An Elementary Proof of “the Most Elementary Theorem” of Euclidean Geometry
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Abstract. We give a fairly elementary proof of the fact that if $ABB'$ and $AC'C$ are triples of collinear points with the line segments $BC$ and $B'C'$ intersecting at $D$, then $d(AB) + d(BD) = d(AC') + d(C'D)$ if and only if $d(AB') + d(B'D) = d(AC') + d(C'D)$, where $d(XY)$ denotes the length of the line segment joining $X$ and $Y$. The “only if” part of this theorem is attributed to Urquhart, and referred to by Dan Pedoe as the most elementary theorem of Euclidean Geometry. We also give a simple proof of a variant of Urquhart’s theorem that was discovered by Pedoe.
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1. Introduction

“The most elementary theorem” referred to in the title states that if $ABB'$ and $AC'C$ are triples of collinear points with the line segments $BC$ and $B'C'$ intersecting at $D$ and if the distances obey $d(AB) + d(BD) = d(AC') + d(C'D)$, then $d(AB') + d(B'D) = d(AC') + d(C'D)$ (see Fig. 1). The origin and some history of this theorem are discussed in [1], where the author attributes the theorem to the late L.M. Urquhart (1902–1966) who “discovered it when considering some of the fundamental concepts of the theory of special relativity”, and where he asserts that “the proof by purely geometric methods is not elementary”, giving variants and equivalent forms of the theorem and citing references where proofs can be found. In this note, we give an elementary proof that is also conceptual and fairly free of computations. The proof, however, does involve circles together with rather unconventional arguments, and as such it may not satisfy D. Pedoe’s curiosity regarding the existence of a circle-free proof of Urquhart’s Theorem.
2. Some preparatory remarks

We fix in the Euclidean plane two reference rays $Ax$ and $Ay$. If $t$ is a positive number, and if $X$ and $Y$ are the points on $Ax$ and $Ay$ with $d(AX) = d(AY) = t$, then there is a unique circle $\Omega_t$ that touches $Ax$ at $X$ and $Ay$ and $Y$. The shorter arc joining $X$ and $Y$ along $\Omega_t$ is denoted by $\Gamma_t$ or by $X\hat{Y}$, and it is called the arc $XY$ (see Fig. 2). The term arc will always stand for an arc of this type. Similarly, the term segment will always stand for a line segment that joins a point on $Ax$ with a point on $Ay$, this time not requiring that these points are equidistant from $A$.

If $BC$ is a segment, and if the $A$-excircle of $ABC$ touches $Ax$ at $B^*$ and $Ay$ at $C^*$, then the arc $B^* \hat{C}^*$ is called the ex-arc of $BC$ (see Fig. 3). It is useful to observe that $d(AB^*) = d(AC^*) = p(ABC)/2$, where $p(ABC)$ denotes the perimeter of $ABC$.

It is intuitively obvious that different arcs do not intersect each other. To see this, let $\alpha$ be the angle between $Ax$ and the angle bisector $Az$ of $xAy$, let $Aw$ be a ray making an angle $\beta \leq \alpha$ with $Az$ and meeting the arc $\Gamma_t = \hat{XY}$ at $W$, as shown in Fig. 4, and let $\rho = \cos \beta / \cos \alpha$. Let $O$ be the center of $\Omega_t$, $r$ be its radius, and $s$ be the length of the perpendicular $OP$ to $Aw$. Then

$$d(AW) = d(AP) - d(PW) = d(AO) \cos \beta - \sqrt{r^2 - s^2}$$
$$= d(AO) \cos \beta - \sqrt{(d(AY) \tan \alpha)^2 - (d(AO) \sin \beta)^2}$$
$$= t \sec \alpha \cos \beta - \sqrt{t^2 \tan^2 \alpha - t^2 \sec^2 \alpha \sin^2 \beta}$$
$$= t \left( \rho - \sqrt{\sec^2 \alpha - 1 - \sec^2 \alpha \sin^2 \beta} \right)$$
$$= t \left( \rho - \sqrt{\rho^2 - 1} \right).$$
showing that \(d(AW)\) increases with \(t\) and that different arcs do not intersect.

![Figure 4: Different arcs do not intersect](image1)

![Figure 5: Proving eq. (1)](image2)

The triangle determined by an arc is the curvilinear triangular region enclosed between the reference rays \(Ax, Ay\) and that arc. Similarly, the triangle determined by a segment is the ordinary triangular region enclosed in the reference rays and that segment. A segment (or arc) is said to lie above another segment (or arc) if the triangle determined by the first is contained in the one determined by the second. We reiterate that due to the fact that different arcs do not intersect, this lying-above partial order on the set of segments and arcs restricts to a total order on the set of arcs.

We shall also make use of the again intuitively obvious fact that if a line \(XY\) does not intersect a circle \(\Omega\) and if \(x\) and \(y\) are the lengths of the tangent lines from \(X\) and \(Y\) to \(\Omega\), then

\[
d(YX) + x > y. \tag{1}
\]

To see this, note that \(Y\) cannot lie in the region enclosed by the tangent lines from \(X\) to \(\Omega\). Therefore, the point \(Y\) and \(\Omega\) lie on the same side of one of the tangents \(XX'\) to \(\Omega\) (see Fig. 5). Similarly, the point \(X\) and \(\Omega\) lie on the same side of one of the tangents \(YY'\) to \(\Omega\). Since \(Y, X, X'\) are not collinear, \(YX'\) is not tangent to \(\Omega\) and therefore crosses it at a point \(Z\) that lies between \(Y\) and \(X'\). From \(d(YX')^2 = d(YZ)d(YX')\), it follows that \(d(YX') > d(YY')\) and hence \(d(YX) + d(XX') > d(YX') > d(YY')\), as desired. It is worth mentioning that (1) still holds under the weaker assumption that \(Y\) does not lie in the one quarter \(Q\) determined by the two tangent lines from \(X\) to \(\Omega\) and not bordering on \(\Omega\).

### 3. The proof

We are now ready to prove a stronger version of Urquhart’s Theorem, together with its converse. Note that Urquhart’s Theorem states that in Theorem 1 the second equality of (i) implies the third equality. It is curious why its converse is not mentioned at all in [1].

**Theorem 1.** Let \(BC\) and \(B'C'\) be two segments that intersect at \(D\).

(i) If the ex-arcs of \(BC\) and \(B'C'\) coincide, then

\[
p(ABC) = p(AB'C'), \quad p(ABD) = p(AC'D), \quad p(AB'D) = p(ACD). \tag{2}
\]

(ii) If the ex-arc of \(BC\) lies strictly above the ex-arc of \(B'C'\), then

\[
p(ABC) < p(AB'C'), \quad p(ABD) < p(AC'D), \quad p(AB'D) < p(ACD). \tag{3}
\]
Thus if
and therefore
we see that any two of the equalities in (2) imply the third. It is trivial that
Noting that
we let
Proof. Suppose that the ex-arc of $BC$ lies above (or on) the ex-arc of $B'C'$. Then the segment $BC$ lies above the ex-arc of $B'C'$. We draw the ex-arc $\overline{UV}$ of $B'C'$, and we let $BC^*$ be the segment tangent to $\overline{UV}$ (see Fig. 6). We let $D^*$ be the point where $BC^*$ intersects $B'C'$, and we let $X$ and $X'$ be the points where $BC^*$ and $B'C^*$ touch $\overline{UV}$.

![Figure 6: Illustrating the proof of Theorem 1](image)

Noting that
we see that any two of the equalities in (2) imply the third. It is trivial that $p(ABC^*) = p(AB'C')$, each being equal to $2d(AU)$. Also,

$\begin{align*}
p(ABD^*) - p(AC'D^*) &= (d(AB) + d(BD^*)) - (d(AC') + d(C'D^*)) \\
&= (d(AB) + d(BX) + d(XD^*)) - (d(AC') + d(C'X') + d(X'D^*)) \\
&= (d(AB) + d(BU) + d(XD^*)) - (d(AC') + d(C'V) + d(X'D^*)) \\
&= (d(AU) - d(AV)) + (d(XD^*) - d(X'D^*)) = 0,
\end{align*}$

and therefore $p(ABD^*) = p(AC'D^*)$. Hence

$p(ABC^*) = p(AC'B'), \quad p(ABD^*) = p(AC'D^*), \quad p(AB'D^*) = p(AC^*D^*).$

Thus if $BC$ coincides with $BC^*$, then (2) holds. This proves (i). Otherwise, we have

$\begin{align*}
p(AB'C') &= p(ABC^*) > p(ABC), \\
p(AC'D) &> p(AC'D^*) = p(ABD^*) > p(ABD), \\
p(ACD) - p(AB'D) &= (d(AC) + d(CD)) - (d(AB') + d(B'D)) \\
&= (d(AC) + d(CD) + d(D'D) + d(D'X')) \\
&\quad - (d(AB') + d(B'D) + d(D'D) + d(D'X')) \\
&= d(AC) + (d(CD) + d(DX')) - (d(AB') + d(B'X')) \\
&\quad \overset{(1)}{=} d(AC) + d(CV) - (d(AB') + d(B'U)) \\
&= 0.
\end{align*}$
This proves (ii).

In order to prove (iii), note that if any of the equalities of (2) holds, then (ii) would imply that the ex-arcs of $BC$ and $B'C'$ coincide. The rest follows from (i).

We end this note by rephrasing and giving a simple proof of an equivalent of Urquhart’s Theorem that was obtained by D. Pedoe by applying the method of reciprocal polars, invoking the contentious shades of Poncelet, Gergonne, Plücker and even Möbius. Without venturing to call this “the most elementary theorem of circle geometry”, D. Pedoe asserts that it is clear that this is not a trivial theorem. The theorem states that

if $BACD$ is a parallelogram and if a circle touches the sides $AB$ and $AC$ and intersects $BC$ in the points $E$ and $F$, then there exists a circle which touches (the extensions of) $DB$ and $DC$ and passes through $E$ and $F$.

We make the observation that since $ABC$ and $DCB$ are glide reflections of each other, statements about $DCB$ can be glide-reflected into appropriate statements about $ABC$, rendering $DCB$ redundant. Thus the theorem can be restated as follows.

**Theorem 2.** A variant of Pedoe’s equivalent of Urquhart’s Theorem: If $ABC$ is a triangle and if a circle touches the sides $AB$ and $AC$ and intersects $BC$ in the points $E$ and $F$, then there exists a circle which touches the extensions of $AB$ and $AC$ and passes through the reflections $E^*$ and $F^*$ of $E$ and $F$ about the midpoint of $BC$.

**Proof.** We place $ABC$ in our reference frame $xAy$ so that $BC$ is a segment, and our circle is $\Omega_t$ for some $t$. Letting $x = x(t) = d(BE)$ and $y = y(t) = d(CF)$, we see that $(x, y)$ is the necessarily unique solution of the system

$$x(a - y) = (c - t)^2, \quad y(a - x) = (b - t)^2.$$  

This system is clearly invariant under the simultaneous substitutions $(x \leftrightarrow y)$ and $(t \rightarrow b + c - t)$. Therefore, letting $s = b + c - t$, we see that the circle $\Omega_s$ has the desired property.

It is worth mentioning that the domain of definition of $x(t)$ and $y(t)$ is the closed interval $J = [(-a + b + c)/2, (a + b + c)/2]$, where the endpoints are the values of $t$ which correspond to the incircle and excircle.

Finally, I find it rather curious that not much, if any, research was generated by the appearance of [1], in spite of its intriguing title, its interesting content and the provocatively simple questions it raises, and in spite of being written by the author of such an attractive book as [2].
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