## Aristotle's Axiom in neutral geometry

The following result receives a fair amount of attention in Greenberg:

<u>Theorem (Aristotle's Axiom).</u> Assume that we are working inside a neutral plane. Let  $\angle$ BAC be an acute angle, and let k be a positive real number. Then there are points X and Y on (AC and (AB respectively such that XY is perpendicular to AC and d(X, Y) > k.

**<u>Proof.</u>** The idea is simple: We start out with any pair of points X and Y satisfying the all the conditions in the theorem except perhaps the inequality, and then we construct a new pair of points such X and Y that d(U, V) is at least twice d(X, Y). If this construction is repeated enough times, then the Archimedean Law implies that we shall obtain a pair of points for which the distance is greater than k.

Suppose that we are given points  $X_0$  and  $Y_0$  satisfying all the conditions in the theorem except possibly the inequality; since is acute and  $Y_0$  lies on (AB, it follows that the foot  $X_0$  of the perpendicular from  $Y_0$  to AC lies on the ray (AC. Choose  $Y_1$  on (AB such that  $Y_0$  is the midpoint of [AY<sub>1</sub>]; if  $X_1$  is the foot of the perpendicular from  $Y_1$  to AC, then as in the preceding sentence we know that  $X_1$  also lies on (AC. Furthermore, the midpoint condition implies the betweenness relationship  $A*Y_0*Y_1$ , so that A and  $Y_1$  lie on opposite sides of the line  $X_0Y_0$ . Since  $X_0Y_0$  and  $X_1Y_1$  have a common perpendicular, it follows that all points of the second line are on the same side of the first, and hence A and  $X_1$  lie on oppositie sides of  $X_0Y_0$ , so that we have  $A*X_0*X_1$ .



Now choose Z so that  $Y_0$  is the midpoint of [XZ]. Then by SAS we have  $\triangle AY_0X_0 \cong \triangle Y_1Y_0Z$ ; therefore, it follows that  $Y_1Z$  is perpendicular to  $X_0Z = X_0Y_0$ . If we combine all the perpendicularity conditions, we see that  $X_0$ ,  $X_1$ ,  $Y_1$ , Z form the vertices of a Lambert quadrilateral with right angles at all vertices except possibly  $Y_1$ . Therefore Exercise V.3.9 implies that  $d(X_0, Z) \leq d(X_1, Y_1)$  [*Note:* The statement of that exercise should be corrected to state that there are right angles at A, B and D.]. By construction we also know that  $d(X_0, Z) = 2d(X_0, Y_0)$ , and hence it also follows that  $d(X_0, Y_0) \leq \frac{1}{2}d(X_1, Y_1)$ ; as indicated above, this suffices to complete the argument.