

Re: invariance of negative signature of the metric?

Re: invariance of negative signature of the metric?

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.physics.relativity/2008-03/msg01158.html>

- *From:* Eric Gisse <jowr.pi@xxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Wed, 12 Mar 2008 12:10:44 -0700 (PDT)
-

On Mar 12, 10:33 am, "Ken S. Tucker" <dynam...@xxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

On Mar 12, 6:12 am, stevendary13...@xxxxxxxxxx (Daryl McCullough) wrote:

On Mar 11, 11:32 am, "Ken S. Tucker" <dynam...@xxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

Can you
find a
reason to
exclude

$\&x / \&x' =$
 $\text{sqrt}(-1)$

as a legit
transformation
coefficient?

I'm sure that it's possible to work perfectly well with complex coordinates.

That's what a (+---) signature is.

NO, IT ISN'T! That is not, in any way, what it represents.

You **still** cannot explain to me, in your own words, what a metric

Re: invariance of negative signature of the metric?

Re: invariance of negative signature of the metric?

signature means.

But the notion of a metric "signature"
only makes sense if the coordinates are real.

I don't know what "makes sense" means, but
I prefer to use a (++++) signature BUT that's
choice not a physical law of nature.

Uh, ++++ is Euclidean. On the other hand, you don't understand the
meaning of a metric signature so you feel free to make it mean
whatever you want.

Ken S. Tucker

--
Daryl McCullough
Ithaca, NY