

# SYMMETRIC PERPENDICULARITY IN HILBERT GEOMETRIES

P. J. KELLY AND L. J. PAIGE

1. **Introduction.** A hilbert plane geometry [2] can be generated in the following way. Let  $K$  be a simple, closed, convex curve in the euclidean plane and  $H$  its open interior. If  $a$  and  $b$  are any two points in  $H$ , they determine a line  $a \times b$ <sup>1</sup> which intersects  $K$  in a pair of points  $u$  and  $v$ . With  $R$  denoting cross-ratio, the hilbert distance from  $a$  to  $b$  is defined by

$$h(a, b) = k |\log R(a, b; u, v)|,$$

where  $k$  is an arbitrary positive constant. The region  $H$  is then a metric set with respect to  $K$ . Under the additional requirement that  $K$  contain at most one segment,  $H$  defines a hilbert plane geometry in which any pair of points are uniquely connected by a geodesic, and these geodesics are open straight lines. If  $K$  is an ellipse, then the hilbert geometry coincides with the well-known Klein model of hyperbolic geometry.

Perpendicularity in  $H$  is defined through the idea of distance. If  $p$  and  $\xi$  are any point and line respectively, then a point  $f$  on  $\xi$  is a "foot of  $p$  on  $\xi$ " if  $h(p, f) \leq h(p, x)$  for all points  $x$  on  $\xi$ . A line  $\eta$ , intersecting  $\xi$ , is perpendicular to  $\xi$  if every point on  $\eta$  has the point of intersection,  $\xi \times \eta$ , as a foot on  $\xi$ . Under this definition, there is no need for the perpendicularity of  $\eta$  to  $\xi$  to imply the perpendicularity of  $\xi$  to  $\eta$ . The aim here is to show that when perpendicularity is always symmetric, the hilbert geometry is hyperbolic.

As before, let  $p$  and  $\xi$  be any point and line in  $H$ , and let  $\eta$  be a line passing through  $p$  and intersecting  $K$  in the points  $u$  and  $v$ . It can be shown quite simply that a necessary and sufficient condition for  $\eta$  to be perpendicular to  $\xi$  is that a pair of supporting lines exist, one at  $u$  and one at  $v$ , intersecting at a point  $w$  on  $\xi$  [1]. If  $\eta$  is perpendicular to  $\xi$ , then the previous statement implies that  $\eta$  is also perpendicular to every line through  $w$  which is a secant to  $K$ . When such a secant cuts  $K$  at points  $m$  and  $n$ , then symmetry of perpendicularity requires that a supporting line exist at  $m$ , and one at  $n$ , such that the two intersect on  $\eta$ .

---

<sup>1</sup>Here and henceforth the line joining  $a$  and  $b$  will be indicated by  $a \times b$ , and symmetrically the point of intersection on lines  $\xi$  and  $\eta$  by  $\xi \times \eta$ .

Received February 1, 1952.

*Pacific J. Math.* 2 (1952), 319-322

2. **The family  $F$ .** The foregoing facts suggested the independent problem of identifying the following family of curves.

*Family  $F$ :* Every curve  $C$  in  $F$  is a simple, closed, convex curve. If supporting lines at  $p$  and  $q$  on  $C$  meet at  $w$ , and  $\xi$  is any secant through  $w$ , cutting  $C$  at  $m$  and  $n$ , then supporting lines at  $m$  and  $n$  exist, intersecting on  $p \times q$ .

We are going to show that the family  $F$  consists of all triangles and ellipses.

LEMMA 1. *If a curve  $C$  in  $F$  contains a straight line segment then the curve is a triangle.*

*Proof.* Let  $a$  and  $b$  denote the end points of a segment contained in  $C$ , and take  $p$  to be a regular point (a point of  $C$  with unique supporting line) of  $C$  which is not on  $\xi = a \times b$ . If  $\sigma$  denotes the supporting line at  $p$ , assume that  $q = \sigma \times \xi$  is not a point of  $C$ . Because the secants to  $C$  through  $q$  form a continuum, while the corner points (points possessing more than one supporting line) of  $C$  are denumerable, there exists a secant  $\eta$ , through  $q$ , such that its intersections with  $C$  are two regular points  $m$  and  $n$ . But by the definition of  $C$ , the unique supporting lines at  $m$  and  $n$  must intersect on  $p \times b$  and also on  $p \times a$ . Hence they intersect at  $p$ , which contradicts the fact that  $p$  is regular. Therefore the intersection  $\sigma \times \xi$  is a point of  $C$ , and so is either  $a$  or  $b$ . Suppose it to be  $a$ . The segment from  $a$  to  $p$  is then part of  $C$ . Let  $c$  denote the other end of the largest segment contained in  $C$  and containing the segment from  $a$  to  $p$ . Let  $r$  be a regular point of  $C$ , not on  $\xi$  nor on  $\gamma = a \times p$ , and let  $\delta$  be the supporting line at  $r$ . By the same reasoning as before, the points  $\xi \times \delta$  and  $\delta \times \gamma$  must lie on  $C$ , and hence are the points  $b$  and  $c$  respectively. Thus  $C$  is the triangle  $a, b, c$ .

LEMMA 2. *If a curve  $C$  in  $F$  contains a corner point, then the curve is a triangle.*

*Proof.* Let  $p$  be a corner point on  $C$ , with  $\delta_1$  and  $\delta_2$  two supporting lines at  $p$ . Assume: (\*) that no supporting line contains two points of  $C$ . Let  $q$  and  $r$  be any two regular points of  $C$ , with  $\sigma$  and  $\eta$  denoting their respective supporting lines. Set  $u_i = \sigma \times \delta_i$  ( $i = 1, 2$ ) and  $v = \eta \times (p \times q)$ . Because of (\*), the line  $u_i \times r$  is a secant, and intersects  $C$  again at a point  $s_i$  ( $i = 1, 2$ ). By the definition of  $C$ , at  $s_i$  a supporting line exists which intersects  $\eta$  at a point of  $p \times q$ , namely at the point  $v$ . But because of (\*), the point  $v$  is exterior to  $C$ . In addition to  $\eta$ , then, there can be only one other supporting line through  $v$ . Hence the lines  $v \times s_1$  and  $v \times s_2$  are the same, which contradicts (\*). Because (\*) is false,  $C$  contains a segment, and so, by Lemma 1, it is a triangle.

THEOREM 1. *The family F consists of all ellipses and all nondegenerate triangles.*

*Proof.* If  $C$  contains a segment or a corner point then it is a triangle; so suppose  $C$  to be strictly convex and differentiable. Let  $p_1$  and  $p_2$  be two points of  $C$  such that the supporting lines,  $\sigma_1$  and  $\sigma_2$ , at  $p_1$  and  $p_2$  are parallel. Introduce a rectangular reference frame so that  $p_1$  is the origin,  $\sigma_1$  is the  $y$ -axis, and with  $p_2$  lying in the first quadrant. Take  $\theta$  to denote the acute angle between the line  $\eta = p_1 \times p_2$  and the  $x$ -axis, and let  $\sigma_2$  be the line  $x = k$ . A vertical chord of  $C$ , lying on the line  $\sigma(x)$  through  $(x, 0)$ , is cut by  $\eta$  into an upper and lower segment such that the ratio of their lengths,  $\mu(x)$ , is constant for all  $x$  on the interval  $\langle 0, k \rangle$ . To prove this, let  $T$  be the affinity  $y' = -x \tan \theta + y$ ,  $x' = x$ , taking  $C$  into a new convex curve  $C'$ . Under  $T$ , the line  $\eta$  goes into the  $x$ -axis, which separates  $C'$  into an upper curve  $y_1 = f_1(x)$  and a lower curve  $y_2 = f_2(x)$ . Because  $T$  preserves distance on any vertical line, the ratio  $\mu(x)$  equals  $f_1(x)/f_2(x)$ . The line  $\sigma(x)$  is a secant to  $C$  through  $\sigma_1 \times \sigma_2$ ; hence the tangents to  $C$ , at its intersections with  $\sigma(x)$ , are lines which intersect on  $\tilde{\eta}$ . Then  $C'$  has the property that the tangents at  $(x, f_1(x))$  and  $(x, f_2(x))$  intersect on the  $x$ -axis. From simple triangle relations it follows that

$$\frac{f_1'(x)}{f_1(x)} = \frac{f_2'(x)}{f_2(x)}$$

for  $x$  on  $\langle 0, k \rangle$ . If  $a$  is fixed, and  $x$  is variable, on  $\langle 0, k \rangle$ , then the equality

$$\int_a^x \frac{f_1'(x) dx}{f_1(x)} = \int_a^x \frac{f_2'(x) dx}{f_2(x)}$$

shows that

$$\frac{f_1(x)}{f_2(x)} = \frac{f_1(a)}{f_2(a)}$$

and hence that  $\mu(x)$  is a constant. The original curve  $C$ , therefore, has the property that if a line joins the contact points of two tangents which are parallel in a direction  $\alpha$ , then the line cuts all chords parallel to  $\alpha$  in a ratio which is constant (with  $\alpha$ ). But then it is known that the ratio is unity for all directions and that the curve is an ellipse [3]. Since it is easily shown that either a triangle or an ellipse does belong to the family  $F$ , the theorem is complete. In particular, it may be noted that the property of family  $F$ , applied to strictly convex curves, characterizes the ellipse.

3. **Symmetric perpendicularity.** The answer to the original problem is now clear. When perpendicularity is symmetric in a hilbert geometry, then the curve  $C$  belongs to the family  $F$ . Since  $C$  can have at most one segment, it is not a triangle, and hence is an ellipse. Therefore the geometry is hyperbolic. Thus we have proved the following theorem.

**THEOREM 2.** *The hilbert geometries in which perpendicularity is symmetric are the hyperbolic geometries.*

The result obviously extends to higher dimensions. Perpendicularity refers to lines in the same plane. When the perpendicularity is symmetric, every plane section of the gauge surface  $K$  is an ellipse; hence  $K$  is an ellipsoid which defines a higher dimensional hyperbolic geometry.

#### REFERENCES

1. H. Buseman and P. Kelly, *Projective geometry and projective metrics* (In Press), Chapter 3, Section 7.
2. David Hilbert, *Grundlagen der Geometrie, Anhang I*, Seventh Edition, Leipzig, 1930.
3. Tadahiko Kubota, *On a characteristic property of the ellipse*, Tohoku Math. J. 9 (1916), 148-151.

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, SANTA BARBARA  
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, LOS ANGELES