



HAL
open science

The concept of prime number and the Legendre and Goldbach conjectures

Jamel Ghannouchi

► **To cite this version:**

Jamel Ghannouchi. The concept of prime number and the Legendre and Goldbach conjectures. Bulletin of Mathematical Sciences and Applications, 2014, 3 (4), pp.25. hal-01067727v4

HAL Id: hal-01067727

<https://hal.science/hal-01067727v4>

Submitted on 19 Jan 2015

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

The concept of prime number and the Legendre conjecture

Jamel Ghanouchi
jamel.ghanouchi@live.com

Abstract

(MSC=11D04) In this document, we deal with the concept of prime number together with the Legendre conjecture.

Keywords : Primes ; Legendre ; Conjecture.

Defintion

The prime numbers are called primes because they are the bricks of the numbers : Each number n can be written as $n = p_1^{n_1} p_2^{n_2} \dots p_i^{n_i}$ when p_j are primes and n_j are integers.

This writing is called the decomposition in prime factors of the number n . In fact, this definition is a very particular case of a much more general one. Indeed, if n_j are rationals, everything changes.

Considering that the decomposition in prime factors of an integer n when n_j are rationals $n = p_1^{n_1} p_2^{n_2} \dots p_i^{n_i}$. In this writing which is unique for each n , then, the p_j have no reason to be the same than before and they become a convention. For example, if we decide that 16 is conventionally prime, we have $2 = 16^{\frac{1}{4}}$ and each number can be written according to 16 and its rational exponent instead of 2.

If we decide conventionally that $F_n = 2^{2^n} + 1$ is prime $\forall n \geq 0$, and it is possible by the fact that $GCD(F_n, F_m) = 1$ when $n \neq m$, then each new prime (new primes=bricks with rational exponents in the writing) replaces another one in the list of the old primes (old primes=bricks with integral exponents in the writing).

Example : If by convention, $F_5 = 2^{2^5} + 1 = 4294967297 = 641.6700417$ is prime, we can decide that it replaces $641 = F_5.6700417^{-1}$ which becomes compound and 6700417 is prime or 641 is prime and $6700417 = F_5.641^{-1}$ is compound.

In all cases, the advantage is that we have a formula which gives for each n a prime. And we can see the the primes are infinite.

There is a result which is enough interesting : Let Ulam spiral. The Fermat numbers are all situated in the same line.

Let us apply it to the real numbers !

The following numbers can be called bricks or elements, because they constitute the bricks of the numbers. They exist, of course, and we prefer to call them prime numbers because they really generalize the concept of primes. Let us see this : A real number is compound if it is equal to $\pm p_1^{n_1} \dots p_i^{n_i}$ where p_j are prime numbers and n_j are rationals. We define other real prime numbers which can not be expressed like this : $\pi, e, \ln(2)$.

Thus $\sqrt[i]{p} = p^{\frac{1}{i}}$ for example is compound.

We can notice that such numbers really generalize the concept of prime, as they can be written only as $p = p.1$

Furthermore $\sqrt[p]{p} + 1$ is conventionally prime, with p prime, hence $\sqrt[p]{p} - 1 = (p - 1)(\sqrt[p]{p} + 1)^{-1}$ is compound !

And

$$\sqrt[i]{p} - 1 = (p - 1)(\sqrt[i]{p} + 1)^{-1}(\sqrt[i]{p^2} + 1)^{-1} \dots (\sqrt[p]{p} + 1)^{-1}$$

And, conventionally, π and e are primes instead of π^{n_0} and e^{m_0} with $(n_0 - 1)(m_0 - 1) \neq 0$ which are compound.

We define the GCD of two numbers as following : If p_1 and p_2 are prime real numbers

$$p_1 \neq p_2 \Rightarrow GCD(p_1, p_2) = 1$$

$$n_1 n_2 < 0 \Rightarrow GCD(p_1^{n_1}, p_1^{n_2}) = 1$$

$$n_1 n_2 > 0; n_1 > 0 \Rightarrow GCD(p_1^{n_1}, p_1^{n_2}) = p_1^{\min(n_1, n_2)}$$

$$n_1 n_2 > 0; n_1 < 0 \Rightarrow GCD(p_1^{n_1}, p_1^{n_2}) = p_1^{\max(n_1, n_2)}$$

$$GCD(p_1^{n_1} p_2^{n_2} \dots p_i^{n_i}, p_1^{m_1} p_2^{m_2} \dots p_j^{m_j}) = \prod_{i,j} (GCD(p_i^{n_i}, p_j^{m_j}))$$

And if $x = p_1^{n_1} p_2^{n_2} \dots p_i^{n_i}$ and $y = p_{l_1}^{m_{l_1}} \dots p_{l_i}^{m_{l_i}}$ then y divides x if $GCD(x, y) = y$. Thus $\frac{3}{2}$ does not divide the prime 3, for example.

The Legendre conjecture

The Legendre conjecture states that there is always a prime number between the squares of two consecutive integers. What does it become with our new definition ? It remains true ! Effectively :

Proof :

We always have

$$(2n)^2 < 4n^2 + 1 < (2n + 1)^2 < 4n^2 + 8n + 1 < (2(n + 1))^2$$

Let us prove that (CD=common divisor)

$$CD(4n^2 + 1, 4p^2 + 1) = 5; p \neq n$$

$$CD(4n^2 + 8n + 1, 4p^2 + 8p + 1) = 3, p \neq n$$

$$GCD(4n^2 + 1; 4p^2 + 8p + 1) = 1$$

We have

$$d|4n^2 + 1; \quad d|4p^2 + 8p + 1$$

$$\Rightarrow d|4(p^2 - n^2) + 8p$$

And $4n^2 + 1$ is odd then d is odd and

$$d|p^2 - n^2 + 2p$$

But

$$d|4n^2 + 4p^2 + 8p + 2 \Rightarrow d|2(n + p)^2 - 4np + 4p + 1$$

Thus

$$d|2(p - n)(p + n)^2 + 4p(n + p)$$

And

$$d|2(p - n)(p + n)^2 + p - n + 4np(n - p) + 4p(p - n)$$

Hence

$$d|p - n + 4np(n - p) = p - n + 4pn^2 - 4np^2 - 8np + 8np$$

Or

$$d|8np \Rightarrow d|np$$

Thus

$$d|p - n \Rightarrow d|n \Rightarrow d = 1$$

Also

$$n = 5(k + k') \pm 1; p = 5(k - k') \pm 1 \neq n$$

$$\Rightarrow 5|4n^2 + 1; 5|4p^2 + 1$$

And

$$n = 3(k + k') + 2; p = 3(k - k') + 2 \neq n$$

$$\Rightarrow 3|4n^2 + 8n + 1; 3|4p^2 + 8p + 1$$

And $4m^2 + 1$ and $4p^2 + 8p + 1$ can be taken primes simultaneously by the new definition of the primes. Here is how : the first $4m^2 + 1$ divisible by 5 is for $m = 4$ and then $4m^2 + 1 = 65 = 13 \cdot 5$. We consider 65 prime and then $5 = 65 \cdot 13^{-1}$ is not a prime. The second $4m^2 + 1$ divisible by 5 is for $m = 6$ and then $4m^2 + 1 = 145 = 29 \cdot 5$, 145 is now prime and $29 = 145 \cdot 5^{-1} = 145 \cdot 65^{-1} \cdot 13$ is not a prime. All this because there is only one decomposition in prime factors. Etc...

Now by the same way, the first $4m^2 + 8m + 1$ divisible by 3 is for $m = 2$ and then $4m^2 + 8m + 1 = 33 = 11 \cdot 3$ is prime and $3 = 33 \cdot 11^{-1}$ is not a prime,

etc...

By this definition of the primes, as

$$(2n)^2 < 4n^2 + 1 < (2n + 1)^2 < 4n^2 + 8n + 1 < (2(n + 1))^2$$

Means that between all x^2 and $(x + 1)^2$ there is a prime $\forall x \in \mathbb{N}$.

Turn back to the old primes

There is always a new prime p between the square of two consecutive integers $p = ux^2 + (1 - u)(x + 1)^2$; $0 < u < 1$)

Let us suppose Legendre false for the old primes. There exists x for which for which there exists $b \neq 0$ verifying $p' - ux^2 - (1 - u)(x + 1)^2 = b$, $\forall p'$ old prime).

True for new primes

$$p - ux^2 - (1 - u)(x + 1)^2 = 0$$

And false for old

$$p' - u''x^2 - (1 - u'')(x + 1)^2 = b$$

But for $a \neq 0$

$$a^2p - u(ax)^2 - (1 - u)(a(x + 1))^2 = 0 = q - u'(ax)^2 - (1 - u')(a(x + 1))^2$$

Because there is a new prime q between $(ax)^2$ and $a^2(x + 1)^2$. And

$$a^2p' - u''(ax)^2 - (1 - u'')(a(x + 1))^2 = a^2b = a^2p' - q + a^2(u' - u'')(x^2 - (x + 1)^2)$$

But

$$-\frac{q}{a^2} = b - p' + (u'' - u')(x^2 - (x + 1)^2) \in \mathbb{Z}$$

$\forall a$. Particularly $a = q$ and then $q = 1$: impossible ! It means that the hypothesis is false, so for all x , there exists p old prime for which $b = 0$.

Conclusion

We del with the concept of prime number and gave a new definition of primes. It allowed to prove the Legendre conjecture for the new definition of primes and to transpose the proof to the old one.

Références

- [1] Alan Baker, Transcendental number theory *Cambridge University Press*, (1975).