

Re: Epistemology 201: The Science of Science

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.physics/2005-02/2300.html>

From: Jason (jasonstevensNOSPAM_at_free.net.nz)

Date: 02/05/05

Date: Sat, 05 Feb 2005 18:37:54 +1300

Torkel Franzen wrote:

> Jason <jasonstevensNOSPAM@free.net.nz> writes:

>

>

>>So the implication, a formula which is part of the "language of ZFC", is
>>used in the proof.

>

>

> No, there is no formula in the language of ZFC used in the proof.

Okay, so you **must** be suggesting that the implication is not part of the language of ZFC. This is a strange theory of sets indeed.

> *Your further comments turn on the existence of derivations in ZFC of formalizations of the theorems of mathematics. This is a different matter. The simple observation at issue is that ordinary mathematical proofs are not formal derivations in ZFC and in fact are nothing like formal derivations in ZFC.*

If mathematical proofs are informal, then they must be appealing to some sort of mathematical intuition or know-how. But it is madness to rest on intuition for proofs, because so many things defy intuition. It is important to ground maths formally as a resource for when intuition fails. In this way, proofs can become formal when required, and be formalisable in principle.