

Re: Who will stun the world as next Einstein?

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.physics/2005-02/1816.html>

From: Ken S. Tucker (*dynamics_at_vianet.on.ca*)

Date: 02/03/05

Date: 3 Feb 2005 15:11:37 -0800

Tom Capizzi wrote:

> *This is the complete text of your last post. Is something missing?*

I don't know, sometimes google seems to send an echo or doesn't post at all. It's a new system they're trying and figured I'd see how it evolves.

> *"Ken S. Tucker" <dynamics@vianet.on.ca> wrote in message
> news:1107384256.335012.211010@z14g2000cwz.googlegroups.com...*

>>

>> *Tom Capizzi wrote:*

>>> *Perhaps I was not clear.*

>>> *A scalar is an invariant ok?*

>>> *An invariant is not necessarily a constant ok?*

>>> *Denote "A" to be such a variable invariant.*

>>>>

>>> *Then $dA/dt \neq$ invariant because dt is not*

>>> *invariant and hence dA/dt is not a scalar.*

>>>>

>>> *Something that's interesting though, is the*

>>> *relativistic fact that dA/dt is not a scalar.*

>>>>

>>> *Maybe that's a good way to present dt as being*

>>> *a vector component, specifically with $ct = x^0$,*

>>> *then, $dA/dt = dA/dx^0$, and is also a vector*

>>> *component, but not a scalar (invariant).*

>>>>

>>> *I just wanted to caution a derivative only*

>>> *in special cases produces a scalar, and*

>>> *certainly not generally in physics.*

>>> *Regards*

>>> *Ken S. Tucker*

>>>>

>>> *Interesting semantic quibble. I use the definition of scalar*

>>> *as an entity with magnitude but no direction, and a vector*

>>> *has both. To require a scalar to be an invariant is overly*

>>> *restrictive, but I won't rule out the possibility that this is*

sci.physics: Re: Who will stun the world as next Einstein?

> >> *customary usage in some circles. However, your argument*
> >> *above is invalid because d/dt is not a component of the*
> >> *Grad operator. Grad is a spatial vector derivative. And it*
> >> *is a vector. The derivative of a scalar apparently may or*
> >> *may not be a scalar (in the restricted sense of the word),*
> >> *but it is never a vector.*

It's a semantic quibble.

>>*I am curious what you call an entity*
>> *with magnitude and no direction that is not an invariant.*

It's a "relative tensor" such as
the determinant of g_{uv} , $g = \det g_{uv}$.
Ken