Prime Lattices and the Structure of Arithmetic: A Conceptual Note

Anonymous for Review

Abstract

This paper gives a clear account of how prime numbers form the basic structure of arithmetic. Using the Fundamental Theorem of Arithmetic, I show that every natural number can be written as a product of primes and that this makes it possible to picture numbers as points in a lattice, each one defined by its prime factors. In this way, arithmetic is not built from isolated numbers but from the network of relations among primes. What is real, on this view, is not the numbers themselves but the structure that connects them.

Keywords: *primes; philosophy of mathematics; structural realism; computation; ontology*

1 Introduction

Philosophers of mathematics have long asked what kind of things numbers are. Platonists think numbers exist independently of us, nominalists deny that they exist at all, and structuralists hold that what matters are not objects themselves but the places they occupy within a structure (Shapiro, 1997; Resnik, 1997).

Most discussions focus on sets, functions, or abstract patterns. Yet one part of arithmetic has received little attention in this debate: prime numbers. By the **Fundamental Theorem of Arithmetic**, every natural number greater than one can be written in one and only one way as a product of primes (Hardy and Wright, 2008). Primes are therefore the basic building blocks or the *'atoms'* of arithmetic. If mathematics is understood structurally, then primes are natural candidates for the most basic elements of that structure. They can be seen not as isolated objects but as coordinates in a network of relations. This paper develops that idea. First, it shows how prime factorization represents each number as a point in an infinite-dimensional lattice. Second, it describes this lattice in set-theoretic terms, where numbers correspond to finitely supported functions from primes to natural exponents. Finally, it draws the philosophical conclusion: numbers are not self-standing things but positions within a lattice of prime relations.

This note extends structural realism by giving it a precise mathematical instance: the structure it describes is not hypothetical or abstract, but one required by the arithmetic facts themselves.

2 Primes as Structural Units

The most natural place to begin is with the Fundamental Theorem of Arithmetic. This theorem states that every natural number greater than one can be expressed uniquely as a product of prime powers (Hardy and Wright, 2008):

$$\forall n \in \mathbb{N},\ n > 1 \implies n = \prod_{i=1}^{k} p_i^{a_i},$$

where each p_i is prime and each $a_i \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$. This result shows that primes act as the irreducible "atoms" of arithmetic. All natural numbers are built out of them, and no number greater than one escapes this structural dependence.From this point of view, each natural number can be represented not only as a product, but also as a vector of exponents across the primes:

$$n \mapsto (a_1, a_2, a_3, \dots).$$

For instance, numbers such as 12 and 30 can be represented in this way, with each coordinate recording the exponent of a prime.[1]The natural numbers can therefore be embedded into an infinite-dimensional lattice of prime exponents, with each axis corresponding to a distinct prime. This provides a structural representation of arithmetic in terms of coordinates rather than isolated objects. We can make this more precise in terms of set theory. Let $\mathbb{P}$ be the set of all primes. Define a mapping:

[1]For example, $12 = 2^2 \cdot 3^1$ corresponds to $(2, 1, 0, 0, \dots)$, while $30 = 2^1 \cdot 3^1 \cdot 5^1$ corresponds to $(1, 1, 1, 0, \dots)$.

$$f : \mathbb{N}_{>1} \to \mathbb{N}^{(\mathbb{P})}, \quad f(n)(p) = a_p,$$

where $\mathbb{N}^{(\mathbb{P})}$ denotes the set of finitely-supported functions from $\mathbb{P}$ to $\mathbb{N}$. In this framework, each number is a finite function that assigns exponents to primes.

The philosophical consequence is clear. If structuralism in mathematics is correct, then the ontological role of numbers is not that of independententities but of positions within a relational system (Shapiro, 1997; Resnik, 1997). On the prime-lattice view, this relational system is generated specifically by the distribution of primes. The primes themselves serve as basis vectors, and the integers emerge as coordinates in this prime-defined structure. This suggests that what truly exists are the *relations of prime structure*, not numbers as individual objects.

3 Computation and Structure

The structure defined by primes is not only mathematical but also computational. In computation, primes play a key role in algorithms for encryption, random number generation, and complexity analysis. The same properties that define integers in the prime lattice also shape how information is processed and secured.

Public-key cryptography provides the clearest example. The security of systems such as RSA depends on the fact that multiplying two large primes is easy, while factoring their product is extremely hard. This asymmetry reflects a structural feature of arithmetic itself: moving "forward" through multiplication is simple, but moving "backward" through factorization is costly. The lattice of primes therefore captures not only numerical identity but also the limits and possibilities of computation (Turing, 1936; Chaitin, 1975).

These ideas suggest that the complexity of algorithms is rooted in the same relations that define numbers. If numbers are determined by their position within the lattice, then computational difficulty expresses the geometry of that structure. The prime lattice thus connects arithmetic and computation: numbers act as structural nodes, and algorithms trace the paths between them. In this sense, the prime lattice shows how a simple mathematical principle can give rise to both the organization of numbers and the constraints of computation. It illustrates how mathematical structure can shape what can be computed, making arithmetic not only a theory of numbers but a framework for information itself.

4 Philosophical Payoff and Objections

The prime lattice view offers a clear philosophical result. If the identity of numbers comes from their relations to primes, then the ontology of mathematics is not based on independent objects but on structure itself. This matches the structuralist idea that mathematical entities exist only through the relations they take within a system (Shapiro, 1997; Resnik, 1997). In this picture, primes act as the basic directions of that system, and integers are the coordinates they define. Numbers are not separate things, but positions in a web of prime relations.

This has consequences for realism in mathematics. Platonism treats numbers as timeless objects, and nominalism denies them altogether. Structuralism stands between these views, holding that what exists is the structure, not the objects (Benacerraf, 1965; Field, 1980). The prime lattice makes this idea precise. It replaces general talk of "patterns" with a definite mathematical construction grounded in the Fundamental Theorem of Arithmetic (Hardy and Wright, 2008). The structure is not invented but required by arithmetic itself. One objection is that the lattice might seem only a metaphor. But every number greater than one fits uniquely into this system, so the representation is not arbitrary but necessary. It shows, rather than assumes, that numbers are defined by their relations. A second objection is that primes themselves remain abstract. If they are part of the structure, what makes them real? The answer follows the line of structural realism in science (Worrall, 1989; Ladyman et al., 2007): what matters is not the nature of the basic units, but the roles they play in maintaining the structure. Primes exist only through the relations that define them. A final concern is that not every structure deserves ontological status. But the prime lattice is special: it follows from a theorem that holds in all consistent versions of arithmetic. It is therefore a natural, not a chosen, structure (Euclid, 1956; Chaitin, 1975).

Together, these points show that the prime lattice gives a concrete example of structural realism in mathematics. It links number theory and ontology by showing that arithmetic depends on relations rather than objects. Primes are not marginal curiosities, but the simplest expression of mathematical structure itself.

5 Relational Invariants and Ramanujan Structure

The prime lattice is not only a static arrangement but also a pattern of repeating relations. Congruences show that arithmetic structure has internal symmetry: numbers that differ by a multiple of a modulus share the same relational form. These repeating patterns act as *relational invariants*-features of arithmetic that remain constant even as numbers change.

Ramanujan's sums express this idea in a different way(Ramanujan, 1927). They reveal hidden periodicity in the arithmetic world: apparent randomness in the primes still gives rise to rhythmic order. The lattice therefore has a harmonic aspect, where structure repeats in cycles of relation rather than in fixed positions. This combination of invariance and harmony shows that arithmetic structure is both stable and dynamic. The same relations that define numerical identity also generate recurring patterns, making the prime lattice not just a framework of positions but a living geometry of relations.

6 Conclusion

This paper has shown that prime numbers reveal a deep structural order within arithmetic. By the Fundamental Theorem of Arithmetic, every number can be seen as a point in a lattice defined by its prime factors. Numbers are not independent objects but positions in this lattice of relations.

The prime lattice gives a simple and precise example of how mathematical reality can be understood structurally. It turns the idea of "structure" from a metaphor into a clear construction, one that arises from arithmetic itself rather than from interpretation. Through congruence and periodicity, the lattice also shows a hidden harmony, echoing the rhythmic order that Ramanujan found in number patterns. The result is not a new mathematics but a clearer way of seeing what mathematics already contains. If structural realism is right, then the prime lattice stands as one of its clearest examples: a necessary structure that gives arithmetic its form, order, and quiet symmetry.

References

Benacerraf, P. (1965). What numbers could not be. *Philosophical Review 74*(1), 47–73.

Chaitin, G. (1975). A theory of program size formally identical to information theory. *Journal of the ACM 22*(3), 329–340.

Euclid (1956). *The Thirteen Books of the Elements, Vol. 2.* New York: Dover Publications. Translated by Thomas L. Heath.

Field, H. (1980). *Science Without Numbers: A Defence of Nominalism.* Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Hardy, G. H. and E. M. Wright (2008). *An Introduction to the Theory of Numbers* (6 ed.). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Ladyman, J., D. Ross, D. Spurrett, and J. Collier (2007). *Every Thing Must Go: Metaphysics Naturalized.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Ramanujan, S. (1927). *Collected Papers of Srinivasa Ramanujan.* Cambridge University Press.

Resnik, M. (1997). *Mathematics as a Science of Patterns.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Shapiro, S. (1997). *Philosophy of Mathematics: Structure and Ontology.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Turing, A. (1936). On computable numbers, with an application to the entscheidungsproblem. *Proceedings of the London Mathematical Society 42*(2), 230–265.

Worrall, J. (1989). Structural realism: The best of both worlds? *Dialectica 43*(1-2), 99–124.