

# Re: Epistemology 201: The Science of Science

**Source:** <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.physics/2005-02/4033.html>

---

*mmeron\_at\_cars3.uchicago.edu*

**Date:** 02/08/05

Date: Tue, 08 Feb 2005 23:10:44 GMT

In article <yU7Od.16139\$mo2.1277440@news.xtra.co.nz>, "Jason" <jasonstevensNOSPAM@free.net.nz> writes:

>> > *I am already familiar with your jargon.*

>>

>> *Jargon is a pejorative term. Say instead, technical vocabulary. Every*

>> *art and science has a technical vocabulary proper to its nature and*

>> *scope. I use simon-pure standard mathematical terminology which can be*

>> *found in every paper and treatise on the subject.*

>>

>> *Mathematicians write to be understood by other mathematicians so a*

>> *standard technical vocabular and lexicon is used. If you do not wish to*

>> *learn it, that is your choice and problem, not mine.*

>

>*I think the point is that we're*

Who's 'we'? Pretensions of royalty here?

>*trying to speak English here, or at least most*

>*of us. I'm guilty of it sometimes, but I try not to use jargon*

Technical vocabulary

> *where I don't need to. You don't need to use jargon*

Technical vocabulary.

>*with the concepts so far. It was clear*

>*to me that people were asking for definitions, not a new jargon*

Technical vocabulary.

>*term. People can too easily hide behind jargon.*

Technical vocabulary.

The question of what technical vocabulary to use, in any specific area, is best left to the people actively involved in said area. If and when you, as a layman, find some of the terminology unclear, feel

sci.physics: Re: Epistemology 201: The Science of Science

free to ask for explanations. That's all.

Mati Meron | "When you argue with a fool,  
meron@cars.uchicago.edu | chances are he is doing just the same"