Re: Is this proof of infinitely many primes flawed?

Source: http://sci.tech−archive.net/Archive/sci.math/2009−01/msg03540.html

- *From*: W^3 <aderamey.addw@xxxxxxxxxxx>
- *Date*: Wed, 28 Jan 2009 11:54:14 −0800

In article
<c0c7ca4c−ac2f−46d1−8140−6eb591a22fdf@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>,
"sttscitrans@xxxxxxxxx" <sttscitrans@xxxxxxxxx> wrote:

> On 28 Jan, 03:15, W^3 <aderamey.a...@xxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:
>
>> In article
>> <192daabf−10e1−483f−bab3−df686a539...@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>,
>>
>>> conrad <con...@xxxxxxxxxx> wrote:
>>>
>>>> Suppose p_1,p_2,...,p_n are all the primes
>>>>
>>>> Let M = (p_1,p_2,...,p_n) + 1
>>>>
>>>> Suppose p_k | M
>>>>
>>>> Clearly p_k | (p_1,p_2,...,p_n)
>>>>
>>>> then p_k | M − (p_1,p_2,...,p_n) = 1
>>>>
>>>> But p_k > 1 (Contradiction)

> > > Where I do not follow this proof is
> > > if we suppose p_k divides evenly M
> > > then how can we say p_k divides
> > > evenly (p_1,p_2,...,p_n)?

> > It has nothing to do with assuming p_k | M. It is simply obvious, as obvious as saying 5 | 3*5*7.

> You are missing the point.
>
> If 2,3,5 were the only primes
> A= 2*3*5
> B = 2*3*5+1
>
> As B>1 some prime 2,3 or 5 must divide it
> say, 3,
> 3 must divide A by definition
> 3 divides B
> 3 must divide B−A =1, but 3 does not divide 1
> a contradiction.

No, you are confused. I addressed specifically the question

> > > Where I do not follow this proof is
> > > if we suppose p_k divides evenly M
> > > then how can we say p_k divides
> > > evenly (p_1,p_2,...,p_n)?

and nothing else.
.