

# Sums of Two Squares

*A Complete Treatment*

December 2025

## 1 The Ring of Gaussian Integers

**Definition 1.1.** The ring of Gaussian integers is  $\mathbb{Z}[i] := \{a + bi : a, b \in \mathbb{Z}\}$ , where  $i^2 = -1$ .

**Definition 1.2.** The norm function  $N : \mathbb{Z}[i] \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$  is defined by  $N(a + bi) := a^2 + b^2$ .

**Lemma 1.3 (Multiplicativity of the Norm).** For all  $\alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{Z}[i]$ , we have  $N(\alpha\beta) = N(\alpha)N(\beta)$ .

*Proof.* Let  $\alpha = a + bi$  and  $\beta = c + di$ . Then  $\alpha\beta = (ac - bd) + (ad + bc)i$ , and direct computation yields  $N(\alpha\beta) = (ac - bd)^2 + (ad + bc)^2 = (a^2 + b^2)(c^2 + d^2) = N(\alpha)N(\beta)$ . ■

**Corollary 1.4 (Unit Characterisation).** The units of  $\mathbb{Z}[i]$  are precisely the elements of norm 1, namely  $\{1, -1, i, -i\}$ .

*Proof.* If  $\alpha\beta = 1$ , then  $N(\alpha)N(\beta) = 1$  with  $N(\alpha), N(\beta) \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ , forcing  $N(\alpha) = 1$ . Conversely,  $a^2 + b^2 = 1$  with  $a, b \in \mathbb{Z}$  implies  $(a, b) \in \{(\pm 1, 0), (0, \pm 1)\}$ . ■

## 2 Euclidean Structure

**Theorem 2.1.** The ring  $\mathbb{Z}[i]$  is a Euclidean domain with respect to the norm  $N$ .

*Proof.* Let  $\alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{Z}[i]$  with  $\beta \neq 0$ . We must find  $q, r \in \mathbb{Z}[i]$  such that  $\alpha = \beta q + r$  with  $N(r) < N(\beta)$ .

Consider  $\alpha/\beta \in \mathbb{C}$ . Write  $\alpha/\beta = x + yi$  with  $x, y \in \mathbb{R}$ . Choose integers  $m, n$  such that  $|x - m| \leq 1/2$  and  $|y - n| \leq 1/2$ . Set  $q := m + ni$  and  $r := \alpha - \beta q$ .

Then  $r/\beta = (\alpha/\beta) - q = (x - m) + (y - n)i$ , whence  $N(r/\beta) = (x - m)^2 + (y - n)^2 \leq 1/4 + 1/4 = 1/2 < 1$ . Multiplicativity of the norm gives  $N(r) = N(r/\beta) \cdot N(\beta) < N(\beta)$ . ■

**Corollary 2.2.** The ring  $\mathbb{Z}[i]$  is a principal ideal domain and hence a unique factorisation domain. In particular, an element of  $\mathbb{Z}[i]$  is irreducible if and only if it is prime.

## 3 Quadratic Residues and Euler's Criterion

**Lemma 3.1 (Euler's Criterion).** Let  $p$  be an odd prime and let  $a$  be an integer with  $p \nmid a$ . Then

$$a^{(p-1)/2} \equiv \left(\frac{a}{p}\right) \pmod{p},$$

where  $\left(\frac{a}{p}\right)$  denotes the Legendre symbol, equal to 1 if  $a$  is a quadratic residue modulo  $p$  and  $-1$  otherwise.

*Proof.* The multiplicative group  $(\mathbb{Z}/p\mathbb{Z})^\times$  is cyclic of order  $p - 1$ . Let  $g$  be a generator and write  $a \equiv g^k \pmod{p}$  for some integer  $k$ . Then  $a^{(p-1)/2} \equiv g^{k(p-1)/2} \pmod{p}$ .

We claim  $g^{(p-1)/2} = -1$  in  $(\mathbb{Z}/p\mathbb{Z})^\times$ . Indeed,  $(g^{(p-1)/2})^2 = g^{p-1} = 1$ , so  $g^{(p-1)/2}$  has order dividing 2. Since  $g$  has order exactly  $p-1$ , we have  $g^{(p-1)/2} \neq 1$ , so  $g^{(p-1)/2}$  has order exactly 2. In  $(\mathbb{Z}/p\mathbb{Z})^\times$ , the equation  $x^2 = 1$  has exactly two solutions, namely  $x = \pm 1$ , and only  $-1$  has order 2. Hence  $g^{(p-1)/2} = -1$ .

Therefore  $a^{(p-1)/2} \equiv (-1)^k \pmod{p}$ .

Now  $a$  is a quadratic residue if and only if  $a = (g^{k/2})^2$  for some integer, which occurs if and only if  $k$  is even. Thus  $\left(\frac{a}{p}\right) = 1$  if and only if  $k$  is even, i.e.,  $\left(\frac{a}{p}\right) = (-1)^k$ . ■

**Corollary 3.2.** Let  $p$  be an odd prime. Then  $-1$  is a quadratic residue modulo  $p$  if and only if  $p \equiv 1 \pmod{4}$ .

*Proof.* By Lemma 3.1,  $(-1)^{(p-1)/2} \equiv \left(\frac{-1}{p}\right) \pmod{p}$ . Both sides lie in  $\{-1, 1\}$ , and since  $p > 2$ , the integers  $-1$  and  $1$  are incongruent modulo  $p$ . Hence congruence implies equality:  $\left(\frac{-1}{p}\right) = (-1)^{(p-1)/2}$ .

Thus  $-1$  is a quadratic residue if and only if  $(p-1)/2$  is even, which holds if and only if  $4 \mid (p-1)$ . ■

#### 4 Classification of Primes in $\mathbb{Z}[i]$

**Definition 4.1.** An element  $\pi \in \mathbb{Z}[i]$  is irreducible if  $\pi$  is a non-unit and whenever  $\pi = \alpha\beta$ , at least one of  $\alpha, \beta$  is a unit. By Corollary 2.2, irreducibility and primality coincide in  $\mathbb{Z}[i]$ .

**Theorem 4.2 (Trichotomy for Rational Primes).** Let  $p$  be a prime in  $\mathbb{Z}$ . Exactly one of the following holds:

- (i)  $p = 2$ : The prime 2 ramifies as  $2 = -i(1+i)^2$ , where  $1+i$  is prime in  $\mathbb{Z}[i]$ .
- (ii)  $p \equiv 1 \pmod{4}$ : The prime  $p$  splits as  $p = \pi\bar{\pi}$  for some prime  $\pi \in \mathbb{Z}[i]$ , where  $\pi$  and  $\bar{\pi}$  are non-associate.
- (iii)  $p \equiv 3 \pmod{4}$ : The prime  $p$  remains prime in  $\mathbb{Z}[i]$ .

**Proof of (i).** We have  $(1+i)(1-i) = 1 - i^2 = 2$ . Moreover,  $1-i = (1+i)(-i)$ , since  $(1+i)(-i) = -i - i^2 = -i + 1 = 1-i$ . Thus  $2 = (1+i)(1-i) = (1+i) \cdot (1+i)(-i) = -i(1+i)^2$ .

Since  $N(1+i) = 1^2 + 1^2 = 2$  is prime in  $\mathbb{Z}$ , any factorisation  $1+i = \alpha\beta$  would yield  $N(\alpha)N(\beta) = 2$ , forcing one of  $N(\alpha), N(\beta)$  to equal 1. By Corollary 1.4, that factor is a unit, so  $1+i$  is irreducible. By Corollary 2.2, it is therefore prime in  $\mathbb{Z}[i]$ . ■

**Proof of (iii).** Suppose  $p \equiv 3 \pmod{4}$  and  $p = \alpha\beta$  for some  $\alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{Z}[i]$  with  $\alpha, \beta$  non-units. Taking norms,  $N(\alpha)N(\beta) = N(p) = p^2$ . Since  $\alpha, \beta$  are non-units, Corollary 1.4 gives  $N(\alpha) > 1$  and  $N(\beta) > 1$ . The only factorisation of  $p^2$  into integers greater than 1 is  $p \cdot p$ , so  $N(\alpha) = N(\beta) = p$ .

Writing  $\alpha = a + bi$ , we have  $a^2 + b^2 = p$ . Now for any integer  $m$ , we have  $m^2 \equiv 0 \pmod{4}$  if  $m$  is even, and  $m^2 \equiv 1 \pmod{4}$  if  $m$  is odd. Hence  $a^2 + b^2 \equiv 0, 1, \text{ or } 2 \pmod{4}$ , according to the parities of  $a$  and  $b$ . But  $p \equiv 3 \pmod{4}$ , a contradiction.

Thus  $p$  admits no factorisation into non-units; that is,  $p$  is irreducible in  $\mathbb{Z}[i]$ . Since  $\mathbb{Z}[i]$  is a UFD (Corollary 2.2), irreducibility implies primality. Hence  $p$  is prime in  $\mathbb{Z}[i]$ . ■

**Proof of (ii).** Let  $p \equiv 1 \pmod{4}$ . By Corollary 3.2, there exists  $a \in \mathbb{Z}$  with  $a^2 \equiv -1 \pmod{p}$ , so  $p \mid (a^2 + 1)$  in  $\mathbb{Z}$ .

In  $\mathbb{Z}[i]$ , we have  $a^2 + 1 = (a + i)(a - i)$ . Suppose, for contradiction, that  $p$  were prime in  $\mathbb{Z}[i]$ . Since  $p \mid (a + i)(a - i)$  and  $p$  is prime, we would have  $p \mid (a + i)$  or  $p \mid (a - i)$ .

Suppose  $p \mid (a + i)$ . By definition of divisibility in  $\mathbb{Z}[i]$ , this means  $a + i = p\gamma$  for some  $\gamma = c + di \in \mathbb{Z}[i]$ . Comparing real and imaginary parts:  $a = pc$  and  $1 = pd$ . The second equation requires  $d \in \mathbb{Z}$  with  $pd = 1$ , which is impossible since  $p > 1$ . By identical reasoning,  $p \nmid (a - i)$ .

This contradicts the primality assumption, so  $p$  is not prime in  $\mathbb{Z}[i]$ . By Corollary 2.2, prime and irreducible are equivalent in  $\mathbb{Z}[i]$ . Since  $p$  is not prime, it is not irreducible, and hence admits a non-trivial factorisation  $p = \alpha\beta$  where  $\alpha, \beta$  are non-units.

Taking norms:  $N(\alpha)N(\beta) = p^2$ . Since  $N(\alpha), N(\beta) > 1$  (by Corollary 1.4), we must have  $N(\alpha) = N(\beta) = p$ .

We now show  $\alpha$  is irreducible. Suppose  $\alpha = \gamma\delta$  for some  $\gamma, \delta \in \mathbb{Z}[i]$ . Then  $N(\gamma)N(\delta) = N(\alpha) = p$ . Since  $p$  is prime in  $\mathbb{Z}$ , either  $N(\gamma) = 1$  or  $N(\delta) = 1$ . By Corollary 1.4, that factor is a unit. Hence  $\alpha$  is irreducible, and by Corollary 2.2,  $\alpha$  is prime in  $\mathbb{Z}[i]$ .

Set  $\pi := \alpha$ . We have  $N(\pi) = p$ . For any  $\zeta \in \mathbb{Z}[i]$ , we have  $N(\bar{\zeta}) = N(\zeta)$ , so  $N(\bar{\pi}) = p$ . Thus  $\bar{\pi}$  is also irreducible by the same argument, hence prime in  $\mathbb{Z}[i]$ . Now  $\pi\bar{\pi} = N(\pi) = p$ , giving the desired factorisation.

It remains to show  $\pi$  and  $\bar{\pi}$  are not associates. Write  $\pi = a + bi$ . The associates of  $\pi$  are  $u\pi$  for  $u \in \{1, -1, i, -i\}$ :

- $1 \cdot \pi = a + bi$
- $(-1) \cdot \pi = -a - bi$
- $i \cdot \pi = i(a + bi) = ai + bi^2 = -b + ai$
- $(-i) \cdot \pi = -i(a + bi) = -ai - bi^2 = b - ai$

For  $\bar{\pi} = a - bi$  to be associate to  $\pi$ , we require  $a - bi \in \{a + bi, -a - bi, -b + ai, b - ai\}$ . Comparing:

- $a - bi = a + bi \implies -b = b \implies b = 0$
- $a - bi = -a - bi \implies a = -a \implies a = 0$
- $a - bi = -b + ai \implies a = -b \text{ and } -b = a \implies a = -b$

$$\bullet a - bi = b - ai \implies a = b \text{ and } -b = -a \implies a = b$$

Thus  $\bar{\pi}$  is associate to  $\pi$  if and only if  $b = 0$ ,  $a = 0$ ,  $a = b$ , or  $a = -b$ .

Since  $p = a^2 + b^2$  is an odd prime:

- $b = 0 \implies p = a^2$ . A prime cannot be a perfect square: if  $p = a^2$  with  $a \in \mathbb{Z}$ , then either  $|a| = 1$  (giving  $p = 1$ , not prime) or  $|a| > 1$  (making  $p$  composite). Contradiction.
- $a = 0 \implies p = b^2$ . Same reasoning yields a contradiction.
- $a = b \implies p = 2a^2$ . Since  $p$  is odd, this is impossible.
- $a = -b \implies p = 2a^2$ . Same contradiction.

Hence none of these cases occur, and  $\pi, \bar{\pi}$  are non-associate Gaussian primes. ■

## 5 The Main Theorem

**Theorem 5.1 (Fermat–Euler).** An odd prime  $p$  is expressible as  $p = x^2 + y^2$  for some  $x, y \in \mathbb{Z}$  if and only if  $p \equiv 1 \pmod{4}$ .

*Proof.* The equation  $p = x^2 + y^2$  holds if and only if  $p = N(x + yi)$  for some  $x + yi \in \mathbb{Z}[i]$ .

( $\Leftarrow$ ) Suppose  $p \equiv 1 \pmod{4}$ . By Theorem 4.2(ii),  $p = \pi\bar{\pi}$  where  $\pi = x + yi$  is a Gaussian prime. Then  $p = N(\pi) = x^2 + y^2$ .

( $\Rightarrow$ ) Suppose  $p = x^2 + y^2$  for some  $x, y \in \mathbb{Z}$ . We show  $p \equiv 1 \pmod{4}$ .

For any integer  $m$ , we have  $m^2 \equiv 0 \pmod{4}$  if  $m$  is even, and  $m^2 \equiv 1 \pmod{4}$  if  $m$  is odd. The possible values of  $x^2 + y^2$  modulo 4 are therefore:

- $0 + 0 = 0$  (both even)
- $0 + 1 = 1$  (one even, one odd)
- $1 + 0 = 1$  (one odd, one even)
- $1 + 1 = 2$  (both odd)

Thus  $x^2 + y^2 \equiv 0, 1, \text{ or } 2 \pmod{4}$ . Since  $p$  is an odd prime,  $p \not\equiv 0 \pmod{4}$  and  $p \not\equiv 2 \pmod{4}$ . Hence  $p \equiv 1 \pmod{4}$  or  $p \equiv 3 \pmod{4}$ .

The case  $p \equiv 3 \pmod{4}$  is ruled out because 3 is not among  $\{0, 1, 2\}$ . Therefore  $p \equiv 1 \pmod{4}$ . ■

## 6 Uniqueness of Representation

**Theorem 6.1.** If  $p \equiv 1 \pmod{4}$ , the representation  $p = x^2 + y^2$  with  $x, y > 0$  is unique up to the interchange of  $x$  and  $y$ .

*Proof.* Suppose  $p = a^2 + b^2 = c^2 + d^2$  with  $a, b, c, d > 0$ . Then

$$p = (a + bi)(a - bi) = (c + di)(c - di).$$

Each factor  $a + bi, a - bi, c + di, c - di$  has norm  $p$ . Since  $p$  is prime in  $\mathbb{Z}$ , any Gaussian integer  $\zeta$  with  $N(\zeta) = p$  is irreducible: if  $\zeta = \gamma\delta$ , then  $N(\gamma)N(\delta) = p$  forces one factor to have norm 1, hence to be a unit by Corollary 1.4. By Corollary 2.2, irreducibility implies primality in  $\mathbb{Z}[i]$ .

By Theorem 4.2(ii),  $p = \pi\bar{\pi}$  is the unique factorisation of  $p$  into non-associate Gaussian primes (up to units and ordering).

Now  $a + bi$  is prime in  $\mathbb{Z}[i]$  and divides  $p = \pi\bar{\pi}$ . Since primes dividing a product must divide one of the factors, either  $(a + bi) \mid \pi$  or  $(a + bi) \mid \bar{\pi}$ .

**Case:** Suppose  $(a + bi) \mid \pi$ . Then  $\pi = (a + bi)\varepsilon$  for some  $\varepsilon \in \mathbb{Z}[i]$ . Taking norms:  $p = N(a + bi) \cdot N(\varepsilon) = p \cdot N(\varepsilon)$ , so  $N(\varepsilon) = 1$  and  $\varepsilon$  is a unit by Corollary 1.4. Hence  $a + bi$  and  $\pi$  are associates.

We now determine that  $a - bi$  is associate to  $\bar{\pi}$ . Conjugation  $\sigma : \mathbb{Z}[i] \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}[i]$  defined by  $\sigma(\alpha) = \bar{\alpha}$  is a ring automorphism: it satisfies  $\sigma(\alpha + \beta) = \sigma(\alpha) + \sigma(\beta)$  and  $\sigma(\alpha\beta) = \sigma(\alpha)\sigma(\beta)$ . Consequently, if  $\alpha \mid \beta$  in  $\mathbb{Z}[i]$ , then  $\sigma(\alpha) \mid \sigma(\beta)$ . From  $\pi = (a + bi)\varepsilon$ , applying  $\sigma$  yields  $\bar{\pi} = (a - bi)\bar{\varepsilon}$ . Since  $\varepsilon$  is a unit, so is  $\bar{\varepsilon}$  (as  $N(\bar{\varepsilon}) = N(\varepsilon) = 1$ ). Hence  $a - bi$  and  $\bar{\pi}$  are associates.

The case  $(a + bi) \mid \bar{\pi}$  yields, by the same reasoning,  $a + bi \sim \bar{\pi}$  and  $a - bi \sim \pi$ .

**Invariance of coordinate pairs.** We show that if  $\alpha \sim \beta$  (associates), then  $\{|\operatorname{Re}(\alpha)|, |\operatorname{Im}(\alpha)|\} = \{|\operatorname{Re}(\beta)|, |\operatorname{Im}(\beta)|\}$ .

Let  $\pi = x + yi$ . The associates of  $\pi$  are  $u\pi$  for  $u \in \{1, -1, i, -i\}$ :

- $1 \cdot \pi = x + yi$
- $(-1) \cdot \pi = -x - yi$
- $i \cdot \pi = -y + xi$
- $(-i) \cdot \pi = y - xi$

In each case, the unordered pair of absolute values of real and imaginary parts is  $\{|x|, |y|\}$ . Hence this pair is invariant under multiplication by units.

**Conclusion.** Since  $a + bi$  is associate to either  $\pi$  or  $\bar{\pi}$ , and both  $\pi = x + yi$  and  $\bar{\pi} = x - yi$  yield the pair  $\{|x|, |y|\} = \{x, y\}$  (as  $x, y > 0$  by construction in Theorem 4.2(ii)), we have  $\{a, b\} = \{x, y\}$ . The same reasoning applied to  $c + di$  gives  $\{c, d\} = \{x, y\}$ .

Therefore  $\{a, b\} = \{c, d\}$ , which is the claimed uniqueness. ■

## 7 Generalisation Framework

The method generalises to norms of quadratic rings. For a squarefree integer  $d < 0$ , consider the imaginary quadratic field  $K = \mathbb{Q}(\sqrt{d})$  with ring of integers  $\mathcal{O}_K$ .

**Remark 7.1.** The structure of  $\mathcal{O}_K$  depends on  $d$  modulo 4: if  $d \equiv 2$  or  $3 \pmod{4}$ , then  $\mathcal{O}_K = \mathbb{Z}[\sqrt{d}]$ ; if  $d \equiv 1 \pmod{4}$ , then  $\mathcal{O}_K = \mathbb{Z}[(1 + \sqrt{d})/2]$ .

**Principle 7.2.** A prime  $p$  is represented by the norm form of  $\mathcal{O}_K$  if and only if:

1.  $p$  splits or ramifies in  $\mathcal{O}_K$ , and
2. the prime ideals above  $p$  are principal.

For  $\mathbb{Z}[i]$ , every ideal is principal (the class number is 1), so condition (2) is automatically satisfied. For rings with class number greater than 1, the analysis requires ideal class groups.

**Example 7.3.** The form  $x^2 + 5y^2$  corresponds to the maximal order  $\mathbb{Z}[\sqrt{-5}]$  of  $\mathbb{Q}(\sqrt{-5})$ , since  $-5 \equiv 3 \pmod{4}$ . This ring has class number 2. The representability of primes by  $x^2 + 5y^2$  is governed by the splitting behaviour in the Hilbert class field of  $\mathbb{Q}(\sqrt{-5})$ . (For nonmaximal orders, the appropriate object is the ring class field rather than the Hilbert class field.)

---

## 8 Connection to Cyclotomic Theory

The ring  $\mathbb{Z}[i] = \mathbb{Z}[\zeta_4]$  is the ring of integers of the 4th cyclotomic field  $\mathbb{Q}(\zeta_4)$ , where  $\zeta_4 = i$  is a primitive 4th root of unity with minimal polynomial  $\Phi_4(x) = x^2 + 1$ .

**Theorem 8.1.** Let  $p$  be a prime with  $p \nmid n$ . The prime  $p$  splits completely in  $\mathbb{Q}(\zeta_n)$  if and only if  $p \equiv 1 \pmod{n}$ .

For  $n = 4$ , the extension  $\mathbb{Q}(i)/\mathbb{Q}$  has degree  $\varphi(4) = 2$ . In a quadratic extension, “splits completely” and “splits” coincide (as opposed to remaining inert or ramifying). Thus  $p$  splits in  $\mathbb{Q}(i)$  if and only if  $p \equiv 1 \pmod{4}$ , recovering our criterion from Theorem 4.2.

The cyclotomic perspective unifies the treatment: the factorisation of  $x^n - 1$  into cyclotomic polynomials  $\Phi_d(x)$  governs the arithmetic of roots of unity, and congruence conditions on primes control their splitting behaviour in cyclotomic fields.