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This volume contains 21 interviews on five questions for formal philosophers. The questions are: (1) Why were you initially drawn to formal methods? (2) What example(s) from your own work illustrates the role formal methods can play in philosophy? (3) What is the proper role of philosophy in relation to other disciplines? (4) What do you consider the most neglected topics and/or contributions in late 20th century philosophy. (5) What are the most important open problems in philosophy and what are the prospects for progress?

This book brings together the opinions of some very distinguished scholars from Europe and North-America. Not every contributor replies to all questions, and the length of the interviews varies from one page (Adolf Grünbaum) to 26 pages (Wolfgang Spohn).
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The term formalism describes an emphasis on form over content or meaning in the arts, literature, or philosophy. A practitioner of formalism is called a formalist. A formalist, with respect to some discipline, holds that there is no transcendent meaning to that discipline other than the literal content created by a practitioner. For example, formalists within mathematics claim that mathematics is no more than the symbols written down by the mathematician, which is based on logic and a few elementary Formal epistemology explores knowledge and reasoning using formal tools, tools from math and logic. For example, a formal epistemologist might use probability theory to explain how scientific reasoning works. Or she might use modal logic to defend a particular theory of knowledge. The questions that drive formal epistemology are often the same as those that drive informal epistemology. What is knowledge, and how is it different from mere opinion? What separates science from pseudoscience? When is a belief justified? Formal philosophy, as others pointed out, is an approach with formalized language. To ease things here, let us assume that the main idea is that by formalization it is possible to infer the truth value and propositional content directly from grammar and syntax. The ultimate goal is a perfect scientific language where equivocations and misunderstandings are impossible (like in mathematics), but still a language. And not only in an analogic sense like mathematics are called a language, but a medium for communication about the world.