

**A NEW PROOF OF THE PYTHAGOREAN THEOREM
INSPIRED BY NOVEL CHARACTERIZATIONS OF UNITAL
ALGEBRAS**

FRED GREENSITE

ABSTRACT. A new proof of the Pythagorean Theorem is presented, based on George Birkhoff's version of the postulates of Euclidean geometry as incorporating \mathbb{R} . The proof is inspired by novel characterizations of unital associative algebras having \mathbb{R}^n as the vector space of elements.

1. THE ORIGIN OF THE PROOF, AND ITS GENERALIZATION TO ALGEBRAS

For geometrical purposes, it has often proved useful to attach a real number to each member of a vector space, where this association is intended to become an intrinsic property of the space. For the case of \mathbb{R}^n , this entails identifying a function $\ell : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ that encodes features we wish to graft onto \mathbb{R}^n , such as that which attends the (degree-1 positive) homogeneity expressed by $\ell(\alpha s) = \alpha \ell(s)$ for $\alpha > 0$, and the concept of a unit sphere $\{s \in \mathbb{R}^n : \ell(s) = 1\}$ with respect to which, e.g., isotropy can be defined. We might also insist that ℓ be continuously differentiable on relevant domains and have an exterior derivative as $\nabla \ell(s) \cdot ds$, where $\nabla \ell(s)$ is defined as the ordered n -tuple of coordinate-wise one-dimensional derivatives. Evidently, s and $\nabla \ell(s)$ are both members of \mathbb{R}^n . However, the latter behave very differently if s is replaced by αs . By the Euler Homogeneous Function Theorem, degree-1 positive homogeneity of ℓ implies $s \cdot \nabla \ell(s) = \ell(s)$. For $\alpha > 0$, replacing s by αs then leads to $\alpha s \cdot \nabla \ell(\alpha s) = \ell(\alpha s) = \alpha \ell(s) = \alpha s \cdot \nabla \ell(s)$, implying $\nabla \ell(\alpha s) = \nabla \ell(s)$ (where $\nabla \ell(\alpha s)$ means that $\nabla \ell$ is evaluated at αs). On the other hand, for degree-1 positive homogeneous ℓ , the expressions s and $\ell(s) \nabla \ell(s)$ *do* behave the same way when s is replaced by αs (each expression simply being multiplied by α). So a "simplest" candidate for ℓ presents itself as the solution to,

$$(1.1) \quad s = \ell(s) \nabla \ell(s),$$

under the constraint,

$$(1.2) \quad \ell(\nabla \ell(s)) = 1,$$

since satisfaction of (1.2) is a necessary condition for a nonnegative solution of (1.1) to be degree-1 positive homogenous (e.g., apply ℓ to both sides of (1.1)). It is easily shown that $\ell(s)$ is then the Euclidean norm.

But without unduly compromising the simplicity of the rationale, we could alternatively propose

$$(1.3) \quad Ls = \ell(s) \nabla \ell(s),$$

for a linear transformation $L : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$, since we would still have Ls and $\ell(s) \nabla \ell(s)$ behaving the same when s is replaced by αs , $\alpha > 0$. L must be self-adjoint since Ls is a gradient (i.e., the right-hand-side of (1.3) is equal to $\frac{1}{2} \nabla \ell^2(s)$). Applying

the dot product with s to both sides of (1.3), the Euler Homogeneous Function Theorem then implies

$$(1.4) \quad s' Ls = s \cdot Ls = \ell^2(s).$$

Hence, L must be positive semi-definite. From the Polarization Identity, it is seen that the above leads to arbitrary inner product spaces on \mathbb{R}^n .

In this paper we will demonstrate that (1.1), (1.2) follow from a formulation of Euclidean geometry that incorporates \mathbb{R} , such as provided by Birkhoff [1]. The resulting proof of the Pythagorean Theorem is believed to be new - at least the idea of this proof is not found in the large compendium [2], the more recent survey [3], or the present version of the Wikipedia article "Pythagorean theorem". But surprisingly, despite the relative simplicity of the underlying argument (as presented in the synopsis in Section 2), rigorously accomplishing the above task is a quite lengthy process, requiring the contents of Sections 3, 4, 5, and an appendix of lemmas.

What is *not* a lengthy process, however, is generalizing the argument of the first two paragraphs of this Introduction to the task of attaching a "norm" to \mathbb{R}^n when the latter is the vector space of elements of a unital associative algebra. That is, the basic rationale of the argument above is easily modified to allow the new feature of the inverse of an element to influence selection of a norm - something not explicitly addressed by the well-recognized non-reduced norm of a finite-dimensional associative algebra. Moreover, this algebraic application of the argument antedated the recognition that derivation of (1.1), (1.2) from the postulates of Euclidean geometry could be used to fashion a proof of the Pythagorean Theorem - and, indeed, led to that recognition (the algebraic program had its origin in the context of Inverse Problems, in the proof of Theorem 2.2 of [4]).

Furthermore, the algebraic program that suggested this new Pythagorean Theorem proof is more interesting than the proof itself. Therefore, it is worthwhile to now present a limited introduction to the algebraic application, which is developed in [5].

Thus, we wish to exploit the existence of an element's inverse to aid in construction of a "norm-like" real function $\mathcal{U}(s)$ on the units of the algebra. By analogy with what happens at the beginning of this Introduction, one recognizes that s^{-1} and $\nabla\mathcal{U}(s)$ are members of \mathbb{R}^n if s is a unit of the algebra, and $\nabla\mathcal{U}(\alpha s) = \nabla\mathcal{U}(s)$ for $\alpha > 0$ if degree-1 positive homogeneity is again mandated. While the expressions s^{-1} and $\nabla\mathcal{U}(s)$ thereby behave differently when αs replaces s , this time it is s^{-1} and $\frac{\nabla\mathcal{U}(s)}{\mathcal{U}(s)}$ that behave the same under that replacement, in that both expressions are simply multiplied by $\frac{1}{\alpha}$ - mirroring the situation that pertains to the first paragraph of this Introduction. So now, based on that latter treatment (and its "minimalist" approach for attaching a norm to a space), we might be tempted to equate s^{-1} and $\frac{\nabla\mathcal{U}(s)}{\mathcal{U}(s)}$ - except that the latter is the gradient of $\log\mathcal{U}(s)$, while s^{-1} is in general not a gradient. That problem resolves if we can find a linear transformation L such that Ls^{-1} is a gradient, i.e., satisfies the exterior derivative condition,

$$(1.5) \quad d([Ls^{-1}] \cdot ds) = d((ds)'Ls^{-1}) = 0.$$

But there is also the Euler Homogeneous Function Theorem to deal with, wherein $\frac{s \cdot \nabla\mathcal{U}(s)}{\mathcal{U}(s)} = 1$. Denoting the multiplicative identity of the algebra as $\mathbf{1}$, we can define $\|\mathbf{1}\|^2$ to be the number of independent entries on the main diagonal of the matrices

comprising the left regular representation of the algebra. We are free to constrain L by the requirement that $\mathbf{1} \cdot (L\mathbf{1}) = \mathbf{1}'L\mathbf{1} = \|\mathbf{1}\|^2$. It follows that we can now propose,

$$(1.6) \quad Ls^{-1} = \|\mathbf{1}\|^2 \frac{\nabla \mathcal{U}(s)}{\mathcal{U}(s)},$$

if L satisfies both (1.5) and

$$(1.7) \quad s' L s^{-1} = s \cdot L s^{-1} = \|\mathbf{1}\|^2,$$

since constraint (1.7) is a necessary condition for a solution of (1.6) to be degree-1 positive homogeneous (e.g., take the dot product of both sides of (1.6) with s and apply the Euler Homogeneous Function Theorem). Note that (1.7) must hold if s is replaced by s^{-1} as both are units, so we expect L to be self-adjoint. Indeed, L is akin to an inner product matrix, and an important feature is that L need not be positive semi-definite (exploitable in a relativistic physics context [6]). Thus, (1.7) can be interpreted to mean that multiplicative inverses s, s^{-1} also behave inversely as vector space members with respect to inner product L . If L satisfying (1.5) and (1.7) can be found, then one can provide $\mathcal{U}(s)$ by integrating (1.6), at least in some simply connected neighborhood of $\mathbf{1}$.

Note that (1.6) is analogous to (1.3), and (1.7) is analogous to (1.4). But the marked difference is that for the “naked” vector space application (where (1.3) and (1.4) pertain), L can be any self-adjoint ($n \times n$)-matrix (allowing for possibly complex-valued $\ell(s)$), while in the unital algebra application (where (1.6) and (1.7) pertain) the additionally required (1.5) very significantly constrains self-adjoint L . It is this constraint that makes things interesting, because different algebras have very different collections of admissible choices for L , and these differences characterize the algebras in novel ways.

As it turns out, for a given unital associative algebra with \mathbb{R}^n its vector space of elements, it is always possible to find at least a one-dimensional family of linear transformations L satisfying (1.5), and there is often a multidimensional family of such matrices - constituting a “Proto-norm family”. In fact, there is often a multidimensional family of L satisfying both (1.5) and (1.7) - implying a “Unital Norm family” of solutions $\mathcal{U}(s)$ to (1.6). Moreover, the Unital Norm family is always nonempty, and always contains a member that is “essentially” equivalent to the non-reduced norm (apart from some exponents). Various theorems relating to Proto-norms and Unital Norms provide the means for satisfying alternative characterizations of members of this class of algebras. Ultimately, the whole business leads to a novel functor connecting the category of unital associative algebras on \mathbb{R}^n (with algebra epimorphisms as morphisms) to a “Proto-norm” category. Thereby, Proto-norms and their morphisms have a lot to say about the existence of ideals in various contexts, among other things. All of this is presented in detail in [5].

Having thus identified its original algebraic inspiration, the remainder of this paper will confine itself to the new proof of the Pythagorean Theorem.

2. SYNOPSIS

As might already be surmised, the new proof has the following prerequisites:

- A rigorous formulation of plane Euclidean geometry in which the parallel postulate (or its equivalent) can be used to derive a bijection between the

points of the Euclidean plane with an “origin” (EPWO) and the points of $\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}$, using any set of perpendicular lines intersecting at the origin (an orthogonal coordinate system through the origin - OCSTO), with $\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}$ thereby inheriting the “Euclidean length function” ℓ (the length of the line segment with endpoints at the origin and a point of EPWO).

- Demonstration that the above bijection leads to a linear isomorphism between the direct sum $\mathbb{R} \oplus \mathbb{R}$ and the natural vector space structure on EPWO that follows from the parallel postulate. Taking into account the respective length functions, the above is an isometric isomorphism.
- The concept of a directional derivative, where the “direction” is identified as a point on the unit circle centered at the origin (Definition 4.1 below).

While the formal proof and its preparation are in aggregate rather lengthy, the idea of the proof is simple, so we provide the following synopsis:

Due to the above isometric isomorphism associated with a given choice of OCSTO, directional derivative values attached to a point in EPWO, but computed in $\mathbb{R} \oplus \mathbb{R}$ via a first OCSTO, are invariant to a change in OCSTO. Demonstration of continuity of the directional derivative values of ℓ at non-origin points, along with the mean value theorem of one-dimensional Calculus, indicate that the directional derivative value at $(x, y) \neq (0, 0)$ in the (u, v) direction is given by $\frac{\partial \ell(x, y)}{\partial x} u + \frac{\partial \ell(x, y)}{\partial y} v$, where the factors multiplying u and v are the directional derivatives at (x, y) in the direction of the first and second coordinate axis, respectively (the coordinate axes are “directed” due to real numbers assigned to their points by the above bijection). According to the latter expression, along with the ordered pair $D_1(x, y) \equiv \left(\frac{\partial \ell(x, y)}{\partial x}, \frac{\partial \ell(x, y)}{\partial y} \right)$ being a point (i.e., vector) of $\mathbb{R} \oplus \mathbb{R}$ (corresponding to a point of EPWO under the isomorphism), it also defines a linear transformation $\mathbb{R} \oplus \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ whose restriction to points of the unit circle gives the directional derivative values at (x, y) . Since the latter values are attached to the point $\mathbf{p} \in \text{EPWO}$ corresponding to (x, y) under the isomorphism, which as noted above are invariant to a change in OCSTO, the point of EPWO that $D_1(x, y)$ labels under the isomorphism must be invariant under a change in OCSTO. Thus, we can use a second OCSTO such that (x, y) corresponds to $(x', 0)$, $x' > 0$ in the second coordinate system (i.e., (x, y) and $(x', 0)$ both label \mathbf{p} but with respect to different OCSTO's, such that \mathbf{p} lies on the positive portion of the first coordinate axis of the alternative OCSTO). We then have that $D_2(x', 0) \equiv \left(\frac{\partial \ell(x', 0)}{\partial x'}, \frac{\partial \ell(x', 0)}{\partial y'} \right)$ labels the same point of EPWO that $D_1(x, y)$ labels, due to invariance of directional derivative values under a change in OCSTO. But in this second coordinate system we can easily show that $D_2(x', 0) = (1, 0)$ (since the necessary directional derivative determinations only require lengths to be evaluated on the coordinate axes). Thus, $D_2(x', 0)$ is the vector of length 1 parallel to $(x', 0)$. This means that $D_1(x, y)$ has length 1 and is parallel to (x, y) , since the isometric isomorphisms attached to the two OCSTO's ultimately indicate that $D_1(x, y)$ has

the same direction and length as $D_2(x', 0)$ when these are recognized as labels of the same point in EPWO. And yet, the easily demonstrated degree-1 positive homogeneity of ℓ indicates that the point in $\mathbb{R} \oplus \mathbb{R}$ of length 1 parallel to (x, y) is $\left(\frac{x}{\ell(x, y)}, \frac{y}{\ell(x, y)}\right)$. Consequently $\left(\frac{\partial \ell(x, y)}{\partial x}, \frac{\partial \ell(x, y)}{\partial y}\right) = \left(\frac{x}{\ell(x, y)}, \frac{y}{\ell(x, y)}\right)$. One-dimensional indefinite integration can then be applied separately to the equality of the first coordinates, and then to the equality of the second coordinates. Reconciliation of the resulting two expressions for ℓ , in the context of the nonnegativity of ℓ and its degree-1 positive homogeneity, quickly leads to $\ell(x, y) = \sqrt{x^2 + y^2}$, from which the theorem easily follows.

It is evident that the argument is based on derivation of equations of the form (1.1), (1.2).

3. BIRKHOFF'S POSTULATES FOR PLANE EUCLIDEAN GEOMETRY, AND THE RESULTING "EUCLIDEAN PLANE WITH ORIGIN" AS A VECTOR SPACE

We will now start over, with a presentation devoid of any of the technical gaps left by the synopsis in the prior section.

In order to "rigorize" the proof (of Proposition 47, book 1, Euclid's Elements) envisioned in the Introduction, it is necessary that the Euclidean plane geometry postulates be imported into an analytic setting appropriate for the derivation of (1.1), (1.2). Thus, it is assumed that the axioms of geometry required to rigorously prove Euclid's theorems are supplemented by the axioms underlying \mathbb{R} as it is understood in Real Analysis, so that we have the concept of limits and the resulting notions of the derivative and anti-derivative of a real function of one real variable. As for the means of joining \mathbb{R} to the plane, Birkhoff's four postulate formulation of Euclidean geometry [1] is well suited to this purpose, and is thus assumed. Accordingly, we will be freely referring to the "parallel postulate", various of Euclid's propositions, and identification of the points of the Euclidean plane with those of $\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}$ (as below), which are consequences of the four postulates presented in [1]. Slightly reworded, Birkhoff's postulates entail the following:

- (1) "Postulate of Line Measure": There is a bijection between \mathbb{R} and the set of points on any line, so that the length of any line segment is the absolute value of the difference of the real numbers corresponding to the segment's endpoints.
- (2) "Point-Line Postulate": There is one and only one line that contains any two given distinct points of the plane.
- (3) "Postulate of Angle Measure": There is a bijection between the set of rays from a point O and the real numbers (mod 2π) such that, for a line not containing O , continuously varying a point on the line implies continuous variation of the resulting mod 2π real number value of the ray it lies on. The angle formed by a first ray from O and a second ray from O is the value (mod 2π) of the value of the first ray minus the value of the second ray.
- (4) "Postulate of Similarity": If a triangle has two sides having lengths related to the lengths of two sides of another triangle by the same positive proportionality constant, and the absolute values of the angles formed by these

two sides of each triangle are equal, then these are similar triangles, i.e., they have the same three angles up to a sign, and the lengths of the third side of the two triangles are related by the same proportionality constant.

Note that the notion of “between” in reference to three distinct collinear points is well-defined in the obvious way from the Postulate of Line Measure.

Regarding the identification of points of the plane with points of $\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}$, we’ll let [1] speak for itself: “We are now prepared to define a rectangular coordinate system (x, y) with axes the directed perpendicular lines Ox, Oy intersecting in the origin O . Choose a system of numeration along Ox, Oy so that O is marked 0 on both lines, and the numbers increase algebraically in the positive direction. Drop the unique perpendiculars from P to Ox and Oy respectively meeting these lines at Px and Py . The rectangular coordinates of P are then the numbers x_P and y_P attached to Px and Py respectively. These are evidently uniquely determined numbers.” This bijection is an immediate consequence of the “parallel postulate” - which follows from the Postulate of Similarity without use of the Pythagorean Theorem [1].

Consider a chosen point of the Euclidean plane as the “origin” and a length function ℓ returning the length of the line segment from the origin to any point of the plane. With respect to these, a vector space can be fashioned such that each point of the plane is assigned the length given by the above length function. We call this vector space the “Euclidean-Plane-With-Origin” - EPWO. This vector space results from the Postulate of Line Measure and the Postulate of Similarity.

Definition 3.1. The EPWO vector space is constituted as follows:

- (1) There is a chosen point of the Euclidean plane termed “the origin”.
- (2) There is a length function $\ell : \text{EPWO} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that for $\mathbf{p} \in \text{EPWO}$ we have $\ell(\mathbf{p})$ as the length of the line segment from the origin to \mathbf{p} .
- (3) For $\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{p}' \in \text{EPWO}$ that are not collinear with the origin O , we use the parallel postulate (a consequence of the Postulate of Similarity) to define $\mathbf{p} + \mathbf{p}'$ to be a third point $\mathbf{p}'' \in \text{EPWO}$ as the point of intersection of two unique lines, the first line being the line through \mathbf{p} parallel to the line segment from the origin to \mathbf{p}' , and the second line being the line through \mathbf{p}' parallel to the line segment from the origin to \mathbf{p} . The case of points $O, \mathbf{p}, \mathbf{p}'$ being collinear is addressed using the Postulate of Line Measure: If the origin is between \mathbf{p} and \mathbf{p}' , then \mathbf{p}'' has length as the absolute value of the difference of the lengths of the two points, and resides on the ray from the origin to the point \mathbf{p} or \mathbf{p}' having greater length. If the origin is not between \mathbf{p} and \mathbf{p}' , then \mathbf{p}'' has length equal to the sum of the lengths of \mathbf{p} and \mathbf{p}' and lies on the ray from the origin on which \mathbf{p}, \mathbf{p}' lie.
- (4) Multiplication of a point \mathbf{p} by $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$ is defined so that, for $\alpha \neq 0$ and \mathbf{p} not at the origin, $\alpha\mathbf{p}$ is one of two points on the line containing the origin and \mathbf{p} that have length $|\alpha|\ell(\mathbf{p})$. If $\alpha > 0$, the point $\alpha\mathbf{p}$ is such that the origin is not between \mathbf{p} and $\alpha\mathbf{p}$ (and the new point is termed “parallel” to \mathbf{p}), for $\alpha < 0$ the point $\alpha\mathbf{p}$ is such that the origin is between \mathbf{p} and $\alpha\mathbf{p}$ (and the new point is termed “antiparallel” to \mathbf{p}). For $\alpha = 0$, or if \mathbf{p} is the origin, the point $\alpha\mathbf{p}$ is the origin.

4. PREPARATORY TECHNICAL ITEMS

Various technical lemmas referred to in the proof are needed, and we provide their proofs in Appendix A. The following items are exploited in the proof of Theorem 5.1.

- $\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}$ is understood to be the vector space with component-wise addition and component-wise multiplication by a scalar, i.e., $\mathbb{R} \oplus \mathbb{R}$.
- The triangle inequality theorem (Proposition 20, book 1, Euclid's Elements) indicates that ℓ is a norm on the EPWO vector space.
- Via a chosen orthogonal coordinate system through the origin, the resulting bijection noted in Section 3 (following from the parallel postulate/Postulate of Similarity) is an isomorphism between EPWO and $\mathbb{R} \oplus \mathbb{R}$ as vector spaces, so that the length function on $\mathbb{R} \oplus \mathbb{R}$ implied by the bijection is also a norm. Thereby, the above bijection is an isometric isomorphism (Lemma A.1). Hence, results of operations in EPWO involving addition, multiplication by a scalar, and length determination, as executed in $\mathbb{R} \oplus \mathbb{R}$ via the isomorphism, are independent of the chosen orthogonal coordinate system through the origin.
- According to Definition 3.1, ℓ is a degree-1 positive homogeneous function. From the triangle inequality, it is also continuous (as indicated in the proof of Lemma A.2). Furthermore, the length of any line segment in EPWO can be expressed using ℓ and vector subtraction (as also explicitly indicated in the proof of Lemma A.2).
- The unit circle centered at the origin is the locus of points a unit distance from the origin, and denoted by \mathbf{C} in both EPWO and $\mathbb{R} \oplus \mathbb{R}$. Each of its points is a "direction". The directional derivative of ℓ is given in Definition 4.1 below. From the above isomorphism, the value of the directional derivative at $\mathbf{p} \in \text{EPWO}$ is independent of the choice of orthogonal coordinate system through the origin.
- Other than at the origin, the directional derivative in any direction exists everywhere (Lemma A.2) and is continuous everywhere (Lemma A.3).

Definition 4.1. The value of the *directional derivative of the length function* $\ell : \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ at a point $(x, y) \neq (0, 0)$ with respect to direction (u, v) , and of $\ell : \text{EPWO} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ at the corresponding point and direction in EPWO under the bijection associated with a set of orthogonal axes through the origin, is given by

$$(4.1) \quad \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \frac{\ell((x, y) + \epsilon(u, v)) - \ell(x, y)}{\epsilon}.$$

5. THE PROOF

With the preparatory analytical items of the last section out of the way, one can proceed with proof of the theorem, which is just a filled-out version of the synopsis presented in Section 2.

Theorem 5.1 (ΠΥΘΑΓΟΡΑΣ). *The square of the length of the hypotenuse of a right triangle is equal to the sum of the squares of the lengths of the other two sides.*

Proof. As noted in Section 3 in the paragraph immediately following the statement of Birkhoff's Postulates, for any pair of perpendicular lines intersecting at the origin in the Euclidean plane there is a corresponding bijection between EPWO and $\mathbb{R} \times$

\mathbb{R} that follows from the Postulate of Similarity without use of the Pythagorean Theorem. Lemma A.1 shows this to be an isometric isomorphism of vector spaces, referred to as the “Isomorphism” in the sequel. Among other things, this implies that it is sufficient to verify the theorem on $\mathbb{R} \oplus \mathbb{R}$.

Suppose non-origin point $\mathbf{p} \in \text{EPWO}$ is labeled by (x, y) via the Isomorphism. Lemma A.2 states that all directional derivatives exist at (x, y) . Let $\frac{\partial \ell(x, y)}{\partial x}$ and $\frac{\partial \ell(x, y)}{\partial y}$ be the respective directional derivative values of ℓ at (x, y) in the $(1, 0)$ and $(0, 1)$ directions. From the mean value theorem of one-dimensional Calculus,

$$\begin{aligned} \ell((x, y) + \epsilon(u, v)) - \ell(x, y) &= [\ell((x, y) + \epsilon(u, 0)) - \ell(x, y)] \\ &\quad + [\ell((x, y) + \epsilon(u, v)) - \ell((x, y) + \epsilon(u, 0))] \\ (5.1) \qquad \qquad \qquad &= \frac{\partial \ell(\mathbf{p}_1)}{\partial x} u \epsilon + \frac{\partial \ell(\mathbf{p}_2)}{\partial y} v \epsilon, \end{aligned}$$

where \mathbf{p}_1 is in the line segment with endpoints (x, y) and $(x, y) + \epsilon(u, 0)$, and \mathbf{p}_2 is in the line segment with endpoints $(x, y) + \epsilon(u, 0)$ and $(x, y) + \epsilon(u, v)$, and by constructing an appropriate parallelogram we already know that the respective lengths of these line segments are just $u\epsilon$ and $v\epsilon$ since the line segments are parallel to the x -axis and y -axis and the values of ℓ are known on these axes (i.e., $\ell(a, 0) = |a|$ and $\ell(0, b) = |b|$ from the Postulate of Line Measure).

We know from Lemma A.3 that the directional derivative of ℓ in a fixed direction is continuous at $(x, y) \neq (0, 0)$. Thus, dividing both sides of (5.1) by ϵ and taking the limit as $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$, we find

$$(5.2) \qquad \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \frac{\ell((x, y) + \epsilon(u, v)) - \ell(x, y)}{\epsilon} = \frac{\partial \ell(x, y)}{\partial x} u + \frac{\partial \ell(x, y)}{\partial y} v.$$

For (u, v) not restricted to unit circle \mathbf{C} , the expression on the right-hand-side above is a symmetric bilinear form. That is, via the right-hand-side of (5.2), the point

$$(5.3) \qquad D_1(x, y) \equiv \left(\frac{\partial \ell(x, y)}{\partial x}, \frac{\partial \ell(x, y)}{\partial y} \right),$$

defines a linear transformation $\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, as well as labeling a point of EPWO. It is easily shown that any other point of $\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}$ defines a different linear transformation. Accordingly, the latter point of EPWO associated with the right-hand-side of (5.3) via the Isomorphism defines a unique linear transformation $\text{EPWO} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. If non-origin point $\mathbf{p} \in \text{EPWO}$ is labeled by (x, y) in a first orthogonal coordinate system through the origin, and labeled by (x', y') in an alternative orthogonal coordinate system through the origin, it follows from the Isomorphism and the above uniqueness that $\left(\frac{\partial \ell(x', y')}{\partial x'}, \frac{\partial \ell(x', y')}{\partial y'} \right)$ labels the same point in EPWO as $D_1(x, y)$, since they both act as linear transformations $\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ but when restricted to \mathbf{C} they both return the directional derivative values of ℓ at $\mathbf{p} \in \text{EPWO}$ via the relevant Isomorphisms.

For the above $\mathbf{p} \in \text{EPWO}$ labeled by (x, y) with respect to a chosen orthogonal coordinate system through the origin, there evidently exists an alternative orthogonal coordinate system through the origin where \mathbf{p} lies on the positive-valued portion of the first coordinate axis, and so is labeled by $(x', 0), x' > 0$. According to the argument in the prior paragraph, this means that $D_2(x', 0) \equiv \left(\frac{\partial \ell(x', 0)}{\partial x'}, \frac{\partial \ell(x', 0)}{\partial y'} \right)$ and $D_1(x, y)$ label the same point in EPWO.

But using (4.1), a simple calculation reveals that,

$$D_2(x', 0) = \left(\frac{\partial \ell(x', 0)}{\partial x'}, \frac{\partial \ell(x', 0)}{\partial y'} \right) = (1, 0),$$

where the second equality follows because the requisite evaluations of ℓ all take place on the coordinate axes. Thus, $D_2(x', 0)$ is a point on the unit circle and is parallel to $(x', 0)$. Since $(x', 0)$ labels $\mathbf{p} \in \text{EPWO}$, it follows that $D_2(x', 0)$ labels the point of the EPWO unit circle parallel to \mathbf{p} . Since it was observed above that $D_1(x, y)$ and $D_2(x', 0)$ label the same point of EPWO with respect to different orthogonal coordinate systems through the origin, it follows that $D_1(x, y)$ labels the EPWO unit circle point parallel to \mathbf{p} . In other words, $D_1(x, y)$ is parallel to (x, y) , and

$$(5.4) \quad \ell(D_1(x, y)) = \ell \left(\frac{\partial \ell(x, y)}{\partial x}, \frac{\partial \ell(x, y)}{\partial y} \right) = 1.$$

Degree-1 positive homogeneity of ℓ follows from Definition 3.1 and the Isomorphism. Thus, the point of $\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}$ parallel to (x, y) having of length 1 is $\left(\frac{x}{\ell(x, y)}, \frac{y}{\ell(x, y)} \right)$. From (5.3) and the final sentence of the prior paragraph, we then have

$$(5.5) \quad D_1(x, y) = \left(\frac{\partial \ell(x, y)}{\partial x}, \frac{\partial \ell(x, y)}{\partial y} \right) = \left(\frac{x}{\ell(x, y)}, \frac{y}{\ell(x, y)} \right).$$

Reconciliation of indefinite integration applied separately to the two equations resulting from the equal coordinate values of the ordered pairs in (5.5), in the context of nonnegativity and degree-1 positive homogeneity of ℓ , quickly results in

$$\ell(x, y) = \sqrt{x^2 + y^2},$$

from which the theorem easily follows, since the length of any line segment in EPWO can be expressed using ℓ and vector subtraction (as explicitly indicated in the proof of Lemma A.2). \square

Since the point of EPWO labeled by $D_1(x, y)$ is invariant under a change of orthogonal coordinate system through the origin, we are entitled to introduce a notation for this point as “ $\nabla \ell(\mathbf{p})$ ”, where \mathbf{p} is the Euclidean plane point labeled by (x, y) . This justifies the additional notation, $\nabla \ell(x, y) \equiv \left(\frac{\partial \ell(x, y)}{\partial x}, \frac{\partial \ell(x, y)}{\partial y} \right)$, i.e., $\nabla \ell(x, y)$ labels $\nabla \ell(\mathbf{p})$ with respect to a given orthogonal coordinate system through the origin. Equation (5.5) is then equivalently expressed by,

$$(1.1) \quad (x, y) = \ell(x, y) \nabla \ell(x, y),$$

while (5.4) becomes,

$$(1.2) \quad \ell(\nabla \ell(x, y)) = 1.$$

APPENDIX A. PREPARATORY LEMMAS

Lemma A.1. *Consider the bijection between vector spaces, $B : \text{EPWO} \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \oplus \mathbb{R}$ resulting from an orthogonal coordinate system through the origin in EPWO, as defined in Section 3. Suppose $\mathbb{R} \oplus \mathbb{R}$ is endowed with a length function similarly notated to that of EPWO, i.e., $\ell : \mathbb{R} \oplus \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, such that $\ell(x, y) \equiv \ell(\mathbf{p}_{x,y})$ where $\mathbf{p}_{x,y} \in \text{EPWO}$ corresponds to (x, y) under the bijection. Then the bijection is an isometric isomorphism.*

Proof. As indicated in the lemma statement, using the bijection we can denote points of EPWO as $\mathbf{p}_{x,y}$, with $(x,y) \in \mathbb{R} \oplus \mathbb{R}$. From the EPWO vector space structure (Definition 3.1), we can write $\mathbf{p}_{x,y} = \mathbf{p}_{x,0} + \mathbf{p}_{0,y}$. Consequently, $\mathbf{p}_{x_1,y_1} + \mathbf{p}_{x_2,y_2} = \mathbf{p}_{x_1,0} + \mathbf{p}_{0,y_1} + \mathbf{p}_{x_2,0} + \mathbf{p}_{0,y_2} = \mathbf{p}_{x_1+x_2,0} + \mathbf{p}_{0,y_1+y_2} = \mathbf{p}_{x_1+x_2,y_1+y_2}$. We then have,

$$\begin{aligned} B(\mathbf{p}_{x_1,y_1} + \mathbf{p}_{x_2,y_2}) &= B(\mathbf{p}_{x_1+x_2,y_1+y_2}) = (x_1 + x_2, y_1 + y_2) = (x_1, y_1) + (x_2, y_2) \\ (A.1) \qquad \qquad \qquad &= B(\mathbf{p}_{x_1,y_1}) + B(\mathbf{p}_{x_2,y_2}). \end{aligned}$$

Furthermore, for $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$, we have

$$(A.2) \qquad B(\alpha \mathbf{p}_{x,y}) = B(\mathbf{p}_{\alpha x, \alpha y}) = (\alpha x, \alpha y) = \alpha(x, y) = \alpha B(\mathbf{p}_{x,y}),$$

where the first equality follows from the Postulate of Similarity. Equations (A.1) and (A.2) indicate that $B : \text{EPWO} \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \oplus \mathbb{R}$ is a linear isomorphism. By definition, $\ell(B(\mathbf{p}_{x,y})) = \ell(x, y) = \ell(\mathbf{p}_{x,y})$. Consequently, $B : \text{EPWO} \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \oplus \mathbb{R}$ is an isometric isomorphism. \square

Lemma A.2. *Directional derivatives of ℓ in all directions exist at each point exclusive of the origin.*

Proof. From Definition 3.1, $\ell(\alpha \mathbf{p}) = |\alpha| \ell(\mathbf{p})$, i.e., ℓ is a degree-1 positive homogenous function. Also note that, using a parallelogram construction, the length of any line segment in EPWO can be expressed using ℓ and vector subtraction. That is, for $\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{p}' \in \text{EPWO}$, the length of the line segment with endpoints \mathbf{p}, \mathbf{p}' is $\ell(\mathbf{p} - \mathbf{p}')$. Using the triangle inequality, the continuity of ℓ immediately follows (i.e., $|\ell(\mathbf{p}') - \ell(\mathbf{p})| \leq \ell(\mathbf{p}' - \mathbf{p})$, the implied “reverse triangle inequality”).

The Postulate of Line Measure assures that every non-origin point is a positive multiple of a direction. Thereby, evaluation of (4.1) immediately indicates that the directional derivative exists in the directions parallel and antiparallel to $(x, y) \neq (0, 0)$, and these values are respectively $+1$ and -1 . Thus, consider the directional derivative in some other direction. We assert that the expression inside the limit in (4.1) is monotonic as $\epsilon \rightarrow 0^+$ and is monotonic as $\epsilon \rightarrow 0^-$. If that were not the case, since ℓ is continuous, there would have to be two choices of ϵ having the same sign such that the expressions inside that limit are equal. We can call these choices ϵ' and $\frac{1}{k}\epsilon'$, with $0 < k < 1$. Using the degree-1 positive homogeneity of ℓ , simple manipulation of the equality of the two expressions leads to

$$(A.3) \quad \ell((x, y) + \epsilon'(u, v)) - \ell(k(x, y) + \epsilon'(u, v)) = \ell(x, y) - \ell(k(x, y)) = (1-k)\ell(x, y).$$

But according to the (reverse) triangle inequality, the absolute value of the left-hand-side above must be strictly less than the absolute value of the right-hand-side, since $k \neq 1$, and (u, v) and (x, y) are not collinear. Thus, (A.3) is not possible, so the above monotonicity assertion is verified. Furthermore, the triangle inequality indicates that the expression inside the limit in (4.1) is bounded by the values of the the directional derivatives of ℓ in the directions parallel and antiparallel to (x, y) . A monotone convergence argument then establishes the existence of the directional derivative. \square

Lemma A.3. *The directional derivative of ℓ in a given fixed direction as a function over the points of the plane is continuous at each point exclusive of the origin.*

Proof. From the existence of directional derivatives in all directions at $(x, y) \neq (0, 0)$ (Lemma A.2), and the degree-1 positive homogeneity of ℓ , it easily follows from the

directional derivative expression (4.1) that a fixed-direction directional derivative of ℓ at any point distinct from the origin depends only on the ray on which the point lies (i.e., it is constant on a ray). This means that to demonstrate continuity of the directional derivative at $(x, y) \neq (0, 0)$, the argument need only evaluate the limit of the difference of the directional derivatives at (x, y) and (x', y') as the ray on which the latter point lies approaches the ray on which the former point lies - so it is sufficient to examine the case where (x', y') approaches (x, y) along the circle with center $(0, 0)$ containing (x, y) . In fact, the derivative is continuous at (x, y) , if and only if it is continuous at the point of the unit circle $\frac{(x, y)}{\ell(x, y)}$.

Thus, without loss we can assume that (x, y) and (x', y') are both points on the unit circle centered at the origin, so that it is then sufficient to show that the difference of their directional derivatives in a fixed direction (u, v) tends to zero as (x', y') approaches (x, y) along the unit circle. That is, we only need to show that the directional derivative in the fixed (u, v) -direction is a continuous function over the points of the unit circle. But, the directional derivative in a direction (u, v) for a point (x, y) on the unit circle depends only on the angle formed by (x, y) and (u, v) , since the directional derivative is coordinate system-independent, and the latter vectors both have unit length. Hence, the following symmetry pertains: demonstrating continuity of the directional derivative in a fixed direction as a function over all points of the unit circle, is equivalent to demonstrating continuity of the directional derivative taken at a fixed point of the unit circle as a function over all directions.

To demonstrate continuity of the latter function, we invoke Proposition 24 of book 1 of Euclid's Elements, which states that if two sides of one triangle are congruent to two sides of a second triangle, and the [absolute value of the] included angle of the first triangle is larger than the [absolute value of the] included angle of the second triangle, then the third side of the first triangle is longer than the third side of the second triangle. Now label the rays from the origin via $\theta \in (-\pi, \pi]$, with $\theta = 0$ labeling the ray containing (x, y) . From the Postulate of Angle Measure, it follows that θ continuously labels the set of directions. Applying the above Proposition 24 to the directional derivative expression (4.1), it is easily seen that the directional derivative at (x, y) as a function of the direction labeled by θ is monotonic for $\theta \in (-\pi, 0]$ and also monotonic for $\theta \in [0, \pi]$ - and is thus a continuous function from a well known result that a derivative which exists at each point of a closed interval, and is monotonic on that interval, is continuous on the interval. In view of the statement at the end of the last paragraph, this establishes the continuity of the directional derivative taken in a fixed direction over the non-origin points of the plane. \square

REFERENCES

- [1] Birkhoff, GD (1932), A Set of Postulates for Plane Geometry (Based on Scale and Protractors), *Annals of Mathematics*, 33: 329–345.
- [2] Loomis ES (1968) *The Pythagorean Proposition*, its demonstrations analyzed and classified and bibliography of sources for data of the four kinds of “proofs”, National Council of Teachers of Mathematics, Washington D.C., (reprint of the 1940 second edition).
- [3] Maor E (2007) *The Pythagorean Theorem*, a 4000 year history, Princeton University Press, Princeton.
- [4] Greensite F (2022) Origin of the Proto-norm functor from an Inverse Problems regularization method, arXiv:2209.14137.

- [5] Greensite F (2022) Novel characterizations of real finite-dimensional unital algebras, arXiv:2207.11358.
- [6] Greensite F (2022) Cosmology from a non-physical standpoint: an algebraic analysis, arXiv:2209.14127.