

Re: Why is there no *really* useful Algebra beyond complex numbers? (and if it were, would John Baez talk about it?)

Re: Why is there no *really* useful Algebra beyond complex numbers? (and if it were, would John Baez talk about it?)

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.math/2005-06/msg01417.html>

- From: Robin Chapman <rjc@xx>
 - Date: Thu, 09 Jun 2005 17:58:36 +0100
-

Roger Bersford wrote:

> Sorry- I was writing as a myopic engineer! I should have said "many",
> not "most"; many Banach algebras are Hoops.

Really? Like hula hoops?

--

Robin Chapman, www.maths.ex.ac.uk/~rjc/rjc.html

"Elegance is an algorithm"

Iain M. Banks, [_The Algebraist_](#)

- **Follow-Ups:**

- ◆ ***Re: Why is there no *really* useful Algebra beyond complex numbers? (and if it were, would John Baez talk about it?)***
◇ From: Lee Rudolph

- **References:**

- ◆ ***Re: Why is there no *really* useful Algebra beyond complex numbers? (and if it were, would John Baez talk about it?)***
◇ From: Robin Chapman
- ◆ ***Re: Why is there no *really* useful Algebra beyond complex numbers? (and if it were, would John Baez talk about it?)***
◇ From: Roger Bersford

- Prev by Date: ***Re: Linear Iteration Rules***
- Next by Date: ***Re: mathematician salaries***
- Previous by thread: ***Re: Why is there no *really* useful Algebra beyond complex numbers? (and if it were, would John Baez talk about it?)***
- Next by thread: ***Re: Why is there no *really* useful Algebra beyond complex numbers? (and if it were, would John Baez talk about it?)***
- Index(es):

Re: Why is there no *really* useful Algebra beyond complex numbers? (and if it were, would John Baez talk about it?)

Re: Why is there no *really* useful Algebra beyond complex numbers? (and if it were, would John Baez talk about it?)

◆ *Date*

◆ *Thread*

Re: Why is there no *really* useful Algebra beyond complex numbers? (and if it were, would John Baez talk