategies that would characterize Western science for millennia. Kahn's assessment of Anaximander's achievement emphasizes this progressive character, noting that his system provided a framework within which subsequent Greek cosmology could develop (Kahn 203).

The Programme in Historical Context

Comparison with rival programmes clarifies the progressivity of Anaximander's programme. Mythological cosmogonies of Hesiod and the Orphic tradition offered genealogical explanations involving divine succession that could accommodate any phenomenon post hoc but generated no novel predictions. The programme of Thales, while groundbreaking, lacked the articulated positive heuristic that enabled Anaximander to extend explanation to so many domains. The programme of Anaximenes, which succeeded Anaximander's, can be seen as a modification of the protective belt replacing the apeiron with air that preserved the hard core's function while offering explanatory advantages regarding rarefaction and condensation. Kirk, Raven, and Schofield trace this development, showing how Anaximenes' modifications addressed specific difficulties in Anaximander's system while maintaining the overall structure of Milesian cosmology (Kirk, Raven, and Schofield 158). Gregory's comprehensive reassessment situates Anaximander within this broader context, showing how his theories relate to early Greek thought and in particular to conceptions of theogony and meteorology in Hesiod and Homer (Gregory 89).

The influence of Anaximander's programme extended beyond the immediate Milesian succession. Later thinkers such as Empedocles and Anaxagoras, while introducing multiple archai, preserved key elements of the Milesian approach: the commitment to naturalistic explanation, the role of opposites in cosmic processes, and the aspiration to provide unified accounts of diverse phenomena. McKirahan traces these influences, showing how the fundamental questions posed by Anaximander shaped the agenda of subsequent Greek philosophy (McKirahan 78). This long-term influence is itself evidence of the programme's progressivity, as it continued to generate new problems and solutions long after its initial formulation.

Objections and Methodological Limitations

Although the Lakatosian reconstruction of Anaximander’s cosmology provides a useful interpretive framework, several important objections must be considered. The first concerns the potential problem of historical anachronism. Applying a twentieth-century philosophy of science to a sixth-century BCE cosmological system may appear to impose modern theoretical categories upon ancient thought. Anaximander did not formulate his ideas in terms of research programmes, heuristics, or methodological rules of theory development. Nevertheless, the aim of this analysis is not to claim historical identity between Anaximander’s thought and Lakatosian methodology. Rather, Lakatos' framework is used as a conceptual tool for identifying structural patterns within Anaximander's cosmology. Lakatos himself emphasized that philosophical analyses often reconstruct the rational structure of scientific development even when historical participants did not explicitly articulate such methodological principles (Lakatos 8–10).

A second limitation arises from the fragmentary character of the evidence for early Greek philosophy. Because Anaximander's original writings have not survived, modern interpretations depend largely on later testimonies preserved by authors such as Aristotle, Theophrastus, and Simplicius. As noted earlier, these sources form part of the doxographical tradition and reflect the interpretive frameworks of later philosophical schools. Hobza's analysis of the Aristotelian and Theophrastan reports illustrates how differences between these accounts complicate attempts to reconstruct Anaximander's original doctrines (Hobza 31). Despite these challenges, careful comparison of the available testimonies allows scholars to identify the principal features of Anaximander's cosmology with reasonable confidence (Kahn 21–25).

A further limitation concerns the relationship between empirical testing and speculative explanation. Lakatos developed his methodology primarily to analyze modern scientific theories evaluated through systematic empirical investigation. Early Greek cosmology, by contrast, emerged in a context where observational tools and experimental techniques were extremely limited. As a result, many of Anaximander's cosmological proposals cannot be assessed according to the empirical standards characteristic of modern science. For this reason, Lakatosian categories such as progressive and degenerating problem shifts must be applied cautiously when interpreting ancient philosophical systems. Nevertheless, Lakatos' model remains useful because it clarifies how fundamental theoretical commitments interact with auxiliary explanatory hypotheses within a broader framework of inquiry. When applied to Anaximander's cosmology, this perspective helps illuminate the role of the *apeiron* as the organizing principle underlying the system's various explanatory models.

Implications of the Study

The present analysis broadens the scope of the methodological framework developed by Imre Lakatos by showing that it can be applied beyond the context of modern empirical science. Interpreting the cosmological thought of Anaximander through the Lakatosian model suggests that certain structural features of rational inquiry may appear even in intellectual traditions that existed before the development of experimental scientific methods. The concepts of hard core, protective belt, and heuristic guidance appear to describe patterns of organized explanation that are not limited to modern scientific practice. This observation indicates that Lakatos' framework may capture general features of theoretical inquiry that operate across different historical periods.

Another important implication concerns the relationship between metaphysical principles and empirical explanation in the development of theoretical systems. In Anaximander's cosmology, the concept of the apeiron functions as a foundational principle that supports explanations of the origin of the cosmos, the arrangement of celestial bodies, and the development of living organisms. Although the apeiron itself is not empirically observable, it performs a role similar to the hard core in a Lakatosian research programme. Around this principle, a range of explanatory hypotheses is developed and adjusted in response to observations and logical considerations. As noted by Mansoor Niaz, the positive heuristic of a research programme guides the process through which scientists construct explanations and extend their investigations into new areas (Niaz 12). A similar constructive process can be observed in Anaximander's attempt to explain different natural phenomena within a unified cosmological framework.

The study also has implications for the interpretation of early Greek philosophy. Viewing Anaximander's cosmology through a Lakatosian perspective highlights the systematic nature of his thought. His ideas appear not simply as isolated speculations but as parts of a coherent programme of inquiry that seeks to explain the structure and origin of the natural world. This perspective also clarifies the intellectual relationship between Anaximander and later thinkers within the Milesian tradition. For instance, the proposal by Anaximenes that air is the fundamental principle of the cosmos may be interpreted as a modification within the same general explanatory framework rather than a complete rejection of the earlier project.

The analysis also opens the possibility of interdisciplinary engagement. Recent work, including the cognitive study of the apeiron by Chiara Ferella, suggests that early philosophical concepts can be examined not only through historical and philosophical methods but also through insights from cognitive science and related fields. Ferella's analysis reveals how the concept operated within a semantic and ontological framework that extended beyond mere spatial infinity to encompass epistemic dimensions (Ferella 209). Such approaches may help clarify how ancient thinkers understood and used key concepts within their attempts to explain the natural world.

Finally, the present study suggests directions for further research. The Lakatosian model could be applied to other thinkers in early Greek philosophy such as Heraclitus and the philosophers associated with the Eleatic and atomist traditions. Examining these systems as competing research programmes may provide a clearer understanding of the intellectual development of early cosmology. Comparisons with mythological accounts of cosmic origins, including those found in the works of Hesiod, may also help explain the gradual transition from mythological explanation to rational cosmological inquiry.

CONCLUSION

The comparative analysis presented in this paper demonstrates that Anaximander's cosmological system can be fruitfully interpreted through the methodological framework developed by Imre Lakatos. By identifying the apeiron as the hard core of a research programme and the surrounding cosmological hypotheses as elements of a protective belt, the analysis reveals the structural coherence underlying Anaximander's explanations of cosmic origin, celestial motion, and biological development.

This reconstruction therefore, highlights the systematic nature of early Greek philosophical inquiry. Far from representing isolated speculative ideas, Anaximander's cosmology appears as an integrated explanatory project guided by a central theoretical principle. The concept of the apeiron provides a unifying foundation from which a wide range of hypotheses concerning the natural world can be generated. In this respect, the Milesian tradition may be seen as anticipating certain structural features of later scientific inquiry, even though it developed in a very different intellectual and historical context.

At the same time, the analysis demonstrates the broader applicability of Lakatos' methodological framework. The concepts of hard core, protective belt and heuristic guidance can illuminate not only modern scientific practice but also earlier attempts to construct systematic explanations of the natural world. By applying this framework to early Greek cosmology, the study contributes to ongoing dialogue between ancient philosophy and contemporary philosophy of science.

Future research may extend this approach to other Pre-Socratic thinkers such as Anaximenes, Heraclitus, and the Atomists in order to examine whether their cosmological systems can likewise be interpreted as competing research programmes. Such investigations would further clarify the intellectual dynamics that shaped the emergence of rational cosmology in ancient Greece and deepen our understanding of the historical development of scientific explanation.

WORKS CITED

1. Altuğ, S. *The Heuristic Role of Questions in the Formation of Research Programmes: Copernicus's Heliocentric System*. Master's thesis, Middle East Technical University, 2016.
2. Couprie, Dirk L. *When the Earth Was Flat: Studies in Ancient Greek and Chinese Cosmology*. Springer, 2018.
3. Ferella, Chiara. "Anaximander's *Apeiron* from a Cognitive Perspective." *Journal of Cognitive Historiography*, vol. 9, no. 2, 2025, pp. 193–213.
4. Freudenthal, Gad. "The Theory of the Opposites and an Ordered Universe: Physics and Metaphysics in Anaximander." *Phronesis*, vol. 31, 1986, pp. 197–228.
5. "From Kuhn to Lakatos to Laudan." *ScienceDirect*, 2008.
6. Gregory, Andrew. *Anaximander: A Re-assessment*. Bloomsbury Academic, 2016.

7. Hobza, Pavel. "Anaximander Without the *Apeiron*: Making Sense of Aristotle's and Theophrastus' Reports." *Apeiron*. De Gruyter Brill, 2025.
8. Imre Lakatos: Scientific Research Programs. Central Connecticut State University, www.ccsu.edu/philosophy/lakatos.html. Accessed 15 Mar. 2026.
9. Kahn, Charles H. *Anaximander and the Origins of Greek Cosmology*. Hackett Publishing, 1994.
10. Kirk, G. S., J. E. Raven, and M. Schofield. *The Presocratic Philosophers: A Critical History with a Selection of Texts*. 2nd ed., Cambridge University Press, 1983.
11. Lakatos, Imre. *The Methodology of Scientific Research Programmes: Philosophical Papers Volume 1*. Edited by John Worrall and Gregory Currie, Cambridge University Press, 1978.
12. McKirahan, Richard D. *Philosophy Before Socrates: An Introduction with Texts and Commentary*. 2nd ed., Hackett Publishing, 2010.
13. Niaz, Mansoor. "Epistemological Anarchism and How Science Works." *R Discovery*, 2020.
14. Wada, Larry Ebikekeme. "Implications of Imre Lakatos' Scientific Research Programme for the 21st Century Studies on the Planetary Systems." *Sapientia Journal of Philosophy*, vol. 18, June 2023, pp. 293–302