

# Zsigmondy's Theorem

Lola Thompson

Dartmouth College

August 11, 2009

# Introduction

## Definition

$o(a \bmod p) :=$  the multiplicative order of  $a \pmod{p}$ .

Recall: The multiplicative order of  $a \pmod{p}$  is the smallest integer  $k$  such that  $a^k \equiv 1 \pmod{p}$ .

**Example**  $o(2 \bmod 5) = 4$  since  $2^1 \equiv 2 \pmod{5}$ ,  $2^2 \equiv 4 \pmod{5}$ ,  $2^3 \equiv 3 \pmod{5}$  and  $2^4 \equiv 1 \pmod{5}$ .

# Introduction

## Theorem (Zsigmondy)

*For every pair of positive integers  $(a, n)$ , except  $n = 1$  and  $(2, 6)$ , there exists a prime  $p$  such that  $n = o(a \bmod p)$ .*

- Let's see why the exceptional cases might not work:

# Introduction

## Theorem (Zsigmondy)

*For every pair of positive integers  $(a, n)$ , except  $n = 1$  and  $(2, 6)$ , there exists a prime  $p$  such that  $n = o(a \bmod p)$ .*

- Let's see why the exceptional cases might not work:
- If  $n = 1$ , then  $1 = o(a \bmod p) \Rightarrow a^1 \equiv 1 \pmod{p}$ . But this is only true when  $a = 1$ .

# Introduction

## Theorem (Zsigmondy)

*For every pair of positive integers  $(a, n)$ , except  $n = 1$  and  $(2, 6)$ , there exists a prime  $p$  such that  $n = o(a \bmod p)$ .*

- $(2, 6)$  is an exception means that there are no primes  $p$  such that  $6 = o(2 \bmod p)$ , i.e. for any prime  $p$  such that  $2^6 \equiv 1 \pmod{p}$ , it must be the case that  $2^3 \equiv 1 \pmod{p}$  or  $2^2 \equiv 1 \pmod{p}$  also.

# Introduction

## Theorem (Zsigmondy)

*For every pair of positive integers  $(a, n)$ , except  $n = 1$  and  $(2, 6)$ , there exists a prime  $p$  such that  $n = o(a \bmod p)$ .*

- $(2, 6)$  is an exception means that there are no primes  $p$  such that  $6 = o(2 \bmod p)$ , i.e. for any prime  $p$  such that  $2^6 \equiv 1 \pmod{p}$ , it must be the case that  $2^3 \equiv 1 \pmod{p}$  or  $2^2 \equiv 1 \pmod{p}$  also.
- The fact that  $(2, 6)$  is an exception can be proven through elementary means, but we'll get it for free in the process of proving Zsigmondy's Theorem.

# Outline

# Cyclotomic Polynomials

## Definition

We define  $n^{\text{th}}$  cyclotomic polynomial as follows:

$$\Phi_n(x) = \prod_{\substack{\zeta \text{ primitive} \\ n^{\text{th}} \text{ root of } 1}} (x - \zeta).$$

$\Phi_n(x)$  has degree  $\varphi(n)$  since there are  $\varphi(n)$  primitive  $n^{\text{th}}$  roots of unity. (Recall: If  $\zeta$  is primitive then  $\zeta^k$  is primitive if and only if  $(k, n) = 1$ )

Some Other Properties:

- Monic



# Cyclotomic Polynomials

## Definition

We define  $n^{\text{th}}$  cyclotomic polynomial as follows:

$$\Phi_n(x) = \prod_{\substack{\zeta \text{ primitive} \\ n^{\text{th}} \text{ root of } 1}} (x - \zeta).$$

$\Phi_n(x)$  has degree  $\varphi(n)$  since there are  $\varphi(n)$  primitive  $n^{\text{th}}$  roots of unity. (Recall: If  $\zeta$  is primitive then  $\zeta^k$  is primitive if and only if  $(k, n) = 1$ )

Some Other Properties:

- Monic
- Irreducible

# Cyclotomic Polynomials

## Definition

We define  $n^{\text{th}}$  cyclotomic polynomial as follows:

$$\Phi_n(x) = \prod_{\substack{\zeta \text{ primitive} \\ n^{\text{th}} \text{ root of } 1}} (x - \zeta).$$

$\Phi_n(x)$  has degree  $\varphi(n)$  since there are  $\varphi(n)$  primitive  $n^{\text{th}}$  roots of unity. (Recall: If  $\zeta$  is primitive then  $\zeta^k$  is primitive if and only if  $(k, n) = 1$ )

Some Other Properties:

- Monic
- Irreducible
- In  $\mathbb{Z}[x]$   
(In fact,  $\Phi_n(x)$  is the minimal polynomial for  $\zeta$  over  $\mathbb{Q}$ )

# Cyclotomic Polynomials

## Theorem

$$x^n - 1 = \prod_{d|n} \Phi_d(x)$$

(True since  $x^n - 1 = \prod_{\zeta \text{ } n^{\text{th}} \text{ root of } 1} (x - \zeta) = \prod_{d|n} \prod_{\substack{\zeta \text{ primitive} \\ d^{\text{th}} \text{ root of } 1}} (x - \zeta)$ ).

# The Mobius Function

The Mobius function  $\mu(n)$  is an arithmetic function satisfying  $\mu(1) = 1$  and  $\sum_{d|n} \mu(d) = 0$  for every  $n > 1$ .

**Example:**  $\sum_{d|2} \mu(d) = \mu(1) + \mu(2) = 0$ .

Since  $\mu(1) = 1$  then it must be the case that  $\mu(2) = -1$ .

**Example:**  $\sum_{d|4} \mu(d) = \mu(1) + \mu(2) + \mu(4) = 0$ .

Since we know that  $\mu(1) + \mu(2) = 0$  then  $\mu(4) = 0$ .

In general: 
$$\mu(n) = \begin{cases} 0, & n = m \cdot p^r, r > 1 \\ -1^k, & n = p_1 p_2 \cdots p_k \end{cases}$$

# Cyclotomic Polynomials

## Theorem (Möbius Inversion Formula)

$$\text{If } f(n) = \sum_{d|n} g(d) \text{ then } g(n) = \sum_{d|n} f(d) \cdot \mu(n/d).$$

$$\text{Since } x^n - 1 = \prod_{d|n} \Phi_d(x) \text{ then } \Phi_n(x) = \prod_{d|n} (x^d - 1)^{\mu(n/d)}$$

(take log of both sides, apply Möbius inversion, then undo the logs).

### Example:

$$\Phi_2(x) = (x^1 - 1)^{\mu(2/1)} \cdot (x^2 - 1)^{\mu(2/2)} = (x - 1)^{-1} \cdot (x^2 - 1) = x + 1.$$

# Cyclotomic Polynomials

Some Examples:

$$\Phi_1(x) = x - 1$$

$$\Phi_2(x) = x + 1$$

$$\Phi_3(x) = x^2 + x + 1$$

$$\Phi_4(x) = x^2 + 1$$

$$\Phi_5(x) = x^4 + x^3 + x^2 + x + 1$$

$$\Phi_6(x) = x^2 - x + 1$$

$$\Phi_7(x) = x^6 + x^5 + x^4 + x^3 + x^2 + x + 1$$

$$\Phi_8(x) = x^4 + 1$$

In general,  $\Phi_p(x) = x^{p-1} + x^{p-2} + \cdots + x + 1$ .

For  $k \geq 1$ ,  $\Phi_{p^k}(x) = \Phi_p(x^{p^{k-1}})$ . So  $\Phi_{p^k}(x)$  has the same number of nonzero terms as  $\Phi_p(x)$ .

# Values of Cyclotomic Polynomials

## Theorem

Suppose  $n > 1$ . Then:

$$(1) \Phi_n(0) = 1$$
$$(2) \Phi_n(1) = \begin{cases} p, & n = p^m, m > 0 \\ 1, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

To prove (2): Evaluate  $\frac{x^n-1}{x-1}$  at  $x = 1$  in 2 different ways to find  $n = \prod_{\substack{d|n \\ d>1}} \Phi_d(1)$ . We know that  $\Phi_p(x) = x^{p-1} + \cdots + x + 1$ , so  $\Phi_p(1) = p$ .

Moreover,  $\Phi_{p^k}(1) = p$ . By unique factorization,  $n = p_1^{e_1} \cdots p_g^{e_g}$ . Since there are  $e_i$  divisors of  $n$  that are powers of  $p_i$  for each prime  $p_i$  dividing  $n$  then, from our formula above,  $\Phi_d(1) = 1$  when  $d$  is composite.

# Values of Cyclotomic Polynomials

## Theorem

Suppose  $n > 1$ . Then:

(3) If  $a > 1$  then  $(a - 1)^{\varphi(n)} < \Phi_n(a) < (a + 1)^{\varphi(n)}$ .

(4) If  $a \geq 3$  and  $p \mid n$  is a prime factor, then  $\Phi_n(a) > p$ .

## Proof of (3)

If  $a > 1$  then geometry implies that  $a - 1 < |a - \zeta| < a + 1$  for every point  $\zeta \neq 1$  on the unit circle. The inequalities stated above follow from the fact that  $|\Phi_n(a)| = \prod |a - \zeta|$ .

## Proof of (4)

Since  $\varphi(n) \geq p - 1$  then when  $a \geq 3$ , we have  $\Phi_n(a) > 2^{\varphi(n)} \geq 2^{p-1}$  (by (3)). But  $2^{p-1} \geq p$  since  $p \geq 2$ .



# Key Lemma

## Lemma

*Suppose that  $n > 2$  and  $a > 1$  are integers and  $\Phi_n(a)$  is prime. If  $\Phi_n(a) \mid n$  then  $n = 6$  and  $a = 2$ .*

## Proof

- Let  $p = \Phi_n(a)$ , where  $p \mid n$ .

# Key Lemma

## Lemma

Suppose that  $n > 2$  and  $a > 1$  are integers and  $\Phi_n(a)$  is prime. If  $\Phi_n(a) \mid n$  then  $n = 6$  and  $a = 2$ .

## Proof

- Let  $p = \Phi_n(a)$ , where  $p \mid n$ .
- If  $a \geq 3$  then  $\Phi_n(a) > p$  by (4), which is obviously false.

# Key Lemma

## Lemma

Suppose that  $n > 2$  and  $a > 1$  are integers and  $\Phi_n(a)$  is prime. If  $\Phi_n(a) \mid n$  then  $n = 6$  and  $a = 2$ .

## Proof

- Let  $p = \Phi_n(a)$ , where  $p \mid n$ .
- If  $a \geq 3$  then  $\Phi_n(a) > p$  by (4), which is obviously false.
- Thus,  $a = 2$  and  $\Phi_n(2) = p$ .

# Key Lemma

## Lemma

Suppose that  $n > 2$  and  $a > 1$  are integers and  $\Phi_n(a)$  is prime. If  $\Phi_n(a) \mid n$  then  $n = 6$  and  $a = 2$ .

## Proof

- Let  $p = \Phi_n(a)$ , where  $p \mid n$ .
- If  $a \geq 3$  then  $\Phi_n(a) > p$  by (4), which is obviously false.
- Thus,  $a = 2$  and  $\Phi_n(2) = p$ .
- Since  $\Phi_n(2) = p$  then  $p \mid (2^n - 1)$   
(since  $\Phi_n(x)$  always divides  $x^n - 1$ ), i.e.  $2^n \equiv 1 \pmod{p}$ .

# Key Lemma

## Lemma

Suppose that  $n > 2$  and  $a > 1$  are integers and  $\Phi_n(a)$  is prime. If  $\Phi_n(a) \mid n$  then  $n = 6$  and  $a = 2$ .

## Proof

- Let  $p = \Phi_n(a)$ , where  $p \mid n$ .
- If  $a \geq 3$  then  $\Phi_n(a) > p$  by (4), which is obviously false.
- Thus,  $a = 2$  and  $\Phi_n(2) = p$ .
- Since  $\Phi_n(2) = p$  then  $p \mid (2^n - 1)$   
(since  $\Phi_n(x)$  always divides  $x^n - 1$ ), i.e.  $2^n \equiv 1 \pmod{p}$ .
- So,  $p$  must be odd.

# Key Lemma

- So far, we have:  $p = \Phi_n(2)$ ,  $p \mid n$ ,  $p$  odd.

# Key Lemma

- So far, we have:  $p = \Phi_n(2)$ ,  $p \mid n$ ,  $p$  odd.
- Factor  $n = p^e \cdot m$  where  $p \nmid m$ .

# Key Lemma

- So far, we have:  $p = \Phi_n(2)$ ,  $p \mid n$ ,  $p$  odd.
- Factor  $n = p^e \cdot m$  where  $p \nmid m$ .
- It's a well-known fact from abstract algebra that if  $n$  is as above and if  $\alpha$  is a root of  $\Phi_n(x)$  over  $F_p$  then  $m = o(\alpha)$ .



# Key Lemma

- So far, we have:  $p = \Phi_n(2)$ ,  $p \mid n$ ,  $p$  odd.
- Factor  $n = p^e \cdot m$  where  $p \nmid m$ .
- It's a well-known fact from abstract algebra that if  $n$  is as above and if  $\alpha$  is a root of  $\Phi_n(x)$  over  $F_p$  then  $m = o(\alpha)$ .
- As a result, since we know that  $\Phi_n(2) \equiv 0 \pmod{p}$ , then  $m = o(2 \pmod{p})$ .

# Key Lemma

- So far, we have:  $p = \Phi_n(2)$ ,  $p \mid n$ ,  $p$  odd.
- Factor  $n = p^e \cdot m$  where  $p \nmid m$ .
- It's a well-known fact from abstract algebra that if  $n$  is as above and if  $\alpha$  is a root of  $\Phi_n(x)$  over  $F_p$  then  $m = o(\alpha)$ .
- As a result, since we know that  $\Phi_n(2) \equiv 0 \pmod{p}$ , then  $m = o(2 \pmod{p})$ .
- If  $e > 1$  then  $p = \Phi_n(2) = \Phi_{p^e \cdot m}(2) = \Phi_m(2^{p^e}) = \Phi_{pm}(2^{p^{e-1}})$ .

## Key Lemma

- So far, we have:  $p = \Phi_n(2)$ ,  $p \mid n$ ,  $p$  odd.
- Factor  $n = p^e \cdot m$  where  $p \nmid m$ .
- It's a well-known fact from abstract algebra that if  $n$  is as above and if  $\alpha$  is a root of  $\Phi_n(x)$  over  $F_p$  then  $m = o(\alpha)$ .
- As a result, since we know that  $\Phi_n(2) \equiv 0 \pmod{p}$ , then  $m = o(2 \pmod{p})$ .
- If  $e > 1$  then  $p = \Phi_n(2) = \Phi_{p^e \cdot m}(2) = \Phi_m(2^{p^e}) = \Phi_{pm}(2^{p^{e-1}})$ .
- This contradicts (4), since  $2^{p^{e-1}} \geq 2^p > 4$ .

## Key Lemma

- So far, we have:  $p = \Phi_n(2)$ ,  $p \mid n$ ,  $p$  odd.
- Factor  $n = p^e \cdot m$  where  $p \nmid m$ .
- It's a well-known fact from abstract algebra that if  $n$  is as above and if  $\alpha$  is a root of  $\Phi_n(x)$  over  $F_p$  then  $m = o(\alpha)$ .
- As a result, since we know that  $\Phi_n(2) \equiv 0 \pmod{p}$ , then  $m = o(2 \pmod{p})$ .
- If  $e > 1$  then  $p = \Phi_n(2) = \Phi_{p^e \cdot m}(2) = \Phi_m(2^{p^e}) = \Phi_{pm}(2^{p^{e-1}})$ .
- This contradicts (4), since  $2^{p^{e-1}} \geq 2^p > 4$ .
- Thus,  $n = pm$ .

# Key Lemma

- At this point, we have deduced:  $p = \Phi_n(2)$ ,  $p \mid n$ ,  $p$  odd,  $n = pm$  where  $p \nmid m$ .

# Key Lemma

- At this point, we have deduced:  $p = \Phi_n(2)$ ,  $p \mid n$ ,  $p$  odd,  $n = pm$  where  $p \nmid m$ .
- We're trying to show that  $n = 6$ .

# Key Lemma

- At this point, we have deduced:  $p = \Phi_n(2)$ ,  $p \mid n$ ,  $p$  odd,  $n = pm$  where  $p \nmid m$ .
- We're trying to show that  $n = 6$ .
- Now,  $p = \Phi_{pm}(2) = \frac{\Phi_m(2^p)}{\Phi_m(2)} > \frac{(2^p-1)^{\varphi(m)}}{(2+1)^{\varphi(m)}} \geq \frac{2^p-1}{3}$  (from (3)).

# Key Lemma

- At this point, we have deduced:  $p = \Phi_n(2)$ ,  $p \mid n$ ,  $p$  odd,  $n = pm$  where  $p \nmid m$ .
- We're trying to show that  $n = 6$ .
- Now,  $p = \Phi_{pm}(2) = \frac{\Phi_m(2^p)}{\Phi_m(2)} > \frac{(2^p-1)^{\varphi(m)}}{(2+1)^{\varphi(m)}} \geq \frac{2^p-1}{3}$  (from (3)).
- But then  $3p + 1 > 2^p$ , which is impossible if  $p > 3$ .



## Key Lemma

- At this point, we have deduced:  $p = \Phi_n(2)$ ,  $p \mid n$ ,  $p$  odd,  $n = pm$  where  $p \nmid m$ .
- We're trying to show that  $n = 6$ .
- Now,  $p = \Phi_{pm}(2) = \frac{\Phi_m(2^p)}{\Phi_m(2)} > \frac{(2^p-1)^{\varphi(m)}}{(2+1)^{\varphi(m)}} \geq \frac{2^p-1}{3}$  (from (3)).
- But then  $3p + 1 > 2^p$ , which is impossible if  $p > 3$ .
- Therefore,  $p = 3$  and  $m = o(2 \bmod 3) = 2$ , so  $n = 2 \cdot 3 = 6$ .

## Recap and Extensions

We have proven the following Key Lemma:

### Lemma

*Suppose that  $n > 2$  and  $a > 1$  are integers and  $\Phi_n(a)$  is **prime**. If  $\Phi_n(a) \mid n$  then  $n = 6$  and  $a = 2$ .*

We can extend the Key Lemma to show that if  $\Phi_n(a)$  is a **divisor** of  $n$  for some  $n > 2$  and  $a > 1$ , then  $n = 6$  and  $a = 2$ .

# Good Pairs, Bad Pairs

## Definition

Let  $a, n \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ ,  $a > 1$ . The pair  $(a, n)$  is **good** if  $n = o(a \bmod p)$  for some prime  $p$ .

## Lemma (Good Pairs Condition)

$(a, n)$  is good if and only if there is a prime  $p$  such that  $p \mid (a^n - 1)$  but  $p \nmid (a^{n/q} - 1)$  for every prime factor  $q \mid n$ .

**Example**  $3^2 - 1$  uses the same primes as  $3^1 - 1$ , so  $(3, 2)$  is bad.

# Good Pairs, Bad Pairs

## Lemma

*$(a, 1)$  is bad when  $a = 2$ .*

*$(a, 2)$  is bad when  $a = 2^m - 1$  for some  $m > 1$ .*

*All other pairs  $(a, 2^k)$  are good.*

**Example**  $2^2 - 1 = 3, 2^3 - 1 = 7, 2^6 - 1 = 63 = 3^2 \cdot 7$ . Thus,  $(2, 6)$  is bad.

# Zsigmondy's Theorem

## Theorem (Zsigmondy)

*If  $n \geq 2$ , the only bad pair  $(a, n)$  is  $(2, 6)$ .*

[In other words, there exists a prime  $p$  such that  $n = o(a \bmod p)$  for every pair  $(a, n)$  except  $(2, 6)$ ]

**Proof Outline** Suppose  $(a, n)$  is bad and  $n > 2$ . We will translate this into a problem about cyclotomic polynomials and use the Key Lemma to derive a contradiction unless  $a = 2$  and  $n = 6$ .

## Two More Lemmas

In order to prove Zsigmondy's Theorem, we will need the following two lemmas:

### Lemma (1)

If  $x^n - 1 = \Phi_n(x) \cdot \omega_n(x)$  then  $\omega_n(x) = \prod_{\substack{d|n \\ d < n}} \Phi_d(x)$  and  $(x^d - 1) \mid \omega_n(x)$  in  $\mathbb{Z}[x]$  whenever  $d \mid n, d < n$ .

### Lemma (2)

Suppose that  $d \mid n$  and  $a^d \equiv 1 \pmod{p}$ . If  $d < n$  then  $p \mid \frac{n}{d}$ . In any case,  $p \mid n$ .

# Proving Zsigmondy's Theorem

## Theorem (Zsigmondy)

*If  $n \geq 2$ , the only bad pair  $(a, n)$  is  $(2, 6)$ .*

### Proof

- Pick an odd prime factor  $p \mid \Phi_n(a)$ .

# Proving Zsigmondy's Theorem

## Theorem (Zsigmondy)

*If  $n \geq 2$ , the only bad pair  $(a, n)$  is  $(2, 6)$ .*

### Proof

- Pick an odd prime factor  $p \mid \Phi_n(a)$ .
- Suppose that  $(a, n)$  is bad, so that  $k = o(a \bmod p)$  is a proper divisor of  $n$ .



# Proving Zsigmondy's Theorem

## Theorem (Zsigmondy)

*If  $n \geq 2$ , the only bad pair  $(a, n)$  is  $(2, 6)$ .*

### Proof

- Pick an odd prime factor  $p \mid \Phi_n(a)$ .
- Suppose that  $(a, n)$  is bad, so that  $k = o(a \bmod p)$  is a proper divisor of  $n$ .
- Let  $x^n - 1 = \Phi_n(x) \cdot \omega_n(x)$ .

# Proving Zsigmondy's Theorem

## Theorem (Zsigmondy)

*If  $n \geq 2$ , the only bad pair  $(a, n)$  is  $(2, 6)$ .*

### Proof

- Pick an odd prime factor  $p \mid \Phi_n(a)$ .
- Suppose that  $(a, n)$  is bad, so that  $k = o(a \bmod p)$  is a proper divisor of  $n$ .
- Let  $x^n - 1 = \Phi_n(x) \cdot \omega_n(x)$ .
- From Lemma (1),  $(a^k - 1) \mid \omega_n(a)$ , so  $p \mid (a^n - 1)$  also.

# Proving Zsigmondy's Theorem

## Theorem (Zsigmondy)

*If  $n \geq 2$ , the only bad pair  $(a, n)$  is  $(2, 6)$ .*

### Proof

- Pick an odd prime factor  $p \mid \Phi_n(a)$ .
- Suppose that  $(a, n)$  is bad, so that  $k = o(a \bmod p)$  is a proper divisor of  $n$ .
- Let  $x^n - 1 = \Phi_n(x) \cdot \omega_n(x)$ .
- From Lemma (1),  $(a^k - 1) \mid \omega_n(a)$ , so  $p \mid (a^n - 1)$  also.
- So  $p^2$  is a factor of  $\Phi_n(a) \cdot \omega_n(a) = a^n - 1$ .

# Proving Zsigmondy's Theorem

## Theorem (Zsigmondy)

If  $n \geq 2$ , the only bad pair  $(a, n)$  is  $(2, 6)$ .

### Proof

- Pick an odd prime factor  $p \mid \Phi_n(a)$ .
- Suppose that  $(a, n)$  is bad, so that  $k = o(a \bmod p)$  is a proper divisor of  $n$ .
- Let  $x^n - 1 = \Phi_n(x) \cdot \omega_n(x)$ .
- From Lemma (1),  $(a^k - 1) \mid \omega_n(a)$ , so  $p \mid (a^n - 1)$  also.
- So  $p^2$  is a factor of  $\Phi_n(a) \cdot \omega_n(a) = a^n - 1$ .
- By Fermat's little Theorem,  $a^{p-1} \equiv 1 \pmod{p}$ , so  $k \mid p - 1$ , hence  $k < p$ .

# Proving Zsigmondy's Theorem

- From Lemma (2), we know that if  $k \mid n$  and  $a^k \equiv 1 \pmod{p}$ , then if  $k < n$ , we must have  $p \mid \frac{n}{k}$  and  $p \mid n$ .

# Proving Zsigmondy's Theorem

- From Lemma (2), we know that if  $k \mid n$  and  $a^k \equiv 1 \pmod{p}$ , then if  $k < n$ , we must have  $p \mid \frac{n}{k}$  and  $p \mid n$ .
- It follows that  $p$  is the only prime factor of  $\frac{n}{k}$ , so we can write  $n = k \cdot p^u$  for some  $u \geq 1$ .

# Proving Zsigmondy's Theorem

- From Lemma (2), we know that if  $k \mid n$  and  $a^k \equiv 1 \pmod{p}$ , then if  $k < n$ , we must have  $p \mid \frac{n}{k}$  and  $p \mid n$ .
- It follows that  $p$  is the only prime factor of  $\frac{n}{k}$ , so we can write  $n = k \cdot p^u$  for some  $u \geq 1$ .
- We can also use Lemma (2) to show that  $p$  is the only prime factor of  $\Phi_n(a)$ . In other words,  $\Phi_n(a) = p^t$  for some  $t \geq 1$ .

## Finishing Up

- We've already shown that  $p$  is odd and  $p \mid n$  and  $\Phi_n(a) = p^t$ .



## Finishing Up

- We've already shown that  $p$  is odd and  $p \mid n$  and  $\Phi_n(a) = p^t$ .
- If  $t > 2$  then  $p^2$  divides  $\frac{a^n - 1}{a^{n/p} - 1}$ , since  $(a^{n/p} - 1) \mid \omega_n(a)$ .

## Finishing Up

- We've already shown that  $p$  is odd and  $p \mid n$  and  $\Phi_n(a) = p^t$ .
- If  $t > 2$  then  $p^2$  divides  $\frac{a^n-1}{a^{n/p}-1}$ , since  $(a^{n/p} - 1) \mid \omega_n(a)$ .
- We can use the exponent law to derive a contradiction to the statement that  $p^2 \mid \frac{a^n-1}{a^{n/p}-1}$ . Thus,  $\Phi_n(a) = p$ .

## Finishing Up

- We've already shown that  $p$  is odd and  $p \mid n$  and  $\Phi_n(a) = p^t$ .
- If  $t > 2$  then  $p^2$  divides  $\frac{a^n - 1}{a^{n/p} - 1}$ , since  $(a^{n/p} - 1) \mid \omega_n(a)$ .
- We can use the exponent law to derive a contradiction to the statement that  $p^2 \mid \frac{a^n - 1}{a^{n/p} - 1}$ . Thus,  $\Phi_n(a) = p$ .
- Now, if  $a \geq 3$  then  $\Phi_n(a) > p$ , which we know is false.

## Finishing Up

- We've already shown that  $p$  is odd and  $p \mid n$  and  $\Phi_n(a) = p^t$ .
- If  $t > 2$  then  $p^2$  divides  $\frac{a^n - 1}{a^{n/p} - 1}$ , since  $(a^{n/p} - 1) \mid \omega_n(a)$ .
- We can use the exponent law to derive a contradiction to the statement that  $p^2 \mid \frac{a^n - 1}{a^{n/p} - 1}$ . Thus,  $\Phi_n(a) = p$ .
- Now, if  $a \geq 3$  then  $\Phi_n(a) > p$ , which we know is false.
- Hence, we must have  $a = 2$ . By the Key Lemma,  $n = 6$ .

## Finishing Up

- We've already shown that  $p$  is odd and  $p \mid n$  and  $\Phi_n(a) = p^t$ .
- If  $t > 2$  then  $p^2$  divides  $\frac{a^n-1}{a^{n/p}-1}$ , since  $(a^{n/p} - 1) \mid \omega_n(a)$ .
- We can use the exponent law to derive a contradiction to the statement that  $p^2 \mid \frac{a^n-1}{a^{n/p}-1}$ . Thus,  $\Phi_n(a) = p$ .
- Now, if  $a \geq 3$  then  $\Phi_n(a) > p$ , which we know is false.
- Hence, we must have  $a = 2$ . By the Key Lemma,  $n = 6$ .
- Therefore,  $(2, 6)$  is the only bad pair.

## Finishing Up

- We've already shown that  $p$  is odd and  $p \mid n$  and  $\Phi_n(a) = p^t$ .
- If  $t > 2$  then  $p^2$  divides  $\frac{a^n-1}{a^{n/p}-1}$ , since  $(a^{n/p} - 1) \mid \omega_n(a)$ .
- We can use the exponent law to derive a contradiction to the statement that  $p^2 \mid \frac{a^n-1}{a^{n/p}-1}$ . Thus,  $\Phi_n(a) = p$ .
- Now, if  $a \geq 3$  then  $\Phi_n(a) > p$ , which we know is false.
- Hence, we must have  $a = 2$ . By the Key Lemma,  $n = 6$ .
- Therefore,  $(2, 6)$  is the only bad pair.
- We've proven Zsigmondy's Theorem!

# A Special Case of Zsigmondy's Theorem

A special case of Zsigmondy's Theorem states the problem in terms of Mersenne numbers:

Consider the  $k^{\text{th}}$  Mersenne number  $M_k = 2^k - 1$ . Then, each of  $M_2, M_3, M_4, \dots$  has a prime factor that does not occur as a factor of an earlier member of the sequence EXCEPT for  $M_6$ .

# Acknowledgements

Thanks to Dr. Dan Shapiro, whose expository notes on the subject were invaluable in writing this talk.

## **Bibliography:**

1. *Introduction to the Theory of Numbers* by Harold N. Shapiro
2. *Abstract Algebra* by David S. Dummit and Richard M. Foote