

Re: Peano's space-filling curve

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.math/2004-06/1470.html>

From: Daniel Grubb (grubb_at_lola.math.niu.edu)

Date: 06/08/04

Date: 8 Jun 2004 18:02:13 GMT

>*Only the comprehensible ones, as I carefully explained in my
>answer to your request above. When you get the Dirac
>equation jargon thrown at you from all angles, which you
>will, just try to treat it as water off a duck's back.
>Someone, somewhere out there, will have the necessary
>ability and skill to: A) understand fully the Dirac equation
>(it isn't me, that's for sure) and; B) a clear mind, solid
>colloquial language and sufficient patience to see you
>through the dark days ahead (that might just be me, but then
>I don't meet requirement A). The incomprehensible will wait
>on Google until you are ready for it. Hope this helps. Good
>luck in your quest!*

One big problem with this is that colloquial language is not specific enough to get any handle on the Dirac equation. You may be able to discuss some of its consequences, but you certainly won't understand the equation itself. In order to understand it, you will have to learn new, technical terminology (aka jargon). For example, you cannot expect someone to understand nuclear physics without knowing the general concepts of charge, protons, neutrons, and isospin. These may all be considered to be 'jargon' to outsiders, but they are crucial for the area. If a person doesn't know them, they have to learn about them, thus gaining familiarity with the jargon.

In math this happens to an even greater degree. Because the results are often counter-intuitive, precise language is crucial for real understanding. In your own posts, you use the 'jargon' of onto, surjection, bijection, one-to-one, function, etc. The problem is that you don't seem to really understand what these concepts are saying. Part of the frustration that some people feel is that you are using this jargon incorrectly. Part is that you are trying to criticize results that depend heavily on the subtleties of those concepts and you seem to be unwilling to relearn the definitions correctly.

BTW, did last few posts make any sense to you?

sci.math: Re: Peano's space-filling curve

—Dan Grubb