Re: Why has no one confirmed or refuted this?

Source: http://sci.tech−archive.net/Archive/sci.math/2007−08/msg03619.html

- *From*: tommy1729 <tommy1729@xxxxxxxxx>

- *Date*: Wed, 22 Aug 2007 09:58:06 EDT

danny wrote:

> > Danny wrote:
> >
> > That there are no more than 5 known
>
> deficient by just 2 triangle numbers!
>
> > Where each of the 5 have a one to one
> > relationship to the Fermat primes.
> >
> > These deficient by 2 triangle numbers are
> > even more rare than the even perfect
> > numbers which are also triangle numbers
> > and with a one to one relationship
> > to the Mersenne primes.
> >
> > Dan
>
> are you the same danny who investigated Leroy
> sequences ?...

Yes!

> your statement seems intresting , but forgive me i

dont >understand;

my english is not so good :s

what is deficient ? plz explain.

tommy1729

(((Correction!!)))
_____

Starting with the even perfect numbers −−
6,28,496..

The sum of its divisors but not including itself.

6 = 1+2+3
28 = 1+2+4+7+14
496 = 1+2+4+8+16+31+62+124+248
etc.

i knew that :−)

but thanks anyways id say since im polite :−)

Where an integer is deficient −−

3 = 1 + no other devisors therefore 3 is deficient
by just 2
10 = 1+2+5 = 8 so 10 is deficient by just 2.
Wrong below −−
136 = 1+2+8+17+34+68 = 134 etc.
Should be−−
136 = 1+2+4+8+17+34+68 = 134 etc.

The other 2 known deficient by 2 triangle numbers
are −−
32896
2147516416
All triangle numbers and each having a one to one
relationship with the 5 known Fermat primes.
3,5,17,257,65537

Dan

so 134 is a sum of two triangles ?

and no other integer have a deficient that is the sum of 2 triangles ?

what about primes ?? prime = triangle + triangle + 1 ??

how do you mean related to fermat primes ?

in what way ??

regards
tommy1729
.