International Journal of Engineering Inventions
e-ISSN: 2278-7461, p-ISSN: 2319-6491
Volume 13, Issue 11 [November. 2024] PP: 171-179

Ontological and Epistemological Disparities between Abstract and Applied Mathematics

Syahrullah Asyari
Department of Mathematics, Faculty of Mathematics and Natural Sciences, Universitas Negeri Makassar, Makassar, INDONESIA
Corresponding Author: syahrullah_math@unm.ac.id

ABSTRACT: *This study explores the distinction between mathematics as an abstract entity and its applications in the real world, as well as the implications of this distinction for the development of contemporary science. Abstract mathematics is understood as a reality that exists independently of the physical world, while applied mathematics is used to solve concrete problems across various disciplines, such as physics, biology, and technology. By examining key philosophical approaches, including Platonism, Formalism, and Constructivism, this research delves into the ontological status of mathematics and how each perspective interprets the relationship between mathematics and reality. The methodology employed involves an analysis of current scientific and philosophical literature to assess the role of mathematics in modeling and predicting real-world phenomena. The findings reveal that while abstract mathematics provides a robust theoretical foundation, its application in science is often constrained by practical limitations, such as uncertainties in data and computational constraints. The conclusion drawn is that abstract and applied mathematics differ not only in their nature and objectives but also in the ways they interact with the real world. This distinction has significant implications for how we understand and advance science and technology in the modern era.*

Keywords: *abstract mathematics, applied mathematics, philosophy of mathematics, modern science*

Date of Submission: 10-11-2024 Date of acceptance: 22-11-2024

I. INTRODUCTION

Mathematics has long been the cornerstone of advancements in science and technology. However, there remains a fundamental debate within the philosophy of mathematics regarding its ontological status—whether mathematical entities truly exist independently in an abstract realm or are merely human mental constructs applied to understand the physical world [1-2]. Various schools of thought in the philosophy of mathematics, such as Platonism, formalism, and constructivism, offer divergent answers to this question, ultimately shaping our understanding of the relationship between mathematics and the physical universe [3].

In the Platonic view, mathematics is seen as a real entity that exists beyond space and time, independent of human cognition [3]. Conversely, formalism regards mathematics as a symbolic language designed to solve practical problems in human life [4]. This perspective is particularly relevant when considering the application of mathematics in the natural sciences, where mathematical models often fall short of capturing the complexity and inherent uncertainties of the real world [5]. For instance, in fields like quantum physics and systems biology, mathematical models are crucial for predicting the behavior of natural phenomena, yet these predictions are frequently approximations rather than perfect representations of reality [6-7]. This can be seen, for example, in the case of population dynamics models in biology, which require simplifying assumptions to predict species growth within dynamic and fluctuating ecosystems.

The distinction between the abstract world of mathematics and its application in the real world raises profound philosophical questions. In modern science, mathematics serves as a tool to predict and comprehend complex natural phenomena, but it remains limited in how effectively these models capture every facet of the real world [8]. Some instances of such limitations include simulations of turbulence in fluid mechanics, where model simplifications often omit significant details. Thus, while mathematics is recognized as an exact system within the abstract realm, its application in the physical world frequently necessitates compromises in its perceived perfection [1].

Although mathematics can be applied in practical contexts, according to Russell, it more closely resembles a “battle-axe” than a “scalpel” when used to manipulate nature [9]. This is because many mathematical models, despite their high precision, often fail to predict outcomes in environments filled with random and unpredictable variables. This reflects the notion that the precision of abstract mathematics is frequently diminished when confronted with the real world, which is rife with uncertainty and variability. For instance, in the realms of artificial intelligence and technology, mathematical models provide the foundation for technical innovation, yet they remain limited in capturing the full complexity of the natural systems they seek to represent [10-11]. This is evident in machine learning models that require constant adjustments to remain relevant in response to real-world data changes.

This research aims to explore the ontological and epistemological distinctions between abstract and applied mathematics and their implications for science. Consequently, this article examines the methodological limitations of mathematics in contemporary science and how scientists employ mathematics to comprehend a dynamic and complex world [12-13]. In this context, it is crucial to understand the extent to which these limitations can be overcome through the development of new methodologies in applied mathematics, particularly in disciplines such as physics and biology [6-7].

II. CLASSICAL PERSPECTIVES IN THE PHILOSOPHY OF MATHEMATICS

The philosophy of mathematics has deep roots in the history of human thought, with two predominant schools of thought: Platonism and Formalism. Platonism, which originates from Plato's philosophy, asserts that mathematical entities, such as numbers and geometric shapes, possess an existence independent of human thought. These entities inhabit an abstract realm that is separate from space and time, characterized by perfection and eternity [3]. Plato considered mathematical objects to be more real than physical objects, which he viewed as mere shadows of the ideal world. This perspective has profoundly influenced later philosophers, such as Frege and Gödel, who reinforced the belief that mathematical truths are objective and not contingent on human perception [1][14].

However, at the beginning of the 20th century, this view was challenged by Formalism, spearheaded by David Hilbert. Formalism regards mathematics as a formal system of symbols that lack intrinsic meaning, except through the logical rules used to manipulate these symbols. According to this view, mathematics is a human construction that does not require the existence of an external world, and its truth is derived from internal consistency within an axiomatic system [4]. This approach gained traction amidst the foundational crisis in mathematics triggered by Kurt Gödel's incompleteness theorems, which demonstrated that formal axiomatic systems cannot resolve all possible statements within those systems [15-16].

Apart from Platonism and Formalism, Constructivism has emerged as an alternative approach. According to Constructivism, mathematical entities cannot be considered to exist unless these entities can be explicitly constructed through mathematical processes. This perspective emphasizes the importance of construction in acquiring mathematical knowledge, which contrasts with Platonism that assumes mathematical entities exist in an abstract realm, and Formalism that regards mathematical symbols merely as tools for logical manipulation [17]. Intuitionistic mathematics, a branch of Constructivism, rejects non-constructive proofs and focuses on explicit proof processes [18]. Although Platonism remains a common view among mathematicians in their everyday practice, their philosophical reflections often lean towards Formalism or Constructivism. Contemporary researchers, such as Maddy, emphasize that mathematics is frequently treated as a tool for solving real-world problems, where ontological clarity about the existence of mathematical entities becomes less relevant than the practical application of mathematics in science [19].

Over time, discussions on classical views in the philosophy of mathematics have continued to evolve. Philosophers such as Dummett observe that debates among Platonism, Formalism, and Constructivism remain pertinent, even though no single approach has achieved true dominance [20]. Rather, these three perspectives often collaborate in resolving various theoretical and applied problems in modern mathematics. On the other hand, scholars like Lavine [21] and Parsons [14] continue to explore the notion that mathematics involves both pure abstraction and empirical practice in its application to the sciences.

III. CONTEMPORARY DEVELOPMENTS IN THE PHILOSOPHY OF MATHEMATICS

In recent decades, advancements in the philosophy of mathematics have increasingly focused on the role of mathematics in the natural sciences and its applications across various technological fields. One of the most frequently discussed topics is the "unreasonable effectiveness" of mathematics in describing the physical world, as highlighted by Eugene Wigner in his renowned essay *The Unreasonable Effectiveness of Mathematics in the Natural Sciences* [5]. Wigner argued that although mathematics is a purely abstract discipline, it has proven remarkably effective in describing and predicting phenomena in the physical world. This raises a profound question: is mathematics a human invention, or does it reveal the fundamental structure of the universe? [10].

The debate over the origins of mathematics has been enriched by developments in modern physics, such as quantum mechanics and relativity. In this context, mathematics is employed to describe phenomena that often lie beyond the scope of everyday human intuition. Theories like general relativity and quantum mechanics have challenged traditional concepts in the philosophy of mathematics, particularly when highly precise mathematical models yield results that appear to contradict our perceptions of the real world [7]. Some philosophers even contend that mathematics may possess an independent reality, given its ability to describe highly abstract and unobservable natural phenomena [2].

However, the effectiveness of mathematics is not always absolute. In systems biology, for instance, mathematical models are employed to predict the behavior of living organisms. While these models are undoubtedly useful, they often require adjustments due to the real world being far more complex and dynamic than the typically simpler mathematical structures [13]. This suggests that, despite the powerful tools mathematics provides, its application in the real world is often constrained by the complexity of natural phenomena that cannot be fully captured by mathematical models [8].

Computational algorithms and artificial intelligence have become integral to recent developments in mathematical applications. In this context, the role of mathematics is frequently transformed through its interaction with modern computation, where machine learning and data-driven algorithms enable the processing of complex information that traditional mathematical methods cannot reach [11]. This challenges the traditional definition of mathematics, especially when statistical and algorithmic models yield practical solutions that lack the orderliness and elegance typically associated with classical mathematics [22].

Modern approaches also involve concepts like emergence, where complex systems exhibit new properties that cannot be predicted from their individual components. In the philosophy of mathematics, this has sparked discussions about whether emergent phenomena can be effectively represented through mathematical models or if there are fundamental limitations to mathematics' ability to capture the dynamic and ever-changing nature of reality [23]. This perspective is increasingly relevant in fields such as statistical physics and evolutionary biology, where mathematical models must often be combined with empirical understanding to generate accurate predictions [24].

Contemporary developments in the philosophy of mathematics further emphasize the importance of a more flexible understanding of the role of mathematics. This includes not only its use as a formal tool for comprehending the physical world but also as a means of addressing the limitations that arise within the complex and dynamic real world. Mathematics is no longer viewed merely as a discipline grounded in theoretical certainty and precision but also as an approach that must adapt to phenomena marked by uncertainty and variability. This adaptability is particularly evident in the applications of mathematics to fields such as artificial intelligence and systems biology, where mathematical models must be continuously refined to remain relevant to dynamic and constantly changing data. Thus, mathematics serves not only as an ideal theoretical framework but also as a flexible and adaptive tool for solving increasingly complex real-world problems.

IV. THE THEORY OF ABSTRACT REALITY AND PHYSICAL REALITY

In the philosophy of mathematics, the distinction between abstract reality and physical reality remains one of the central topics of ongoing debate. Modern Platonism, as advocated by philosophers like Gödel and Frege, posits that mathematical entities exist independently of the physical world. These entities inhabit an abstract realm that is not bound by space and time; although they are inaccessible to the senses, truths about them can be discerned through reason [3][1]. This raises profound ontological questions: how can we know about mathematical entities if they do not interact with the physical world? On the other hand, naturalistic views, such as those put forth by Quine and Putnam, reject the notion that mathematical entities possess a separate existence. Quine argued that mathematics is an integral part of the scientific description of the world and that mathematical entities should be understood in an empirical context [10][25]. According to Quine, mathematics is not a discovery of an abstract reality, but rather a construction driven by human needs to comprehend the physical world. In this perspective, mathematical reality is not divorced from physical reality.

This debate becomes increasingly relevant in the context of mathematics' applications in modern science. For instance, in quantum physics, mathematical models yield highly precise predictions about the behavior of subatomic particles, yet these results often contradict our intuitive understanding of everyday reality [8]. Similarly, in cosmology, mathematical theories about the structure of space-time describe a reality that is radically different from our physical experience [2]. This suggests that while abstract mathematics possesses internal consistency, its application in the real world requires careful adjustment and interpretation [6]. Conversely, Formalism argues that mathematics lacks existence outside the formal systems created by humans. In this view, mathematical entities are the products of symbol manipulation according to logical rules, without any need to claim the existence of these symbols beyond the human mind [4]. Although this view helps explain how mathematics can be applied across various contexts without raising questions about its ontological status, it still does not address why mathematics is so remarkably effective in explaining the physical world.

Criticism of both approaches arises from constructivism, which asserts that mathematical entities exist only insofar as they can be explicitly constructed. Constructivism rejects the notion that mathematical objects can exist independently of the human mind, as posited by Platonism, or that mathematics is merely a game of symbols, as proposed by Formalism [17-18]. Constructivism places greater emphasis on constructive processes and tangible interactions, which it argues are more aligned with scientific practices in the real world. In line with this, some contemporary philosophers, such as Penelope Maddy, offer a naturalistic approach to mathematics. Maddy contends that mathematical entities should be treated like other scientific objects, whose existence can be justified by their role within scientific theories [19]. This perspective underscores the importance of viewing mathematics as a tool in science that can be adapted to empirical needs and scientific practices, rather than attempting to understand it as a reality separate from the physical world.

The evolving discourse on the relationship between mathematics and physical reality reflects an ongoing search for deeper understanding, especially in light of recent scientific advancements like quantum physics and cosmology. At the forefront of theoretical discussions, Platonism remains influential, asserting that mathematical entities exist independently of the physical world. However, alternative perspectives, such as naturalism, formalism, and constructivism, are gaining traction by offering more practical approaches. These views emphasize that mathematics should be understood as a flexible tool used to model and explain empirical phenomena, rather than as an abstract reality separate from our physical experiences. As scientific knowledge expands, these more pragmatic perspectives increasingly shape how mathematics is applied in both theoretical and practical contexts.

V. MATHEMATICS IN THE ABSTRACT REALM: A PHILOSOPHICAL PERSPECTIVE

MATHEMATICS AS AN ABSTRACT ENTITY

Mathematics has long been regarded as a discipline that exists within the realm of the abstract, detached from the physical phenomena that surround us. Mathematical entities such as numbers, functions, and geometric forms are viewed by some philosophers and mathematicians as part of a reality that transcends time, space, or sensory experience. This perspective, often referred to as Platonism, asserts that mathematical objects are abstract entities that exist independently of the physical world. In his Theory of Forms, Plato argued that the physical world is merely a shadow of a perfect abstract world where mathematical objects exist in unchanging and eternal forms [3].

Platonism posits that numbers, for instance, are not merely human mental constructs but are components of an objective reality that can be discovered and studied, yet are not created by humans. This view is bolstered by the work of Kurt Gödel, who argued that the mathematical truths revealed in his incompleteness theorems hint at a deeper reality beyond mere symbols and formal logic [15]. Frege was also a proponent of this notion, asserting that numbers and other mathematical objects exist independently of the empirical world, accessible only through the human intellect [26].

These mathematical entities possess characteristics of consistency and certainty that remain unaffected by changes in the physical world. Pythagoras was among the early thinkers who saw mathematics as the key to understanding the universe, where mathematical relationships and patterns reflect the harmony and order of the cosmos [1]. Even in modern times, mathematicians like Roger Penrose continue to uphold the view that mathematics exists beyond the human mind and possesses an objective existence within the universe [27]. However, this approach is not without its critics. Formalism, for instance, rejects the notion that mathematical entities have an objective reality, arguing instead that mathematics is a game of symbols manipulated according to logical rules set by humans. In this view, mathematics does not reflect the real world or an independent abstract realm, but rather is a product of human intellectual activity shaped by practical needs and formal logic [4].

Constructivism also presents a challenge to Platonism. Brouwer, a prominent figure in constructivism, argued that mathematical entities do not exist until they can be explicitly constructed by the human mind [18]. In the constructivist view, mathematics is seen more as a product of human mental activity interacting with the real world, and mathematical truth cannot be claimed to exist without a constructive process. Consequently, in this approach, mathematical proof is not merely confined to formal logical consistency but also involves a process that is comprehensible and constructible. As a result, constructivism rejects non-constructive proofs that rely solely on existence without actual construction, which are often found in Platonism. Instead, this approach demands explicit and reproducible evidence, which is more relevant to practical applications in the real world, particularly in disciplines that require concrete and testable solutions, such as computer science and systems biology.

THE IMPLICATIONS OF MATHEMATICAL PRECISION IN THE ABSTRACT WORLD

Precision in mathematics plays a central role, particularly within the realm of the abstract, where consistency and perfection serve as fundamental principles. In this abstract world, as depicted by Platonism, every mathematical entity is regarded as possessing a flawless beauty and order. Pythagoras taught that everything in the universe is governed by numbers and proportions, making mathematical precision not merely a tool but a reflection of the universe's inherent order itself [1].

This precision is also acknowledged within the tradition of the philosophy of mathematics, which considers mathematical truths to be absolute and independent of physical observation. Plato believed that mathematical precision enables us to access "truths" that lie beyond the reach of the ever-changing physical world. His Theory of Forms situates mathematical objects within a perfect realm of ideas, where precision and consistency remain untouched by the fluctuating conditions of the material world [3]. In this theory, the perfection of mathematical forms mirrors a higher reality, far surpassing the imperfections of the physical world [26].

In modern thought, this precision continues to be recognized as one of the defining characteristics that distinguishes mathematics from other scientific disciplines. Gödel demonstrated that, although his incompleteness theorems reveal that certain mathematical truths cannot be proven within formal systems, this does not diminish the precision and consistency of mathematics as a perfect abstract system [15]. Penrose also argues that the mathematical world reflects an objective reality that is exceptionally precise and consistent, where mathematics possesses an "unassailable" quality that remains beyond the reach of physical observation [27].

However, the views of Formalism and Constructivism differ significantly. Formalism contends that mathematical precision is merely the result of human-devised manipulation of symbols and logical rules. From this perspective, mathematical precision does not reflect an abstract, perfect reality but is instead a product of the internal consistency of formal systems designed to reach specific conclusions. Hilbert and other formalists perceive precision as a characteristic of systems governed by logically agreed-upon rules, rather than as a reflection of a universal truth existing in an abstract world [4]. Meanwhile, constructivists like Brouwer assert that precision can only be achieved through direct construction. Constructivism emphasizes that mathematical truth cannot be presumed to exist in an abstract world until it is explicitly proven or constructed by humans [18]. Thus, in the constructivist view, precision is something that must be built, not something assumed to exist independently of the human mind.

VI. MATHEMATICS IN THE REAL WORLD: APPLICATIONS AND CHALLENGES

THE APPLICATION OF MATHEMATICS IN NATURAL SCIENCES

Mathematics plays a crucial role across various branches of natural sciences, particularly in physics, biology, and technology. In physics, for instance, mathematics provides a formal language to describe natural phenomena, ranging from quantum mechanics to the theory of relativity. By employing differential equations, physicists can predict the behavior of subatomic particles, planetary orbits, and gravitational fields [5]. Mathematical models are also utilized in biology to study population dynamics, interspecies interactions, and the spread of diseases, as seen in ecological and systems biology models [13].

In the realm of technology, the application of mathematics is indispensable, particularly in the development of artificial intelligence and machine learning. Machine learning algorithms that process large-scale data for prediction and decision-making heavily rely on mathematical principles such as linear algebra, statistics, and probability theory [28]. Furthermore, the application of mathematics in computational technology has enabled the creation of complex simulations of physical phenomena, allowing scientists to study processes that are difficult to access directly. However, the application of mathematics in science often necessitates model simplification due to the complexity and dynamics of the real world, which cannot be perfectly captured by mathematical models [29]. For example, in fluid mechanics, turbulence models are frequently simplified for computational implementation, even though these models may not fully capture the underlying physical dynamics.

LIMITATIONS OF THE APPLICATION OF MATHEMATICS IN PHYSICAL REALITY

Although mathematics is highly effective in explaining natural phenomena, it encounters numerous challenges when applied to the realm of physical reality. One of the primary challenges lies in the fact that physical reality is often rife with uncertainty and instability. For instance, in quantum physics, Heisenberg's uncertainty principle illustrates that it is impossible to simultaneously determine both the position and momentum of a particle with absolute precision, thereby necessitating that mathematical models account for such inherent uncertainties [30]. Moreover, in systems biology, mathematical models frequently require adaptation to reflect the high levels of complexity and variability within biological systems. Biological systems, such as the interactions among organisms within ecosystems or the dynamics of disease transmission, are often unstable and difficult to predict accurately [31]. In these cases, mathematical models tend to simplify variables and parameters to address these challenges, but such simplifications can, in turn, reduce the accuracy of the models' predictions.

Beyond the issues of uncertainty and complexity, computational limitations also pose a significant obstacle to the application of mathematics in modern science. Complex mathematical models often demand substantial computational power, particularly in computational physics and quantum simulations. While advancements in modern computing have helped alleviate some of these challenges, there remain numerous models that current computational technologies are still unable to resolve [32].

MATHEMATICS AS A TOOL FOR PREDICTING AND MANIPULATING NATURE

Although mathematics is often perceived as an abstract discipline, its role in applied sciences is both tangible and crucial. In many instances, mathematics serves as a predictive tool to model and manipulate natural phenomena. For example, weather forecasting relies on mathematical models that integrate empirical data with partial differential equations to describe atmospheric dynamics [33].

In the realm of technology, mathematics also facilitates the design and development of new technologies, such as computer simulations used to design building structures, bridges, or even new pharmaceuticals through molecular modeling [2]. Mathematics provides a framework for scientists to understand complex patterns in nature and leverage this understanding to make predictions or even control the outcomes of natural processes. However, the role of mathematics as a predictive tool is not without limitations. As discussed in the previous subsection, mathematical models often need to simplify complex physical phenomena to render them computationally manageable. Therefore, while mathematics can offer robust predictive outcomes, its application frequently involves compromises with the intricate and uncertain dynamics of the real world [34].

VII. DIVERGENT PERCEPTIONS: THE ABSTRACT WORLD VS. THE REAL WORLD

ONTOLOGICAL DISPARITIES BETWEEN ABSTRACT MATHEMATICS AND APPLIED MATHEMATICS

The ontological debate surrounding abstract and applied mathematics underscores fundamental differences in how mathematical entities are treated. In the context of abstract mathematics, entities such as numbers and geometric objects are viewed as having an independent existence in a realm distinct from physical reality. This approach is chiefly represented by Platonism, which posits that mathematical entities exist in an abstract world that is not bound by time and space [3]. Gödel also supported this perspective, arguing that there are mathematical truths that cannot be proven within formal systems, implying that mathematics is not entirely constrained by physical reality [15].

In contrast, within applied mathematics, mathematical entities are interpreted and utilized to describe or model dynamic physical reality. While abstract mathematics operates within the domain of "exact truth," in the real world, mathematical models often experience distortions due to limitations in data and variability in physical phenomena. For instance, in the applications of quantum mechanics and general relativity, precise mathematical concepts such as spacetime or quantum probability encounter interpretive challenges when applied to the ever-changing realities [2][8].

Within this context, the ontology of applied mathematics is often seen as a practical predictive tool rather than a direct depiction of metaphysical truths [35]. David Hilbert, as a proponent of Formalism, argued that applied mathematics is essentially the manipulation of symbols governed by logical rules, without requiring any claims about the actual existence of mathematical objects [4]. Thus, while abstract mathematics claims absolute and exact truths, applied mathematics must compromise with the dynamic reality that involves uncertainty and limitations.

This ontological examination also reveals differences in how mathematical entities are acknowledged. In abstract mathematics, mathematical truths are considered universal and immutable, whereas in applied mathematics, such truths become relative, contingent upon specific applications within physical reality. Therefore, distortions arise when the "exact truths" of the abstract realm must be adapted to confront the complexity and dynamics of the real world [13].

EPISTEMOLOGY OF MATHEMATICS: MATHEMATICS AS A PRODUCT OF IMAGINATION OR A TOOL FOR PREDICTION?

In the realm of epistemology, the question of whether mathematics is a product of imagination or a predictive tool in the real world remains at the heart of debate. Platonism posits that mathematics is a discovery, wherein humans uncover truths that already exist in an abstract world, thereby endowing mathematics with an independent relevance to the real world [3]. From this perspective, mathematical knowledge is acquired through logical contemplation that is universal and immutable.

However, there is a contrasting view that considers mathematics as more of a creation of human imagination, wherein symbolic systems and concepts are developed to address practical problems. Formalism, spearheaded by David Hilbert, argues that mathematics lacks an independent reality; rather, it is merely a symbolic system constructed to fulfill logical or computational needs [4]. In this context, mathematical knowledge is seen as a product of human mental constructs, utilized to solve practical problems in science or technology. On the other hand, when mathematics is applied to the real world, it often serves as a remarkably powerful predictive tool. In physics, for instance, mathematical models used in quantum mechanics or relativity can yield highly accurate predictions about natural phenomena, even though the underlying concepts of these models are abstract and cannot be directly observed [8]. Here, mathematical knowledge is acquired through empirical experience and validated through practical applications, thus directly bearing relevance to the real world [19].

These epistemological perspectives reflect the tension between viewing mathematics as a human construct designed to solve problems, and as a tool capable of accurately describing and predicting natural phenomena. Mathematical naturalism, as proposed by Penelope Maddy, seeks to reconcile these views by asserting that mathematics functions as an empirical tool for explaining the world, without necessarily being considered a distinct metaphysical entity [19]. Consequently, the epistemology of mathematics continues to grapple with the best way to understand and apply mathematical knowledge: is it more closely related to logical abstractions accessible only through rational contemplation, or is it a practical tool relevant for solving real-world problems and generating useful predictions?

VIII. IMPLICATIONS FOR THE PHILOSOPHY OF SCIENCE

THE INFLUENCE OF DIFFERENCES BETWEEN ABSTRACT AND CONCRETE MATHEMATICS ON SCIENTIFIC METHODOLOGY

The distinction between abstract and applied mathematics has had a significant impact on contemporary scientific methodology. Abstract mathematics, with its emphasis on theoretical proof and logical consistency, is often unconstrained by physical or practical limitations. This freedom allows mathematicians to explore ideal concepts that may not always have direct relevance to the real world. In contrast, applied mathematics aims to model and solve concrete problems that arise within the physical world, thereby introducing elements of uncertainty and imperfection [5][36].

This divergence is reflected in scientific methodologies. In physics, for instance, the use of mathematical models to predict experimental outcomes requires certain assumptions that are often at odds with the unpredictable variables of the real world. Abstract mathematics, in this context, provides a formal structure, yet applying such models in scientific experiments demands constant adjustments based on empirical results. David Hilbert argued that while abstract mathematics offers a robust theoretical framework, these models must be adapted to align with the complexities of real-world data when applied in scientific experiments [4]. For example, the application of quantum mechanics often necessitates highly precise mathematical models. Nonetheless, in scientific experiments, uncertainties in data collection or limitations of instruments frequently impact the outcomes. This creates challenges in bridging the gap between the abstract realm of mathematics and the empirical world of physics [30]. The philosophy of science continues to explore the implications of this divide between the idealized nature of abstract mathematics and the uncertainty inherent in the real world.

PHILOSOPHICAL IMPLICATIONS OF THE APPLICATION OF MATHEMATICS IN EXPERIMENTS AND TECHNOLOGY

The use of mathematics in scientific experiments and technological applications also carries significant philosophical implications. Abstract mathematics provides a crucial tool for science in modeling natural phenomena; however, its application is often constrained by real-world limitations, such as data uncertainty, experimental errors, and technological constraints [31]. Thus, the philosophy of science must take into account how mathematics, which is internally consistent, can be applied within the imperfect context of the real world. For instance, the advent of quantum computing opens new avenues for leveraging mathematics to solve problems that are too complex for classical computation [30]. Nonetheless, while mathematics offers a framework for comprehending physical phenomena, the practical implementation of such technologies necessitates continual adjustments and interpretations to address the real-world limitations [37].

The philosophical implications of applying mathematics in scientific experiments involve challenges in determining whether mathematical results genuinely represent reality or merely serve as useful idealized models. Penelope Maddy, for example, argues that within the scientific context, mathematics functions as a tool for understanding and organizing natural phenomena, yet the imperfections of the real world often limit the ideal application of mathematics [19]. Consequently, the use of mathematics in science demands a careful consideration of the inevitable imperfections that characterize the real world.

MATHEMATICS AS A TOOL FOR SCIENTIFIC REASONING

In modern philosophy of science, mathematics is not merely regarded as a technical tool for solving problems but also as a framework for shaping scientific understanding of the world. Max Tegmark, for instance, argues that the universe itself is a mathematical structure, suggesting that mathematics is not only a means of describing reality but also serves as the very foundation of that reality [2]. This perspective implies that mathematics is the primary framework utilized by scientists to develop scientific theories and comprehend the fundamental relationships within the universe.

In contemporary science, the role of mathematics in scientific reasoning is particularly evident in the application of the theory of relativity and quantum mechanics, where mathematical relationships play a central role in formulating physical theories [8]. Mathematics provides the conceptual basis for scientific experiments and data interpretation, enabling scientists to achieve a deeper understanding of phenomena that are difficult to grasp through human intuition alone. Furthermore, mathematics facilitates the development of increasingly complex computational models to simulate intricate systems in fields such as biology, economics, and technology [32]. In this context, mathematics functions not only as a descriptive tool but also as a predictive framework that empowers scientists to formulate new theories and explore areas that were previously beyond explanation.

IX. CONCLUSIONS

SUMMARY OF KEY FINDINGS

The ontological and epistemological debate between abstract mathematics and its applications in the real world has long been a central focus in the philosophy of mathematics. Platonism, which views mathematics as entities existing independently in an abstract realm, provides the foundation for understanding mathematics as a form of reality that is perfect and eternal [1][3]. In contrast, Formalism and Constructivism emphasize that mathematics is a human construct used as a tool for solving problems, without making ontological claims regarding the objective existence of mathematical entities [4][35]. This divergence suggests that, while abstract mathematics may maintain internal consistency, its application in the real world encounters challenges in the form of uncertainty, complexity, and empirical limitations [8].

One of the significant implications of this divergence is its impact on our understanding of nature. The application of mathematics in modern science, such as in quantum physics and general relativity, demonstrates its remarkable effectiveness in explaining complex natural phenomena that often surpass human intuition [2]. However, such applications also highlight limitations when mathematical models do not fully align with real-world phenomena, as observed in the challenges of quantum computing or the variability inherent in systems biology [30-31]. Thus, while mathematics can offer precise models, its real-world applications require profound interpretation and adaptation.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

In light of these findings, several important recommendations can be made for future research in the field of the philosophy of mathematics and its applications in contemporary science. Firstly, further research is needed to explore the limitations of mathematical applications in complex scientific domains, particularly those involving non-linear phenomena and highly dynamic systems, such as evolutionary biology and ecology. Such studies could deepen our understanding of how mathematics can be used to describe systems that are not entirely deterministic [31].

Additionally, further investigation is required to explore the role of quantum computing in expanding the capabilities of applied mathematics. Quantum computing, which is capable of processing vast amounts of data in an exceptionally short time, has the potential to revolutionize how we model natural phenomena that are too complex for classical computers [30]. Further research is also needed to understand how machine learning algorithms and artificial intelligence can be integrated into mathematical models to address challenges related to incomplete data or uncertainties in various scientific disciplines [11][37].

Lastly, there is a need for deeper exploration into how advancements in the philosophy of mathematics might influence our understanding of the universe. Max Tegmark has suggested that the universe itself is a mathematical structure, but the philosophical implications of this claim require more thorough analysis, especially in terms of how we perceive physical reality through the lens of mathematics [2]. By focusing research on the relationship between abstract mathematics and physical reality, we can enhance our comprehension of the universe and develop more effective methods to solve complex problems in the future.

REFERENCES

[1]. Linnebo, Ø. (2017). *Philosophy of mathematics*. Princeton University Press. DOI: 10.1515/9781400885244

[2]. Tegmark, M. (2014). *Our mathematical universe: My quest for the ultimate nature of reality*. Alfred A. Knopf. Retrieved from: https://archive.org/details/ourmathematicalu0000tegm

[3]. Balaguer, M. (1998). *Platonism and anti-platonism in mathematics*. Oxford University Press. Retrieved from: https://philpapers.org/rec/BALPAA-3

[4]. Shapiro, S. (2000). *Thinking about mathematics: The philosophy of mathematics*. Oxford University Press. Retrieved from: https://danielwharris.com/teaching/360/readings/Shapiro.pdf

[5]. Wigner, E. P. (1960). The unreasonable effectiveness of mathematics in the natural sciences. *Communications on Pure and Applied Mathematics*, 13(1), 1-14. Retrieved from: https://www.maths.ed.ac.uk/~v1ranick/papers/wigner.pdf

[6]. Putnam, H. (1975). *Mathematics, matter, and method: philosophical papers (Vol. 1)*. Cambridge University Press. Retrieved from: https://www.andrew.cmu.edu/user/kk3n/80-300/putnam1975.pdf

[7]. Ladyman, J., & Ross, D. (2007). *Every thing must go: Metaphysics naturalized*. Oxford University Press. Retrieved from: https://www.physicalism.com/osr.pdf

[8]. Butterfield, J. (2014). On under-determination in cosmology. *Studies in History and Philosophy of Modern Physics*, 46, Part A, 57-69. DOI: 10.1016/j.shpsb.2013.06.003

[9]. Russell, B. (1950). *Introduction to mathematical philosophy*. George Allen & Unwin. Retrieved from: https://people.umass.edu/~klement/imp/imp-ebk.pdf

[10]. Colyvan, M. (2012). *An introduction to the philosophy of mathematics*. Cambridge University Press. Retrieved from: https://critica.filosoficas.unam.mx/index.php/critica/article/view/567

[11]. Bishop, C. M. (2006). *Pattern recognition and machine learning*. Springer. Retrieved from: http://users.isr.ist.utl.pt/~wurmd/Livros/school/Bishop%20-%20Pattern%20Recognition%20And%20Machine%20Learning%20-%20Springer%20%202006.pdf

[12]. Mac Lane, S. (1978). *Categories for the working mathematician* (2nd ed.). Springer. DOI: 10.1007/978-1-4757-4721-8

[13]. Longo, G. (2017). The biological consequences of the computational world: Mathematical reflections on cancer biology. Retrieved from: https://arxiv.org/pdf/1701.08085

[14]. Parsons, C. (2008). *Mathematical thought and its objects*. Cambridge University Press. Retrieved from: https://transcendental.ucoz.ru/_fr/0/Parsons_Ch-Math.pdf

[15]. Gödel, K. (1992). *On formally undecidable propositions of Principia Mathematica and related systems*. Basic Books. Retrieved from: https://monoskop.org/images/9/93/Kurt_G%C3%B6del_On_Formally_Undecidable_Propositions_of_Principia_Mathematica_and_Related_Systems_1992.pdf

[16]. Ernest, P. (1991). *The philosophy of mathematics education*. Routledge. Retrieved from: https://p4mriunpat.wordpress.com/wp-content/uploads/2011/10/the-philosophy-of-mathematics-education-studies-in-mathematicseducation.pdf

[17]. Tait, W. W. (2005). *The Provenance of pure reason: Essays in the philosophy of mathematics and its history*. Oxford University Press. Retrieved from: https://www.andrew.cmu.edu/user/avigad/Reviews/tait.pdf

[18]. Troelstra, A. S., & van Dalen, D. (1988). *Constructivism in mathematics: An introduction*. North-Holland. Retrieved from: https://api.pageplace.de/preview/DT0400.9780080955100_A23592023/preview-9780080955100_A23592023.pdf

[19]. Maddy, P. (2007). *Second philosophy: A naturalistic method*. Oxford University Press. DOI: 10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199273669.001.0001

[20]. Dummett, M. (1977). *Elements of intuitionism*. Oxford University Press. Retrieved from: https://archive.org/details/elementsofintuit0000dumm/page/n7/mode/2up

[21]. Lavine, S. (1994). *Understanding the infinite*. Harvard University Press. Retrieved from: https://archive.org/details/shaughan-lavine-understanding-the-infinite/page/n7/mode/2up

[22]. Kitcher, P. (1984). *The Nature of mathematical knowledge*. Oxford University Press. Retrieved from: https://jwood.faculty.unlv.edu/unlv/Articles/Kitcher.pdf

[23]. Batterman, R. W. (2001). *The Devil in the Details: Asymptotic Reasoning in Explanation, Reduction, and Emergence*. Oxford University Press. Retrieved from: https://ndpr.nd.edu/reviews/the-devil-in-the-details-asymptotic-reasoning-in-explanation-reduction-and-emergence/

[24]. De Regt, H. W. (2017). *Understanding scientific understanding*. Oxford University Press. Retrieved from: https://api.pageplace.de/preview/DT0400.9780190652920_A35486867/preview-9780190652920_A35486867.pdf

[25]. Quine, W. V. O. (1961). *From a logical point of view: Nine logico-philosophical essays*. Harvard University Press. Retrieved from: https://ia601809.us.archive.org/12/items/FromALogicalPointOfView/QuineFromALogicalPointOfViewText.pdf

[26]. Maziarz, E. A. (1952). *The foundations of arithmetic: A logico-mathematical enquiry into the concept of number*. By Dr. G. Frege. Translated by J. L. Austin, New York: Philosophical Library, 1950. Pp. xii+119. $4.75. *The New Scholasticism*, 26(1): 91-92. DOI: 10.5840/newscholas19522615

[27]. Jorgensen, P. E. T. (2006). The Road to reality: A complete guide to the laws of the universe. *The Mathematical Intelligencer* **28**, 59–61. DOI: 10.1007/BF02986885

[28]. Spielberg, A., Zhong, F., Rematas, K., Jatavallabhula, K. M., Oztireli, C., Li, T. M., Nowrouzezahrai, D. (2023). Differentiable visual computing for inverse problems and machine learning. *Machine Learning*. DOI: 10.48550/arXiv.2312.04574

[29]. Cattani, C., Baskonus, H. M., & Ciancio, A. (2023). *Recent Developments in Computational Biology-I. Computer Modeling in Engineering & Sciences*, 139(3): 2261-2264. DOI: 10.32604/cmes.2024.050209

[30]. Buonaiuto, G., Gargiulo, F., De Pietro, G., Esposito, M., & Pota, M. (2024). The effects of quantum hardware properties on the performances of variational quantum learning algorithms. *Quantum Machine Intelligence*, 6(9). DOI: 10.1007/s42484-024-00144-5

[31]. Ogbunugafor, C. B., & Yitbarek, S. (2024). Towards a fundamental theory of taxon transitions in microbial communities. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*. DOI: 10.1073/pnas.2400433121

[32]. Klaska, J. (2023). Real-world applications of number theory. *Journal of Mathematics and Society,* 8(4): 93-104. Retrieved from: https://math-sci.ui.ac.ir/jufile?ar_sfile=583936

[33]. Sekhwama, M., Mpofu, K., & Sivarasu, S. (2024). Applications of microfluidics in biosensing. *Discover Applied Sciences*, 6(303). DOI: 10.1007/s42452-024-05981-4

[34]. Rizvi, S. S. H. (2024). *Food Engineering Principles and Practices*. Springer. DOI: 10.1007/978-3-031-34123-6

[35]. Resnik, M. D. (1980). Hartry H. Field, *Science without Numbers* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1980), xii+130pp., $16.00. DOI: 10.2307/2215268

[36]. Mitra, A. N. (2011). "Mathematics: The Language of Science." *arXiv preprint arXiv:1111.6560*. Retrieved from: https://arxiv.org/abs/1111.6560

[37]. Cevikbas, M., Greefrath, G., & Siller, H.-S. (2023). Advantages and challenges of using digital technologies in mathematical modelling education – a descriptive systematic literature review. *Frontiers in Education*, 8, Article 1142556. DOI: 10.3389/feduc.2023.1142556