

No triangle can be cut into seven congruent triangles

Michael Beeson

November 27, 2018

Abstract

We give a short and direct proof of the theorem in the title, as well as a general introduction to the theory of triangle tiling to which this theorem belongs. We also prove the theorem with 11 in place of 7.

1 Introduction

An N -tiling of triangle ABC by triangle T is a way of writing ABC as a union of N triangles congruent to T , overlapping only at their boundaries. The triangle T is the “tile”. We consider the problem of cutting a triangle into N congruent triangles. Very shortly we shall give a number of examples of N -tilings, for various small values of N . These examples will be tilings that have, for the most part, been known a very long time. But it will be obvious that $N = 7$ is not in this list of examples, nor is $N = 11$.

These two values of N are the focus of this short paper. We will prove here, without using the machinery developed in a longer paper or any very deep theories at all, that there are no 7-tilings or 11-tilings. Originally it was the question of 7-tilings that attracted us to this subject. This question would have easily been understood by the Greek geometers working in Alexandria with Euclid three centuries BCE, and possibly could have been solved by them too. We were able to give a purely Euclidean proof, but it was very long and complicated. Once sufficient machinery is developed, non-existence for many N , including those mentioned, will be an easy corollary, but again that development is long and complicated. Therefore we were happy, in October 2018, to discover a short and simple proof of the non-existence of any 7-tiling, which we present here. It was also possible to treat $N = 11$ with very little extra work—something we could not do with a purely Euclidean proof. One might say that here Descartes is victorious over Euclid, as algebra and computation is shorter and more efficient than geometry. Following Euclid we could do $N = 7$, but not 11.

We checked most of the algebra both by hand and by computer, using SageMath [10], and we provide the short snippets of code we used. In only one place is it too laborious to do by hand.¹

These results fit into a larger research program, begun by Lazkovich [4]. Lazkovich studied the possible shapes of tiles and triangles that can possibly be used in tilings, and obtained results that will be described below. It is our contribution to focus attention on N as well. One may say that Lazkovich studied the pair (ABC, T) , and we want to refine his work to study the triple (ABC, T, N) .

¹SageMath code, being written in Python, needs to contain tabs for indentation. When you cut and paste from a pdf file, you will get spaces, not tabs. Therefore you must paste into a file and supply tabs using the Unix utility `unexpand`. Also single quote marks are a different character in pdf. For very short snippets you may find it easier just to retype.

2 Some examples of tilings

Figures 1 through 4 show the simplest examples of N -tilings.

Figure 1: Two 3-tilings






Figure 2: A 4-tiling, a 9-tiling, and a 16-tiling



The method illustrated for $N = 4, 9,$ and 16 generalizes to any perfect square N . While the two exhibited 3-tilings clearly depend on the exact angles of the triangle, *any* triangle can be decomposed into n^2 congruent triangles by drawing $n - 1$ equally spaced lines parallel to each of the three sides of the triangle, as illustrated in Fig. 3. Moreover, the large (tiling) triangle is similar to the small triangle (the “tile”). We call such a tiling a *quadratic tiling*.


Figure 3: A quadratic tiling of an arbitrary triangle



It follows that if we have a tiling of a triangle ABC into N congruent triangles, and m is any integer, we can tile ABC into Nm^2 triangles by subdividing the first tiling, replacing each of the N triangles by m^2 smaller ones. Hence the set of N for which an N -tiling of some triangle exists is closed under multiplication by squares.

Sometimes it is possible to combine two quadratic tilings (using the same tile) into a single tiling, as shown in Fig. 4. We will explain how these tilings are constructed. We start with a big right triangle resting on its hypotenuse, and divide it into two right triangles by an altitude. Then we

Figure 4: Biquadratic tilings with $N = 13 = 3^2 + 2^2$ and $N = 74 = 5^2 + 7^2$



quadratically tile each of those triangles. The trick is to choose the dimensions in such a way that the same tile can be used throughout. If that can be done then evidently N , the total number of tiles, will be the sum of two squares, $N = n^2 + m^2$, one square for each of the two quadratic tilings. On the other hand, if we start with an N of that form, and we choose the tile to be an n by m right triangle, then we can construct such a tiling. We call these tilings “biquadratic.” More generally, a *biquadratic tiling* of triangle ABC is one in which ABC has a right angle at C , and can be divided by an altitude from C to AB into two triangles, each similar to ABC , which can be tiled respectively by n^2 and m^2 copies of a triangle similar to ABC . A larger biquadratic tiling, with $n = 5$ and $m = 7$ and hence $N = 74$, is shown in at the right of Fig. 4.

Since $5 = 2^2 + 1^2$, the simplest case of a biquadratic tiling is $N = 5$. The second 5-tiling in Fig. 5 shows that a biquadratic tiling can sometimes be more complicated than a combination of two quadratic tilings. Symmetry can permit rearranging some of the tiles. The symmetrical tile used in Fig. 6 also allows for variety.

Figure 5: Two 5-tilings






Figure 6: Three 4-tilings



If the original triangle ABC is chosen to be isosceles, and is then quadratically tiled, then each of


the n^2 triangles can be divided in half by an altitude; hence any isosceles triangle can be decomposed into $2n^2$ congruent triangles. If the original triangle is equilateral, then it can be first decomposed into n^2 equilateral triangles, and then these triangles can be decomposed into 3 or 6 triangles each, showing that any equilateral triangle can be decomposed into $3n^2$ or $6n^2$ congruent triangles. For example we can 12-tile an equilateral triangle in two different ways, starting with a 3-tiling and then subdividing each triangle into 4 triangles (“subdividing by 4”), or starting with a 4-tiling and then subdividing by 3.

Figure 7: A 6-tiling, an 8-tiling, and a 12-tiling



The examples above do not exhaust all possible tilings, even when N is a square. For example, Fig. 8 shows a 9-tiling that is not produced by those methods; again this seems attributable to symmetry permitting a rearrangement of tiles in a quadratic tiling.

Figure 8: Another 9-tiling



There is another family of N -tilings, in which N is of the form $3m^2$, and both the tile and the tiled triangle are 30-60-90 triangles. We call these the “triple-square” tilings. The case $m = 1$ is given in Fig. 1; the case $m = 2$ makes $N = 12$. There are two ways to 12-tile a 30-60-90 triangle with 30-60-90 triangle. One is to first quadratically 4-tile it, and then subtile the four triangles with the 3-tiling of Figure 1. This produces the first 12-tiling in Fig. 9. Somewhat surprisingly, there is another way to tile the same triangle with the same 12 tiles, also shown in Fig. 9. The next member of this family is $m = 3$, which makes $N = 27$. Two 27-tilings are shown in Fig. 10. Similarly, there are two 48-tilings (not shown).

Until October 12, 2008, we did not know any more complicated tilings than those illustrated above (and there also none in [9]). Then we found the beautiful 27-tiling shown in Fig. 11. This tiling is one of a family of $3k^2$ tilings (the case $k = 3$). The next case is a 48-tiling, made from six hexagons (each containing 6 tiles) bordered by 4 tiles on each of 3 sides. In general one can arrange $1 + 2 + \dots + k$ hexagons in bowling-pin fashion, and add $k + 1$ tiles on each of three sides, for a total

Figure 9: Two 12-tilings





Figure 10: Two 27-tilings



number of tiles of $6(1 + 2 + \dots + k) + 3(k + 1) = 3k(k + 1) + 3(k + 1) = 3(k + 1)^2$. Fig. 12 shows more members of this family, which we call the “hexagonal tilings.”²

Whenever there is an N -tiling of the right triangle ABM , there is a $2N$ -tiling of the isosceles triangle ABC . Using the biquadratic tilings (see Fig. 5 and Fig. 4) and triple-square tilings (see Fig 9 and Fig. 10), we can produce $2N$ -tilings when N is a sum of squares or three times a sum of squares. We call these tilings “double biquadratic” and “hexquadratic”. For example, one has two 10-tilings and two 26-tilings, obtained by reflecting Figs. 4 and 5 about either of the sides of the triangles shown in those figures; and one has 24-tilings and 54-tilings obtained from Figs. 8 and 9. Note that in the latter two cases, ABC is equilateral.

In the case when the sides of the tile T form a Pythagorean triple $n^2 + m^2 + k^2 = N/2$, then we can tile one half of ABC with a quadratic tiling and the other half with a biquadratic tiling. The smallest example is when the tile has sides 3, 4, and 5, and $N = 50$. See the third tiling in Fig. 16. One half is 25-tiled quadratically, and the other half is divided into two smaller right triangles which are 9-tiled and 16-tiled quadratically. This shows that the tiling of ABC does not have to be symmetric about the altitude.

2.1 Definitions, notation, and some simple lemmas

We give a mathematically precise definition of “tiling” and fix some terminology and notation. Given a triangle T and a larger triangle ABC , a “tiling” of triangle ABC by triangle T is a set of triangles T_1, \dots, T_n congruent to T , whose interiors are disjoint, and the closure of whose union is triangle ABC .

²In January, 2012, I bought a puzzle at the exhibition at the AMS meeting, which contained the tiling in Fig. 11 as part of a tiling of a larger hexagon. The tiling is attributed to Major Percy Alexander MacMahon (1854-1929) [7].

Figure 11: A 27-tiling due to Major MacMahon 1921, rediscovered 2011





Figure 12: $3m^2$ (hexagonal) tilings for $m = 4$ and $m = 5$



Let a , b , and c be the sides of the tile T , and angles α , β , and γ be the angles opposite sides a , b , and c . The letter “ N ” will always be used for the number of triangles used in the tiling. An N -tiling of ABC is a tiling that uses N copies of some triangle T . The meanings of N , α , β , γ , a , b, c , A , B , and C will be fixed throughout this paper, and we assume $\alpha \leq \beta \leq \gamma$, when there is no other assumption about α and β , such as $3\alpha + 2\beta = \pi$.

3 History

In our gallery of examples, we saw quadratic and biquadratic tilings in which the tile is similar to ABC , and also hexagonal tilings. These involve N being square, a sum of two squares, or three times a square. Snover *et. al.* [8] took up the challenge of showing that these are the only possible values of N . The following theorem completely answers the question, “for which N does there exist an N -tiling in which the tile is similar to the tiled triangle?”

Theorem 1 (Snover *et. al.* [8]) *Suppose ABC is N -tiled by tile T similar to ABC . If N is not a square, then T and ABC are right triangles. Then either*

- (i) N is three times a square and T is a 30-60-90 triangle, or*
 - (ii) N is a sum of squares $e^2 + f^2$, the right angle of ABC is split by the tiling, and the acute angles of ABC have rational tangents e/f and f/e ,*
- and these two alternatives are mutually exclusive.*

Soifer's book [9] appeared in 1990, with a second edition in 2009. He considered two "Grand Problems": for which N can *every* triangle be N -tiled, and for which N can *every* triangle be dissected into similar, but not necessarily congruent triangles. (The latter eventually became a Mathematics Olympiad problem.) The 2009 edition has an added chapter in which the biquadratic tilings and a theorem of Laczkovich occur.

Mikhail Laczkovich published five papers [3, 4, 5, 1, 6] on triangle and polygon tilings. According to Soifer, the 1995 paper was submitted in 1992. Laczkovich, like Soifer, studied dissecting a triangle into smaller *similar* triangles, not *congruent* triangles as we require here. If those similar triangles are rational (i.e., the ratios of their sides are rational) then if we divide each of them into small enough quadratic subtilings, we can achieve an N -tiling into *congruent* triangles, but of course N may be large. Laczkovich paid little attention to N , focusing instead on the shapes of ABC and of the tile. His theorems, for example, say little about the possibility of an N -tiling (of some ABC by some tile) for any particular N , but they do give us an exhaustive list of the possible shapes of ABC and the tile, which we will need in our proof that there is no 7-tiling. This list can be found in §4 (of this paper). However, his theorem published in the last chapter of [9] does mention N . It states that given an integer k , there exists an N -tiling for some N whose square-free part is k .

4 Laczkovich

A basic fact is that, apart from a small number of cases that can be explicitly enumerated, if there is an N -tiling of ABC by a tile with angles (α, β, γ) , then the angles α and β are not rational multiples of π . This theorem is Theorem 5.1 of [4]. Laczkovich calls the angles of the tile commensurable if each of them is a rational multiple of π . He states his theorem conversely to the way we just described it: if there is a tiling of ABC by a tile T with commensurable angles, then the pair (ABC, T) belongs to a specific, fairly short list. It is important to note that Laczkovich's list in Theorem 5.1 is about dissections of ABC into *similar*, not necessarily congruent, triangles. His subsequent Theorem 5.3 shows that three possibilities for dissecting the right isosceles triangle ABC into similar triangles are impossible with congruent tiles. That is stated *in the proof*, but not in the statement, of Theorem 5.3.

We will need to know exactly what Laczkovich's list of possibilities is; it is given in Table 1. In the table, the triples giving the angles of the tile are (α, β, γ) after a suitable permutation, i.e., they are unordered triples. The reader who checks with [4] will need to remember that we have deleted the entries for the right isosceles ABC mentioned above.


Table 1: Laczkovich’s list of tilings by tiles with commensurable angles

ABC	the tile
(α, β, γ)	similar to ABC
$(\alpha, \alpha, 2\beta)$	$\gamma = \pi/2$
equilateral	$(\frac{\pi}{6}, \frac{\pi}{6}, \frac{2\pi}{3})$
equilateral	$(\frac{\pi}{3}, \frac{\pi}{12}, \frac{7\pi}{12})$
equilateral	$(\frac{\pi}{3}, \frac{\pi}{30}, \frac{19\pi}{30})$
equilateral	$(\frac{\pi}{3}, \frac{7\pi}{30}, \frac{13\pi}{30})$

5 The coloring equation

In this section we introduce a tool that is useful for some, but not all, tiling problems. Suppose that triangle ABC is tiled by a tile with angles (α, β, γ) and sides (a, b, c) , and suppose there is just one tile at vertex A . We color that tile black, and then we color each tile black or white, changing colors as we cross tile boundaries. Under certain conditions this coloring can be defined unambiguously, and then, we define the “coloring number” to be the number of black tiles minus the number of white tiles. An example of such a coloring is given in Fig. 13.

Figure 13: A tiling colored so that touching tiles have different colors.



The following theorem spells out the conditions under which this can be done. In the theorem, “boundary vertex” refers to a vertex that lies on the boundary of ABC or on an edge of another tile, so that the sum of the angles of tiles at that vertex is π . At an “interior vertex” the sum of the

angles is 2π .

Theorem 2 *Suppose that triangle ABC is tiled by the tile (a, b, c) in such a way that*

- (i) *There is just one tile at A .*
- (ii) *At every boundary vertex an odd number of tiles meet.*
- (iii) *At every interior vertex an even number of tiles meet.*
- (iv) *The numbers of tiles at B and C are both even, or both odd.*

Then every tile can be assigned a color (black or white) in such a way that colors change across tile boundaries, and the tile at A is black. Let M be the number of black tiles minus the number of white tiles. Then the coloring equation

$$X \pm Y + Z = M(a + b + c)$$

holds, where Y is the side of ABC opposite A , and X and Z are the other two sides. The sign is $+$ or $-$ according as the number of tiles at B and C is odd or even.

Proof. Each tile is colored black or white according as the number of tile boundaries crossed in reaching it from A without passing through a vertex is even or odd. The hypotheses of the theorem guarantee that color so defined is independent of the path chosen to reach the tile from A . The total length of black edges, minus the total length of white edges, is $M(a + b + c)$, since $a + b + c$ is the perimeter of each tile. Each interior edge makes a contribution of zero to this sum, since it is black on one side and white on the other. Therefore only the edges on the boundary of ABC contribute. Now sides X and Y contain only edges of black tiles, by hypotheses (i) and (ii). Side Y is also black if the number of tiles at B and C is odd, and white if it is even. Hence the difference in the total length of black and white tiles is $X \pm Y + Z$, with the sign determined as described. That completes the proof.

6 Certain tilings of an equilateral triangle

Our next theorem takes up three rows from Laczkovich's Table 1. We will show that two of these rows can be eliminated, since the possible tilings of the equilateral triangle to which those rows refer are actually not possible. The idea of the proof is simple: if there were an N -tiling, the area of the triangle would be N times the area of the tile. These tiles are not rational tiles (that requires some computation), so the area equation is an equation in some algebraic number field. Then the coefficients in some basis must be equal, and that leads to a contradiction. It turns out that SageMath can help with the computations.

Theorem 3 *Let (β, α, γ) be*

$$(\beta, \alpha, \gamma) = \left(\frac{\pi}{3}, \frac{\pi}{12}, \frac{7\pi}{12} \right)$$

Suppose there is an N -tiling of an equilateral triangle by a tile with angles (α, β, γ) . Then N must be six times a square.

Remark. Here we come to the first open problem mentioned in this paper: as of November 2018, it is unknown if any such tilings actually exist.

Proof. Suppose equilateral triangle ABC is N -tiled by a tile with angles (α, β, γ) . Let X be the length of the sides of ABC , and let (a, b, c) be the sides of the tile opposite angles (α, β, γ) .

Twice the area of a triangle is the magnitude of the cross product of its sides, which is the product of the lengths of those sides times the sine of the included angle. Equating the area of ABC to N times the area of the tile, we have

$$\begin{aligned} X^2 \sin(\pi/3) &= Nac \sin(\pi/3) \\ X^2 &= Nac \end{aligned}$$

Since the length of each side of triangle ABC is a sum of tile edges, there are non-negative integers (p, q, r) such that $X = pa + qb + rc$. Then $X^2 = Nac$ becomes

$$(pa + qb + rc)^2 = Nac \tag{1}$$

According to SageMath,

$$\sin \alpha = \frac{1}{4}(\sqrt{6} - \sqrt{2}) \tag{2}$$

$$\sin \gamma = \frac{1}{4}(\sqrt{6} + \sqrt{2}) \tag{3}$$

It is easy to check that (1) is solved with $q = 0$ and $p = r$, with $a = \sin \alpha$ and $c = \sin \gamma$. So we cannot hope to use the area equation alone to prove that there are no such tilings. However, we can show that this is the *only* solution, in which case $N = 6p^2$, and in the process we will verify that $q = 0$ and $p = r$ does provide a solution.

By the law of sines, we can put $(\sin \alpha, \sin \beta, \sin \gamma)$ into (1) for (a, b, c) . Doing so, we have

$$\left(\frac{p}{4}(\sqrt{6} - \sqrt{2}) + \frac{r}{4}(\sqrt{6} + \sqrt{2}) + q\frac{\sqrt{3}}{2} \right)^2 = \frac{N}{4}$$

Multiplying by 16 we have

$$\left(p(\sqrt{6} - \sqrt{2}) + r(\sqrt{6} + \sqrt{2}) + 2q\sqrt{3} \right)^2 = 4N$$

This is an equation in the field $\mathbb{Q}(\sqrt{2}, \sqrt{3})$. A basis for that field over \mathbb{Q} is $\{1, \sqrt{2}, \sqrt{3}, \sqrt{6}\}$, so when both sides of the equation are expressed as linear combinations of basis elements, the coefficients of the basis elements on both sides must be equal. Expanding the left side (and putting it on the right)

$$\begin{aligned} 4N &= -2\sqrt{6}\sqrt{2}p^2 + 4\sqrt{6}\sqrt{3}pq - 4\sqrt{3}\sqrt{2}pq + 4\sqrt{6}\sqrt{3}qr \\ &\quad + 4\sqrt{3}\sqrt{2}qr + 2\sqrt{6}\sqrt{2}r^2 + 8p^2 + 12q^2 + 8pr + 8r^2 \end{aligned}$$

The calculations up to this point can be checked by the SageMath code in Fig. 14.

Using $\sqrt{6}\sqrt{3} = 3\sqrt{2}$ and $\sqrt{6}\sqrt{2} = 2\sqrt{3}$ this becomes

$$\begin{aligned} 4N &= -4\sqrt{3}p^2 + 12\sqrt{2}pq - 4\sqrt{6}pq + 12\sqrt{2}qr + 4\sqrt{6}qr \\ &\quad + 4\sqrt{3}r^2 + 8p^2 + 12q^2 + 8pr + 8r^2 \end{aligned}$$

Figure 14: SageMath code to check Theorem 3

```

var('alpha,beta,gamma,p,q,r')
alpha = pi/12
gamma = 7*pi/12
beta = pi/3
a = sin(alpha)
b = sin(beta)
c = sin(gamma)
X = 4*(p*a + q*b + r*c)
X = X.simplify();
print(X)
Xsq = X*X
Xsq = Xsq.expand()
print(Xsq)

```

Equating the coefficients of each basis element we have

$$\begin{aligned}
 0 &= -4p^2 + 4r^2 && \text{from } \sqrt{3} \\
 0 &= pq + qr && \text{from } \sqrt{2} \\
 0 &= -pq + qr && \text{from } \sqrt{6} \\
 N &= 3q^2 + 2(p^2 + pr + r^2) && \text{from the constant terms}
 \end{aligned}$$

Therefore $p = r$ and $pq = 0$. Then $p = 0$ or $q = 0$. Assume, for proof by contradiction, that $p = 0$. Then $r = 0$. Then there are *only* b edges on the sides of ABC (as the argument so far applies not only to AC but any side).

Then every tile on AB has its γ angle and its α angle on AC . These cannot all have the same orientation (e.g., γ to the west), since γ exceeds $\pi/3$ and hence cannot occur at A or C . Hence there must be a vertex P on AC where two γ angles occur. But $\gamma = 7\pi/12 > \pi/2$, so this is impossible. That completes the proof that $p \neq 0$.

Since $pq = 0$, we now have $q = 0$. Then since $p = r$ we have $N = 6p^2$, so N is six times a square as claimed. That completes the proof of the theorem.

Theorem 4 *Let (β, α, γ) be one of the triples*

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \left(\frac{\pi}{3}, \frac{\pi}{30}, \frac{19\pi}{30} \right) \\
 & \left(\frac{\pi}{3}, \frac{7\pi}{30}, \frac{13\pi}{30} \right)
 \end{aligned}$$

Then there is no tiling of any equilateral triangle by a tile with angles (α, β, γ) .

Proof. Case 1, $\alpha = \pi/30$, $\gamma = 19\pi/30$. Then we claim

$$\begin{aligned}\sin \alpha &= -\frac{1}{8}\sqrt{5} + \frac{1}{4}\sqrt{-\frac{3}{2}\sqrt{5} + \frac{15}{2}} - \frac{1}{8} \\ \sin \gamma &= \frac{1}{8}\sqrt{5} + \frac{1}{4}\sqrt{-\frac{3}{2}\sqrt{5} + \frac{15}{2}} + \frac{1}{8} \\ \sin \beta &= \frac{\sqrt{3}}{2} \\ \sin \alpha \sin \gamma &= \frac{3}{8} - \frac{\sqrt{5}}{8}\end{aligned}$$

These equations are produced by the following SageMath code:

```
var('p,q,r,N')
alpha = pi/30
gamma = 19*pi/30
a = sin(alpha)
c = sin(gamma)
b = sin(pi/3)
ac = (a*c).full_simplify();
print(a,b,c,ac)
```

Nevertheless we verify in human-readable equations that the equation for $\sin \alpha \sin \gamma$ follows from the equations for $\sin \alpha$ and $\sin \gamma$. For simplicity we define

$$\xi = \frac{1}{4}\sqrt{-\frac{3}{2}\sqrt{5} + \frac{15}{2}}.$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned}\sin \alpha \sin \gamma &= \left(\xi - \frac{1+\sqrt{5}}{8}\right)\left(\xi + \frac{1+\sqrt{5}}{8}\right) \\ &= \xi^2 - \frac{(1+\sqrt{5})^2}{64} \\ &= \frac{1}{16}\left(-\frac{3}{2}\sqrt{5} + \frac{15}{2}\right) - \frac{6+2\sqrt{5}}{64} \\ &= \frac{3}{8} - \frac{\sqrt{5}}{8}\end{aligned}$$

That duplicates the result SageMath produced, as promised.

Putting $(\sin \alpha, \sin \beta, \sin \gamma)$ in for (a, b, c) in (1), we have

$$(p \sin \alpha + q \sin \beta + r \sin \gamma)^2 = N \sin \alpha \sin \gamma$$

$$\left(p\left(\xi - \frac{1+\sqrt{5}}{8}\right) + q\frac{\sqrt{3}}{2} + r\left(\xi + \frac{1+\sqrt{5}}{8}\right)\right)^2 = N\left(\frac{3}{8} - \frac{\sqrt{5}}{8}\right) \quad (4)$$

The right side belongs to $\mathbb{Q}(\sqrt{5})$. It is not difficult to show by hand that ξ does not belong to $\mathbb{Q}(\sqrt{5})$. It is rather more difficult to show that $\sqrt{3}$ does not belong to $\mathbb{Q}(\sqrt{5}, \xi)$. But both these facts are within the capabilities of SageMath. Just run the following code; it will print **False** twice in answer to the questions.

Figure 15: SageMath code to check (5)

```

X = p*a + q*b + r*c
print("f = ")
f = (X^2 - N*ac)
g = f.substitute(q= -q)
print("changing the sign of q we have")
h = (f-g).full_simplify()
print(h)

xi = (1/4)*sqrt(-3/2*sqrt(5) + 15/2)
K.<a>=QuadraticField(5)
print("Is xi in K ?")
print(xi in K)
R.<x> = PolynomialRing(K)
t = x^2 - (1/16)*(-3/2*a+ 15/2)
L.<b> = K.extension(t)
print("Is sqrt(3) in L?")
print(sqrt(3) in L)

```

Since $\sqrt{3}$ does not belong to $\mathbb{Q}(\sqrt{5}, \xi)$, there is an automorphism of $\mathbb{Q}(\sqrt{5}, \xi, \sqrt{3})$ that moves $\sqrt{3}$ but fixes $\sqrt{5}$ and ξ . Applying that automorphism to (4), and subtracting the result from (4), we find

$$0 = q \left(p \left(\xi - \frac{1 + \sqrt{5}}{8} \right) + r \left(\xi + \frac{1 + \sqrt{5}}{8} \right) \right) \quad (5)$$

This result can be checked using the SageMath code in Fig. 15, following the previous snippet of SageMath.

The second factor of (5) (in large parentheses) is not zero unless $r + p = 0$, since ξ does not lie in $\mathbb{Q}(\sqrt{5})$. Since r and p nonnegative, it follows that either $r = p = 0$, or $q = 0$. Assume, for proof by contradiction, that $r = p = 0$. Then (4) becomes

$$\frac{3q^2}{4} = N \left(\frac{3}{8} - \frac{\sqrt{5}}{8} \right)$$

which implies that $\sqrt{5}$ is rational, contradiction. Hence $p = r = 0$ does not hold.

Hence $q = 0$. Expanding the square on the left side of (4), we get a linear expression in the basis $\{1, \xi, \sqrt{5}\}$. On the right side there is no ξ term, so the term in ξ on the left must be zero too. Setting the term in ξ on the left of (4) to zero, we find (using $q = 0$, and remembering that ξ^2 belongs to $\mathbb{Q}(\sqrt{5})$, we have

$$2(r - p) \left(\xi + \frac{1 + \sqrt{5}}{8} \right) = 0$$

and hence $r = p$ (the second factor cannot be zero since ξ does not belong to $\mathbb{Q}(\sqrt{5})$). Then (4)

simplifies to

$$\begin{aligned} \left(2r \left(\frac{1+\sqrt{5}}{8}\right)\right)^2 &= N \left(\frac{3}{8} - \frac{\sqrt{5}}{8}\right) \\ \frac{r^2}{8}\sqrt{5} + r^2\frac{3}{8} &= \frac{3N}{8} - \frac{N}{8}\sqrt{5} \end{aligned}$$

Equating the coefficients of $\sqrt{5}$ and 1, we find that N must be equal to both r^2 and $-r^2$, which is impossible, since N is positive. This contradiction shows that Case 1 is impossible.

One may suspect a sign error here, since if the signs were the same on both sides we would get $N = r^2$ instead of a contradiction. Let us check the signs carefully. The minus sign on the right came from the computation of $\sin \alpha \sin \gamma$, which was verified by SageMath. And the positive sign on the left has not changed since (4), and it got there by substituting for $p \sin \alpha$ and $r \sin \gamma$, and the values for $\sin \alpha$ and $\sin \gamma$ were also verified by SageMath. So there is no sign error here.

Case 2, $\alpha = 7\pi/30$, $\gamma = 13\pi/30$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \sin \alpha &= -\frac{1}{8}\sqrt{5} + \frac{1}{4}\sqrt{\frac{3}{2}\sqrt{5} + \frac{15}{2}} + \frac{1}{8} \\ \sin \gamma &= \frac{1}{8}\sqrt{5} + \frac{1}{4}\sqrt{\frac{3}{2}\sqrt{5} + \frac{15}{2}} - \frac{1}{8} \end{aligned}$$

This differs from Case 1 only in not having minus signs before $3/2$. After removing two minus signs from the SageMath code above, it still prints `False` twice, and the rest of the proof proceeds verbatim as in Case 1. That completes the proof of the theorem.

7 Some number-theoretic facts

The facts in this section may not be well-known to all our readers, and their proofs are short. Some readers may still have to look up some of the definitions.

Lemma 1 *An integer N is a sum of two squares (of integers) if and only if no prime p of the form $4n + 3$ has an odd exponent in the prime factorization of N .*

Proof. The proof can be found in most number-theory textbooks, and in the Wikipedia article on the Gaussian integers.

Lemma 2 *If N is a sum of two squares of rational numbers, then N is the sum of two squares of integers.*

Proof. See for example, Proposition 5.4.9, p. 314 of [2], where the theorem is attributed to Fermat. The proof given there is a one-paragraph appeal to the Hasse-Minkowski theorem, which was not available to Fermat. A simpler proof was pointed out to me by Will Sawin (on MathOverflow), which uses only Lemma 1 above. (Fermat knew that theorem.) Here is the proof: Suppose $N = r^2 + q^2$. Then, clearing denominators, $w^2N = u^2 + v^2$ for some integers w , u , and v . Then any prime p congruent to 3 mod 4 has an even exponent in the prime factorization of $u^2 + v^2$, and hence p also has an even exponent in the prime factorization of w^2N , and hence also in the prime factorization of N . It follows that N is a sum of two integer squares. That completes the proof of the lemma.

Lemma 3 *If $N/2$ is a sum of two squares of rational numbers, then $N/2$ is an integer and a sum of two squares of integers.*

Proof. If N is even, then Lemma 2 applies, so we may suppose N is odd. Suppose $N/2$ is a sum of two squares of rational numbers. Then $2N$ is also. By Lemma 2, there are integers m and k such that $2N = m^2 + k^2$. Since N is odd, $2N$ is congruent to 2 mod 4. Then m and k are both congruent to 1 mod 4. Then $u = m - k$ and $v = m + k$ are both even, and $u^2 + v^2 = m^2 + k^2 = 2N$, so $N/2 = (u/2)^2 + (v/2)^2$ shows that $N/2$ is a sum of two integer squares. That completes the proof.

The following lemma identifies those relatively few rational multiples of π that have rational tangents or whose sine and cosine satisfy a polynomial of low degree over \mathbb{Q} .

Lemma 4 *Let $\zeta = e^{i\theta}$ be algebraic of degree d over \mathbb{Q} , where θ is a rational multiple of π , say $\theta = 2m\pi/n$, where m and n have no common factor.*

Then $d = \varphi(n)$, where φ is the Euler totient function. In particular if $d = 4$, which is the case when $\tan \theta$ is rational and $\sin \theta$ is not, then n is 5, 8, 10, or 12; and if $d = 8$ then n is 15, 16, 20, 24, or 30.

Remark. For example, if $\theta = \pi/6$, we have $\sin \theta = 1/2$, which is of degree 1 over \mathbb{Q} . Since $\cos \theta = \sqrt{3}/2$, the number $\zeta = e^{i\theta}$ is in $\mathbb{Q}(i, \sqrt{3})$, which is of degree 4 over \mathbb{Q} . The number ζ is a 12-th root of unity, i.e. n in the theorem is 12 in this case; so the minimal polynomial of ζ is of degree $\varphi(12) = 4$. This example shows that the theorem is best possible.

Remark. The hypothesis that θ is a rational multiple of π cannot be dropped. For example, $x^4 - 2x^3 + x^2 - 2x + 1$ has two roots on the unit circle and two off the unit circle.

Proof. Let f be a polynomial with rational coefficients of degree d satisfied by ζ . Since $\zeta = e^{i2m\pi/n}$, ζ is an n -th root of unity, so its minimal polynomial has degree $d = \varphi(n)$, where φ is the Euler totient function. Therefore $\varphi(n) \leq d$. If $\tan \theta$ is rational and $\sin \theta$ is not, then $\sin \theta$ has degree 2 over \mathbb{Q} , so ζ has degree 2 over $\mathbb{Q}(i)$, so ζ has degree 4 over \mathbb{Q} . The stated values of n for the cases $d = 4$ and $d = 8$ follow from the well-known formula for $\varphi(n)$. That completes the proof of (ii) assuming (i).

Corollary 1 *If $\sin \theta$ or $\cos \theta$ is rational, and $\theta < \pi$ is a rational multiple of π , then θ is a multiple of $2\pi/n$ where n is 5, 4, 8, 10, or 12.*


Proof. Let $\zeta = \cos \theta + i \sin \theta = e^{i\theta}$. Under the stated hypotheses, the degree of $\mathbb{Q}(\zeta)$ over \mathbb{Q} is 2 or 4. Hence, by the lemma, θ is a multiple of $2\pi/n$, where $n = 5, 8, 10, \text{ or } 12$ (if the degree is 4) or $n = 3$ or 6 (if the degree is 2). But the cases 3 and 6 are superfluous, since then θ is already a multiple of $2\pi/12$.

8 Tilings of an isosceles triangle

Laczkovich studied the possible shapes of tiles that can tile an isosceles triangle, but did not characterize the possible N . We do so in this section. We have two ways to tile an isosceles triangle by a right triangle: either tile each of its two halves by a quadratic tiling, in which case N is twice a square, or tile each of its halves with a biquadratic tiling, in which case N is twice a sum of squares. See Fig. 16. The main theorem in this section shows that these are the only possible values of N .


Is it possible to have more complicated tilings without essential edges? Yes, because when two tiles share their hypotenuses, they form a rectangle, and we can just draw the diagonal of that

Figure 16: N is a twice a square or a twice a sum of squares. 50 is both.



rectangle the other way. In this way we can produce (exponentially) many different tilings, but they differ only in this trivial way. And sometimes, as shown in Fig. 17, even those rectangles can be rotated. That figure also shows that a tiling need not necessarily include the altitude of ABC .

Figure 17: There are many ways to rearrange the tiles



In the tilings based on two biquadratic tilings, there are no c edges on AB and BC , while in the tilings based on two quadratic tilings, there are only c edges. There are of course some hybrid tilings when a square is also a sum of squares, in which AB falls under one case and BC under the other. Part (ii) of the theorem below states that if $N/2$ is not a square (as is the case for the biquadratic tilings) then there are no c edges on AB and BC , as we see in the biquadratic tilings. All these tilings, in which $N/2$ is a sum of squares, involve essential edges (where tiles of different lengths occur on the two sides of an internal line). One sees such linear relations in two of the tilings illustrated in Fig. 16.

Lemma 5 *Let the isosceles triangle ABC with base angles β and base BC be N -tiled by a tile with angles $(\alpha, \beta, \pi/2)$. Then $\sin \alpha$ and $\sin \beta$ belong to $\mathbb{Q}(\sqrt{N/2})$.*

Proof. Scale the tile and the triangle ABC so that the tile has sides $(a, b, 1)$ where $a = \sin \alpha$, $b = \cos \alpha$. Let X be the length of the equal sides of ABC . Then twice the area of ABC is given by $X^2 \sin(\pi - 2\beta) = X^2 \sin 2\beta$. Twice the area of the tile is ab . Since there is an N -tiling of ABC , we may equate the area of ABC to N times the area of the tile. That is, $X^2 \sin 2\beta = N ab$. Since $\sin 2\beta = 2 \sin \beta \cos \beta = 2ab$, we have

$$2X^2 = N \tag{6}$$

Since there is a tiling, X is a sum of tile edges. Then there are non-negative integers (p, q, r) such that $X = pa + rb + qc$. Therefore

$$2(pa + rb + q)^2 = N \tag{7}$$

Define

$$\lambda := \sqrt{\frac{N}{2}}.$$

Then the fields $\mathbb{Q}(a)$, $\mathbb{Q}(b)$, $\mathbb{Q}(a, b)$, and $\mathbb{Q}(\lambda)$ are all of interest. Are they distinct or do some or all of them coincide? The answer to that question is: They all coincide. To prove a belongs to $\mathbb{Q}(b)$, expand the square in (7) and use $a^2 = b^2 - 1$ (which is $\sin^2 \alpha = 1 - \cos^2 \alpha$) to eliminate a^2 ; then solve for a . Similarly b belongs to $\mathbb{Q}(a)$. Now, if a does not belong to $\mathbb{Q}(\lambda)$, then $\{1, \lambda, a\}$ can be extended to a basis of $\mathbb{Q}(\lambda, a)$. Therefore there is an automorphism σ of $\mathbb{Q}(\lambda, a)$ that changes the sign of λ and fixes a . Since b belongs to $\mathbb{Q}(a)$, σ also fixes b . Applying σ to the equation $\lambda = pa + rb + q$, the right side is fixed but not the left, contradiction. Hence a and b do belong to $\mathbb{Q}(\lambda)$. Therefore all three fields coincide. That completes the proof of the lemma.

Theorem 5 *Let the isosceles triangle ABC with base angles β and base BC be N -tiled by a tile with angles $(\alpha, \beta, \pi/2)$. Then N is twice a square or a twice a sum of squares.*

Proof. We use notation as in the proof of Lemma 5. Recall (7):

$$2(pa + rb + q)^2 = N$$

If a and b are both rational, then $N/2$ is a rational square, and hence, by Lemma 3, it is the square of an integer, so the conclusion of the theorem holds. Therefore we may assume without loss of generality that a and b are not both rational. By Lemma 5, they both belong to $\mathbb{Q}(\sqrt{N/2})$.

We may assume $N/2$ is not a square, since if it is, we are done. If $p = r = 0$, then $2X^2 = 2q^2 = N$, contradiction. Therefore not both p and r are zero. Define

$$\zeta := e^{i\beta}$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned} a &= \frac{\zeta - \zeta^{-1}}{2i} \\ b &= \frac{\zeta + \zeta^{-1}}{2} \end{aligned}$$

Putting these expressions into the equation

$$X = pa + rb + q = \sqrt{N/2} = \lambda$$

we have, after multiplying by 2,

$$0 = p(\zeta + \zeta^{-1}) - ri(\zeta - \zeta^{-1}) + 2(q - \lambda)$$

Multiplying by ζ we have

$$0 = (p - ri)\zeta^2 + 2(q - \lambda)\zeta + (p + ri)$$

Multiplying by $(p + ri)$ we have

$$0 = (p^2 + r^2)\zeta^2 + 2(q - \lambda)(p + ri)\zeta + (p + ri)^2$$

Solving for ζ by the quadratic formula, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \zeta &= \frac{(\lambda - q)(p + ri) \pm \sqrt{(q - \lambda)^2(p + ri)^2 - (p^2 + r^2)(p + ri)^2}}{p^2 + r^2} \\ &= \frac{(\lambda - q)(p + ri) \pm (p + ri)\sqrt{(q - \lambda)^2 - (p^2 + r^2)}}{p^2 + r^2} \\ &= (p + ri) \left(\frac{(\lambda - q) \pm \sqrt{(q - \lambda)^2 - (p^2 + r^2)}}{p^2 + r^2} \right) \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

The parenthesized factor on the right is real. Since $\zeta = a + ib = \cos \beta + i \sin \beta$, we have $\tan \beta$ equal to the ratio of the imaginary and real parts, and the complicated parenthesized factor cancels out:

$$\tan \beta = r/p \quad (9)$$

It follows from $\tan^2 \beta + 1 = \sec^2 \beta$ that

$$\begin{aligned} a &= \cos \beta = \frac{p}{\sqrt{p^2 + r^2}} \\ b &= \sin \beta = \frac{r}{\sqrt{p^2 + r^2}} \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

Thus a and b belong to $\mathbb{Q}(\sqrt{p^2 + r^2})$. Since $Q(\lambda) = \mathbb{Q}(a, b)$, λ belongs to $\mathbb{Q}(\sqrt{p^2 + r^2})$. That is,

$$\sqrt{N/2} = u + v\sqrt{p^2 + r^2} \quad \text{for some rational } (u, v)$$

Then $N/2 = u^2 + v^2(p^2 + r^2) + 2uv\sqrt{p^2 + r^2}$, which implies $uv = 0$, since $p^2 + r^2$ is irrational. If $v = 0$ then $N/2 = u^2$, so N is twice a square. If $u = 0$ then $N/2 = (pv)^2$, so $N/2$ is a sum of rational squares. Hence by Lemma 3, $N/2$ is a sum of integer squares. That completes the proof of the theorem.

The following theorem characterizes the tilings when $N/2$ is a sum of squares. They look like the double biquadratic tiling shown third in Fig. 16. Of course they might vary by having some triangles rearranged, but the triangles must be the same size and shape, and the number of a , b , and c edges along the sides of ABC must be the same as in those tilings.

Theorem 6 *Let isosceles triangle ABC be N -tiled by a right angle with acute angles (α, β) and sides $(a, b, 1)$. Suppose the equal sides of ABC have length $X = pa + qb + r$, and $N/2$ is not a square. Then $r = 0$, $N/2 = p^2 + q^2$, and $\tan \beta = r/p$.*

Proof. We may use equations from the proof of Theorem 5, which were derived under the assumption that N was not a square. Taking the real part of (8) we have

$$a = \frac{p}{p^2 + r^2} \left((\lambda - q) \pm \sqrt{(q - \lambda)^2 - (p^2 + r^2)} \right)$$

Dividing that equation by (10) we find

$$\begin{aligned}
1 &= \left(\frac{(\lambda - q) \pm \sqrt{(q - \lambda)^2 - (p^2 + r^2)}}{\sqrt{p^2 + r^2}} \right) \\
\sqrt{p^2 + r^2} &= (\lambda - q) \pm \sqrt{(q - \lambda)^2 - (p^2 + r^2)} \\
p^2 + r^2 &= 2(\lambda - q)^2 \pm 2(\lambda - q)\sqrt{(q - \lambda)^2 - (p^2 + r^2)} - (p^2 + r^2)
\end{aligned}$$

Adding $p^2 + r^2$ to both sides and dividing by 2,

$$\begin{aligned}
(p^2 + r^2) - (\lambda - q)^2 &= \pm(\lambda - q)\sqrt{(q - \lambda)^2 - (p^2 + r^2)} \\
((p^2 + r^2) - (\lambda - q)^2)^2 &= (\lambda - q)^2 ((q - \lambda)^2 - (p^2 + r^2)) \\
(p^2 + r^2)^2 - 2(p^2 + r^2)(\lambda - q)^2 + (\lambda - q)^4 &= (\lambda - q)^4 - (\lambda - q)^2(p^2 + r^2) \\
(p^2 + r^2)^2 &= (p^2 + r^2)(\lambda - q)^2 \\
p^2 + r^2 &= (\lambda - q)^2 = \lambda^2 - 2\lambda q + q^2
\end{aligned}$$

Since $\lambda = \sqrt{N/2}$ is irrational, this implies $q = 0$ and $p^2 + r^2 = \lambda^2 = N/2$. That $\tan \beta = r/p$ was proved in (9). That completes the proof of the theorem.

Theorem 7 *Suppose ABC is isosceles with base angles α , and ABC is tiled by triangle T similar to half of ABC . If α is a rational multiple of π , then N is even and either*

- (i) $N/2$ is a square, or
- (ii) $N/2$ is a twice a square (that is, N is a square) and $\alpha = \pi/4$, or
- (iii) $N/2$ is three times a square and $\alpha = \pi/6$.

Proof. Suppose that α is a rational multiple of π . By Lemma 5, $\cos \alpha$ and $\sin \alpha$ belong to $\mathbb{Q}(\sqrt{N/2})$. Therefore $e^{i\alpha}$ has degree 2 or 4 over \mathbb{Q} . We can therefore apply Lemma 4 to conclude that $\alpha = 2\pi/n$, where $n = 5, 8, 10$, or 12 .

In case $n = 8$ we have $\alpha = \pi/4$; hence the left hand side of (7) belongs to $\mathbb{Q}(\sqrt{2})$; hence $\sqrt{N/2}$ belongs to $\mathbb{Q}(\sqrt{2})$. Then $\sqrt{N/2}$ has the form $u + v\sqrt{2}$ with u and v rational. Squaring both sides we have $N/2 = u^2 + 2v^2 + 2uv\sqrt{2}$. Hence $uv = 0$. In case $v = 0$ then $N/2$ is a square. In case $u = 0$ then $N/2$ is twice a square.

In case $n = 12$, $\alpha = \pi/6$, so $\cos \alpha = \sqrt{3}/2$ and $\sin \alpha = 1/2$; hence the left hand side belongs to $\mathbb{Q}(\sqrt{3})$; hence $\sqrt{N/2}$ belongs to $\mathbb{Q}(\sqrt{3})$. Then $\sqrt{N/2}$ has the form $u + v\sqrt{3}$ with u and v rational. Squaring both sides we have $N/2 = u^2 + 3v^2 + 2uv\sqrt{3}$. Hence $uv = 0$. Hence either $u = 0$ or $v = 0$. In case $u = 0$ then $N/2$ is three times a square (which is possible, for example by bisecting each tile in Fig. 11, producing a 54-tiling); in case $v = 0$ then $N/2$ is a square.

In case $n = 10$ we have $\alpha = \pi/5$. Then $\cos \alpha = (1/4)(1 + \sqrt{5})$, and

$$\sin \alpha = \frac{1}{2} \sqrt{\frac{1}{2}(5 - \sqrt{5})}$$

But by Lemma 5, $\sin \alpha$ and $\cos \alpha$ are both of degree 2 over \mathbb{Q} , so $\sin \alpha$ must belong to $\mathbb{Q}(\cos \alpha)$. Hence $\sqrt{(5 - \sqrt{5})/2}$ belongs to $\mathbb{Q}(\cos \alpha) = \mathbb{Q}(\sqrt{5})$. This is impossible, as SageMath can tell us using this code:

```

x = sqrt((5 - sqrt(5))/2)
K.<a> = QuadraticField(5)
x = sqrt((5 - a)/2)
print("Is x in Q(sqrt(5))?")
print(x in K)

```

It is not difficult to verify that result by hand if desired, by showing that there are no rational numbers u and v such that $\sqrt{(5 - \sqrt{5})/2} = u + v\sqrt{5}$. Thus the case $n = 10$ cannot actually arise.

In case $n = 5$ we have $\alpha = 2\pi/5$ and

$$\begin{aligned}\sin \alpha &= \frac{1}{2}\sqrt{\frac{1}{2}(5 + \sqrt{5})} \\ \cos \alpha &= \frac{1}{4}(-1 + \sqrt{5})\end{aligned}$$

and in this case also $\sin \alpha$ does not belong to $\mathbb{Q}(\cos \alpha)$, so by Lemma 5, this case cannot actually arise. That completes the proof of the theorem.

9 Possible values of N in tilings with commensurable angles

We wish to add a third column to Laczkovich's Table 1, giving the possible forms of N if there is an N -tiling of ABC by the tile in that row. For example, when ABC is similar to the tile, then N must be a square, so we put n^2 in the third column. While we are at it, we add a fourth column with a citation to the result, and delete the rows corresponding to the tilings of the equilateral triangle that we have proved impossible. The revised and extended table is Table 2. All the entries in this table except the last one give necessary and sufficient conditions on N for the tilings to exist. The last one gives necessary conditions for certain tilings that probably do not actually exist.

Table 2: N -tilings by tiles with commensurable angles, with form of N

ABC	the tile	form of N	citation
(α, β, γ)	similar to ABC	n^2	[8]
(α, β, γ)	similar to ABC , $\gamma = \pi/2$	$e^2 + f^2$	[8]
$(\frac{\pi}{6}, \frac{\pi}{3}, \frac{\pi}{2})$	similar to ABC	$3n^2$	[8]
$(\alpha, \alpha, 2\beta)$	$\gamma = \pi/2$	$2n^2$	Theorem 7
$(\alpha, \alpha, 2\beta)$	$(\frac{\pi}{4}, \frac{\pi}{4}, \frac{\pi}{2})$	n^2	Theorem 7
$(\frac{\pi}{6}, \frac{\pi}{6}, \frac{2\pi}{3})$	$(\frac{\pi}{6}, \frac{\pi}{3}, \frac{\pi}{2})$	$6n^2$	Theorem 7
equilateral	$(\frac{\pi}{6}, \frac{\pi}{3}, \frac{\pi}{2})$	$6n^2$	Theorem 7
equilateral	$(\frac{\pi}{6}, \frac{\pi}{6}, \frac{2\pi}{3})$	$3n^2$	Theorem 7
equilateral	$(\frac{\pi}{12}, \frac{\pi}{3}, \frac{7\pi}{12})$	$6n^2$	Theorem 3

Theorem 8 Suppose (α, β, γ) are all rational multiples of 2π , and triangle ABC is N -tiled by a tile with angles (α, β, γ) . Then ABC , (α, β, γ) , and N correspond to one of the lines in Table 2.

Proof. As discussed above, Laczkovich characterized the pairs of tiled triangle and tile, as given in Table 1.³ It remains to characterize the possible N for each line. In several cases lines in Table 1 split into two or more lines in Table 2, which supplies the required possible forms of values of N . That table lists in its last column citations to the literature or theorems in this paper for each line. Finally, we have deleted the rows of Table 1 corresponding to the tilings that are impossible by Theorem 4. That completes the proof.

10 Laczkovich's second table

Laczkovich also studied the case when not all the angles of the tile are rational multiples of π . Again a finite number of cases can arise. This is Theorem 4.1 of [4], and the list of cases is given in Table 3.

Table 3: Tilings when not all angles are rational multiples of π .

ABC	the tile
(α, β, γ)	similar to ABC
equilateral	$\alpha = \pi/3$
$(\alpha, \alpha, 2\beta)$	$\gamma = \pi/2$
$(\alpha, \alpha, \pi - 2\alpha)$	$\gamma = 2\alpha$
$(2\alpha, \beta, \alpha + \beta)$	$3\alpha + 2\beta = \pi$
$(2\alpha, \alpha, 2\beta)$	$3\alpha + 2\beta = \pi$
isosceles	$3\alpha + 2\beta = \pi$
$(\alpha, \alpha, \pi - 2\alpha)$	$\gamma = 2\pi/3$
$(\alpha, 2\alpha, \pi - 3\alpha)$	$\gamma = 2\pi/3$
$(\alpha, 2\beta, 2\alpha + \beta)$	$\gamma = 2\pi/3$
$(\alpha, \alpha + \beta, \alpha + 2\beta)$	$\gamma = 2\pi/3$
$(2\alpha, 2\beta, \alpha + \beta)$	$\gamma = 2\pi/3$
equilateral	$\gamma = 2\pi/3$

Table 1 and 3 together constitute an exhaustive list of tilings. If we have some conditions on the tile, such as for example $3\alpha + 2\beta = \pi$, then we look to see what entries in Table 1 satisfy those conditions. That gives some tilings with commensurable angles. Then we look in the other table for tilings in which not all the angles are rational multiples of 2π . To fix the ideas we spell out the details for the case $3\alpha + 2\beta = \pi$.

³ Again, we remind readers who may check with [4] that there are three entries in Laczkovich's Theorem 5.1 that are shown in the subsequent Theorem 5.3 not to apply to tilings by congruent triangles, so they do not appear in our tables.

Lemma 6 *Let $3\alpha + 2\beta = \pi$. Suppose there is an N -tiling of triangle ABC by tile T with angles (α, β, γ) . Suppose also that ABC is not similar to T . Then α and β are not rational multiples of π , and every linear relation between π , α , and β is a multiple of $3\alpha + 2\beta = \pi$.*

Proof. Suppose there is an N -tiling as in the statement of the lemma. Then if angles of the tile are all rational multiples of π , the pair ABC and the tile must occur in Table 1. So we have to check if any of the triples in that table satisfy $3\alpha + 2\beta = \pi$. And they do not, so that completes the proof.

Remark. The reader of Laczkovich's paper [4] should beware: Theorem 5.1 includes the triple $(\pi/4, \pi/8, 5\pi/8)$, which does satisfy $3\alpha + 2\beta = \pi$. But as discussed above, it is included since the theorem is about dissections into *similar* triangles, and Theorem 5.3 of [4] rules it out for tilings into *congruent* triangles. Hence we have deleted it from Table 1 and do not need to consider it here.

11 Adding a column for N to Laczkovich's second table

The research program that we have been pursuing in this subject is to study triples (ABC, T, N) instead of just pairs (ABC, T) , where there is an N -tiling of ABC by tile T . Another way to say that is that we wish to add a third column to Laczkovich's second table, entering the possible forms of N in that column, as we did to the first table. This has proved to be a longer business than I had originally imagined, although also more interesting, since several new tilings have been discovered in the process, and this research program is not complete. The point of the present paper is that we have pursued it far enough to reach the goal of showing that 7-tilings are impossible. Presently, we can supply entries in the third column down to the cases with $\gamma = 2\pi/3$, but some of them are only necessary conditions, not necessary and sufficient, leaving open many questions about particular values of N that are not ruled out by those necessary conditions.

11.1 Angles

Lemma 7 *Suppose triangle ABC is N -tiled by a tile in which $3\alpha + 2\beta = \pi$. Then $\gamma > \pi/2$.*

Proof.

$$\begin{aligned} \pi &= 3\alpha + 2\beta \\ &= \alpha + 2(\alpha + \beta) \\ &= \alpha + 2(\pi - \gamma) \\ \gamma &= \frac{\pi}{2} + \frac{\alpha}{2} > \frac{\pi}{2} \end{aligned}$$

That completes the proof.

Lemma 8 *Let triangle ABC be N -tiled by a tile with angles (α, β, γ) . Suppose that either $3\alpha + 2\beta = \pi$ and ABC is not isosceles with base angles α , or $\gamma = 2\pi/3$. Then no tile has its γ angle at a vertex of ABC .*

Proof. By Lemma 6, α and β are not rational multiples of π . Hence the angles of ABC are linear integral combinations of α , β , and γ . First assume $3\alpha + 2\beta = \pi$. Then the angles of ABC are each equal to α , 2α , $\alpha + \beta$, β , or 2β . Of these angles, all but 2β are less than γ , as we now show. Then

$\gamma = \beta + 2\alpha$, and

$$\begin{aligned}\alpha &< \beta + 2\alpha = \gamma \\ \beta &< \beta + 2\alpha < \gamma \\ \alpha + \beta &< \beta + 2\alpha = \gamma \\ 2\alpha &< \beta + 2\alpha = \gamma.\end{aligned}$$

Since ABC is not similar to the tile, there cannot be a γ angle alone at any vertex, since that would leave $\alpha + \beta$ for the other two vertices, making ABC similar to the tile, since α is not a rational multiple of β .

Since all the possible angles but 2β are less than γ , it only remains to deal with the case where angle C is equal to 2β and $\gamma < 2\beta$, and there is a tile with its γ angle at C . We do not have $2\beta = \gamma$, by Lemma 6. Then there must be another tile at C as well. If the angle of that tile at C is α , then the total angle at C is at least $\gamma + \alpha = 2\alpha + \beta + \alpha = 3\alpha + \beta$, leaving only β for the other two angles of ABC . But that is impossible, since α is not a rational multiple of β . If the second angle at C is β , then the total angle at C is at least $\gamma + \beta = 2\alpha + 2\beta$, leaving just α for the other two angles, which is again impossible. Hence the second angle at C cannot be β . That completes the proof under the assumption $3\alpha + 2\beta = \pi$.

We now take up the case $\gamma = 2\pi/3$. Then the possible angles of ABC are α , β , $\alpha + \beta$, $\alpha + 2\beta$, $2\alpha + \beta$, 3α , and 3β . All but 3α and 3β are less than $2\alpha + 2\beta = \gamma$, so a γ tile can occur, if at all, only at a vertex angle of 3α or 3β . Suppose vertex C has angle 3α and there is a γ angle of a tile at C . Then $\gamma < 3\alpha$ and angles A and B together are $\pi - 3\alpha < \pi - \gamma$, which is impossible since the three angles of ABC add up to π . Similarly if vertex C has angle 3β and $\gamma < 3\beta$. That completes the proof of the lemma.

11.2 Two c edges on each side of ABC

Lemma 9 *Suppose triangle ABC is N -tiled by a tile with angles (α, β, γ) and $\gamma > \pi/2$. Suppose all the tiles along one side of ABC do not have their c sides along that side of ABC . Then there is a tile with a γ angle at one of the endpoints of that side of ABC .*

Proof. Let PQ be the side of ABC with no c sides of tiles along it. Then the γ angle of each of those tiles occurs at a vertex on PQ , since the angle opposite the side of the tile on PQ must be α or β . Let n be the number of tiles along PQ ; then there are $n - 1$ vertices of these tiles on the interior of PQ . Since $\gamma > \pi/2$, no vertex on the boundary has more than one γ angle. By the pigeonhole principle, there is at least one tile whose γ angle is not at one of those $n - 1$ interior vertices; that angle must be at P or Q . That completes the proof of the lemma.

Lemma 10 *Suppose triangle ABC is N -tiled by a tile T with angles (α, β, γ) . Suppose*


- (i) $\gamma > \pi/2$, and
- (ii) α is not a rational multiple of π , and
- (iii) Every angle of triangle ABC is less than γ , and
- (iv) One of the following two conditions holds: Either b is not a multiple of a , or the tiling does not have two equal angles of tiles at A or at C , i.e. two α or two β angles.

Then there are at least two c edges of tiles on side AC .

Remarks. One can prove by the same method that the c edges must occur in adjacent blocks of at least two edges, but we found no use for that result.

Proof. By hypothesis (ii), every boundary vertex P (except A , B , and C) that has a γ angle (i.e., some tile with a vertex at P has its γ angle at P) touches exactly three tiles, which contribute angles of α , β , and γ . By Lemma 9, each side of ABC has at least one c edge. The present lemma, however, claims more: there must be at least two c edges. Suppose, to the contrary, that there is just one c tile, Tile 1, with an edge on one side EF of triangle ABC . Then all the other tiles with an edge on EF have a γ angle on EF . We visualize EF as horizontal with triangle ABC above, and use the word “north” and “northwest” accordingly. See Fig. 18.

Figure 18: Proof of Lemma 10: another tile won't fit next to Tile 2



Since there cannot be a γ angle at the vertices of ABC , it follows that both the tiles on AC adjacent to Tile 1 (if there are two, or otherwise, only the one) have their γ angles adjacent to Tile 1. Let PQ be the c edge of Tile 1 lying on AC . Let R be the northern vertex of Tile 1. Suppose (without loss of generality) that Tile 1 has its β angle at Q . Then the side PR of Tile 1, opposite Q , has length b . Let Tile 2 be the tile adjacent to PR .

Since the hypotheses of the theorem remain true if (the names of) α and β are interchanged, we may assume without loss of generality that $\alpha < \beta$. Then by the law of sines, $a < b$. Since $\gamma > \pi/2$ we also have $a < c$ (by the law of cosines).

Assume, for proof by contradiction, that neither P nor Q is a vertex of ABC . Then there exist Tile 0 and Tile 3 on AC sharing vertices P and Q with Tile 1. Tile 2, between Tile 0 and Tile 1, must have its β angle at P , since Tile 1 has its α angle there and Tile 0 has its γ angle at P . There is an open α angle between Tile 1 and Tile 3; let Tile 4 be the tile that fills that notch. Then Tile 4 has its b or c edge along QR . Since Tile 1 has its a edge along QR and $a < b$ and $a < c$, the edge of Tile 4 on QR extends past R . Then the segment PR is of length b and its northwest side is composed of a number of tile edges, starting with Tile 2 at P . These must all be a edges, since a is the only edge less than b . Since the tiles northwest of PR all have their a edges on PR , they all have a γ angle on PR . But Tile 2 does not have its γ angle at P , since Tile 0 has its γ angle at P . And the last tile cannot have its γ angle at R , since Tile 4 extends along QR past R , and Tile 1 has its γ angle at R . So if there are n tiles northwest of PR , there are only $n - 1$ possible places for their γ angles, contradicting the pigeon-hole principle. This contradiction proves that one of P or Q is a vertex of ABC .

Now we argue by cases.

Case 1: Q is a vertex of ABC , i.e., $Q = C$. If the angle of ABC at Q is strictly between β and 2β , then Tile 4 must have its α angle at Q , and we argue exactly as before. If the angle of ABC at Q is exactly β , then we argue as above, except that RQ is now extended past R by one side of ABC rather than an edge of Tile 4. The argument about the γ angles of the tiles northwest of PR is unchanged, if P is not a vertex of ABC . If P is a vertex of ABC , then we still can argue that Tile 2 must have its a side on PR , because it cannot fit next to Tile 1 with its b or c side on PR . (Hypothesis (iii) is not needed here.)

Therefore we may assume that the angle of ABC at Q is at least 2β , and that Tile 4 has its β angle at Q and its a edge against Tile 1. Hence there is a double angle at Q . Then by hypothesis (iv), b is not a multiple of a . Tile 3 cannot have its γ angle at Q , by hypothesis (iii). Therefore Tile 3 has its γ angle at R , and since $\gamma > \pi/2$ by hypothesis (i), PR does not extend past R as part of the tiling. The tiles northwest of PR must all have their a edges on PR , since a is the only edge less than b . Then b is a multiple of a , contradiction. That completes Case 1.

Case 2: P is a vertex of ABC , and Q is not. Then Tile 4 is placed as shown in the figure. Therefore the angle of ABC at vertex P must be greater than α , since if it were equal to α , Tile 4 would not lie inside ABC . Then Tile 2 exists, and Tile 2 must have its a side on PR , because it cannot fit next to Tile 1 with its b or c side on PR . From there the argument proceeds as before. That completes Case 2.

That completes the proof of the lemma.

If there are enough tiles on the boundary of ABC then N must be at least 12. How many is “enough”? As it turns out we do not need a precise answer; the following lemma is helpful enough and easy to prove. No doubt the number 10 can be improved, but this is good enough.

Lemma 11 *Let ABC be N -tiled, and suppose the total number of tiles with an edge on the boundary of ABC is at least k , with at least two tiles on each side of ABC , and only one tile at B , and a total of five tiles at the vertices of ABC . Then $N \geq k + 2$.*

Proof. We must produce at least two non-boundary tiles. Case 1, two vertices, say A and B , of ABC have only one tile each. Since three tiles (at least) meet at each boundary vertex, the tile that shares an edge with the tile at A is not a boundary tile, and the same for the tile next to the tile at B . That makes at least $k + 2$ tiles.

Case 2, only B has a single tile, while vertices A and C have two tiles each. Then the tile adjacent to the tile at B is a non-boundary tile. Consider the two tiles at vertex A , say Tile 1 and Tile 2. If they do not share a common edge then one of them, say Tile 1, has a shorter edge along their common boundary. Then the tile adjacent to that edge is not a boundary tile, and hence it is a second non-boundary tile. If they do share a common edge, then let Tile 3 and Tile 4 be the tiles adjacent to Tile 1 and Tile 2, respectively. At most one of Tile 3 and Tile 4 can have a boundary extending past the common interior vertex E of Tile 1 and Tile 2, and the one that does not cannot be a boundary tile. Hence it is a second non-boundary tile. That completes the proof of the lemma.

11.3 The case $3\alpha + 2\beta = \pi$

Three of the rows of Table 3 fall under the case $3\alpha + 2\beta = \pi$, with α not a rational multiple of π . For some of those cases we have proved necessary and sufficient conditions for the existence of an N -tiling; and for all of them we have strong necessary conditions. In other words, we have added a fourth column to Table 3, at least for the rows corresponding to $3\alpha + 2\beta = \pi$. From those entries we can simply read off that $N = 7$ and $N = 11$ are impossible. In fact $N = 28$ is the smallest possible N . But the proofs, which are still unpublished, occupy approximately a hundred pages, and we

wish to make the present paper self-contained (except for its dependence on [4] and [8]). Therefore we give a short, self-contained, algebraic and computational proof that N -tilings do not exist when $N < 12$ and $3\alpha + 2\beta = \pi$ and α is not a rational multiple of π .

An important tool in the analysis of these tilings is the “coloring equation” given in Theorem 2. That theorem applies here, as we now show. If $3\alpha + 2\beta = \pi$ and α is not a rational multiple of π , then every boundary vertex is composed of three tiles ($\alpha + \beta + \gamma$) or five tiles ($3\alpha + 2\beta$), and every interior vertex is either a “center” with four tiles ($3\gamma + \beta$) or has six tiles ($2\alpha + 2\beta + 2\gamma$) or eight tiles ($4\alpha + 3\beta + \gamma$) or ten tiles ($6\alpha + 4\beta$).

Since there are five tiles at the angles of ABC , by renaming the vertices we may assume that only one tile is at B . Let (X, Y, Z) be the lengths of sides AB , BC , and AC . Then we have the “coloring equation”

$$M(a + b + c) = X + Z \pm Y \tag{11}$$

where the $+$ sign is taken if the angles at A and C have an odd number of tiles, and the $-$ sign is taken if they have an even number.

Besides the coloring equation, we have the “area equation”, which says that the area of ABC is equal to N times the area of the tile. We use the formula for the area of a triangle that says twice the area is the product of two adjacent sides and the sine of the included angle. By the law of sines, $a/c = \sin \alpha / \sin \gamma$. Then the area equation can be written

$$XZ \sin \alpha = Nbc \sin \alpha \tag{12}$$

$$XZ = Nbc \quad \text{if angle } B = \alpha \tag{13}$$

$$XZ = Nac \quad \text{if angle } B = \beta \tag{14}$$

Definition 1 *Let a triangle have angles (α, β, γ) . We define*

$$s = 2 \sin(\alpha/2).$$

This definition is useful because the ratios a/c and b/c can be expressed simply in terms of s , as shown in the following lemma.

Lemma 12 *Suppose $3\alpha + 2\beta = \pi$. Let $s = 2 \sin \alpha/2$. Then we have*

$$\begin{aligned} \sin \gamma &= \cos \frac{\alpha}{2} \\ \frac{a}{c} &= s \\ \frac{b}{c} &= 1 - s^2 \end{aligned}$$

Proof. Since $\gamma = \pi - (\alpha + \beta)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \sin \gamma &= \sin(\pi - (\alpha + \beta)) \\ &= \sin(\alpha + \beta) \\ &= \cos(\pi/2 - (\alpha + \beta)) \\ &= \cos \frac{\alpha}{2} \quad \text{since } \pi/2 - \beta = 3\alpha/2 \end{aligned}$$

Then $c = \sin \gamma = \cos \alpha/2$, and $a = \sin \alpha = 2 \sin(\alpha/2) \cos(\alpha/2)$. Hence

$$\frac{a}{c} = 2 \sin \alpha/2.$$

Since $3\alpha + 2\beta = \pi$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\sin \beta &= \sin(\pi/2 - 3\alpha/2) \\ &= \cos(3\alpha/2) \\ &= 4 \cos^3 \frac{\alpha}{2} - 3 \cos \frac{\alpha}{2}\end{aligned}$$

Hence

$$\begin{aligned}b/c &= 4 \cos^2(\alpha/2) - 3 \\ &= 4(1 - \sin^2 \alpha/2) - 3 \\ &= 1 - 4 \sin^2 \alpha/2\end{aligned}$$

Then we have

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{a}{c} &= s \\ \frac{b}{c} &= 1 - s^2\end{aligned}$$

establishing the second equation of the lemma. That completes the proof of the lemma.

Theorem 9 *Suppose $3\alpha + 2\beta = \pi$, and triangle ABC is N -tiled by a tile with angles (α, β, γ) not similar to ABC , and α is not a rational multiple of π . Then $N \geq 12$.*

Proof. We first discuss the possibility of applying of Lemma 10. Do the hypotheses hold? By Lemma 8, no tile has a γ angle at a vertex of ABC ; and by Lemma 7, $\gamma > \pi/2$. Since the tile is not similar to ABC , and α is not a rational multiple of π , each angle of ABC is less than γ . The possibilities for the angles of ABC are as follows: (1) isosceles, with base angles α or β , or (2) isosceles, with base angles $\alpha + \beta$, or (3) $(\alpha, 2\alpha, 2\beta)$, or (4) $(2\alpha, \alpha + \beta, \beta)$. In cases (1) and (2) there is no “double angle”, i.e., 2α or 2β , so Lemma 10 applies to all three sides of ABC . In cases (3) and (4), it applies to one side, but it may apply generally, if the larger of b and a is not a multiple of the smaller.

According to Lemma 12, with $s = a/c$ we have $b/c = 1 - s^2$, so if $b = ma$ with $m \geq 2$, then $1 - s^2 = ms$. Then $2s = -m + \sqrt{m^2 + 4}$. This is irrational, since $m^2 < m^2 + 4 < m^2 + 2m + 1 = (m + 1)^2$, so $m^2 + 4$ is not a square. Hence, if s is rational, then b is not a multiple of a , so if $a < b$ then Lemma 10 can be applied to all three sides of ABC . On the other hand if $b < a$ and $a = mb$ then we have $2s = -(1/m) + \sqrt{1/m^2 + 4}$, That is rational if and only if $\sqrt{1 + 4m^2}$ is rational, but $1 + 4m^2$ is not a square, so if s is rational, a is not a multiple of b , so Lemma 10 will be applicable (to all three sides of ABC) whenever s is rational.

We now explain the idea of the proof. The tiling provides an expression for each side of ABC as a linear combination of abc . Thus

$$\begin{aligned}X &= pa + qb + rc \\ Z &= ua + vb + wc \\ Y &= ka + lb + mc\end{aligned}$$

Substitute these expressions for (X, Y, Z) in the coloring equation. With $P = p + u \pm k$, $Q = q + v \pm \ell$, $R = r + w \pm m$ we have $M(a + b + c) = Pa + Qb + Rc$. Dividing by c and use $a/c = s$ and $b/c = 1 - s^2$ we have

$$M(2 + s - s^2) = Ps + Q(1 - s^2) + R$$

For given (M, P, Q, R) that quadratic can be solved for s (provided its discriminant is nonnegative). The area equation too can be expressed in terms of s , and we can check if it is satisfied for the s from the coloring equation. For a given N , we need to consider only values of the integer parameters between 0 and N , so this search will terminate. Moreover, as discussed in the first paragraph of this proof, Lemma 10 tells us that we can restrict the search by only examining values of r , w , and m that are at least 2, provided ABC is isosceles or s is rational. Finally, Lemma 11 allows us to not consider cases in which there would be ten or more boundary tiles, i.e., when $p+q+r+u+v+w+k+\ell+m \geq 10$. SageMath code to carry out this plan for isosceles ABC with base angles α or β is exhibited in Fig. 19. Run that code passing 7 as the function parameter, and then again passing 11. It runs in about 12 seconds, and produces no output except the reassuring progress reports as M changes. That shows that there is no 7 or 11 tiling in the case of isosceles ABC with angles α at A and B , or β at A and B , i.e., when the coloring equation is $M(a + b + c) = X + Y + Z$.

The other possible shapes of ABC satisfy the coloring equation $M(a + b + c) = X - Y + Z$. That code differs from the code in Fig. 19 in two respects. First, because of the minus sign in the coloring equation, negative values of (P, Q, R) are allowed, and the upper limits of (P, Q, R) go up to N , $N - |P|$, and $N - |P| - |R|$, respectively, and the values of (k, ℓ, m) are preceded by a minus sign, with a continue statement inserted to reject negative values. Second, we are only allowed to assume each side contains at least two c edges in case s is rational, so the variable `looplimit` has to be recalculated each time s is recalculated, and set to 2 if s is rational, and otherwise to 1. Although it adds a page to the length of the paper, we also include enough of this code so that any reader can reproduce our results. See Fig. 20.

To prove the theorem as stated, we ran both programs for all N between 3 and 11, inclusive. The second program is slower, requiring 27 seconds for $N = 7$, over three minutes for $N = 11$, and about 8 minutes for all values 3 to 11. But it gets the answer: no solutions are found. That completes the proof.

Remark. This method cannot be used for $N = 19$, as some solutions are found. As discussed in § 13 below, we do have a proof that there is no 19-tiling with $3\alpha + 2\beta = \pi$; but the short direct computational proof given here will not work.

Figure 19: SageMath code used in the proof of Theorem 9, ABC isosceles

```

def oct22(N): # ABC isosceles
    var('P,Q,R,M,s,p,q,r,u,v,w,k,ell,m')
    epsilon = 0.0000001
    lowerlimit = 2 # each side has at least 2 c edges
    for M in range(1,N):
        print("M=%d" %M)
        for P in range(0,N):
            for Q in range(0,N-P):
                for R in range(6,N-P-Q):
                    eq1 = M*(2+s-s^2) - P*s - Q*(1-s^2) - R
                    discriminant = (M-P)^2 - 4*(Q-M)*(2*M-Q-R)
                    if discriminant < 0:
                        continue
                    answers = solve(eq1,s)
                    for x in answers:
                        S = x.rhs()
                        if S <= 0 or S >= 1:
                            continue
                        # print(S)
                        for r in range(lowerlimit,R+1):
                            for w in range(lowerlimit,R-r):
                                m = R -r-w
                                if m < lowerlimit:
                                    continue
                                for p in range(0,P+1):
                                    for u in range(0,P-p):
                                        k = P-p-u;
                                        for q in range(0,Q+1):
                                            for v in range(0,Q-q):
                                                ell = Q-q-v
                                                boundarytiles = p+q+r+u+v+w+k+ell+m
                                                if boundarytiles >= N-2:
                                                    continue
                                                X = r + p*S + q*(1-S^2)
                                                Y = w + u*S + v*(1-S^2)
                                                area1 = abs(X*Y - N*(1-S^2)) # if B = alpha
                                                area2 = abs(X*Y - N*S) # if B = beta
                                                if n(area1) < epsilon:
                                                    print("alpha",N,M,p,q,r,u,v,w,k,ell,m)
                                                    print(area1)
                                                if n(area2) < epsilon:
                                                    print("alpha",N,M,p,q,r,u,v,w,k,ell,m)

```

Figure 20: SageMath code used in the proof of Theorem 9, ABC not isosceles

```

def oct22b(N): # case when ABC is not isosceles
    var('P,Q,R,M,s,p,q,r,u,v,w,k,ell,m')
    epsilon = 0.0000001
    for M in range(1,N):
        print("M=%d" %M)
        for P in range(-N,N+1):
            # print(P)
            for Q in range(-(N-abs(P)),N-abs(P)+1):
                # print("...%d" % Q)
                for R in range(-(N-abs(P)-abs(Q)),N-abs(P)-abs(Q)+1):
                    eq1 = M*(2+s-s^2) - P*s - Q*(1-s^2) - R
                    discriminant = (M-P)^2 - 4*(Q-M)*(2*M-Q-R)
                    if discriminant < 0:
                        continue
                    answers = solve(eq1,s)
                    for x in answers:
                        S = x.rhs()
                        if S <= 0 or S >= 1:
                            continue
                        lowerlimit = 1; # will be set to 2 when s is rational
                        if S < 1-S^2 and (S in QQ or not (1-S^2)/S in ZZ):
                            lowerlimit = 2
                        else:
                            if 1-S^2 < S and (not (S/(1-S^2) in ZZ)):
                                lowerlimit = 2;
                            else:
                                lowerlimit = 1
                    for r in range(lowerlimit,R+1):
                        for w in range(lowerlimit,R-r):
                            m = -(R -r-w)
                            if m < lower3limit:
                                continue
                            for p in range(0,P+1):
                                for u in range(0,P-p):
                                    k = -(P-p-u);
                                    if k < 0:
                                        continue
                                    for q in range(0,Q+1):
                                        for v in range(0,Q-q):
                                            ell = -(Q-q-v)
                                            if ell < 0:
                                                continue
                                # ... the rest as in the previous figure

```

11.4 The case $\gamma = 2\pi/3$ and α not a rational multiple of π

In this case, $\alpha + \beta = \pi/3$, so a boundary vertex can be composed of angles contributed by 3 or 6 tiles. Hence it is not in general possible to color the tiles black and white in a way that leads to a “coloring equation.”

There are several shapes possible for ABC , listed in Table 3, but for our purposes here there are just two cases to consider: either one of the vertices of ABC has just one tile (in which case we rename α and β so that the standalone angle is α , and we rename the vertices so it occurs at A), or there are two tiles at each of the three vertices, in which case we may assume that the angle at A is $\alpha + \beta$. We do not need to consider the case ABC similar to the tile, so no γ angles occur at the vertices of ABC . The shape of the tile can be expressed using the law of cosines, since $\cos(2\pi/3) = -\frac{1}{2}$, by the equation

$$c^2 = a^2 + b^2 + ab. \tag{15}$$

For example, $(3, 5, 7)$ and $(8, 7, 13)$ are rational tiles satisfying this equation.

Although there is no coloring equation, we do still have the “area equation” that says the area of ABC is N times the area of the tile. That equation takes different forms depending on the shape of ABC . In case the angle at A is α , and the sides AB and AC have length X and Y , the area equation is $XY \sin \alpha = Nab \sin \alpha$. After canceling $\sin \alpha$ we have


$$XY = Nab \tag{16}$$

We do have some general results about this kind of tiling, but the theory is incomplete and we do not go into it here. For our present purposes it suffices to show that any such tiling requires at least 12 tiles; that is Theorem 10 below.

Theorem 10 *Let triangle ABC be N -tiled by a tile with angles $(\alpha, \beta, 2\pi/3)$, not similar to ABC , and suppose α is not a rational multiple of π . Then N is not equal to 7 or 11.*

Remark. The idea of the proof of this case is that, because of Lemma 10, each side of ABC is at least $2c$ in length, and that makes the area more than the area of 12 tiles. See Fig. 21, which illustrates an equilateral ABC with six tiles placed, and more area remaining than six tiles can cover. (This figure is only illustrative.) We first proved this theorem by a geometrical argument about placing tiles, but algebra is shorter and simpler. Both ideas can be seen in Fig. 21: It is geometrically impossible to complete the tiling, and also the untiled area is more than the area of six tiles.

Figure 21: The case of Theorem 10 when there are exactly six boundary tiles



Proof. Since the tile is not similar to ABC , and α is not a rational multiple of π , there can be no γ angle at a vertex of ABC . Then there must occur a total of six tiles at the vertices of ABC , contributing three α angles and three β angles to make up the angles of ABC .

We divide the proof into two cases. Case 1: One vertex of ABC has an angle δ with $\pi/3 \leq \delta \leq \pi/3$. The point of that inequality is that $\sin \pi/3 < \sin \delta$. Let X and Y be the lengths of the sides adjacent to that angle. Then we have the area equation

$$XY \sin \delta = Nab \sin \frac{2\pi}{3}$$

Since $\sin \frac{2\pi}{3} = \sin \frac{\pi}{3} \leq \sin \delta$, we have

$$XY \leq Nab$$

According to Lemma 10, there are at least two c edges on each side of ABC . Hence $X \geq 2c$ and $Y \geq 2c$. Therefore $Nab \geq XY \geq 4c^2$. Therefore

$$3ab \geq \frac{12c^2}{N} \tag{17}$$

Recall (15):

$$\begin{aligned} c^2 &= a^2 + b^2 + ab \\ c^2 - 3ab &= a^2 + b^2 - 2ab = (a - b)^2 > 0 \end{aligned} \tag{18}$$

Substituting on the left from (17) we have

$$c^2 \left(1 - \frac{12}{N}\right) > 0$$

Since $c^2 > 0$ and $a \neq b$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} 1 - \frac{12}{N} &> 0 \\ N &> 12 \end{aligned}$$

That completes the proof in Case 1.

Case 2: Every vertex angle of ABC is either more than $2\pi/3$ or less than $\pi/3$. They cannot all be less than $\pi/3$ since they add up to π . Therefore one angle is more than $2\pi/3$. Renaming the vertices if necessary, we can assume the angle at B is more than $2\pi/3$. Renaming α and β if necessary, we can assume $\alpha < \beta$. Then the angles at A and C are (possibly after renaming A and C) either (α, α) or $(\alpha, 2\alpha)$, since if otherwise the angle at B is $\leq \pi - (\alpha + \beta) = 2\pi/3$. Since the angle at B exceeds $2\pi/3$, there exists a point D on AC such that angle $ABD = 2\pi/3$. Then the area of ABD is less than the area of ABC . It suffices to show that the area of ABD exceeds the area of 12 tiles.

Let X be the length of AB and Y the length of AD . Then $X \geq 2c$ by Lemma 10. The angle $ADB = \pi - 2\pi/3 - \alpha = \beta$. Thus angle $ADB = \beta$ is less than angle $ABD = 2\pi/3$. In any triangle, the side opposite the smaller angle is smaller; therefore $X < Y$. Since $2c \leq X$ we have $2c < Y$. Hence $XY > 4c^2$. Now if triangle ABC is N -tiled, then the area of ABD is less than the area of N tiles, so we have

$$XY \sin \frac{2\pi}{3} \leq Nab \sin \frac{\pi}{3}$$

Since $\sin(2\pi/3) = \sin \pi/3$ those terms can be cancelled:

$$XY \leq Nab$$


Since $XY > 4c^2$ we have

$$4c^2 < Nab$$

From that point the proof can be completed as in Case 1. That completes the proof of the theorem.

Laczkovich proved that N -tilings of the kind discussed in this section exist, but did not actually exhibit any. While in [4], he did not explicitly consider N at all, in a theorem he allowed Soifer to publish in [9], he showed that for tilings of an equilateral triangle by a tile $(\alpha, \beta, 2\pi/3)$, the square-free part of N could be anything desired. Following Laczkovich's ideas, we found the tiling of Fig. 22, with $N = 10935$. Other tilings that we found require more than 32,000 tiles (and so are too big to draw nicely on a normal page). What the smallest possible N is, we have no idea. For all we know, the construction method used for this tiling might yield a smaller N for some tile with very large sides; or there might be a much more efficient tiling construction yet to be discovered. It is not known if there is an N -tiling of the equilateral triangle for every sufficiently large N , or if instead there are arbitrarily large N for which, like 7 and 11, there is no N -tiling at all.

Figure 22: $N = 10935$. The tile is $(3, 5, 7)$. ABC is equilateral.



11.5 Tilings of an isosceles triangle with $\gamma = 2\alpha$

In this section we take up the row of Laczkovich's second table in which ABC is isosceles with base angles α and is tiled by a tile with $\gamma = 2\alpha$, and α is not a rational multiple of π . The condition $\gamma = 2\alpha$ can also be written as $3\alpha + \beta = \pi$. Unlike the similar-looking condition $3\alpha + 2\beta = \pi$, this condition does not imply $\gamma > \pi/2$. The vertex angle of ABC is then $\pi - 2\alpha = \alpha + \beta$.

By the law of cosines,

$$\begin{aligned} c^2 &= a^2 + b^2 - 2ab \cos \gamma \\ &= a^2 + b^2 - 2ab \cos 2\alpha \quad \text{since } \gamma = 2\alpha \\ &= a^2 + b^2 - 2ab(2 \cos^2 \alpha - 1) \\ &= a^2 + b^2 + 2ab - 4ab \cos^2 \alpha \end{aligned}$$


By the law of sines, $\sin \alpha/a = \sin \gamma/c = \sin 2\alpha/c = 2 \sin \alpha \cos \alpha/c$, so $\cos \alpha = c/(2a)$. Hence

$$\begin{aligned} c^2 &= a^2 + b^2 + 2ab - bc^2/a \\ &= (a+b)^2 - bc^2/a \\ c^2(1+b/a) &= (a+b)^2 \\ c^2 &= a(a+b) \end{aligned}$$

Rational triangles with $\gamma = 2\alpha$ correspond to solutions of this equation with $c < a+b$ and $b < a+c$ and $a < b+c$. For example, $(4, 5, 6)$, and $(9, 7, 12)$.

Laczkovich [4] proves that an isosceles triangle can be dissected into triangles *similar* to the tile. See Fig. 23, which is based on the tile $(4, 5, 6)$. To make an N -tiling, we have to tile each of these

Figure 23: Laczkovich's dissection of isosceles ABC into triangles similar to $(4, 5, 6)$



triangles and the parallelogram with many copies of the same tile. Along each edge in the figure there is an arithmetical condition to satisfy. Working out those conditions, we find that more than five million tiles are required: 5861172 to be precise. It is not possible to print such a large tiling (unless one could use the side of a large building), and we do not know a smaller one. But at least, some such tilings do exist.

Nor do we know any theorems addressing the question of for which N such N -tilings exist. One difficulty is that there is no "coloring equation" in this case, since there might be three or there

might be four tiles meeting at a given boundary vertex. It is not difficult to derive the area equation in the form $X^2 = Nab$, where X is the length of the equal sides of ABC . That gives rise to a degree 8 equation for $\zeta = \cos \alpha + i \sin \alpha$. But we so far made no progress beyond that. We do not even know whether the tile has to be rational or not.

For the purposes of the present paper, it suffices to put a lower bound on N .

Theorem 11 *Let ABC be an isosceles triangle with base angles α . Let $\gamma = 2\alpha$. Suppose ABC is N -tiled by a tile with angles (α, β, γ) and α is not a rational multiple of π . Then N is at least 12.*

Remark. There is a big gap between 12 and 5861172. Is there a tiling with N in that range?

Proof. Suppose ABC is isosceles with base angles α , and is N -tiled as in the statement of the theorem. Let B be the vertex with angle $\alpha + \beta$. At any boundary vertex, there must either be $\alpha + \beta + \gamma$, or $3\alpha + \beta$. In particular, two γ angles cannot occur, and two β angles cannot occur. Let Tile 1 be the tile at A , and Tile 2 the tile at B . Since they have their α angles at A and B , neither one has its α angle at B . Without loss of generality we can assume that Tile 3, on the west at B , has its α angle at B , so there are at least two tiles on AB , with b or c edges there.

Let P be the eastern vertex of Tile 1 on AC . Then $P \neq C$ since Tile 1 does not have its α angle at P . Then Tile 1 and Tile 2 have their a sides connecting AC with AB and BC respectively, and hence the tiles sharing those a edges are not the same tile. Call them Tile 4 and Tile 5, respectively. Hence P is not also the western vertex of Tile 2.

In order that there not be two β or two γ angles at P , Tile 1 and Tile 4 must have different angles at P . It follows that the northern edge of Tile 4 is parallel to AC , and similarly, the northern edge of Tile 5 is parallel to AC . Let Tile 6 be the tile south of Tile 4. Then it has its α angle at P . Let Q be the western vertex of Tile 2, and Tile 7 the tile south of Tile 5. Then Tile 7 has its α angle at Q . Therefore Tiles 6 and 7 do not coincide, since 6 has its α angle to the west and 7 has its α angle to the east. Now we have accounted for seven distinct tiles, and there is still one more tile, say Tile 8, at vertex B that we have not counted yet.

Let R be the northern vertex of Tile 1, lying on AC . Then Tile 3 cannot have its southern vertex at R , since the tile on AB north of R must have its α angle there, but Tile 3 has its α angle at B . Therefore there is another tile, say Tile 9, with its southern vertex at R and an edge on AB , with its northern vertex on AB , call it S . Possibly S is the southern vertex of Tile 3, but there is at least one more tile, say Tile 10, with a vertex at S . Now there are three tiles with edges on AB , and none of those edges are a edges, since those three tiles all have an α angle at a vertex on AC . If there are only three tiles on AB , then at S there must be a β and a γ angle contributed by Tile 3 and Tile 10, since neither has an α angle there and two β or two γ angles cannot occur. Then Tile 11, between Tile 3 and Tile 10, has its α angle there, and its b and c sides extend beyond Tiles 3 and 10 respectively, which have their a edges ending at S . Tile 8, the second tile at B , therefore shares exactly a c edge with Tile 3, since Tile 8 has a β angle at B and hence cannot share a b edge with Tile 3. Then there is another tile south of Tile 8 and north of Tile 11, with its α angle at the southeast vertex of Tile 3. That is Tile 12. That completes the proof of the theorem.

11.6 Tilings of an equilateral triangle when $\alpha = \pi/3$ and β/π is irrational

Laczkovich's second table has an entry for the case when ABC is equilateral and $\alpha = \pi/3$. The second table assumes not all the angles are rational multiples of π , so this entry also assume that β , and hence γ , are not rational multiples of $\pi/3$.

Laczkovich's Theorem 3.1 [4] says that an equilateral ABC can be tiled by any rational tile with $\alpha = \pi/3$. There are infinitely many such rational tiles, as Laczkovich proves. The two simplest ones are $(7, 5, 8)$ and $(7, 3, 8)$.

We have $\beta + \gamma = 2\pi/3$, and without loss of generality we may assume $\beta < \pi/3 < \gamma$. Thus in a tiling of equilateral ABC , every vertex has the $\pi/3$ angle of a tile, and the only way to make a boundary vertex is as $\alpha + \beta + \gamma$, and every internal vertex has six tiles, two each of (α, β, γ) . Then the coloring number of the tiling can be defined as for the case $3\alpha + 2\beta = \pi$, and we have the coloring equation

$$M(a + b + c) = 3X \quad (19)$$

By the law of cosines we have

$$\begin{aligned} a^2 &= b^2 + c^2 - 2bc \cos(\pi/3) \\ a^2 &= b^2 + c^2 - bc \end{aligned} \quad (20)$$

The area equation is

$$\begin{aligned} X^2 \sin \pi/3 &= Nbc \sin \pi/3 \\ X^2 &= Nbc \end{aligned} \quad (21)$$

In unpublished work, we have interesting results about the existence or non-existence of such tilings, including a proof that the tile must be rational, and that the tile ratios b/a and c/a can be computed from N and M , and that N cannot be prime, which certainly covers the cases 7 and 11. But these proofs will not fit into the margin here, and instead we treat the cases $N = 7$ and 11 computationally, in less than two pages.

Lemma 13 *Let the equilateral triangle ABC be N -tiled by a tile with angles $(\pi/3, \beta, \gamma)$ with β not a rational multiple of π . Then $N \geq 12$.*

Proof. Let M be the coloring number of the tiling and (a, b, c) the sides of the tiles, with $b < a < c$. Let X be the length of the sides of ABC , and suppose $X = pa + qb + rc$. Then by (19)

$$M(a + b + c) = 3(pa + qb + rc).$$

Divide by a and put $s = b/a$, $t = c/a$:

$$M(1 + s + t) = 3(p + qs + rt) \quad (22)$$

By the law of cosines $a^2 = b^2 + c^2 - 2bc \cos \alpha$. Since $\cos \alpha = 1/2$, we have $c^2 = b^2 + c^2 - bc$, and dividing by a^2 we have $1 = s^2 + t^2 - st$. Hence $s^2 - st + (t^2 - 1) = 0$ and applying the quadratic formula we have

$$\begin{aligned} s &= t/2 \pm (1/2)\sqrt{t^2 - 4(t^2 - 1)} \\ 2s &= t \pm \sqrt{4 - 3t^2} \end{aligned}$$

Multiplying (22) by 2, we have

$$M(2 + 2s + t) = 6(p + qs + rt)$$

Putting the terms in s on the right,

$$\begin{aligned} 2M + Mt - 6p - 6rt &= (3q - M)2s \\ &= (3q - M)(t \pm \sqrt{4 - 3t^2}) \quad \text{by (23)} \\ 2M - 6p + (2M - 3q - 6r)t &= \pm(3q - M)\sqrt{4 - 3t^2} \\ (2M - 6r + (2M - 3q - 6r)t)^2 &= (3q - M)^2(4 - 3t^2) \end{aligned}$$

For fixed M and (p, q, r) this quadratic equation can be solved for t (if its discriminant is non-negative). For fixed N , we can solve it for every M, p, q, r less than N . These solutions will tell us the only possible values of $t = b/a$; that is, all other values of b/a are ruled out (they cannot occur in tilings). Fig. 24 shows the code.

Figure 24: Code for Lemma 13

```
def oct21(N):
    var('p,q,r,M,s,t')
    print("N=%d" % N)
    for M in range(1,N):
        print("M=%d" %M)
        for p in range(1,N-1):
            for q in range(1,N-p):
                for r in range(1,N-p-q):
                    eq1 = (2*M-6*p + (2*M-3*q-6*r)*t)^2 - (3*q-M)^2*(4-3*t^2)
                    answers = solve(eq1,t)
                    for ans in answers:
                        T = ans.rhs();
                        if 1< T and 4-3*T^2 >= 0:
                            print(T)
```

For $N = 7$ there are five solutions:

```
M=5
40/37
8/73*sqrt(61) + 20/73
14/211*sqrt(199) + 32/211
4/13*sqrt(10) + 2/13
M=6
1/4*sqrt(13) + 1/4
```

For $N = 11$ there are many solutions, but all with $M \geq 5$.

Now what we need to extract from these exact solutions is this fact: a is never an integer multiple of b . What the code in Fig. 24 found is formulas for $t = b/a$. So, we need to check that $1/t$ is never an integer. That is not so hard to do by just inspecting the output; but we can also check it by adding this code to Fig. 24 right after the `print(T)` command:

```
if 1/T in ZZ:
print "Failure"
```

Then just run the code again, and notice that `Failure` is never printed. Therefore, we may assume that a is not an integer multiple of b .

Let B and W be the numbers of black and white tiles, respectively. Then $M = B - W = N - 2W$. Thus $M \leq N - 2W$. To show $M < 5$ it suffices to show $2W > N - 5$. When $N = 7$ that is $W > 1$. When $N = 11$ it is $W > 3$.

Since the corner tiles (the ones with a vertex at A , B , or C) have their $\beta = \pi/3$ angles in the corner, they are three distinct tiles, so there are at least two tiles on each side of ABC , and hence

at least one vertex on the interior of each side. Assume, for proof by contradiction, that one sides of ABC has only two tile edges on it. We may assume that side is AC , and the two tiles have a common vertex P on AC . Since a is not an integer multiple of b , and b is the only shorter edge than a , the white tile at P must share exactly the whole a edge of each corner tile, which is a contradiction, since it has only one a edge to share. Therefore, each side of ABC has at least three tile edges on it. That makes six notches between the black triangles that have to be filled by white triangles. Six notches have twelve sides, so at least four white triangles are required to fill them. Hence $W > 3$. That completes the proof both for $N = 7$ and $N = 11$.

12 No 7-tilings

We break the proof that there are no 7-tilings or 11-tilings into two cases, according as the angles are commensurable or not. All the required cases have already been dealt with: it only remains to put the pieces together.

Theorem 12 *Suppose (α, β, γ) are all rational multiples of 2π . Then there is no 7-tiling of any triangle ABC by a tile with angles (α, β, γ) . Moreover, there is no N -tiling by such a tile for $N = 11, 19, 31$ or any number which is neither a square, sum of squares, or 2, 3, or 6 times a square.*

Remark. Any odd N which is not divisible by 3 but is divisible by some prime congruent to 3 mod 4 meets the conditions of the theorem.

Proof. Assume, for proof by contradiction, that there is such a tiling. By Theorem 8, the pair ABC and (α, β, γ) (after a suitable renaming of the angles) occurs in Table 2. But 7 does not match any of the forms of N listed in that table, which are the forms listed in the final sentence of the theorem. That completes the proof.

Finally we have arrived at the main theorem.

Theorem 13 *There are no 7-tilings or 11-tilings.*

Proof. Suppose, for proof by contradiction, that triangle ABC is 7-tiled by a tile with angles (α, β, γ) . Since 7 is not a square or a sum of two squares, then by [8], ABC is not similar to the tile. Then according to Theorem 12, not all the angles (α, β, γ) are rational multiples of π . Then according to [4], the tiling must correspond to one of the rows in Table 3 in this paper.

For our purpose these rows will be combined into five cases: Either $3\alpha + 2\beta = \pi$, or $\gamma = 2\pi/3$, or ABC is isosceles with base angles α and $\gamma = \pi/2$, or ABC is isosceles with base angles α and $\gamma = 2\alpha$, or ABC is equilateral and $\alpha = \pi/3$.

In case ABC is equilateral and $\alpha = \pi/3$, Lemma 13 tells us there is no 7-tiling or 11-tiling.

In case ABC is isosceles with base angles α and $\gamma = \pi/2$, Theorem 5 tells us that N is twice a square. But 7 and 11 fail this condition. Hence that case is inapplicable. Theorem 11 tells us that the case when ABC is isosceles and $\gamma = 2\alpha$ is impossible.

In case $3\alpha + 2\beta = \pi$, Theorem 9 tells us there is no 7-tiling or 11-tiling. In case $\gamma = 2\pi/3$, by Theorem 10 there is no 7-tiling or 11-tiling. That completes the proof of the theorem.

13 Some new tilings and open problems

The next cases for which we think there are no N -tilings are $N = 14, 19, 21, 23, 29, 31, 41$. We know there are no N -tilings for these numbers when $3\alpha + 2\beta = \pi$, as discussed below. The possible tile shapes for which these N are not yet settled are when $\gamma = 2\alpha$, or $\gamma = 2\pi/3$. These numbers are all primes, so the case when ABC is equilateral and $\gamma = \pi/3$ is settled by our as-yet-unpublished proof that there is no N -tiling for N prime in that case. The difficulty with the unsolved cases is that there is no coloring equation for those cases, which puts a serious crimp in both our theoretical and computational methods.

This paper has successfully avoided the need to appeal to the hundred pages of theoretical work on the case $3\alpha + 2\beta = \pi$, by means of an algebraic and computation shortcut that works only for small values of N . In this section we nevertheless mention some results of that investigation. In effect, we expand the lines with $3\alpha + 2\beta = \pi$ in Table 3 by adding a third column with restrictions on the possible form of N . In some cases this is a necessary and sufficient condition; in others it is only a necessary condition. Where the necessary and sufficient conditions do not match, there are open questions. Whether there are yet-undiscovered tilings, or our necessary conditions are too weak, we do not know. Table 4 gives a summary of what we know about $N \leq 100$. If there is no line in the table for N , there is no N -tiling with $3\alpha + 2\beta = \pi$. If there is a line, we know what the coloring number M and the tile and the shape of ABC must be, and in some cases we have tilings in hand. Figures 25 and 26 show some examples of tilings unknown before 2011 and 2108, respectively. We also have many examples of larger tilings.

Table 4: Possible N -tilings with $3\alpha + 2\beta = \pi$ for $N \leq 100$

N	M	(a, b, c)	(A, B, C)	tiling exists
26	4	(3, 8, 9)	isosceles- β	no
28	2	(2, 3, 4)	triquadratic	yes
39	7	(12, 7, 16)	isosceles- β	no
44	6	(2, 3, 4)	isosceles- β	yes
45	3	(6, 5, 9)	isosceles- $\alpha + \beta$?
47	5	(4, 15, 16)	isosceles- β	?
48	4	(2, 3, 4)	isosceles- $\alpha + \beta$	yes
59	9	(20, 9, 25)	isosceles- β	?
66	8	(15, 16, 25)	isosceles- β	?
70	8	(6, 5, 9)	isosceles- α	?
71	7	(10, 21, 25)	isosceles- β	?
72	6	(3, 8, 9)	isosceles- $\alpha + \beta$?
74	6	(5, 24, 25)	isosceles- β	?
75	5	(2, 3, 4)	isosceles- $\alpha + \beta$?
77	5	(2, 3, 4)	$(2\alpha, \alpha, 2\beta)$?
83	11	(30, 11, 36)	isosceles- β	?
84	10	(2, 3, 4)	isosceles- α	yes
92	10	(6, 5, 9)	isosceles- β	?
99	3	(30, 11, 3)	isosceles- $\alpha + \beta$?
99	9	(2, 3, 4)	isosceles- β	?
100	5	(15, 16, 25)	isosceles- $\alpha + \beta$?

Figure 25: A tiling with $N = 28$ and $3\alpha + \beta = \pi$, and tile $(2, 3, 4)$





Figure 26: Tilings with $N = 44$ and 48 , with $3\alpha + \beta = \pi$ and tile $(2, 3, 4)$



References

- [1] Steve Butler, Fan R. K. Chung, Ronald L. Graham, and Miklós Laczkovich. Tiling Polygons with Lattice Triangles. *Discrete and Computational Geometry*, 44:896–903, 2010.
- [2] Henri Cohen. *Number Theory, Volume 1: Tools and Diophantine Equations*. Springer, 2007.
- [3] M. Laczkovich. Tilings of polygons with similar triangles. *Combinatorica*, 10:281–306, 1990.
- [4] M. Laczkovich. Tilings of triangles. *Discrete Mathematics*, 140:79–94, 1995.
- [5] M. Laczkovich. Tilings of Polygons with Similar Triangles, II. *Discrete and Computational Geometry*, 19:411–425, 1998.
- [6] M. Laczkovich and G. Szekeres. Tilings of the Square with Similar Rectangles. *Discrete and Computational Geometry*, 13:569–572, 1995.
- [7] Percy Alexander MacMahon. *New Mathematical Pastimes*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, England, 1921.
- [8] Stephen L. Snover, Charles Waiveris, and John K. Williams. Rep-tiling for triangles. *Discrete Mathematics*, 91:193–200, 1991.
- [9] Alexander Soifer. *How Does One Cut a Triangle?* Springer, 2009.
- [10] W. A. Stein et al. *Sage Mathematics Software (Version 8.0)*. The Sage Development Team, 2017. <http://www.sagemath.org>.