



**Universiteit  
Leiden**  
The Netherlands

## **On the inverse Fermat equation**

Lenstra, H.W.

### **Citation**

Lenstra, H. W. (1992). On the inverse Fermat equation. Retrieved from <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/3835>

Version: Not Applicable (or Unknown)

License: [Leiden University Non-exclusive license](#)

Downloaded from: <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/3835>

**Note:** To cite this publication please use the final published version (if applicable).

# On the inverse Fermat equation

H.W. Lenstra Jr

*Department of Mathematics, University of California, Berkeley, CA 94720, USA*

Received 10 December 1991

## *Abstract*

Lenstra Jr, H W , On the inverse Fermat equation, *Discrete Mathematics* 106/107 (1992) 329–331

In this paper the equation  $x^{1/n} + y^{1/n} = z^{1/n}$  is solved in positive integers  $x, y, z, n$ . If the  $n$ th roots are taken to be positive real numbers, then all solutions are known to be trivial in a certain sense. A very short proof of this is provided. The argument extends to give a complete description of all solutions when other  $n$ th roots are allowed. It turns out that up to a suitable equivalence relation there are exactly four nontrivial solutions.

The *inverse Fermat equation* is the diophantine equation

$$x^{1/n} + y^{1/n} = z^{1/n},$$

to be solved in positive integers  $x, y, z, n$ . When the  $n$ th roots are interpreted as positive real numbers, then it is known that the only solutions are given by  $x = ca^n$ ,  $y = cb^n$ ,  $z = c(a + b)^n$ , where  $a, b, c$  are positive integers with  $\gcd(a, b) = 1$ ; see [1, 2] and the references listed there. Equivalently, if  $\alpha, \beta$  are positive real numbers for which

$$\alpha + \beta = 1, \quad \alpha^n \text{ and } \beta^n \text{ are rational,}$$

then  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$  are rational.

The following proof is so short that it might be called a *one line* proof, had it not employed two circles as well. It relies on a fact from Euclidean geometry: *if two nonconcentric circles in the plane intersect in a point that is collinear with their centres, then they have no other intersection point.* The rationality of  $\alpha^n$  implies that the algebraic number  $\alpha$  and all of its conjugates have the same absolute value, so that in the complex plane they are all located on a circle centred at 0; and since the same is true for  $\beta = 1 - \alpha$ , they also lie on a circle centred at 1. Thus, by the geometric fact just stated,  $\alpha$  has no conjugates different from itself, which means that it is rational.

*Correspondence to* H W Lenstra Jr, Department of Mathematics, University of California, Berkeley, CA 94720, USA

When other  $n$ th roots than positive real ones are allowed in the inverse Fermat equation, then there are a few special solutions. Namely, consider the identities

$$1 + 1^{\frac{1}{4}} = 16^{\frac{1}{8}},$$

$$1 + 1^{\frac{1}{3}} = 1^{\frac{1}{6}},$$

$$1 + 9^{\frac{1}{4}} = 64^{\frac{1}{6}},$$

$$1 + 1^{\frac{1}{6}} = 729^{\frac{1}{12}},$$

where the roots are suitably chosen. The first identity leads to a solution  $x = y = 1$ ,  $z = 16$ ,  $n = 8$  of the inverse Fermat equation. The others lead in a similar way to solutions, with  $n = 6, 12, 12$ , respectively.

There are essentially no other solutions. To formulate this precisely, denote by  $G$  the multiplicative group of nonzero complex numbers  $\delta$  with the property that  $\delta^n$  is rational for some positive integer  $n$ . Consider the equation

$$\alpha + \beta + \gamma = 0, \quad \alpha, \beta, \gamma \in G.$$

Each of the above four identities represents a solution; let the solutions obtained in this way be called *special*. In addition, there are *trivial* solutions, in which  $\alpha$ ,  $\beta$ , and  $\gamma$  are rational. Let two solutions be called *equivalent* if one is proportional to a permutation of the other, up to complex conjugation. With this terminology, *each solution is equivalent either to a trivial one or to one of the four special solutions*.

Permuting  $\alpha$ ,  $\beta$ ,  $\gamma$  one can achieve that  $|\gamma| = \max\{|\alpha|, |\beta|, |\gamma|\}$ , and dividing by  $-\gamma$  one may assume that  $\gamma = -1$ , so that  $\alpha + \beta = 1$ . If  $\alpha$  is real, then the same proof as above shows that the solution is trivial. Suppose that  $\alpha$  is not real. Then the same reasoning leads to two circles that intersect in two nonreal points, so  $\alpha$  is imaginary quadratic. From  $|\alpha| \leq 1$ ,  $|1 - \alpha| = |\beta| \leq 1$  one sees that the real part of  $\alpha$  is strictly between 0 and 1. Also, from  $\alpha \in G$  it follows that the number  $\zeta = \alpha/\bar{\alpha}$  is a root of unity, and it is different from  $\pm 1$ . Further,  $\zeta$  belongs to the quadratic field generated by  $\alpha$ . The same statements are true for the number  $\eta = \beta/\bar{\beta} = (1 - \alpha)/(1 - \bar{\alpha})$ . However, the only quadratic fields that contain roots of unity different from  $\pm 1$  are the Gaussian field, generated by a primitive fourth root of unity, and the Eisenstein field, generated by a primitive cube root of unity. If  $\alpha$  generates the Gaussian field, then  $\zeta$  has order 4, and the same is true for  $\eta$ , so that the triangle with vertices  $0, 1, \alpha$  has angles equal to  $\pi/4, \pi/4, \pi/2$ ; in this case the solution is equivalent to the first special one. If  $\alpha$  generates the Eisenstein field, then  $\zeta$  has order 3 or 6, and the same is true for  $\eta$ . If both  $\zeta$  and  $\eta$  have order 3, then the triangle with vertices  $0, 1, \alpha$  is equilateral, and the solution is equivalent to the second special one. If one of  $\zeta$  and  $\eta$  has order 6, and the other has order 3 or 6, then one finds in a similar way one of the remaining two special solutions.

### **Acknowledgement**

The author was supported by NSF under Grant No. DMS 90-02939. He is grateful to Andrew Granville and Guoqiang Ge for their bibliographic and linguistic assistance.

### **References**

- [1] M Newman, A radical diophantine equation, *J Number Theory* 13 (1981) 495–498
- [2] Zhao Yu Xu, On the diophantine equation  $X^{1/m} + Y^{1/m} = Z^{1/m}$  (Chinese), *Hunan Ann Math* 6 (1) (1986) 115–117, *Math Rev* 88f 11019