## 2.C. An Easy Trisection Fallacy

We have already noted that any purported straightedge and compass construction for trisecting an angle will be incorrect. The following simple example illustrates how appealing such a construction might appear at first and how one can look more closely to find a mistake.

Suppose we are given an angle  $\angle$  **BAE** as in the diagram below and we wish to trisect it. Let's assume that the lengths of the segments [**BA**] and [**AE**] are equal, say to *r*. It is known that segments can be divided into any number of pieces of equal length by straightedge and compass, so apply this to segment [**BE**] and divide it into three equal segments that we shall call [**BC**], [**CD**] and [**DE**]. If we look at the picture it might seem that the rays [**AC** and [**AD** trisect  $\angle$  **BAE**, but is this really true?



One can use the classical methods of Euclidean geometry to conclude that the segments **[AC]** and **[AD]** have equal length, and it is possible to analyze this figure even further using classical methods, but we shall take a shortcut using trigonometry.

Let *h* denote the common altitude of the isosceles triangles  $\triangle$ BAE and  $\triangle$ CAD, and let **|XY|** denote the length of the segment joining X and Y. Then standard results in trigonometry imply the following relationships:

 $\tan \frac{1}{2} \angle BAE = |BE|/2h$   $\tan \frac{1}{2} \angle CAD = |CD|/2h = |BE|/6h$ 

From these formulas we conclude that  $\tan \frac{1}{2} \angle CAD$  is one third of  $\tan \frac{1}{2} \angle BAE$ . If this construction yielded a trisection then we would have a trigonometric identity of the form

$$(\tan x)/3 = \tan (x/3)$$

and one can check directly from tables (or a scientific calculator) that the first expression is always greater than the second. Since the tangent function is strictly increasing, it follows that *the measure of the middle angle is always larger than the measures of the angles on both sides*.

It is also possible to disprove this trisection fallacy using classical methods from Euclidean geometry, but the argument is somewhat longer.