Konstantine Dabmian Zelator (formerly K. Spyropoulos) Carnegie Mellon University, Pittsburgh, PA 15213 (Submitted December 1990)

As it is well known, the equation

(1)  $x^2 + y^4 = z^4$ 

has no solutions in the set of positive integers (one can find this equation in a number of sources including Dickson's *History of the Theory of Numbers* [2]). The equation  $x^2 + y^4 = z^4$  serves as a classic result in the history of diophantine analysis, and one of the first known examples where Fermat's method of infinite descent is employed.

Therefore, if  $m \equiv 0 \pmod{4}$  and n is even, the equation  $x^2 + y^m = z^{2n}$  has no solution in positive integers x, y, and z.

Now consider the diophantine equation  $x^2 + a^2y^m = z^{2n}$  with *m* even. We will show that if *a* is a positive odd integer and if it has a prime divisor  $p \equiv \pm 3$ (mod 8), then the above equation has no solution with (x, ay) = 1 and *y* odd, provided that  $n \equiv 0 \pmod{2}$ . This author has shown in [3] that the equation  $x^4 + p^2y^4 = z^2$ , *p* a prime with  $p \equiv 5 \pmod{8}$ , has no solution in the set of positive integers. It is known, however, that for certain primes of the form  $p \equiv 1, 3$ , or 7 (mod 8), the latter equation does have a solution over the set of positive integers (for fruther details, refer to [3]).

To start, we have

Theorem 1: Let a be a positive odd integer with a prime factor p of the form  $p \equiv \pm 3 \pmod{8}$ . Also, let m and n be positive integers with m and n both even. Then the diophantine equation  $x^2 + a^2y^m = z^{2n}$  with (x, ay) = 1 and y odd has no solution in the set of positive integers.

*Proof:* Assume (x, y, z) to be a solution to the equation

(2) 
$$x^2 + a^2 y^m = z^{2n}$$

with (x, ay) = 1. Since *m* is even, m = 2k, the equation

(3) 
$$x^2 + a^2 y^{2k} = z^{2n}$$
,

describes a Pythagorean triangle with side lengths x,  $ay^k$ , and  $z^n$ . Accordingly, there must exist positive integers t and  $\ell$  of different parity, i.e.,  $t + \ell \equiv 1 \pmod{2}$ , with  $(t, \ell) = 1$  (t and  $\ell$  relatively prime), such that

(4) 
$$x = 2tl, ay^k = t^2 - l^2, z^n = t^2 + l^2.$$

From the second equation of (4), we obtain

1,

(5) 
$$ay^k = (t - l)(t + l).$$

In view of the fact that the integers t and  $\ell$  are relatively prime and of different parity, we conclude that  $t - \ell$  and  $t + \ell$  must be relatively prime and both odd; thus, (5) implies

(6) 
$$t - l = a_1 y_1^*$$
,  $t + l = a_2 y_2^*$   
with  $y_1$ ,  $y_2$  both odd and  $(y_1, y_2) = 1 = (a_1, a_2)$  and  $a_1 a_2 = a$ .  
Equations (6) yield  
 $t = \frac{a_1 y_1^k + a_2 y_2^k}{2}$ ,  $l = \frac{a_2 y_2^k - a_1 y_1^k}{2}$ 

7.

1992]

and by substituting in the third equation of (4), we obtain

$$2z^n = a_1^2 y_1^{2k} + a_2^2 y_2^{2k}.$$

By the hypothesis of the Theorem, n is even,  $n = 2\beta$ , and so we obtain

(7)  $2z^{2\beta} = a_1^2 y_1^{2k} + a_2^2 y_2^{2k}$ .

According to the general solution of the diophantine equation

 $2Z^2 = X^2 + Y^2$  with (X, Y) = 1

(refer to [2] and also to the Remark at the end of the proof for comment on this equation), (7) implies

(8) 
$$z^{\beta} = r^2 + s^2$$
,  $a_1 y_1^k = r^2 + 2rs - s^2$ ,  $a_2 y_2^k = -r^2 + 2rs + s^2$ 

with (r, s) = 1 (and, in fact, r and s are of different parity).

According to the hypothesis of the Theorem,  $a = a_1a_2$  is divisible by a prime  $p = \pm 3 \pmod{8}$ . Thus,  $a_1$  or  $a_2$  is divisible by p, say  $a_1$ . Then the second equation in (8) gives  $r^2 + 2rs - s^2 = 0 \pmod{p}$ ;  $(r + s)^2 - 2s^2 = 0$ ; and so

(9) 
$$(r + s)^2 \equiv 2s^2 \pmod{p}$$
.

But s and r + s are relatively prime, since r and s are; thus, neither of them is divisible by p [by (9)] and so congruence (9) shows that 2 is a quadratic residue modulo p, which is impossible according to the quadratic reciprocity law and since  $p = \pm 3 \pmod{8}$  [recall that  $p = \pm 1 \pmod{8}$  iff 2 is a quadratic residue mod p]. The argument is identical when  $a_2$  is divisible by p; the congruence that yields the contradiction is

$$(r + s)^2 \equiv 2r^2 \pmod{p}$$
.

*Remark:* Given two positive integers  $\alpha$  and b which are relatively prime, it can be shown through elementary means that every solution (with X, Y, and Z relatively prime) (X, Y, Z) in  $\mathbb{Z}$ , to the diophantine equation

 $(a^2 + b^2)Z^2 = X^2 + Y^2,$ 

must satisfy

$$X = \frac{-am^2 + 2bmn + an^2}{D}, \quad Y = \frac{bm^2 + 2amn - bn^2}{D}, \quad Z = \frac{m^2 + n^2}{D},$$

where D is the greatest common divisor of the three numerators and where the integers m and n are relatively prime. In the case of the equation

$$2Z^2 = X^2 + Y^2$$

we have, of course, a = b = 1; so the parametric solution takes the form

$$X = -m^2 + 2mn + n^2$$
,  $Y = m^2 + 2mn - n^2$ ,  $Z = m^2 + n^2$ 

with (X, Y) = 1, (m, n) = 1, and m, n of different parity. If we set a = b = 1in the above formulas and require (X, Y) = 1, then it is not hard to see that D = 1 or 2 according to whether m and n are of different parity or both odd with (m, n) = 1; but the case D = 2 reduces to D = 1 when m and n are both odd. To see this, we may set m = m' - n' and n = m' + n' with (m', n') = 1 and m', n' of different parity. By solving the above formulas for m' and n' in terms of m and n, substituting for a = b = 1 and D = 2 in the above formulas, we do see indeed that the case (m, n) = 1 and  $m + n = 0 \pmod{2}$  reduces to that of (m, n) = 1 and  $m + n \equiv 1 \pmod{2}$  (and so D = 1).

These elementary derivations of parametric solutions make essential use of the fact that the equation  $(a^2 + b^2)Z^2 = X^2 + Y^2$  is homogeneous. For further reading, you may refer to [1].

Corollary 1: If  $\alpha$  satisfies the hypothesis of Theorem 1, there is no primitive Pythagoran triangle (primitive means that any two sides are relatively prime) whose odd perpendicular side is divisible by  $\alpha$  and whose hypotenuse is an integer square.

*Proof:* Suppose, to the contrary, that there is such a primitive Pythagorean triple, say  $(x_1, y_1, z_1)$ , so that  $x_1^2 + y_1^2 = z_1^2$ ,  $(x_1, y_1) = 1$ ,  $y_1$  odd. Then we must, accordingly, have  $y_1 = ay$  and  $z_1 = z^2$ , where y and z are positive integers. Substituting into the above equation, we obtain  $x_1^2 + a^2y^2 = z^4$ ; since  $y_1$  is odd, so must be y in view of  $y_1 = ay$ . But  $(x_1, y_1) = (x_1, ay) = 1$ , which, together with the last equation, violate Theorem 1 for n = m = 2. Thus, a contradiction.

Comment: It is not very difficult to show that, given any positive integer  $\rho$ , there is an infinitude of Pythagorean triangles with a perpendicular side being a  $\rho^{\rm th}$  integer power; or with the hypotenuse a  $\rho^{\rm th}$  integer power. A construction of such families of Pythagorean triangles can be done elementarily and explicitly. Specifically, if  $\alpha$  and b are odd positive integers which are relatively prime, define the positive integers

$$M = \frac{a^{\rho} + b^{\rho}}{2} \quad \text{and} \quad N = \frac{a^{\rho} - b^{\rho}}{2}; \quad a > b.$$

Then the triple  $(M^2 - N^2, 2MN, M^2 + N^2)$  is a primitive Pythagorean triple such that  $M^2 - N^2$  is the  $\rho^{\text{th}}$  power of an integer. That the triple is Pythagorean is well known and established by a straightforward computation. To show that it is primitive, it is enough to observe that, in view of the fact that a and b are both odd (and so are  $a^{\rho}$  and  $b^{\rho}$ ), M and N must have different parity (to see this, consider  $a^{\rho} + b^{\rho}$  and  $a^{\rho} - b^{\rho}$  modulo 4). If p is a prime divisor of M and N one easily shows that p must divide both  $a^{\rho}$  and  $b^{\rho}$ , an impossibility in view of (a, b) = 1. This establishes that (M, N) = 1. Finally, a computation shows  $M^2 - N^2 = a^{\rho}b^{\rho} = (ab)^{\rho}$ .

To construct a primitive Pythagorean triangle whose even side is the  $\rho^{\text{th}}$  power of an integer, it would suffice to take  $M = a^{\rho}$  and  $N = 2^{\rho-1} \cdot b^{\rho}$  (or vice versa), with (a, b) = 1, a and b positive integers and a odd. Here we assume  $\rho \ge 2$  (for  $\rho = 1$  the problem is trivial, in which case one must assume b to be even). By inspection, we have (M, N) = 1. And  $2MN = 2a^{\rho} \cdot 2^{\rho-1}b^{\rho} = (2ab)^{\rho}$ ; the triangle  $(M^2 - N^2, 2MN, M^2 + N^2)$  is a primitive one whose even side is a  $\rho^{\text{th}}$  integer power.

Now, let us discuss the construction of a primitive Pythagorean triangle whose hypotenuse is the  $\rho^{\text{th}}$  power of an integer. In the special case  $\rho = 2^n$ , the following procedure can be applied. We form the sequence

$$(x_0, y_0, z_0), \ldots, (x_n, y_n, z_n)$$

by first defining

$$x_0 = M_0^2 - N_0^2$$
,  $y_0 = 2M_0N_0$ ,  $z_0 = M_0^2 + N_0^2$ 

where  $M_0$  and  $N_0$  are given positive integers, relatively prime, of different parity, and  $M_0 > N_0$ . Then recursively define

$$M_i = M_{i-1}^2 - N_{i-1}^2$$
 and  $N_i = 2M_{i-1}N_{i-1}$ , for  $i = 1, ..., n$ .

It can easily be shown by induction that  $(M_i, N_i) = 1$  and that  $(x_i, y_i, z_i)$  is a Pythagorean triple, where

$$x_i = M_i^2 - N_i^2$$
,  $y_i = 2M_i N_i$ ,  $z_i = M_i^2 + N_i^2$ .

It is also easily shown that  $z_i = z_{i-1}^2$ , which eventually leads to  $z_n = z_0^{2n}$ . The Pythagorean triple  $(x_n, y_n, z_n)$  would then be a primitive one, with  $z_n$  the  $\rho^{\text{th}}$ 

1992]

power of an integer  $\rho = 2^n$ . More generally, if  $\rho \ge 2$  is any integer, a primitive Pythagorean triangle can be constructed such that the hypotenuse is the  $\rho^{\text{th}}$  power of a prime  $p \equiv 1 \pmod{4}$ .

Specifically, if p is any prime such that  $p = 1 \pmod{4}$ , then  $p = a^2 + b^2$ , where the relatively prime integers a and b are uniquely determined.

We have

$$p^2 = p \cdot p = (a^2 + b^2)(a^2 + b^2) = (a^2 - b^2)^2 + (2ab)^2;$$

one can easily check that  $a^2 - b^2$  and 2ab must be relatively prime. Now, suppose that  $p^{\rho-1} = M^2 + N^2$ ,  $\rho \ge 3$ , for some positive integers M and N such that (M, N) = 1.

We have

 $p^{\rho} = p^{\rho-1} \cdot p = (M^2 + N^2)(a^2 + b^2) = (Mb - Na)^2 + (Ma + Nb)^2$  $= (Mb + Na)^2 + (Ma - Nb)^2.$ 

We claim that

$$(Mb - Na, Ma + Nb) = 1$$
 or  $(Mb + Na, Ma - Nb) = 1$ .

For, otherwise, there would be a prime q dividing Mb - Na and Ma + Nb and a prime r dividing Mb + Na and Ma + Nb. But then, according to the above equation, both q and r would divide  $p^{\rho}$ ; hence, q = r = p. But this would imply that p must divide 2Mb, 2Na, 2Ma, and 2Nb; consequently, p must divide (since p is odd) Mb, Na, Ma, and Nb; however, this is impossible by virtue of (M, N) = (a, b) = 1. Thus, we have shown that, for given  $\rho \ge 2$  and prime  $p \equiv 1 \pmod{4}$ , there exist integers M, N, (M, N) = 1 such that  $p^{\rho} = M^2 + N^2$ . Then the desired Pythagorean triple is  $(M^2 - N^2, 2MN, p^{\rho})$ .

Corollary 2: If in a primitive Pythagorean triangle the hypotenuse is an integer square, then each prime factor p of its odd perpendicular side must be congruent to  $\pm 1$  modulo 8.

*Proof:* The result is an immediate consequence of Corollary 1. Indeed, if it were otherwise, that is, if the odd perpendicular side y had a prime factor  $p = \pm 3 \pmod{8}$ , then by setting  $y = py_1$ , we would obtain

 $x^2 + p^2 \cdot y_1^2 = z^2$ , with (x,  $py_1$ ) = 1.

But  $z = R^2$  by hypothesis, and so the last equation produces

$$x^2 + p^2 y_1^2 = R^4$$
,

which is contrary to Corollary 1 with a = p.

Theorem 2: Let *m* be a (positive) even integer, m = 2k, with k odd,  $k \ge 3$ , and n even. Also, let a be an odd positive integer that contains a prime divisor  $p \equiv \pm 3 \pmod{q}$ , and assume that b is a non- $k^{\text{th}}$  residue modulo q, while 2 is a  $k^{\text{th}}$  residue of q, where q is some prime divisor of a; b some positive integer relatively prime to a. Moreover, assume that each divisor  $\rho$  of  $a/q^e$ , where  $q^e$  is the highest power of q dividing a, is a  $k^{\text{th}}$  residue modulo q. Then the diophantine equation

 $b^2 x^m + a^2 y^m = z^{2n}; (bx^k)^2 + (ay^k)^2 = (z^n)^2$ 

has no solution in positive integers x, y, z with (bx, ay) = 1.

*Proof:* By Theorem 1, there is nothing to prove when y is odd. If, on the other hand, y is even and x odd, with (bx, ay) = 1 and  $b^2x^m + a^2y^m = z^{2n}$ , we see that  $bx^k$ ,  $ay^k$ , and  $z^n$  form a primitive Pythagorean triple, where k = m/2. In that case, of course, bx is odd and ay is even, and so we must have

(10) 
$$bx^k = M^2 - N^2$$
,  $ay^k = 2MN$ ,  $z^n = M^2 + N^2$ 

with (M, N) = 1 and M, N being positive integers of different parity.

Let q be the prime divisor of a, as stated in the hypothesis. The second equation of (10) shows that q must divide M or N. Certainly the above coprimeness conditions show that q does not divide bx. On the other hand, by virtue of the fact that k is odd, we have  $(-1)^k = -1$ . First, suppose  $M \equiv 0 \pmod{q}$ . Then, if  $q^e$  is the highest power of q dividing a, then since (M, N) = 1, the second equation in (1) shows that  $q^e$  divides M; and

 $N = N_1^k \rho 2^f,$ 

where  $\rho$  is a divisor of  $a/q^e$  and the exponent f equals 0 or k - 1, depending on whether  $\mathbb{N}$  is odd or even, respectively. Thus,

 $N^2 = N_1^{2k} \rho^2 \cdot 2^{2f};$ 

but  $\rho$  is a  $k^{\text{th}}$  residue of q by hypothesis; hence, so is  $\rho^2$ . Also  $2^{k-1}$  is a  $k^{\text{th}}$ residue of q, since 2 is (by hypothesis) and  $2 \cdot 2^{k-1} = 2^k$ . Consequently,  $N^2$  is a  $k^{\text{th}}$  residue and since  $(-1)^k = -1$ , the first equation in (10) clearly implies that b is also a  $k^{\text{th}}$  residue of q, contrary to the hypothesis.

A similar argument settles the case  $N \equiv 0 \pmod{q}$ .

*Example:* Take k = 3, and so m = 6, p = 29, q = 31, e = 1, and  $a = p \cdot q = 899$ ; then  $p \equiv 5 \pmod{8}$  and the cubic residues of 31 are ±1, ±2, ±4, ±8, and ±15; p = 29 is a cubic residue of q. Thus, if  $b \neq \pm 1$ ,  $\pm 2$ ,  $\pm 4$ ,  $\pm 15 \pmod{31}$ , the diophantine equation  $(bx^3)^2 + (899y^3)^2 = z^4$  has no solution over the set of positive integers.

Corollary 3 (to Th. 2): Let a, b, and k be positive integers satisfying the hypothesis of Theorem 2. Then, there is no primitive Pythagorean triangle with one perpendicular side equal to a times a  $k^{\text{th}}$  integer power, the other b times a  $k^{\text{th}}$  power, and the hypotenuse a perfect square.

*Proof:* Apply Theorem 2 with m = n = 2. We omit the details.

## References

- 1. L. J. Mordell. Diophantine Eugations. London: Academic Press, 1969.
- 2. L. E. Dickson. History of the Theory of Numbers, Vol. II. New York: Chelsea, 1952.
- 3. K. Spyropoulos. "On a Property of Pythagorean Triangles and Its Application to Two Diophantine Equations." Congressus Numerantium 57 (March 1987):281-88.
- 4. W. Sierpinski. Elementary Theory of Numbers. Warsaw, 1964.

AMS Classification number: 11NT (number theory)

\*\*\*\*