

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/msg07250.html>

- *From:* bootlace <anonymous@xxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* 26 Oct 2006 11:17:06 EDT
-

On Thu, 26 Oct 2006 03:30:00 GMT, Gerry Myerson
<gerry@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

In article <8a20k25nr9ec167rgvgdr4mkrrsul6pe95@xxxxxxxx>, bootlace <anonymous@xxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

On Wed, 25 Oct 2006 22:58:33 GMT, Gerry Myerson
<gerry@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

In article
<fhcvj2pr6hke07r7aqt2kuds9gq9klbuee@xxxxxxxx>, bootlace <anonymous@xxxxxxxxxx> 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.

For example you might find a function that will produce the hex base digits of pi to infinity. You could calculate more hex digits of pi than are needed to describe anything in the physical universe. Is

Re: Riemann geometry, chicken or the egg?

this example the same as developing a geometry that describes more than 3 physical dimensions?

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.

The motion of planets and asteroids were available to the greeks and it seems logical they might have wondered how you could describe an ellipse.

.