Error theory. In 1920, Brown of Norway 9 ＋ 9.～～In1966, 1＋2 Chen Jingrun, China

“a + b”The advancement of the problem

1920year，Brown's proof of Norway“9＋ 9”。

1924year，Germany's Ratmah proved that“7 ＋ 7”。

1932year，Esteman of England proved that“6 ＋ 6”。

1937year，Lacey of Italy has proven“5 + 7”, “4 ＋ 9”, “3＋15”and“2＋366”。

1938year，Buhe of the Soviet Union proved that“5＋5”。

1940year，Buhe of the Soviet Union proved that“4＋4”。

1956year，Wang Yuan of China proved that“3＋4”。Proved again. “3 ＋3”和“2 ＋ 3”。

1948year，Hungary's Renee proved it.“1＋ c”，Where c is a large natural number.

1962year，Pan Chengdong of China and Barbarne of the Soviet Union proved“1＋5”，Wang Yuan of China has proved“1 ＋ 4”。

1965year，Bukhesitab and Vinogradov of the Soviet Union, as well as Pembili of Italy, proved that“1＋3 ”。

1966year，Chen Jingrun of China has proved “1＋2 ”。

Why the wrong theory?
“a + b”question
Brown, Norway“9 + 9”

even number：N=a*b*c*d*e*f*g*h*i＋j*k*l*m*n*o*p*q*r

Chen Jingrun of China “1 ＋ 2 ”

even number: N=a＋b*c

9＋9”～～ “1 ＋ 2 ” 。Integer theory or fractional theory

Error 1. If they belong to integer theory, then their theory includes fraction theory.
If it is integer theory and fractional theory, then how to judge what is prime.
Use integer solutions to judge prime numbers, or fractional solutions to judge prime numbers。
Error 2. Screening method can't prove that the prime number is infinite.
Why can't we prove that the prime number is infinite? The screening method is to screen

18 Dec 2018 01:16:17 PST
Version 1 - Submitted to Acta Math.

out the prime number in a limited field.
Gradual Screening from Small to Large
The screening method needs to sift to infinity before it can judge whether there are finite or infinite prime numbers.
Number is infinite.
Assuming that there are finite primes,
No contradiction
So the screening method can not prove that the prime number is infinite.
Conversely, it cannot prove the theory of infinite prime number.
Of course, it can't be proved.
even number S，S≠a*b*c*d*e*f*g*h*i＋j*k*l*m*n*o*p*q*r

S=a*b*c*d*e*f*g*h*i＋j*k*l*m*n*o*p*q*r

S≠a＋b*c

S=a＋b*c

On the other hand, in 1920, Brown of Norway "9 9". ~ 1932, Esterman of England ~ 1966, Chen Jingrun of China. Error theory

Mathematical theory: known and unknown numbers

Screening Theory: how many Prime numbers N contains

Known number 88, containing prime numbers，2,3,5,7,11,13,17,，19，23，29,31，37,41,47,53,59,61,67,71,73,79,83

88=a＋b(88=5＋83,88=17＋71,88=29＋59,88=41＋47,)

Need to be solved one by one，

So 90 = a + b, 92, 94, 96, 98,...... infinite proof theory.Yes or no，N=a＋b

Unknown academic field；

Assumption：N≠a＋b,or,N≠a*b*c*d*e*f*g*h*i＋j*k*l*m*n*o*p*q*r

If you don't judge,，

90=7＋83（83,How to prove that it is a prime number)

Arbitrary even number N。
set up：

$N \neq a*b*c*d*e*f*g*h*i+j*k*l*m*n*o*p*q*r$
$N \neq a+b*c$
$N \neq a+b$

You can’t prove it at all. Correct or incorrect

Proof of Infinite Prime Number

吴叶唐寅 （Wu Ye TangYin）

Gantang Town, Ningde City, Fujian Province, China

2468377295@qq.com

Abstract, simulates basic arithmetic logic, reasoning judgment and hypothesis contradiction.

Integer theory

Abstract hypothesis: finite number of prime numbers

From small to large in order of order P_1、P_2、 P_3、、、、、P_n

Simulating basic arithmetic Logic: multiply from small to large

$P_1 \times P_2 \times P_3 \times \ldots\ldots \times .P_n = N$

Then，$N+1$

Is a prime or not a prime

Reasoning judgment：

If N + 1 is a composite number，

set up：$W=P_1$、P_2、 P_3、、、、、P_n（Arbitrary prime number）

（$N+1$）$\div W$

$N \div W$（Satisfying integer solution）

$1 \div W$（Unsatisfied integer solution）

18 Dec 2018 01:16:17 PST
Version 1 - Submitted to Acta Math.

Propositional condition is integer theory

but，1÷W（Unsatisfied integer solution），Belong to fraction。

Does not belong to integer theory

So N + 1 is a composite or a prime.

N＋1The factorized prime factor is certainly not assumed. P_1、P_2、 P_3、、、、、P_n、

Inside

There are also other prime numbers in addition to the assumed finite number of prime numbers. So the original assumption is not true. That is, there are infinitely many prime numbers.

Note: this article belongs to Euclidean academic theory，

But I need to quote Euclidean theory to prove my theory in mathematics.

So the Euclidean theory is analyzed and rewritten.

Welcome to comment on my article

Either Euclidean theory or 9＋9～1＋2 error

Suppose that 9+9−1+2 is correct, and vice versa, Euclidean theory is wrong.

Assuming that Euclidean theory is correct, 9+9−1+2 error theory

http://viXra.org/abs/1812.0072
http://viXra.org/abs/1812.0031