∞ A Contribution to the Mathematical Understanding of Infinity ∞

Nassiri's First Theorem

Walid Nassiri

Independent Research — 2026

Supervisor / Professor

Prof. Lahsen Ghedda

Institution

First Prepa Meknès

Contact

wnassiri3@gmail.com

Before this paper belongs to mathematics, it belongs to ***GOD****.*

Every equation in these pages, every idea that kept me up at night, every moment where something suddenly clicked after I had nearly given up — none of that came from me alone. I know that in a way I can't fully explain, but also can't honestly ignore.

On Periodicity, Chaos, and the Structure of the Infinite Loop

A Note of Gratitude

There were nights where the problem felt impossibly large. Where I sat with my pen and nothing came. And then something would quietly shift, and a door I hadn't seen before would open. I stopped being surprised by that after a while. I just started being thankful.

I'm thankful for the mind I was given — scattered and restless and full of doubt as it often is. I'm thankful for the curiosity that never really switched off, even on the days I wished it would. I'm thankful for the patience that got me through the long stretches where nothing was working, and for those rare, sudden moments of clarity that never quite felt like something I had earned — more like something I had been quietly handed when I needed it most.

And I'm thankful for the beauty. For the way it kept showing up, in the patterns, in the equations, in the way the mathematics itself kept gesturing at something beyond what the mathematics could say. As if the whole thing had been put together with real care, by someone who wanted it to be found.

Whatever is good in these pages, whatever is true, whatever might one day be useful to someone else sitting alone with a hard question and a blank piece of paper — I give it back, with a full heart, to the One who made the infinite in the first place.

— *W. Nassiri, 2026*

Contents

Preface — A Personal Note Before We Begin

Before we get into any of the math, I want to be upfront with you: I'm not a genius, and this paper isn't trying to be the work of one. It came from someone — me — who got a little obsessed with an idea that kept slipping out of reach every time I thought I had it. That idea is *infinity*. And after a lot of reading, a lot of thinking, and honestly more confusion than I'd like to admit, I ended up with something I felt was worth putting into words.

I'm not here to claim I cracked something that centuries of brilliant mathematicians couldn't. If anything, digging into this topic just made me more aware of how much I'm standing on other people's shoulders — and how modest any single person's contribution really is next to everything that's already been figured out.

So what I'm offering here is small. But it's real, and it's mine. And it's written with a lot of respect for Georg Cantor — someone who, I genuinely believe, understood infinity more deeply than almost any person who's ever lived. That understanding came at a cost for him, a real and painful one, and his story sits quietly underneath everything in these pages. I think you should know that going in.

> *This paper is not written for specialists alone. It is written for anyone who has ever stared at the symbol ∞ and felt, without quite being able to say why, that there is more to it than any textbook has fully let on.*

1. Who Was Georg Cantor, and Why Does He Matter Here?

Georg Cantor was a German mathematician, born in 1845, and probably the single person most responsible for turning infinity into something mathematics could actually work with. Before him, it was this vague, almost spiritual concept — the kind of thing poets and theologians reached for when words ran out. Cantor made it precise. He made it something you could study, compare, and reason about.

The thing is, mathematicians before him weren't exactly comfortable with infinity. They used it when they had no choice, but they kept their distance. It was a bit like the sun — everyone knew it was there, but looking straight at it felt like a bad idea. Cantor looked straight at it.

And what he found was genuinely strange: *not all infinities are the same size*. The infinity of whole numbers and the infinity of real numbers aren't just different — they're different in a deep, provable, mathematical sense, and the second one is actually larger than the first. He called these different sizes *cardinal numbers* and built an entire theory around them.

His colleagues hated it. Not just disagreed — hated. Henri Poincaré, one of the greatest mathematicians of the era, called Cantor's ideas a "disease" spreading through mathematics. Leopold Kronecker went further, reportedly calling him a "corrupter of youth." The pushback wasn't just intellectual. It was personal and it was relentless.

Cantor paid for it. He struggled for much of his later life with what we'd now recognize as bipolar disorder — swinging between periods of intense mania and devastating depression, hospitalized more than once. Whether the illness fed his obsession with infinity, or whether the obsession and the rejection made the illness worse, nobody can really say. What we do know is that one of the most original mathematical minds in history spent his final years in a sanatorium, largely cut off from the world he'd devoted his life to, and died there in 1918 — underfed, during wartime.

History came around. Of course it did. Cantor's set theory is now the bedrock of modern mathematics. David Hilbert — not someone who threw compliments around lightly — called his work "the finest product of mathematical genius and one of the supreme achievements of purely intellectual human activity."

> *I'm sharing all of this not to be dramatic about it. I'm sharing it because Cantor's story is really a story about what it costs to stare into something without limits. Infinity has a way of pushing back. It pushed Cantor as far as a person can be pushed. The least we can do, coming to it after him, is be a little careful — and a little humble.*

2. What Is Infinity? — Toward a Definition

Most of us meet the infinity symbol — ∞ — pretty early in life, and we think we get it right away. It means *goes on forever*. More than any number you could possibly name. The biggest thing there is.

And honestly? That's not wrong. It's just... not the whole picture. And the parts it's missing matter a lot once you start doing real mathematics.

Here's where it gets genuinely tricky: *infinity isn't a number*. You can't add one to it and get something bigger. You can't cut it in half. The basic rules of arithmetic that you've been using your whole life simply don't apply to it. And yet — and this is the part that keeps you up at night — it doesn't behave randomly. It has patterns. It follows rules. It can be studied and reasoned about with real precision.

It's both wild and orderly at the same time. That tension is exactly what makes it so fascinating, and if I'm being honest, a little maddening.

With that in mind, in Nassiri's First Theorem, we put forward a definition that tries to hold both of those things at once — the mathematical rigor and the *something deeper* that infinity seems to point at.

Definition 2.1 ◇ The Infinite Loop

Infinity is a boundless loop — something with no beginning, no end, and no point along the way where it is any more *itself* than anywhere else.

The image I keep coming back to is a racetrack. Picture a driver on a perfectly circular course. He drives and drives and drives. He passes the same markers over and over. From inside the car, every moment feels fresh — the engine's humming, the road is moving under him, something is *happening*. But if you pull back and watch from above, you see the truth: he's just repeating. Completely, endlessly repeating.

That driver is us — the human mind trying to get a grip on infinity. We feel like we're getting somewhere. Like we're covering ground, building toward something, closing in on an answer. And in a way, we are. But the loop itself doesn't notice. It was there long before we showed up, and it'll still be there long after we've gone.

I don't mean that to be discouraging. Actually, it's kind of the opposite. Once you realize you're on a loop — once you really *accept* it rather than fight it — something loosens. You stop needing to reach the end. You stop being anxious about the fact that there isn't one. And that, I think, is its own kind of understanding.

3. The Formal Proof — Periodicity as the Mathematical Skeleton of the Loop

That idea of the loop — it actually has a precise mathematical equivalent, and it's one of the most studied and important objects in all of analysis: the *periodic function*.

3.1 Setup and Definitions

Let's start with the formal setup. Take a function $f(x)$ defined on the real numbers $\mathbb{R}$.

Definition 3.1 ◇ Periodic Function

A function $f : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ is said to be **periodic** if there exists a positive real number $T > 0$, called the **period**, such that:

$$f(x+T) = f(x) \quad \text{for every } x \in \mathbb{R}.$$

The smallest such T is called the **fundamental period**.

The most familiar examples of this are the trigonometric functions. Take $\sin(x)$, for instance:

$$\sin(x+2\pi) = \sin(x) \quad \text{for all } x \in \mathbb{R}.$$

So its fundamental period is 2π. Every 2π units along the x-axis, the function comes back to exactly where it started — and then does the whole thing over again.

3.2 The Central Proof of Nassiri's First Theorem

Here is the core claim of the theorem: a periodic function with period T repeats itself infinitely — the same pattern, over and over, stretching out in both directions forever.

Theorem 3.1 ▶ Nassiri's First Theorem

Let $f : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ be a periodic function with period $T > 0$. That is, suppose:

$$f(x+T) = f(x) \quad \text{for all } x \in \mathbb{R}.$$

Then for every integer $n \in \mathbb{Z}$ (positive, negative, or zero):

$$f(x+nT) = f(x) \quad \text{for all } x \in \mathbb{R}.$$

In particular, the function assumes each of its values infinitely often — in both directions along the real line.

Proof of Nassiri's First Theorem

Step 1: Non-negative integers (by mathematical induction).

Base case. For $n = 0$: $f(x + 0 \cdot T) = f(x)$. ✓

Inductive step. Assume $f(x + kT) = f(x)$ holds for some $k \geq 0$. Then:

$$f\big(x + (k+1)T\big) = f\big((x + kT) + T\big) = f(x + kT) = f(x).$$

The first equality is algebra; the second uses the periodicity condition; the third uses the induction hypothesis. By induction, $f(x + nT) = f(x)$ holds for all $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$.

Step 2: Negative integers.

For any $n \geq 1$, apply Step 1 with x replaced by $x - nT$:

$$f\big((x - nT) + nT\big) = f(x - nT) \implies f(x) = f(x - nT).$$

Step 3: Conclusion.

Combining both steps: for every $n \in \mathbb{Z}$,

$$\boxed{f(x+nT) = f(x) \quad \text{for all } x \in \mathbb{R}.}$$

Since n ranges over all integers — a countably infinite set with no upper or lower bound — every value of f is attained at infinitely many points, in both directions. The loop is complete. The loop never ends. ■

3.3 What This Means in Plain Language

What the proof is really telling us is something almost elegant in its simplicity: once a periodic pattern gets going, it just *keeps* going — in both directions, without exception. The function never decides to do something different. There's no final repetition where it all winds down. Whatever structure you lay down at the start, it runs straight out to infinity, unchanged.

This is the mathematical backbone of everything we were talking about with the loop. The racetrack, the circle, the idea of something folding back on itself forever — all of that has a precise formal version, and that version is the periodic function.

4. Introducing Chaos — When the Loop Becomes Unpredictable

Up until now, we've been dealing with perfect loops — functions that repeat with total regularity, no surprises, no deviations. It's mathematically clean, and there's something deeply satisfying about it. But it's also a little idealized. The world doesn't really work that way.

Real systems — weather, ecosystems, financial markets, a human heartbeat — tend to be *almost* periodic. They have an underlying rhythm, a pull toward repetition, but they're also sensitive. A small nudge in the wrong direction and they veer off somewhere unexpected. That's the territory chaos theory lives in, and honestly? That's where things start to get really interesting.

4.1 The General Framework

We put forward the following chaotic differential equation as a natural extension of the periodic loop:

Definition 4.1 ◇ The Nassiri Chaotic Extension

$$\frac{df(x)}{dt} = f(x) + a \cdot g(x,t)$$

where:

- x represents the **state** of the system at any given moment.
- $\frac{df(x)}{dt}$ is the **rate of change** of that state.
- $f(x)$ is the **core dynamic**: the underlying periodic behavior.
- $g(x,t)$ is the **perturbation**: an external, nonlinear influence.
- $a \in \mathbb{R}$ is the **chaos constant**: controlling perturbation strength.

4.2 A Concrete Example

Let us plug in specific functions to make this concrete. Take:

$$f(x) = \sin(x), \qquad g(x,t) = x(1-x) + \sin(3t).$$

The perturbation term has two parts:

1. $x(1-x)$: a classic nonlinear term from population dynamics introducing feedback from the system's own state.
2. $\sin(3t)$: an external oscillating force running at a different frequency, creating interference.

Combining everything, our full equation becomes:

$$\boxed{\frac{df(x)}{dt} = \sin(x) + a \cdot \big[x(1-x) + \sin(3t)\big]}$$

4.3 Reading the Equation

- **When** $a = 0$: The system is purely periodic — predictable, regular, calm.
- **As** a **grows**: The perturbation begins to dominate. Trajectories that once circled safely begin to spiral away.

- **At large** a: The behavior becomes chaotic — deterministic yet practically impossible to predict.

Remark 4.1 ○ The Butterfly Effect

Chaotic systems are completely *deterministic* — there is no randomness in the equation itself — and yet their long-term behavior is practically impossible to predict. A tiny change in initial conditions can produce wildly different trajectories. This is what people call the *butterfly effect*: the loop doesn't have to be calm to be infinite. It can be stormy, chaotic, and wild — and still run forever.

5. Infinity in the World Around Us

One of the things that struck me during the preparation of this paper is how many places the loop appears once you start looking for it.

In physics, the concept of infinity is unavoidable. Wave functions, field theories, and models of the early universe all involve infinities in various forms — some of which are physically meaningful, and some of which are embarrassing technical problems that physicists spend careers trying to remove. The idea that energy can cycle, that fields can oscillate forever, that certain conserved quantities are truly indestructible — all of these carry the signature of the infinite loop.

In vortex mathematics, which sits somewhere between mainstream mathematics and more speculative territory, the infinite repetition of numerical sequences is used to describe rotational and cyclical structures. Whether one accepts the full claims of this field or not, its intuition — that numbers themselves carry a kind of circular, looping structure — is at least worth sitting with.

In everyday life, the loop appears in places we might not expect. The boomerang video format — short clips that play forward and then immediately reverse and repeat, endlessly — is a small, trivial, but oddly accurate illustration of a periodic function. It begins, it ends, it begins again, and there is no natural stopping point.

> *Mathematics, at its best, is in conversation with the rest of human experience — not sealed off from it in a private language accessible only to specialists.*

6. A Note on Cantor's Fate and What It Means for Us

I want to come back to Cantor before we go further, because I think his story carries something that a purely technical paper would just leave on the table.

His breakdown wasn't only about the rejection — though that was real, and it was brutal. I think it was also about what happens to a mind that travels somewhere most minds never go. He had stood right at the edge of the infinite and looked over. And what he found there was genuinely disorienting.

There's a scene people often imagine — maybe not literally true, but true in spirit — of Cantor sitting alone in his study, having just proved that some infinities are larger than others, and asking himself the next natural question: is there an infinity that sits *between* the size of the whole numbers and the size of the real numbers? He called this the **Continuum Hypothesis**, and it haunted him for decades.

Remark 6.1 ○ The Continuum Hypothesis

The Continuum Hypothesis asks whether there exists a set whose cardinality is strictly between $\aleph_0$ (countable infinity) and $|\mathbb{R}|$ (the cardinality of the continuum). Through the extraordinary work of Kurt Gödel (1940) and Paul Cohen (1963), we now know that the Continuum Hypothesis is *undecidable* within standard ZFC set theory — neither provably true nor provably false. It is, in a very precise technical sense, beyond reach. Cantor never knew this. He died searching for an answer to a question that had no answer to give.

I'm not drawing a comparison between his work and this paper — the scales are completely different. But I do think there's something worth carrying with you: hold ideas firmly enough to do real work, but lightly enough that they don't become a trap. The loop is infinite. You are not. And somehow, when you really sit with that, it's not a sad thought. It's almost a relief.

7. Supplementary Argument: The Sum of Infinity — When the Loop Converges

7.1 A Question Worth Asking

Here's something that troubled mathematicians for a long time, and still catches students off guard: can something that goes on forever still add up to a finite number?

Most people's gut reaction is *no*. If you never stop adding, the total never stops growing — and a total that never stops growing can't possibly settle into something fixed. That feels obvious. Almost self-evident.

And yet it's wrong. Or at least, it's not always right. And the cases where it falls apart — where an infinite process somehow lands on a perfectly finite answer — are exactly where the infinite loop starts to show its most surprising, most beautiful side.

7.2 The Geometric Series — Infinity That Converges

Consider the following infinite sum:

$$S = 1 + \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{4} + \frac{1}{8} + \frac{1}{16} + \cdots$$

Derivation of the Geometric Series Sum

Call the total sum S. Observe:

$$S = 1 + \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{4} + \frac{1}{8} + \cdots$$

Multiply both sides by $\frac{1}{2}$:

$$\frac{S}{2} = \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{4} + \frac{1}{8} + \frac{1}{16} + \cdots$$

Subtracting the second equation from the first:

$$S - \frac{S}{2} = 1 \implies \frac{S}{2} = 1 \implies \boxed{S = 2.}$$

An infinite number of terms. A finite, exact answer. The loop runs forever — and lands precisely on 2. ■

This isn't a trick. It generalizes beautifully. For any $|r| < 1$:

Theorem 7.1 ▶ Geometric Series Formula

$$\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} r^n = \frac{1}{1-r}, \qquad |r| < 1.$$

In our example, $r = \frac{1}{2}$, and $\dfrac{1}{1-\frac{1}{2}} = 2$, exactly as derived.

Think about our racetrack driver — but now each lap he completes is exactly half the length of the previous one. His first lap is 1 kilometre. His second is half a kilometre. He drives forever — infinitely many laps — and yet the total distance he travels comes out to exactly 2 kilometres.

He never stops. And yet he never goes farther than 2.

7.3 The Radius of Convergence — Where the Loop Holds and Where It Breaks

The geometric series converges only when $|r| < 1$. When $|r| \geq 1$, the terms do not shrink fast enough and the sum diverges. This boundary is the simplest case of what mathematicians call the **radius of convergence**.

Definition 7.1 ◇ Radius of Convergence

For a power series $f(x) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} a_n x^n$, there exists a radius of convergence $R \in [0, +\infty]$ such that:

- For $|x| < R$: the series converges absolutely.
- For $|x| > R$: the series diverges.
- For $|x| = R$: the behavior must be examined case by case.

The value R is given by the **Cauchy–Hadamard formula**:

$$\frac{1}{R} = \limsup_{n\to\infty} |a_n|^{1/n}.$$

7.4 The Fourier Series — The Loop Built from Loops

This is where everything starts to connect back to the core of NASSIRI'S FIRST THEOREM. Every periodic function satisfying reasonable smoothness conditions can be written as:

Theorem 7.2 ▶ Fourier Series Decomposition

Let $f : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ be periodic with period 2π and piecewise smooth. Then f admits the **Fourier series**:

$$f(x) = \frac{a_0}{2} + \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \big[a_n \cos(nx) + b_n \sin(nx)\big],$$

where the Fourier coefficients are:

$$a_n = \frac{1}{\pi} \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} f(x) \cos(nx)\, dx, \qquad b_n = \frac{1}{\pi} \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} f(x) \sin(nx)\, dx.$$

What the Fourier series is really telling us is that our loop isn't primitive. It's a *composition* — infinitely many cycles, nested inside each other, each one vibrating at its own frequency, each one adding its voice to something larger.

7.5 What This Adds to the Theorem

The argument in this section extends NASSIRI'S FIRST THEOREM in the following direction. The infinite loop is not merely a structure that repeats. It is a structure that:

1. **Can contain itself within finite bounds** — as demonstrated by the converging geometric series.

2. **Has a precise boundary between controlled and uncontrolled infinity** — the radius of convergence.

3. **Is itself composed of infinitely many simpler loops** — as the Fourier decomposition reveals.

These three properties together point to something worth sitting with: infinity isn't one uniform, featureless thing. It has texture. It has layers. And the mathematics gives us the tools to say, with real precision and honesty, which is which.

8. Further Mathematical Foundations

8.1 On Limits — The Mirror That Reflects Infinity Without Touching It

Perhaps the most honest thing mathematics ever does is the limit. It doesn't claim to actually reach infinity — it just watches carefully as something gets closer and closer, the way you might watch a road thin out and disappear into the horizon without ever pretending you could walk up and touch it.

Consider:

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n} = 0.$$

As n grows: $n = 10 \mapsto 0.1$, $n = 100 \mapsto 0.01$, $n = 1000 \mapsto 0.001$, and so on. The values keep shrinking. They never actually hit zero. But they approach it so consistently, so faithfully, that mathematics gives us permission to name that unreachable destination with complete precision.

Now consider the opposite:

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} n = +\infty.$$

Here the sequence doesn't settle. It escapes. There's no destination — just a direction that keeps going forever. This mirrors exactly what happens in the chaotic case of our differential equation, when the perturbation constant grows large enough that the system breaks free of any finite boundary and just runs.

8.2 On the Golden Ratio — The Loop That Knows Itself

Consider the following expression:

$$x = 1 + \cfrac{1}{1 + \cfrac{1}{1 + \cfrac{1}{1 + \cdots}}}$$

This is a continued fraction that contains itself — forever, nested inside itself, loop within loop. Since the pattern repeats infinitely, whatever sits inside the first denominator is, by definition, the same as the entire expression. This gives us permission to write:

$$x = 1 + \frac{1}{x}$$

Multiplying both sides by x: $x^2 = x + 1$, i.e., $x^2 - x - 1 = 0$. Applying the quadratic formula:

$$x = \frac{1+\sqrt{5}}{2} \approx 1.618\ldots =: \varphi.$$

This number is the ***Golden Ratio*** *— φ. One of the most studied constants in all of mathematics, art, and natural science. It shows up in the spiral geometry of nautilus shells, in the way trees branch, in the arrangement of seeds in a sunflower, in the proportions that human eyes tend to find beautiful without ever quite knowing why. And it lives, quietly and permanently, inside an infinite loop that does nothing but refer to itself.*

The loop, it turns out, was pointing at something real the whole time.

8.3 On Cantor's Paradox of Size — When the Part Equals the Whole

ONE of the most unsettling things Cantor discovered is that ordinary intuitions about size completely fall apart when you apply them to infinite sets.

The set of all natural numbers $\mathbb{N} = \{1, 2, 3, 4, \ldots\}$ is infinite. So is the set of even numbers $\{2, 4, 6, 8, \ldots\}$. Common sense says $\mathbb{N}$ must be bigger — it contains all the even numbers *plus* all the odd numbers. It seems not just intuitive but completely obvious.

Cantor showed it was wrong.

His argument: two sets are the same size if you can pair every element of one with exactly one element of the other. Here is the bijection:

$$n \longleftrightarrow 2n, \quad n \in \mathbb{N}.$$

$$1 \leftrightarrow 2, \quad 2 \leftrightarrow 4, \quad 3 \leftrightarrow 6, \quad \ldots$$

Every natural number pairs perfectly with an even number. Nothing left over on either side. And therefore, by the only definition of size that actually holds up for infinite sets, these two collections are exactly the same size. Cantor called this size

$\aleph_0$ — aleph-null.

Remark 8.1 ∘ Dedekind's Characterization of Infinity

This is, in fact, the modern mathematical definition of an infinite set: a set is infinite if and only if it can be put into a one-to-one correspondence with a proper subset of itself. The loop contains itself completely. Take away half of it and you still have the whole thing. That is not a flaw in the mathematics. That *is* what infinity actually means.

8.4 On Differentiation — The Loop That Survives Every Analysis

THERE is one final observation — the simplest in this entire paper, and maybe the most beautiful. Take $\sin(x)$ and apply the derivative operator repeatedly:

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{d}{dx}\left[\sin(x)\right] &= \cos(x)\\ \frac{d}{dx}\left[\cos(x)\right] &= -\sin(x)\\ \frac{d}{dx}\left[-\sin(x)\right] &= -\cos(x)\\ \frac{d}{dx}\left[-\cos(x)\right] &= \sin(x)\end{aligned}$$

We are back. The derivative of $\sin(x)$, taken four times in succession, returns us to $\sin(x)$ itself. The cycle is:

$$\sin(x) \;\to\; \cos(x) \;\to\; -\sin(x) \;\to\; -\cos(x) \;\to\; \sin(x) \;\to\; \cdots$$

Four steps. Then home. Then four steps again. Then home again. Forever.

Corollary 8.1 ▶ Persistence of Periodicity under Differentiation

If $f : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ is a smooth periodic function with period T, then f' is also periodic with period T. Periodicity is preserved — and indeed, regenerated — at every level of analysis.

The loop doesn't break under examination. It doesn't simplify away or quietly dissolve into something non-periodic when you look closely enough. It reasserts itself at every single level of analysis. Look as hard as you like. The loop goes all the way down.

9. Extended Explorations

9.1 On Prime Numbers — The Loop That Has No Pattern and Yet Never Ends

THERE is one infinite sequence in mathematics that has fascinated and defeated mathematicians for thousands of years precisely because it seems to loop without any discernible pattern whatsoever — and yet it never stops producing new elements. That sequence is the prime numbers.

A **prime number** is a natural number greater than 1 that can't be divided evenly by anything other than 1 and itself. The first few are:

$$2, 3, 5, 7, 11, 13, 17, 19, 23, 29, 31, 37, \ldots$$

Theorem 9.1 ▶ Euclid's Theorem (c. 300 BC)

There are infinitely many prime numbers.

Proof (Euclid's Argument)

Suppose, for contradiction, that there are only finitely many primes: $p_1, p_2, \ldots, p_n$. Construct:

$$N = (p_1 \cdot p_2 \cdot p_3 \cdots p_n) + 1.$$

- If N is prime: we've found a new prime not on our list. Contradiction.
- If N is composite: some prime p divides N. But p cannot be any p_i, since dividing N by any p_i leaves remainder 1. So p is a new prime. Contradiction.

In either case, the list was incomplete. Therefore, the set of primes is infinite. ■

Remark 9.1 ○ Infinity Without Periodicity

The primes give us an infinite sequence that is provably endless, yet entirely aperiodic. Infinity, it turns out, doesn't require order. It doesn't require rhythm or structure or any discernible shape at all. It simply requires that you never run out.

9.2 On the Infinite in Music — The Loop That the Ear Follows Without Knowing It

THERE is a place where mathematics and human experience meet so naturally that most people never notice the mathematics is there at all — and that place is music.

A rhythm is a periodic function in the most literal sense — a pattern of beats that repeats with a fixed period T, satisfying exactly the condition $f(x+T) = f(x)$. Every time a drummer plays a repeating pattern, the mathematics of periodicity is present and active.

When a musical instrument plays a single note, what comes out isn't one pure frequency — it's a superposition of infinitely many frequencies: the fundamental f_0, and all its integer multiples $2f_0, 3f_0, 4f_0, \ldots$ These are the harmonics, and they form a Fourier series made audible. The *timbre* of an instrument — what makes a violin sound like a violin and not a flute — is determined entirely by the relative amplitudes of these harmonics.

Johann Sebastian Bach took the mathematical structure of music further than almost anyone before or since. His fugues are studies in the infinite elaboration of a simple theme. There is a piece — the *Musical Offering* — that contains a modulating canon which returns, after six key changes, to the original key but one octave higher: a musical Escher staircase, going always down and yet never arriving anywhere lower than where it started. It is, in a way I find hard to dismiss, NASSIRI'S FIRST THEOREM played on a harpsichord.

10. The Ouroboros and Infinity

THERE is an ancient symbol that appears in almost every culture in human history — in Egypt, in Greece, in India, in Norse mythology, and in many others. A serpent eating its own tail, forming a perfect circle with no beginning and no end. It is called the **Ouroboros**, and it is perhaps the oldest human attempt to draw infinity.

What makes it so remarkable is how accurately it describes what Nassiri's First Theorem defines as the infinite loop. The serpent's head meets its tail with no gap. The circle is complete. And yet the serpent isn't still — it is always moving, always consuming, always in the middle of a process that never finishes. This is exactly what a periodic function does. It moves. It returns. It moves again. It never stops.

The Ouroboros also captures something beautiful and strange that mathematics confirms: the serpent *feeds itself*. It needs nothing from outside to keep going. The loop sustains itself. In the same way, the infinite loop in mathematics is self-sufficient — it doesn't need a starting point or an ending point to exist.

People drew this symbol thousands of years before Cantor proved that infinity has structure, and thousands of years before anyone wrote down the equation $f(x+T) = f(x)$. They drew it because something in human experience recognizes the loop — in the cycle of seasons, in the rising and setting of the sun, in the way that endings always seem to carry the seeds of something new. Mathematics gave that recognition precision. The Ouroboros gave it a face.

11. On the Mirror — Infinity Between Two Reflections

There is an experience so common that most people have had it without once thinking about the mathematics. You stand between two mirrors facing each other — in a barber's shop, a fitting room, any space where two reflective surfaces are placed directly opposite — and you look into one of them. What you see isn't simply your reflection. You see your reflection reflecting your reflection reflecting your reflection, tunneling backward into an apparently endless corridor of diminishing images.

The loop is still running. You just can't see it anymore.

The mathematics is straightforward. Each reflection sends roughly 95% of the light back, absorbing around 5%. So the sequence of brightnesses forms a geometric series with ratio $r = 0.95$. Since $|r| < 1$, this series converges:

$$\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} (0.95)^n = \frac{1}{1 - 0.95} = 20.$$

The loop of reflections is infinite. The total light involved is finite. The Ouroboros of mirrors consumes itself into invisibility while the mathematical loop beneath it runs on forever.

This is the convergent loop — the loop that tends toward silence without ever achieving it.

12. Closing Reflections

WHAT started as a definition has, I hope, become something a little fuller by the time you reach this page. The loop, the periodic function, the chaotic differential equation — these aren't just isolated technical objects sitting next to each other. They're different faces of the same underlying truth: that certain patterns repeat, that repetition can be orderly or completely wild, and that infinity isn't an emptiness. It's a kind of fullness — one that spills over the edges of any attempt to pin it down.

This paper was written with a firm belief that mathematics and meaning don't have to be at odds with each other. A rigorous proof and a genuinely hard philosophical question can share the same page. And when they do, each one tends to make the other more honest.

We close with three passages from three different traditions — not to make any claim about religion or to suggest that one tradition has the answer — but simply because the question of infinity has never been fully settled by mathematics alone:

> *From the Qur'an*
>
> *"Indeed, in the creation of the heavens and the earth and the alternation of the night and the day are signs for those of understanding."*
> — *Sūrah Āli 'Imrān 3:190*

From the New Testament

"Be transformed by the renewing of your mind, that you may discern what is the will of God — his good, pleasing and perfect will."
— *Romans 12:2*

From the Hebrew Psalms

"Your commandment makes me wiser than my enemies... I have more understanding than all my teachers, for your testimonies are my meditation."
— *Psalm 119:98–99*

The loop continues. The inquiry continues. And perhaps that is enough.

Conclusion — Cantor and the Loop That Consumed Him

Before we talk about what Georg Cantor proved, it is worth spending some time with who he actually was — because the mathematics and the man are inseparable in a way that is unusual even in a discipline full of passionate and troubled figures.

Georg Ferdinand Ludwig Philipp Cantor was born on March 3, 1845, in Saint Petersburg, Russia, to a Danish father and a Russian mother. His father recognized his son's mathematical gifts early and encouraged them with a mixture of genuine support and considerable pressure. His mother came from a family of musicians, and Cantor inherited something of that sensibility: a feel for pattern, for structure, for the way things that seem entirely unrelated can be shown to belong to the same deep order.

By all accounts he was an excellent student — methodical, precise, deeply serious about mathematics from an early age, with the kind of focus that looks like obsession from the outside and feels like love from the inside. He studied at the University of Berlin under some of the finest mathematicians of his era, including Karl Weierstrass — and Leopold Kronecker, who would later become Cantor's most bitter and damaging critic. The irony of that mentorship is one of the sadder details in the entire history of mathematics.

The author acknowledges with gratitude the foundational contributions of Georg Cantor, without whose courage to look directly at infinity this work would have had no ground to stand on.

The loop continues. And perhaps that is the point.

Acknowledgements

The author wishes to express sincere gratitude to **Professor Lahsen Ghedda** for his guidance, patience, and intellectual generosity throughout this work. His mentorship has been, in the truest sense, a compass.

Thanks are also due to the institution of **First Prepa Meknès** for providing an environment where curiosity is not merely permitted but actively encouraged.

References

On Georg Cantor and Set Theory

[1] Cantor, G. (1874). Über eine Eigenschaft des Inbegriffes aller reellen algebraischen Zahlen. *Journal für die reine und angewandte Mathematik*, 77, 258–262.

[2] Cantor, G. (1883). *Grundlagen einer allgemeinen Mannigfaltigkeitslehre.* Teubner, Leipzig.

[3] Cantor, G. (1895–1897). Beiträge zur Begründung der transfiniten Mengenlehre. *Mathematische Annalen*, 46 and 49.

[4] Dauben, J. W. (1979). *Georg Cantor: His Mathematics and Philosophy of the Infinite.* Harvard University Press, Cambridge.

[5] Grattan-Guinness, I. (1971). Towards a Biography of Georg Cantor. *Annals of Science*, 27(4), 345–391.

[6] Hallett, M. (1984). *Cantorian Set Theory and Limitation of Size.* Oxford University Press, Oxford.

On the Foundations of Mathematics and Logic

[7] Gödel, K. (1931). Über formal unentscheidbare Sätze der Principia Mathematica und verwandter Systeme I. *Monatshefte für Mathematik und Physik*, 38, 173–198.

[8] Gödel, K. (1940). *The Consistency of the Axiom of Choice and of the Generalized Continuum Hypothesis with the Axioms of Set Theory.* Princeton University Press, Princeton.

[9] Cohen, P. J. (1963). The Independence of the Continuum Hypothesis. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 50(6), 1143–1148.

[10] Russell, B. and Whitehead, A. N. (1910–1913). *Principia Mathematica* (3 volumes). Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

[11] Zermelo, E. (1908). Untersuchungen über die Grundlagen der Mengenlehre I. *Mathematische Annalen*, 65, 261–281.

On Mathematical Analysis and Periodic Functions

[12] Fourier, J. B. J. (1822). *Théorie analytique de la chaleur.* Firmin Didot, Paris.

[13] Rudin, W. (1976). *Principles of Mathematical Analysis* (3rd ed.). McGraw-Hill, New York.

[14] Apostol, T. M. (1974). *Mathematical Analysis* (2nd ed.). Addison-Wesley, Reading.

[15] Stein, E. M. and Shakarchi, R. (2003). *Fourier Analysis: An Introduction.* Princeton University Press, Princeton.

On Chaos Theory and Dynamical Systems

[16] Lorenz, E. N. (1963). Deterministic Nonperiodic Flow. *Journal of the Atmospheric Sciences*, 20(2), 130–141.

[17] Strogatz, S. H. (1994). *Nonlinear Dynamics and Chaos: With Applications to Physics, Biology, Chemistry, and Engineering.* Addison-Wesley, Reading.

[18] Gleick, J. (1987). *Chaos: Making a New Science*. Viking Penguin, New York.

[19] Poincaré, H. (1890). Sur le problème des trois corps et les équations de la dynamique. *Acta Mathematica*, 13, 1–270.

Walid Nassiri · Independent Research — 2026
Supervisor: Prof. Lahsen Ghedda · First Prepa Meknes
wnassiri3@gmail.com