

Re: naive question from a non-mathematician

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.math/2006-05/msg04791.html>

- *From:* David C. Ullrich <ullrich@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Sun, 28 May 2006 13:30:31 -0500
-

On Sun, 28 May 2006 15:17:21 GMT, Stephen Montgomery-Smith <stephen@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

Gene Ward Smith wrote:

Stephen Montgomery-Smith wrote:
[...]

Incidentally, the problem with your way of defining the complex numbers is that it is by no means a priori obvious that this defines the complex numbers uniquely (up to isomorphism). I am going to take your word for it that it does.

I don't recall him saying explicitly that it does. I doubted that it did; Denis says it doesn't.

But I would contend that this is not a natural way to define the complex numbers.

Stephen

David C. Ullrich

.