

# The Infinitude of Primes

Timo Chang

[timo65537@protonmail.com](mailto:timo65537@protonmail.com)

Last edited: December 26, 2025

## Contents

<b>1</b>	<b>Euclid's Original Proof</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>2</b>	<b>The Limit of the Prime Counting Function</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>3</b>	<b>The Sum of Reciprocals of Primes</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>4</b>	<b>Furstenberg's Proof Using Topology</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>5</b>	<b>Whang's Proof Using Legendre's Formula</b>	<b>5</b>
	<b>References</b>	<b>5</b>

## 1 Euclid's Original Proof

**Theorem 1.1** (Euclid). *Let  $S$  be a finite collection of prime numbers. Then there exists a prime that is not in  $S$ .*

*Proof.* Suppose  $S = \{p_1, \dots, p_n\}$  and set  $P = p_1 \cdots p_n + 1$ . If  $P$  itself is a prime, then we are done because  $P$  is not equal to any of  $p_1, \dots, p_n$ . So suppose  $P$  is composite, then it has a prime factor, say  $q$ . We claim that this  $q$  is not in  $S$ . Otherwise, we have  $q = p_i$  for some  $i = 1, \dots, n$ . This implies  $q$  divides  $p_1 \cdots p_n$ . And since  $q$  also divides  $P$ , we have  $q$  divides  $P - p_1 \cdots p_n = 1$ , which is absurd. Hence,  $q$  is not in  $S$ .  $\square$

We mention that Euclid's proof of the "infinitude" of primes did not start with assuming that there are only finitely many. Instead, Theorem 1.1 says that any finite set of primes (not only the first  $n$  primes) can be extended to a larger prime set. We illustrate this by the following example.

**Example 1.2.** Let's say  $S := \{2, 17, 43\}$ . Then  $P = 2 \cdot 17 \cdot 43 + 1$ , which is divisible by 7. Thus, we have a new prime 7.

Let's adjoin 7 to our prime list and put  $S' := \{2, 7, 17, 43\}$ . Then  $P' = 2 \cdot 7 \cdot 17 \cdot 43 + 1$ , which is divisible by 5. Thus, we have a new prime 5.

Continuing this process, we obtain an infinite sequence of distinct primes. (It would be interesting to ask whether all primes appear in this way.)

*Remark 1.3.* It is a common mistake (due to the false belief mentioned earlier) to think that the product of the first  $n$  primes plus 1 is a prime. As an example,

$$2 \cdot 3 \cdot 5 \cdot 7 \cdot 11 \cdot 13 + 1 = 59 \cdot 509$$

is not a prime.

## 2 The Limit of the Prime Counting Function

**Definition 2.1.** The *prime counting function*  $\pi : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$  is a function which counts the number of primes less than or equal to  $x$ . Precisely,

$$\pi(x) := \#\{p \leq x \mid p \text{ is a prime}\}.$$

**Proposition 2.2.**  $\lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} \pi(x) = \infty$ .

As an immediate corollary, this implies that there are infinitely many prime numbers.

*Proof.* Our strategy is to find a function which is bounded above by  $\pi(x)$ , but goes to infinity when  $x \rightarrow \infty$ . Then by comparison theorem we will obtain the result.

Let us fix an  $x$  and assume that  $n \leq x < n + 1$  for some  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ . We consider the graph of the function  $1/t$  as in Figure 1. Note that the area under the curve  $1/t$  from 1 to  $x$  is smaller than the area of those rectangles. From basic Calculus, they are simply Riemann integral and the upper Riemann sum, respectively. So we see that

$$\int_1^x \frac{1}{t} dt = \ln x \leq 1 + \frac{1}{2} + \cdots + \frac{1}{n}. \quad (1)$$

Let  $p_1 < p_2 < \cdots < p_s$  be all primes  $\leq x$ . We observe that

$$1 + \frac{1}{2} + \cdots + \frac{1}{n} \leq \sum_{\substack{m=p_1^{\alpha_1} \cdots p_s^{\alpha_s} \\ \alpha_i \in \mathbb{N}}} \frac{1}{m}. \quad (2)$$

This is because the prime factorization of every positive integer  $\leq n$  (which is now  $\leq x$ ) involves only primes among  $p_1, \dots, p_s$ , and the sum on the right runs over all the possible powers, so it contains more terms than the left-hand side.




Figure 1

On the other hand, by the distributive law, we see that the sum

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{\substack{m=p_1^{\alpha_1} \cdots p_s^{\alpha_s} \\ \alpha_i \in \mathbb{N}}} \frac{1}{m} &= \left(1 + \frac{1}{p_1} + \frac{1}{p_1^2} + \cdots\right) \cdots \left(1 + \frac{1}{p_s} + \frac{1}{p_s^2} + \cdots\right) \\ &= \prod_{i=1}^s \frac{1}{1 - \frac{1}{p_i}} = \prod_{i=1}^s \left(\frac{p_i}{p_i - 1}\right) = \prod_{i=1}^s \left(1 + \frac{1}{p_i - 1}\right). \end{aligned}$$

Note that by the definition,  $p_i$  is the  $i$ -th prime number. This implies that  $p_i - 1 \geq i$ . Hence, we have

$$\sum_{\substack{m=p_1^{\alpha_1} \cdots p_s^{\alpha_s} \\ \alpha_i \in \mathbb{N}}} \frac{1}{m} = \prod_{i=1}^s \left(1 + \frac{1}{p_i - 1}\right) \leq \prod_{i=1}^s \left(1 + \frac{1}{i}\right) = \prod_{i=1}^s \left(\frac{i+1}{i}\right) = s+1. \quad (3)$$

But recall that  $s$  is the number of primes  $\leq x$ . This means by Definition 2.1,

$$s+1 = \pi(x) + 1. \quad (4)$$

Now, we may combine all of the information and see that

$$\ln x \stackrel{(1)}{\leq} 1 + \frac{1}{2} + \cdots + \frac{1}{n} \stackrel{(2)}{\leq} \sum_{\substack{m=p_1^{\alpha_1} \cdots p_s^{\alpha_s} \\ \alpha_i \in \mathbb{N}}} \frac{1}{m} \stackrel{(3)}{\leq} s+1 \stackrel{(4)}{=} \pi(x) + 1.$$

Finally, since  $\ln x \rightarrow \infty$  as  $x \rightarrow \infty$ , we have  $\lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} \pi(x) = \infty$ . This completes the proof.  $\square$

### 3 The Sum of Reciprocals of Primes

**Proposition 3.1** (Euler, 1744<sup>1</sup>). *Let  $\mathcal{P}$  be the set of all primes. Then the series  $\sum_{p \in \mathcal{P}} 1/p$  diverges.*

*Proof.* We give a short proof due to Clarkson [Cla66]. Suppose on the contrary, the series  $\sum_{p \in \mathcal{P}} 1/p$  converges. Then there exists  $k \in \mathbb{N}$  such that

$$\sum_{\substack{p \in \mathcal{P} \\ p > k}} \frac{1}{p} \leq \frac{1}{2}.$$

In the case where  $\mathcal{P}$  is finite, we take  $k$  to be the largest prime in  $\mathcal{P}$  minus 1, so that the sum is non-empty.

Let  $Q$  be the product of primes  $\leq k$ . Then for each  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , we have  $p \nmid 1 + nQ$  for all  $p \leq k$ . Thus, all the prime divisors of  $1 + nQ$  are  $> k$ . This implies for each  $N \in \mathbb{N}$ , the partial sum

$$\sum_{n=1}^N \frac{1}{1 + nQ} \leq \sum_{t=1}^{\infty} \left( \sum_{\substack{p \in \mathcal{P} \\ p > k}} \frac{1}{p} \right)^t \leq \sum_{t=1}^{\infty} \left( \frac{1}{2} \right)^t = 1.$$

Thus, the series  $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} 1/(1 + nQ)$  converges. But by the limit comparison test, this series should diverge.  $\square$

### 4 Furstenberg's Proof Using Topology

**Theorem 4.1** ([Fur55]). *There are infinitely many primes.*

*Proof.* For  $a, b \in \mathbb{Z}$  with  $b \neq 0$ , put

$$S(a, b) := \{a + nb \mid n \in \mathbb{Z}\}.$$

We define the topology on  $\mathbb{Z}$  by declaring that  $U \subseteq \mathbb{Z}$  is open if it is empty or a union of  $S(a, b)$ . One checks that this is indeed a topology.

- $\emptyset$  is open by the definition, and  $\mathbb{Z} = S(0, 1)$  is also open.
- Any union of open sets is open by the definition.
- The intersection of two open sets is open. This is because  $S(a_1, b_1) \cap S(a_2, b_2)$ , if non-empty, is precisely  $S(x, b')$  where  $x \in S(a_1, b_1) \cap S(a_2, b_2)$  and  $b' := \text{lcm}(b_1, b_2)$ .

---

<sup>1</sup>See <https://scholarlycommons.pacific.edu/euler-works/72/> Theorem 19.

Note also that the basis  $S(a, b)$  is closed because

$$S(a, b) = \mathbb{Z} \setminus \bigcup_{i=1}^{b-1} S(a + i, b).$$

Now, since every integer other than  $\pm 1$  is an integral multiple of some prime, we have

$$\mathbb{Z} \setminus \{1, -1\} = \bigcup_{p: \text{ prime}} S(0, p).$$

The left-hand side is not closed because the finite set  $\{1, -1\}$  can not be open. Thus, if there are only finitely many primes, then the right-hand side is a finite union of closed sets, so it is closed. This leads to a contradiction. Hence, there are infinitely many primes.  $\square$

## 5 Whang's Proof Using Legendre's Formula

**Theorem 5.1** ([Wha10]). *There are infinitely many primes.*

*Proof.* Recall the following formula due to Legendre: For each  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ ,

$$n! = \prod_{p: \text{ prime}} p^{e_p(n)} \quad \text{where} \quad e_p(n) = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \left\lfloor \frac{n}{p^k} \right\rfloor.$$

Note that

$$e_p(n) \leq \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{n}{p^k} = \frac{n}{p-1} \leq n.$$

Thus, for all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ ,

$$n! \leq \prod_{p: \text{ prime}} p^n.$$

This implies there are infinitely many primes because we always have

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{c^n}{n!} = 0$$

for any constant  $c \in \mathbb{R}$ .  $\square$

## References

- [Cla66] James A. Clarkson. "Shorter Notes: On the Series of Prime Reciprocals". In: *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.* 17.2 (1966), p. 541.
- [Fur55] Harry Furstenberg. "On the Infinitude of Primes". In: *Amer. Math. Monthly* 62.5 (1955), p. 353.
- [Wha10] Junho Peter Whang. "Another Proof of the Infinitude of the Prime Numbers". In: *Amer. Math. Monthly* 117.2 (2010), p. 181.