A remark of the definition of 0/0 = 0 by Brahmagupta

HIROSHI OKUMURA hokmr@yandex.com

Abstract. We consider why Brahmagupta did not refer to z/0 for $z \neq 0$ but 0/0 = 0.

Mathematics Subject Classification (2010). 01A32, 03C99.

Indian mathematician and astronomer Brahmagupta (598-665+?) stated 0/0 = 0, but did not refer to z/0 for $z \neq 0$. The purpose of this note is to deduce how he considered on this matter.

We deduce that he considered that division is made by multiplying a number as subtraction is essentially addition. Indeed if $a \neq 0$,

$$z \div a = z \cdot a^{-1}.$$

Therefore in the case a = 0,

 $z \div 0 = z \cdot x.$

for some x. However he could not specify the number x in this case. Hence he could not refer to z/0 for any number z. But the right side always equals 0 if z = 0 for any x. Thereby he could consider

$$0 \div 0 = 0 \cdot x = 0.$$

which implies 0/0 = 0. This seems to be the reason he only referred to 0/0 = 0.