

# Re: Relative Cardinality

---

*Source:* <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.math/2005-07/msg00778.html>

---

- *From:* "Proginoskes" <[proginoskes@xxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:proginoskes@xxxxxxxxxxxxx)>
  - *Date:* 6 Jul 2005 17:09:16 -0700
- 

mueckenh@xxxxxxxxxxxxx wrote:

> Randy Poe wrote:  
>> mueck...@xxxxxxxxxxxxx wrote:  
>>> As this would lead to strange results like  $\text{Card}(N) =$   
>>>  $\text{Card}(\{\text{Primes}\})$ ,  
>>  
>> Of course,  $\text{Card}(N)$  does equal  $\text{Card}(\text{Primes})$ .  
>>  
>> Does WM think there is a natural number  $n$  such that the  
>>  $n$ -th prime does not exist?  
>  
> Yes, it is so. I am not sure, whether sequences like 111...111 with  $n$   
> 1's or like  $10^{2n} - 10^n + 1$  do ever cease to supply primes now and  
> then.

That is an irrelevant comment, because there are prime numbers which are not of that form (like 2).

> In principle such numbers with  $10^{10000}$  digits do exist and  
> perhaps could be prime. The prime number  $10^{100}$  does not exist,  
> however, for the simple reason that we cannot count up to that number  
> step by step.

Er ... Euclid proved that there are an infinite number of primes.

If in fact there are only a finite number of primes, list them as  $p_1$ ,  $p_2$ , ...,  $p_k$ .

Let  $N = p_1 * p_2 * \dots * p_k + 1$ . Then there is a prime number  $p$  that divides evenly into  $N$ . This  $p$  cannot be  $p_1$ , since the remainder when you divide  $N$  by  $p_1$  is 1. Similarly,  $p$  is not  $p_1$ , ...,  $p_k$ , so it's not on the list. But this contradicts the assumption that the list is complete. So there cannot be an infinite number of primes.

What do you find wrong with that proof?

— Christopher Heckman

.

- *Follow-Ups:*
  - ◆ **Re: Relative Cardinality**
    - ◇ *From:* mueckenh
  
- *References:*
  - ◆ **Re: Relative Cardinality**
    - ◇ *From:* mueckenh
  - ◆ **Re: Relative Cardinality**
    - ◇ *From:* Virgil
  - ◆ **Re: Relative Cardinality**
    - ◇ *From:* mueckenh
  - ◆ **Re: Relative Cardinality**
    - ◇ *From:* Dik T. Winter
  - ◆ **Re: Relative Cardinality**
    - ◇ *From:* mueckenh
  - ◆ **Re: Relative Cardinality**
    - ◇ *From:* Randy Poe
  - ◆ **Re: Relative Cardinality**
    - ◇ *From:* mueckenh
  
- Prev by Date: **Re: logic question**
- Next by Date: **Re: The Math Behind IQ Tests**
- Previous by thread: **Re: Relative Cardinality**
- Next by thread: **Re: Relative Cardinality**
- Index(es):
  - ◆ **Date**
  - ◆ **Thread**