

Re: Riemann geometry, chicken or the egg?

## Re: Riemann geometry, chicken or the egg?

---

*Source:* <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.math/2006-10/msg07057.html>

---

- *From:* Gerry Myerson <[gerry@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:gerry@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx)>
  - *Date:* Thu, 26 Oct 2006 03:30:00 GMT
- 

In article <8a20k25nr9ec167rgvgdr4mkrrsul6pe95@xxxxxxx>, bootlace <[anonymous@xxxxxxxx](mailto:anonymous@xxxxxxxx)> wrote:

On Wed, 25 Oct 2006 22:58:33 GMT, Gerry Myerson <[gerry@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:gerry@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx)> wrote:

In article <fhcvj2pr6hke07r7aqt2kuds9gq9klbuee@xxxxxxx>, bootlace <[anonymous@xxxxxxxx](mailto:anonymous@xxxxxxxx)> wrote:

Many mathematical representations are borne from observation.

And many are not. You have found one that wasn't. So?

So you are saying that developing a geometry that describes more than 3 physical dimensions was a natural extension of math?

I thought we were talking about Riemannian geometry, which doesn't necessarily have anything to do with higher dimensions.

I don't know what "natural extension of math" means.

I believe that doing geometry without an eye to physics goes back to ancient Greece. Conic sections were studied pretty much for their own sake.

—

Gerry Myerson ([gerry@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:gerry@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx)) (i -> u for email)

.