There Is No Largest Prime Number With an introduction to a new proof technique

Euclid of Alexandria¹ DDU²

¹euclid@alexandria.edu Department of Mathematics University of Alexandria

²ddu6@protonmail.com Simple Text Orgnazition

27th International Symposium of Prime Numbers, -280

- Motivation
 - What Are Prime Numbers?

- Motivation
 - What Are Prime Numbers?
- 2 Results
 - Proof of the Main Theorem

- Motivation
 - What Are Prime Numbers?
- 2 Results
 - Proof of the Main Theorem
- What's More
 - What's Still To Do?
 - Another Open Question
 - An Algorithm For Finding Primes Numbers

- Motivation
 - What Are Prime Numbers?
- 2 Results
 - Proof of the Main Theorem
- What's More
 - What's Still To Do?
 - Another Open Question
 - An Algorithm For Finding Primes Numbers

What Are Prime Numbers?

Definition

A prime number is a number that has exactly two divisors.

Example

• 2 is prime (two divisors: 1 and 2).

What Are Prime Numbers?

Definition

A prime number is a number that has exactly two divisors.

Example

- 2 is prime (two divisors: 1 and 2).
- 3 is prime (two divisors: 1 and 3).

What Are Prime Numbers?

Definition

A prime number is a number that has exactly two divisors.

Example

- 2 is prime (two divisors: 1 and 2).
- 3 is prime (two divisors: 1 and 3).
- 4 is not prime (three divisors: 1, 2, and 4).

- Motivation
 - What Are Prime Numbers?
- 2 Results
 - Proof of the Main Theorem
- 3 What's More
 - What's Still To Do?
 - Another Open Question
 - An Algorithm For Finding Primes Numbers

The proof uses reductio ad absurdum

Theorem

There is no largest prime number.

Proof.

• Suppose *p* were the largest prime number.

3 But q + 1 is divisible by some prime number not in the first p numbers.



The proof uses reductio ad absurdum

Theorem

There is no largest prime number.

Proof.

- Suppose *p* were the largest prime number.
- ② Let q be the product of the first p numbers.
- **3** But q + 1 is divisible by some prime number not in the first p numbers.



The proof uses reductio ad absurdum

Theorem

There is no largest prime number.

Proof.

- Suppose *p* were the largest prime number.
- ② Let q be the product of the first p numbers.
- **3** Then q+1 is not divisible by any of them.
- **9** But q+1 is divisible by some prime number not in the first p numbers.



The proof uses reductio ad absurdum

Theorem

There is no largest prime number.

Proof.

- Suppose *p* were the largest prime number.
- 2 Let q be the product of the first p numbers.
- **③** Then q+1 is not divisible by any of them.
- But q + 1 is greater than 1, thus divisible by some prime number not in the first p numbers.

The proof uses reductio ad absurdum

Theorem

There is no largest prime number.

Proof.

- Suppose *p* were the largest prime number.
- 2 Let q be the product of the first p numbers.
- **③** Then q + 1 is not divisible by any of them.
- But q + 1 is greater than 1, thus divisible by some prime number not in the first p numbers.

The proof used reductio ad absurdum.

- Motivation
 - What Are Prime Numbers?
- 2 Results
 - Proof of the Main Theorem
- What's More
 - What's Still To Do?
 - Another Open Question
 - An Algorithm For Finding Primes Numbers

What's Still To Do?

Answered Questions

How many primes are there?

Open Questions

Is every even number the sum of two primes? [1]



[Goldbach, 1742] Christian Goldbach.

A problem we should try to solve before the ISPN '43 deadline, *Letter to Leonhard Euler*, 1742.

In complex plane, define $\zeta(s)=\sum\limits_{n=1}^{\infty}\frac{1}{n^s}$. Then, are all zeros of ζ in the strip $0\leq \operatorname{Re}(s)\leq 1$ lie on the line $\operatorname{Re}(s)=\frac{1}{2}$?

In complex plane, define $\zeta(s) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n^s}$. Then, are all zeros of ζ in the strip $0 \le \text{Re}(s) \le 1$ lie on the line $\text{Re}(s) = \frac{1}{2}$?

Some Observation

If Re(s) > 1

In complex plane, define $\zeta(s) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n^s}$. Then, are all zeros of ζ in the strip $0 \le \text{Re}(s) \le 1$ lie on the line $\text{Re}(s) = \frac{1}{2}$?

Some Observation

If Re(s) > 1, then

$$\zeta(s) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n^s}$$
$$= \prod_{p} \frac{1}{1 - p^{-s}}.$$

In complex plane, define $\zeta(s) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n^s}$. Then, are all zeros of ζ in the strip $0 \le \text{Re}(s) \le 1$ lie on the line $\text{Re}(s) = \frac{1}{2}$?

Some Observation

If Re(s) > 1, then

$$\zeta(s) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n^s}$$
$$= \prod_{p} \frac{1}{1 - p^{-s}}.$$

Thus ζ does not vanish when Re(s) > 1.

```
int main (void)
std::vector<bool> is_prime (100, true);
for (int i = 2; i < 100; i++)
return 0;
```

```
int main (void)
std::vector<bool> is_prime (100, true);
for (int i = 2; i < 100; i++)
if (is_prime[i])
return 0;
```

```
int main (void)
std::vector<bool> is_prime (100, true);
for (int i = 2; i < 100; i++)
if (is_prime[i])
std::cout << i << " ";
for (int j = i; j < 100;
is_prime [j] = false, j+=i);
return 0;
```

```
int main (void)
std::vector<bool> is_prime (100, true);
for (int i = 2; i < 100; i++)
if (is_prime[i])
std::cout << i << " ";
for (int j = i; j < 100;
is_prime [j] = false, j+=i);
return 0;
```

Note the use of std::.