On the diophantine equation  $\binom{n}{k} = x^l$ 

by

K. GYŐRY (Debrecen)

To the memory of Professor P. Erdős

1. Introduction. Consider the equation

(1) 
$$\binom{n}{k} = x^{l} \quad \text{in integers } n, k, x, l \\ \text{with } k \ge 2, \ n \ge 2k, \ x > 1, \ l > 1.$$

There is no loss in generality in assuming that  $n \ge 2k$ , since  $\binom{n}{k} = \binom{n}{n-k}$ . It is clear that there are infinitely many solutions if k = l = 2. For k = 3, l = 2, equation (1) has only the solution n = 50, x = 140 (for references see e.g. [4], p. 25 or [7], p. 251). In 1939, P. Erdős [5] proved that no solutions exist if  $k \ge 2^l$  or if l = 3. Further, he conjectured that (1) has no solution if l > 3. R. Obláth [13] confirmed this conjecture for l = 4 and l = 5.

In 1951, Erdős [6] (see also [7]) proved in an ingenious, elementary way the following.

THEOREM A (P. Erdős [6]). For k > 3, equation (1) has no solution.

There remained the cases k = 2 and k = 3. In what follows, we consider the equations

(2) 
$$\binom{n}{2} = x^l$$
 in integers  $n, x, l$  with  $n > 2, x > 1, l > 2,$ 

and

(3) 
$$\binom{n}{3} = x^l$$
 in integers  $n, x, l$  with  $n > 3, x > 1, l > 2$ .

It follows from results of P. Dénes [3] that for certain regular primes l, equations (2) and (3) have no solutions in n and x.

[289]

Research supported in part by the Hungarian Academy of Sciences and by Grants 16975 and 16791 from the Hungarian National Foundation for Scientific Research.

In [10] (see also [8]) I proved the following. Assume that for given prime l > 5, equation (2) is not solvable. Then equation (3) has at most one solution. Further, if in addition

$$(4) 3^{l-1} \not\equiv 1 \pmod{l^2}$$

holds, then (3) has no solution.

An important contribution was made by R. Tijdeman [16] who proved that equations (2) and (3) have only finitely many solutions, and all these solutions can be effectively determined. In his proof Tijdeman used a profound effective inequality of A. Baker concerning linear forms in logarithms. Recently, N. Terai [15] utilized a recent estimate of linear forms in logarithms to show that if (2) or (3) is solvable then l < 4250.

H. Darmon and L. Merel [2] have recently proved that for given integer  $l \geq 3$ , the equation

 $x^{l} + y^{l} = 2 \cdot z^{l}$  in relatively prime integers x, y, z

has only trivial solutions for which xyz = 0 or  $\pm 1$ . In their proof the authors combined various recent powerful results in number theory, including Wiles' proof of most cases of the Shimura–Taniyama conjecture. If now equation (2) is solvable then  $n = y^l$ ,  $n - 1 = 2z^l$  or  $n = 2z^l$ ,  $n - 1 = y^l$  with some coprime positive integers y, z, whence  $y^l \pm 1 = 2z^l$ . Thus, the next theorem immediately follows from the above theorem of Darmon and Merel.

THEOREM B (H. Darmon and L. Merel). Equation (2) has no solution.

In the present paper we shall prove the following.

THEOREM 1. Equation (3) has no solution.

To prove Theorem 1, we combine the arguments of [10] with Theorem B, a result on (4) and a recent theorem of M. A. Bennett and B. M. M. de Weger [1]. As will be shown after the proof of Theorem 1, this latter theorem can be replaced in our proof by the results of Dénes [3] and Terai [15].

Together with Theorems A and B, Theorem 1 proves Erdős' conjecture. The following theorem provides a complete solution of equation (1). It may be regarded as a joint result of Erdős, Darmon, Merel and the present author.

THEOREM 2 (P. Erdős, case k > 3; H. Darmon and L. Merel, case k = 2; K. Győry). Apart from the case k = l = 2, equation (1) has only the solution n = 50, k = 3, x = 140, l = 2.

As was quoted above, for k = 3, l = 2 the assertion of Theorem 2 had been proved a long time ago. For other values of k and l, Theorem 2 is an immediate consequence of Theorems A, B and Theorem 1. 2. Proof of Theorem 1. We first show that we can make some restrictions concerning l. The number  $140^2$  is the only square which can be represented in the form  $\binom{n}{3}$  with n > 3. Since 140 is not a full power, in equation (3) the exponent l cannot be even. Further, the results of Erdős [5] and Obláth [13] imply that l must be greater than 5. Therefore it suffices to prove that (3) has no solution for any prime l > 5.

For primes l > 5 satisfying (4), the proof of a result of my thesis [10] can be adapted. A similar result was earlier published in my paper ([8], Thm. 2). However, [10] and [8] were written in Hungarian, and the proof of the theorem in question in [8] is not complete. Hence we shall give here a detailed proof of our Theorem 1.

We shall need five lemmas. In Lemmas 1 to 3, l denotes a prime greater than 3.

LEMMA 1. Let a, b be relatively prime integers with  $a + b \neq 0$ . Then

$$\left(a+b, \frac{a^l+b^l}{a+b}\right) = 1 \text{ or } l.$$

Further,  $l^2 \nmid \frac{a^l + b^l}{a + b}$  and each prime divisor  $\neq l$  of  $\frac{a^l + b^l}{a + b}$  is of the form lt + 1.

Proof. See e.g. [11]. ■

The following two lemmas have been proved by means of Eisenstein's reciprocity theorem.

LEMMA 2 (S. Lubelski [12]). Let a, b, c be integers such that

(5) 
$$\frac{a^l + b^l}{a + b} = c^l, \quad (a, b) = 1, \quad (a^2 - b^2, l) = 1.$$

Then for each prime r with  $r \neq l$  and  $r \mid a - b$ , we have (6)  $r^{l-1} \equiv 1 \pmod{l^2}$ .

Proof. See [12], Satz 2. ■

LEMMA 3 (K. Győry [9]). Let a, b, c be integers satisfying (5). Then we have (6) for each prime r with  $r \neq l$  and  $r \mid a + b$ .

Proof. This was proved in [9] (cf. the Lemma in the proof of Satz 1). ■

LEMMA 4. If l is an odd prime with  $l < 2^{30}$  and

(7) 
$$3^{l-1} \equiv 1 \pmod{l^2}$$

then l = 11 or l = 1006003.

Proof. See e.g. [14], pp. 169–170, and the references given there. ■

The next result has recently been proved by means of rational approximation to hypergeometric functions, the theory of linear forms in logarithms and some recent computational methods.

LEMMA 5 (M. A. Bennett and B. M. M. de Weger [1]). Let a, b and l be integers with b > a > 1 and  $3 \le l < 17$  or l > 347. Then the equation

$$|ax^l - by^l| = 1$$

has at most one solution in positive integers x, y.

Proof. This is an immediate consequence of Theorem 1.1 in [1]. ■

Proof of Theorem 1. Suppose that equation (3) has a solution n, x, l with n > 3, l > 2. As was remarked above, we may assume that l is a prime greater than 5.

We first show that, for l, (7) must hold. To prove this, we follow the arguments of [10] (cf. also [8]). It follows from (3) that

$$n(n-1)(n-2) = 6x^l$$

We distinguish three cases according as n, n-1 or n-2 is divisible by 3. Among the numbers n, n-1 and n-2 at most one is divisible by  $2^2$ . Hence, apart from the prime factors 2 and 3, each of the numbers n, n-1 and n-2must be an lth power.

First, we consider the case when n is divisible by 3. We have the following three subcases. In what follows, u, v and w denote positive integers.

- $n = 3u^l, n-1 = 2v^l, n-2 = w^l$ , whence  $\binom{n-1}{2} = (vw)^l$  and n-1 > 2. However, by Theorem B this is not possible.  $n = 3 \cdot 2^l u^l, n-1 = v^l, n-2 = 2w^l$ , whence  $\binom{n-1}{2} = (vw)^l$ , which (i,1)
- (i,2)is also impossible.
- $n = 6u^{l}, n 1 = v^{l}, n 2 = 2^{l}w^{l}$ , which gives  $v^{l} 1 = (2w)^{l}$ . This (i,3)is, however, not solvable in positive integers v, w because l > 5.

When n-2 is divisible by 3, we have the following three subcases.

- $n = u^{l}, n 1 = 2v^{l}, n 2 = 3w^{l},$  whence  $\binom{n}{2} = (uv)^{l}$  and n > 2. (ii,1)But this is impossible by Theorem B.
- $n = 2u^l, n 1 = v^l, n 2 = 3 \cdot 2^l w^l$ , whence  $\binom{n}{2} = (uv)^l$ , which is (ii,2)again impossible.
- $n = 2^{l}u^{l}, n 1 = v^{l}, n 2 = 6w^{l}$ , whence  $v^{l} + 1 = (2u)^{l}$ , which has (ii,3)no solution in positive integers v, u.

Finally, consider those subcases when n-1 is divisible by 3.

 $n = u^{l}, n - 1 = 6v^{l}, n - 2 = w^{l},$  whence  $u^{l} - w^{l} = 2$ , which is (iii.1)impossible.

We have showed that the above cases cannot hold. It remains to deal with the following two subcases:

- $n = 2w^{l}, n 1 = 3v^{l}, n 2 = 2^{l}u^{l},$ (iii,2)
- $n = 2^{l}u^{l}, n 1 = 3v^{l}, n 2 = 2w^{l}.$ (iii,3)

It is easily seen that, in both cases, v and w must be greater than 1. In the cases (iii,2) and (iii,3) we obtain the systems of equations

(8) 
$$2(w^l - 1) = 3v^l - 1 = 2^l u^l$$
 in integers  $u, v, w$   
with  $u \ge 1, v, w > 1$ ,

and

(9) 
$$2(w^l + 1) = 3v^l + 1 = 2^l u^l$$
 in integers  $u, v, w$   
with  $u \ge 1, v, w > 1$ 

respectively.

It is sufficient to prove that none of the systems (8) and (9) is solvable. Consider (8) and (9) simultaneously. It follows from (8) and (9) that

(10) 
$$(2u)^l \pm 1 = 3v^l.$$

Here and in the sequel the upper and lower sign must be taken according as the case under consideration is a consequence of (8) or (9), respectively. First assume that  $l \nmid v$  and  $l \nmid (2u)^2 - 1$ . Then, by Lemma 1, we infer from (10) that

$$\frac{(2u)^l \pm 1}{2u \pm 1} = c^l$$

with some non-zero integer c, and that 3 | 2u+1 in the first case and 3 | 2u-1 in the second case. Hence, by Lemma 3, we deduce in both cases that

(7) 
$$3^{l-1} \equiv 1 \pmod{l^2}.$$

Next assume that  $l \mid (2u)^2 - 1$  or  $l \mid v$ . If  $l \mid v$ , then it follows from (10) that  $2u \pm 1 \equiv 0 \pmod{l}$ , which implies that  $l \mid (2u)^2 - 1$ . Hence it is sufficient to deal with the systems of equations (8) and (9) under the assumption that

(11) 
$$2u \equiv 1 \pmod{l}$$

or

(12) 
$$2u \equiv -1 \pmod{l}.$$

Consider again (8) and (9) simultaneously. It follows from (8) and (9) that (13)  $w^{l} \neq 1 = 2^{l-1}u^{l}$ .

By (11) and (12), we have  $l \nmid u$ . Thus, by Lemma 1, we infer from (13) that

(14) 
$$\frac{w^l \mp 1}{w \mp 1} = d^l$$

with some non-zero integer d. To apply Lemma 2 to (14), we have to show that  $l \nmid w^2 - 1$ . Together with (11) or (12), (13) implies in both cases that 2w can be congruent only to 1, -1, 3 or -3 (mod l). But l > 5, hence it follows indeed in both cases that  $w \not\equiv 1 \pmod{l}$  and  $w \not\equiv -1 \pmod{l}$ . In view of  $w^l \equiv w \pmod{3}$ , (8), resp. (9), implies that  $3 \mid w + 1$ , resp.  $3 \mid w - 1$  holds. Thus, by applying Lemma 2 to (14) we conclude again that (7) must hold.

It follows both from (8) and from (9) that v, w satisfy the equation

(15)  $|2w^l - 3v^l| = 1$  in positive integers v, w.

This equation has the solution v = w = 1. Hence, if l < 17 or l > 347, it follows by Lemma 5 that equation (15) has no solution in positive integers with v > 1 or w > 1. Thus there remains the case  $17 \le l \le 347$ . However, in view of Lemma 4, (7) does not hold for these values of l. This completes the proof of Theorem 1.

Remark. After having proved above that (7) must hold, the results of Terai [15] and Dénes [3] can also be used in place of Lemma 5. Indeed, Terai's theorem implies that no solutions of (3) exist if  $l \ge 4250$ . By Lemma 4, l = 11 is the only prime l for which both (7) and l < 4250 hold. Finally, it follows from Satz 8 of Dénes [3] that equation (10) is not solvable for l = 11, and the proof of Theorem 1 is again complete.

Acknowledgements. I would like to thank Professor R. Tijdeman for stimulating discussions and for his helpful remarks. I am also indebted to Professors B. M. M. de Weger and L. Merel for putting their papers [1] and [2], respectively, at my disposal prior to their publication.

## References

- [1] M. A. Bennett and B. M. M. de Weger, On the Diophantine equation  $|ax^n by^n| = 1$ , to appear.
- [2] H. Darmon and L. Merel, Winding quotients and some variants of Fermat's Last Theorem, to appear.
- [3] P. Dénes, Über die diophantische Gleichung  $x^l + y^l = cz^l$ , Acta Math. 88 (1952), 241–251.
- [4] L. E. Dickson, *History of the Theory of Numbers*, Vol. II, reprinted by Chelsea, New York, 1971.
- [5] P. Erdős, Note on the product of consecutive integers (II), J. London Math. Soc. 14 (1939), 245–249.
- [6] —, On a diophantine equation, ibid. 26 (1951), 176–178.
- [7] P. Erdős and J. Surányi, Selected Topics in Number Theory, 2nd ed., Szeged, 1996 (in Hungarian).
- [8] K. Győry, On the diophantine equations  $\binom{n}{2} = a^l$  and  $\binom{n}{3} = a^l$ , Mat. Lapok 14 (1963), 322–329 (in Hungarian).
- [9] —, Über die diophantische Gleichung  $x^p + y^p = cz^p$ , Publ. Math. Debrecen 13 (1966), 301–305.
- [10] —, Contributions to the theory of diophantine equations, Ph.D. Thesis, Debrecen, 1966 (in Hungarian).
- [11] E. Landau, Vorlesungen über Zahlentheorie, III, Leipzig, 1927.

- [12] S. Lubelski, Studien über den grossen Fermatschen Satz, Prace Mat.-Fiz. 42 (1935), 11-44.
- [13] R. Obláth, Note on the binomial coefficients, J. London Math. Soc. 23 (1948), 252-253.
- [14] P. Ribenboim, The Little Book of Big Primes, Springer, 1991.
- [15] N. Terai, On a Diophantine equation of Erdős, Proc. Japan Acad. Ser. A 70 (1994), 213–217.
- [16] R. Tijdeman, Applications of the Gelfond-Baker method to rational number theory, in: Topics in Number Theory, North-Holland, 1976, 399-416.

Institute of Mathematics and Informatics Kossuth Lajos University 4010 Debrecen, Hungary E-mail: gyory@math.klte.hu

Received on 20.11.1996

(3081)