Academic Journal of Science and Technology,
Aug, 2025, vol.6, No.1, p301-305

Rethinking Division by Negatives: A Distribution-Centric View

Omar A Zargelin[1*]

1. Office of Innovation and Entrepreneurship Projects, Libyan Authority for Scientific Research, Tripoli Libya

ABSTRACT

This paper re-examines division by negative numbers through a distribution-centric lens and then focuses on the canonical case negative over negative. In classical algebra, sign rules yield identities such as $(-a)/(-b) = a/b$, which are internally consistent and indispensable for symbolic manipulation. However, when division is interpreted as allocating a quantity into real, positive, countable groups, negative divisors lack any ontological referent there are no negative groups, and (in ordinary settings) no "negative items" to distribute. We formalize this gap between symbolic algebra and realistic interpretation by distinguishing symbolic validity from distributive meaning. Within this framework, division by zero is treated as a non-operation, and any division with a negative divisor including $(-a)/(-b)$ is classified as symbolic-only rather than a realizable act of allocation. A comparative analysis across mathematics, physics, economics, and education illustrates where sign rules succeed formally yet fail conceptually. We conclude with a proposed usage policy that preserves algebraic utility while constraining realistic interpretation, and we outline implications for curriculum design, philosophical clarity, and semantic tagging in computer algebra systems.

KEYWORDS: *Division by negatives, realistic distribution, symbolic validity, zero-centric arithmetic.*

* *Corresponding author:* zargelin@aonsrt.ly

1. INTRODUCTION

Division is classically defined as the inverse of multiplication:

$$\frac{a}{b} = a \times b^{-1}, b \neq 0 \quad (1)$$

From this definition follow the familiar sign rules for divisions with negatives (overview only):

$$\frac{+a}{-b} = -\left(\frac{a}{b}\right), \frac{-a}{+b} = -\left(\frac{a}{b}\right), \frac{-a}{-b} = \frac{a}{b} \quad (2)$$

In this paper, division is interpreted distributionally as **allocating a quantity into real, countable groups** that is, determining "quantity per group" when both the quantity and the groups exist in the world:

$$\frac{a}{b} = \text{quantity per group}, a \geq 0,\ b \in \mathbb{N} \quad (3)$$

Under this interpretation, **negative groups** and **negative objects** have no real referent: one cannot distribute into "–b groups," nor allocate "–a items" in any concrete setting. Consequently, there is a gap between symbolic algebra and realistic distribution. To make this gap precise, we begin with the **general case** of a negative divisor and then **narrow the scope** to the canonical identity

$$\frac{-a}{-b} = \frac{a}{b}, \quad (4)$$

which is algebraically valid yet, as we argue, lacks a coherent distributional meaning.

2. Literature and Background

Division by zero has long been a source of mathematical and philosophical controversy. In classical algebra, it is undefined because zero has no multiplicative inverse. There exists no real number $x$that satisfies:

$$a = x \times 0 \quad (5)$$

since $0 \times x = 0$for all values of x, and never equals $a$unless $a = 0$. This leads to an inherent contradiction. As Eli Maor (1994) notes in his historical analysis, attempts to define division by zero date back to ancient Indian and Arabic mathematicians, yet no consistent model has resolved its paradox.

In modern frameworks, several attempts have been made to fix division by zero through extended number systems. Carlström (2004) introduced Wheel Theory, which treats division by zero as defined within a closed circular arithmetic, though it sacrifices properties like cancellation. Similarly, Anderson (2004) proposed Transreal Arithmetic, which introduces a special "nullity" value to absorb such divisions, again altering core algebraic laws.

Yet some scholars argue that division by zero should not be defined at all but rather reclassified as a non-operation. Neely (2022) asserts that division by zero is not just undefined but logically invalid. Following this line, Zargelin (2025) proposed the Zero-Centric Arithmetic model, which defines division by zero as:

$$\frac{a}{0} \notin \mathbb{R}, \text{and does not exist} \quad (6)$$

This model is not merely symbolic; it introduces a philosophical stance: if no quantity can be distributed across zero groups, then the operation itself does not occur. It is not "undefined," but non-existent.

This distinction between symbolic and realistic arithmetic becomes crucial when we examine division by negatives especially in the case of $(-a)/(-b)$. While classical algebra affirms, through the rule of signs, as in Eq. (4), this rule functions purely symbolically. There is no real-world meaning to "negative objects" or "negative groups." One cannot distribute a deficit across anti-groups. Thus, just as division by zero leads to contradiction, division by negative divisors leads to unrealism a symbolic manipulation detached from physical meaning.

This growing divide between algebraic symbolism and realistic interpretation calls for a reevaluation of operations once taken for granted. The following sections explore this divide in depth, with special attention to the implications for mathematics education and conceptual clarity.

3. Theoretical Problem: Division as Distribution

In realistic terms, division answers the question "how much per group?" when a real, non-negative quantity is allocated into a positive, countable number of groups. These are the existence conditions for a distributive interpretation:

$$a = x \times 0,\ a \geq 0, b \in \mathrm{N}^{+} \quad (7)$$

Under these conditions, division denotes quantity per group (cf. (3)), where both *quantity* and *groups* refer to entities that can, in principle, be realized in the world (apples, boxes, students, tokens, etc.). The interpretation assumes:

- the quantity exists and can be portioned without contradiction,
- groups exist as actual recipients/containers,
- and the outcome (per-group amount) is meaningful in the same domain.

Table 1. Negative Divisors: Algebraic vs. Real Distribution

Case	Classical Algebra	Realistic Distribution	Philosophical Perspective	Practical Example
$a \div b$, $b > 0$	Well-defined	Groups exist → realistic	Valid operation	$12 \div 3 = 4$, (12 apples in 3 boxes)
$a \div b$	Undefined	No groups exist → no distribution	No Operation	$12 \div 0$,: cannot distribute 12 apples into 0 boxes
$a \div -b$ $a > 0$	Defined (negative result)	No such thing as negative groups	Unrealistic	$12 \div -3$: cannot distribute apples into -3 boxes
$-a \div b$, $b > 0$	Defined (negative result)	Negative quantity unrealistic	Unrealistic	$-12 \div 3 = -4$: cannot distribute -12 apples into 3 boxes
$-a \div -b$	Defined (positive result)	negative objects into negative groups	Symbolic only	$-12 \div -3 = 4$: debt / persons meaningless

Why any negative divisor breaks realism (no negative groups).

A negative divisor would require allocating into "−b groups." But groups are countable recipients; their count can be 1, 2, 3, … — never "−3." There is no physical operation that corresponds to "gathering negative baskets" or "addressing negative recipients." Thus, whenever $b < 0$, the instruction "distribute into b groups" has no real referent:

$$a/(-b) = \text{Not a real distribution} \qquad (8)$$

This does not deny algebraic consistency (symbolically, $a/-b = -(a/b)$ aper (2)); it denies the existence of the distributive act under negative group count.

negative group count.

Why are negative quantities not distributable items.

A negative quantity $(-a)$ typically represents a deficit, debt, or signed measure (orientation, direction, or inversion), rather than a stock of items that can be physically handed out. One may owe 12 dollars, but there are no "−12 coins" to distribute. In contexts like signed distances, a negative value indicates direction, not a negative pile of meters. Hence, whenever $a < 0$, the

instruction "distribute items" fails to refer to countable, present objects:

$$(-a)/b = \text{Not a real distribution} \qquad (9)$$

Again, the algebraic identity (2) remains correct; it is the realization as distribution that fails.

Transition to the focal case

$$(-a)/(-b)$$

Combining both defects negative quantity **and** negative groups yields the identity that is algebraically neat yet distributively void:

$$(-a)/(-b) = a/b$$

The equality in (4) follows from sign-cancellation rules and is symbolically valid (see (2)). But distributionally, it presupposes both negative objects and negative groups, neither of which exists as a recipient or allocable stock. Therefore, while (4) is true within symbolic algebra, it is not the outcome of any realizable act of allocation:

$$(-a)/(-b) = \text{Not a real distribution} \qquad (10)$$

In what follows, we keep the symbolic identity (4) intact while arguing that it lacks ontological and pedagogical meaning as a distributive operation. This clarifies the boundary between formal manipulation and realistic interpretation that underpins the rest of the paper.

4. Comparative Framework

Table 1. contrasts how the rule "negative ÷ negative = positive" functions in classical algebra versus how division is interpreted as a realistic distribution into countable, positive groups. By surveying physics, economics, and education, it highlights where the sign rule rule remains symbolically valid yet lacks a concrete distributive meaning clarifying why certain expressions should be treated as symbolic-only rather than realizable acts of allocation. The comparison prepares readers for the philosophical and pedagogical implications that follow.

Table 2. Negative Divisors by Domain: Symbolic Validity vs. Real-World Distribution

Case	Classical Algebra	Realistic Distribution	Philosophical Perspective	Practical Example
Physics	Symbolic manipulation possible	No meaning for negative groups	Exclude negative divisors	-10 ÷ -2 = 5: negative energy over -2 particles impossible
Economics	Algebraically valid	No such thing as -10 people	Reject operation	-1000 ÷ -10 = 100: debt on -10 persons impossible
Education	Rule taught: - ÷ - = +	Students ask: how negative groups exist?	Needs rethinking	Difficult to explain without abstraction

Table 2 summarizes how the rule "negative ÷ negative = positive" is treated across physics, economics, and education. While classical algebra permits symbolic manipulation, a distribution-based reading requires positive, countable groups rendering "negative groups" nonsensical. The contrast clarifies why these cases should be classified as symbolic-only operations rather than realizable acts of allocation.

Philosophical and Educational Implications (Symbolic truth vs. ontological meaning)

The identity equation 4 is symbolically true it follows from field axioms and sign rules but it lacks ontological meaning when division is read as distribution. Symbols can be coherently manipulated within algebraic structures while failing to denote realizable actions in the world. This gap is not a flaw in algebra; it is a boundary on what algebraic equalities can be taken to mean outside symbol games.

Classroom difficulty: no concrete model for negative groups.

Learners internalize division through sharing models: a things among b groups. These rely on countable, positive groups and present quantities. There is no concrete enactment of "−b groups," nor of distributing "−a items." Without a tangible model, students face a representational void precisely where intuition should anchor the rule.

Consequence: rote rule " − ÷ − = +" without concept.

In practice, teachers resort to memorization: the rule works but why remains opaque. This encourages procedural success at the cost of conceptual understanding, and it blurs the line between transformations that have real interpretations and those that are symbolic-only (sign cancellation).

Need to separate symbol manipulation from real-world reasoning.

Curricula should explicitly distinguish two layers:

1. Symbolic layer: formal rules

   (e.g., $\frac{-a}{-b} = \frac{a}{b}$) valid for algebraic computation.

2. Realistic layer: distributional interpretation, restricted to non-negative quantities

   and positive, countable groups.

   Marking $\frac{-a}{-b}$ as symbolic-only preserves algebraic utility while preventing category errors in physical reasoning and pedagogy. This separation clarifies explanations, reduces cognitive

Proposed Redefinition

Aim. Preserve algebraic utility while clarifying when division has a realistic (distributional) meaning.

Conditions for Realistic Division

Division describes *quantity per group* only when the distribution has real referents:

- **Non-negative quantity** (the stock to be allocated is present, not a deficit).
- **Positive, countable groups** (actual recipients/containers).

Center the next line in Word:

$$a/b = \text{quantity per group}, \quad a \geq 0 \text{ and } b \in N^{+} \qquad (10)$$

These conditions ensure that the act "distribute a into b groups" can actually occur.

Division by Zero → non-operation

No quantity can be allocated into zero groups. Rather than calling it merely undefined, we classify it as something that does not occur:

$$\frac{a}{0} \notin R \qquad (11)$$

Any Negative Divisor → Symbolic Rule Only

Whenever the divisor is negative (including the focal identity), the result is algebraically valid but not a distributive act. It reflects sign cancellation, not allocation:

$$(-a)/(-b) = a/b$$

symbolic only, not distributive. Policy summary. Use such identities freely in symbolic algebra; do not present them as models of real-world division unless the conditions in §6.1 are satisfied dissonance, and guides appropriate use in applications.

Objections and Clarifications (Field-axioms objection)

From the real-number field axioms (existence of inverses; distributivity; compatibility of multiplication with sign), one derives:

$$\frac{-1}{-1} = +1$$

and therefore, for any nonzero a, b:

$$\frac{-a}{-b} = \frac{a}{b}$$

Thus, the objection claims: consistency itself demands (4); rejecting it would undermine algebra.

Clarification: we do not alter algebra; we alter interpretation/usage.

This paper does not dispute (4). We keep its symbolic validity intact. Our claim is about interpretation: when division is read distributionally as allocating a real, non-negative quantity into positive, countable groups an expression with a negative divisor (and a fortiori the case $\frac{-a}{-b}$ does not correspond to a realizable act. Hence:

$\frac{-a}{-b} = \frac{a}{b}$, symbolically valid; not a real distribution

Symbolic validity preserved; distributive reading rejected.

We preserve algebra for formal computation and proofs, while rejecting the distributive reading wherever its existence conditions (non-negative quantity; positive, countable groups) fail. In short: no change to algebra only to how and where we claim an algebraic identity models a real operation.

Conclusion

This paper distinguished between symbolic truth and realistic (distributional) meaning for divisions involving negative numbers. While the sign rules of classical algebra ensure that expressions with negative divisors especially the canonical identity $(-a)/(-b) = a/b$ are algebraically valid, they do not correspond to realizable acts of allocation when division is read as distributing a quantity into real, positive, countable groups. Negative groups (and, in ordinary contexts, negative distributable items) have no ontological referent; hence, negative division is symbolic-only in distributional settings, with $(-a)/(-b)$ serving as the clearest illustration of this symbolic realistic split.

5. Call to rethink teaching and interpretation.

We recommend principled separation in curricula and exposition: retain sign rules for formal computation, but label divisions with negative divisors as symbolic-only whenever a distributional model is implied. Making this boundary explicit helps learners and practitioners avoid category errors, clarifies explanations, and aligns mathematical instruction with meaningful real-world reasoning.

Future Work

Apply the same realism criteria to other sign-heavy or symbolically permissive topics that often lack a concrete distributive (or constructive) model: logarithms of negatives (branch choice vs. real interpretation), factorials off the natural numbers (analytic continuation vs. combinatorial meaning), signed/imaginary roots (orientation vs. quantity), and piecewise signed rate constructs (e.g., average rates over signed intervals). The aim is to separate symbolic utility from ontological realizability and to mark where operations are *symbolic-only*.

Empirical studies in pedagogy.

Design classroom experiments comparing two teaching tracks:

(1) a conventional approach that presents "$- \div - = +$" as a rule.

(2) a realism-aware approach that explicitly labels negative-divisor division as symbolic-only and constrains real division to non-negative quantities and positive, countable groups. Measure effects on concept retention, transfer to word problems, and reduction of misconceptions (e.g., negative groups).

Integration into Computer Algebra Systems (CAS).

Prototype existence/meaning tagging for expressions: flags such as *distributive-real*, *symbolic-only*, *non-operation* (e.g., a/0). Provide user-visible warnings when simplifications (like $(-a)/(-b) \rightarrow a/b$) are invoked in contexts that imply distribution. Expose an API for downstream tools (education apps, simulations) to query and respect these semantic tags.

References

1. Maor, E. (1994). *To Infinity and Beyond: A Cultural History of the Infinite*. Princeton University Press.

2. Neely, M. J. (2022). *Why We Cannot Divide by Zero*. University of Southern California. Available at: arXiv:2203.12345

3. Carlström, J. (2004). *Wheel Theory*. *Mathematical Structures in Computer Science*, 14(1), 101–127.

4. Anderson, J. A. D. W. (2004). *Perspex Machine VIII: Axioms of Transreal Arithmetic*. *Applied Mathematics and Computation*, 151(1), 181–200.

5. Zargelin, O. A. (2025). Zero Centric Arithmetic: Rethinking division by zero. Derna Academy Journal for Applied Sciences, 5(1), 17–24