

# A glossary for research reports

C D GRAHAM, JR.

From *Metal Progress* 71, 75 (1957).

It has long been known that. . . . I haven't bothered to look up the original reference

. . . of great theoretical and practical importance . . . interesting to me

While it has not been possible to provide definite answers to these questions . . . The experiments didn't work out, but I figured I could at least get a publication out of it

The W-Pb system was chosen as especially suitable to show the predicted behaviour. . . . The fellow in the next lab had some already made up

High-purity . . . Composition unknown except for the exaggerated claims of the supplier

Very high purity . . . A scratch

Extremely high purity . . . The results on the others didn't make sense and were ignored

Super-purity . . .

Spectroscopically pure . . .

A fiducial reference line . . .

Three of the samples were chosen for detailed study . . .

. . . accidentally strained during . . . dropped on the floor mounting

. . . handled with extreme care . . . not dropped on the floor throughout the experiments

Typical results are shown . . . The best results are shown

Although some detail has been lost in reproduction, it is clear from the original micrograph that . . .

Presumably at longer times . . . I didn't take time to find out

The agreement with the predicted curve is excellent

good fair

satisfactory poor

fair doubtful

imaginary imaginary

. . . as good as could be expected non-existent

These results will be reported at a later date I might possibly get around to this sometime

The most reliable values are those of Jones He was a student of mine

It is suggested that . . . I think

It is believed that . . . I think

It may be that . . .

It is generally believed that . . . A couple of other guys think so too

It might be argued that . . . I have such a good answer to this objection that I shall now raise it

It is clear that much additional work will be required before a complete understanding . . . I don't understand it

Unfortunately, a quantitative theory to account for these effects has not been formulated Neither does anybody else

Correct within an order of magnitude Wrong

It is to be hoped that this work will stimulate further work in the field This paper isn't very good, but neither are any of the others in this miserable subject

Thanks are due to Joe Glotz for assistance with the experiments and to John Doe for valuable discussions Glotz did the work and Doe explained what it meant

Technological progress has merely provided us with more efficient means for going backwards.

ALDOUS HUXLEY