

# Re: math.sci

---

*Source:* <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.math/2006-04/msg02183.html>

---

- *From:* [ullrich@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:ullrich@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx) (David C. Ullrich)
  - *Date:* Tue, 11 Apr 2006 18:03:20 GMT
- 

On Tue, 11 Apr 2006 10:09:45 -0700, Ronald Bruck <[bruck@xxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:bruck@xxxxxxxxxxxx)> wrote:

In article <[j9dn32517r5p95emr2cerboc8f1ut16nob@xxxxxxx](mailto:j9dn32517r5p95emr2cerboc8f1ut16nob@xxxxxxx)>, David C. Ullrich <[ullrich@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:ullrich@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx)> wrote:

On 11 Apr 2006 04:58:20 -0700, [v4vijayakumar@xxxxxxxxxx](mailto:v4vijayakumar@xxxxxxxxxx) wrote:

shouldn't it be math.sci?

No.

(Can't explain why not until you say why it should be math.sci; I can imagine a few reasons someone might think that.)

I think the explanation is simple enough. Usenet is divided hierarchically, with the most generic group first, the refinements following. sci. is the hierarchy most concerned with science, technology, mathematics, etc.

Well of course that's the reason that it is sci.math; that doesn't explain why the reason he thinks it should be math.sci is wrong.

For example, one of my conjectures about why he thought it should be math.sci would be domain names, which are also hierarchical but spelled in the opposite direction: in "math.usc.edu" the top-level domain is edu, usc is a sub-domain of edu, and math is a subdomain of usc (domain names never made any sense to me until I realized this was what was going on...)

Re: math.sci

If \_that\_'s why he thinks it should be math.sci then the explanation is that newsgroup names are not domain names.

Only if you're not aware of ANY other newsgroups could you be puzzled as to the convention. And I dunno about the OP's newsreader, but mine is constantly reminding me of new newsgroups.

I thought it was a troll.

--

Ron Bruck

David C. Ullrich

.