No, S^2 Does Not Live in Two Dimensions

Dr. R. K. Matheson
Department of Geometry, Cambridge

I have seen a curious claim circulating online that the two–sphere S^2 can be "contained" within an abstract space of the same logical rank as $\mathbb{R}^2$, and that therefore $\mathbb{R}^3$ is somehow "overprovisioned."

Let us be clear: this is wordplay, not mathematics.

The *definition* of S^2 is as a 2–dimensional embedded submanifold of $\mathbb{R}^3$. The "dimension" of the sphere refers to the dimension of its tangent spaces, not the cardinality of its underlying set. Confusing topological embedding with set–theoretic mapping collapses the very distinction that gives geometry meaning.

Yes, one can trivially exhibit a bijection between $\mathbb{R}^2$ and S^2. That is not new—stereographic projection has been known since the sixteenth century. But a bijection does not preserve topology, metric, or curvature. Without those, the object is not a sphere in any useful sense. The author's "logical containment" ignores precisely the properties that make S^2 interesting.

The final section's rhetoric about "over–embedding" and "epistemic humility" reads like AI–generated philosophy. Mathematics is not about how many coordinates we *feel* are needed; it is about structure. The structure of S^2 is inherently curved, and that curvature cannot be represented by a globally Euclidean coordinate system in two dimensions—a fact known to Gauss and Riemann two centuries ago.

In short, the argument confuses parametrization with embedding, and treats a tautological bijection as a discovery. The "minimal abstract space" is just $\mathbb{R}^2$ with fancy adjectives attached. There is no "mistake in orthodoxy," only a category error between logic and geometry.

I understand the excitement of AI–assisted thought, but collaboration does not substitute for comprehension. Let us not reinvent stereographic projection and call it a revolution.

Dr. R. K. Matheson
Department of Geometry, Cambridge
`rkmatheson@cam.ac.uk`
October 18, 2025