



**planetmath.org**

Math for the people, by the people.

## congruence axioms

|                  |                      |
|------------------|----------------------|
| Canonical name   | CongruenceAxioms     |
| Date of creation | 2013-03-22 15:31:59  |
| Last modified on | 2013-03-22 15:31:59  |
| Owner            | CWoo (3771)          |
| Last modified by | CWoo (3771)          |
| Numerical id     | 16                   |
| Author           | CWoo (3771)          |
| Entry type       | Axiom                |
| Classification   | msc 51F20            |
| Synonym          | axioms of congruence |
| Defines          | congruence relation  |

**General Congruence Relations.** Let  $A$  be a set and  $X = A \times A$ . A relation on  $X$  is said to be a *congruence relation* on  $X$ , denoted  $\cong$ , if the following three conditions are satisfied:

1.  $(a, b) \cong (b, a)$ , for all  $a, b \in A$ ,
2. if  $(a, a) \cong (b, c)$ , then  $b = c$ , where  $a, b, c \in A$ ,
3. if  $(a, b) \cong (c, d)$  and  $(a, b) \cong (e, f)$ , then  $(c, d) \cong (e, f)$ , for any  $a, b, c, d, e, f \in A$ .

By applying  $(b, a) \cong (a, b)$  twice, we see that  $\cong$  is reflexive according to the third condition. From this, it is easy to see that  $\cong$  is symmetric, since  $(a, b) \cong (c, d)$  and  $(a, b) \cong (a, b)$  imply  $(c, d) \cong (a, b)$ . Finally,  $\cong$  is transitive, for if  $(a, b) \cong (c, d)$  and  $(c, d) \cong (e, f)$ , then  $(c, d) \cong (a, b)$  because  $\cong$  is symmetric and so  $(a, b) \cong (e, f)$  by the third condition. Therefore, the congruence relation is an equivalence relation on pairs of elements of  $A$ .

**Congruence Axioms in Ordered Geometry.** Let  $(A, B)$  be an ordered geometry with strict betweenness relation  $B$ . We say that the ordered geometry  $(A, B)$  satisfies the *congruence axioms* if

1. there is a congruence relation  $\cong$  on  $A \times A$ ;
2. if  $(a, b, c) \in B$  and  $(d, e, f) \in B$  with
  - $(a, b) \cong (d, e)$ , and
  - $(b, c) \cong (e, f)$ ,
then  $(a, c) \cong (d, f)$ ;
3. given  $(a, b)$  and a ray  $\rho$  emanating from  $p$ , there exists a unique point  $q$  lying on  $\rho$  such that  $(p, q) \cong (a, b)$ ;
4. given the following:
  - three rays emanating from  $p_1$  such that they intersect with a line  $\ell_1$  at  $a_1, b_1, c_1$  with  $(a_1, b_1, c_1) \in B$ , and
  - three rays emanating from  $p_2$  such that they intersect with a line  $\ell_2$  at  $a_2, b_2, c_2$  with  $(a_2, b_2, c_2) \in B$ ,
  - $(a_1, b_1) \cong (a_2, b_2)$  and  $(b_1, c_1) \cong (b_2, c_2)$ ,

- $(p_1, a_1) \cong (p_2, a_2)$  and  $(p_1, b_1) \cong (p_2, b_2)$ ,

then  $(p_1, c_1) \cong (p_2, c_2)$ ;

5. given three distinct points  $a, b, c$  and two distinct points  $p, q$  such that  $(a, b) \cong (p, q)$ . Let  $H$  be a closed half plane with boundary  $\overleftrightarrow{pq}$ . Then there exists a unique point  $r$  lying on  $H$  such that  $(a, c) \cong (p, r)$  and  $(b, c) \cong (q, r)$ .

**Congruence Relations on line segments, triangles, and angles.** With the above five congruence axioms, one may define a congruence relation (also denoted by  $\cong$  by abuse of notation) on the set  $S$  of closed line segments of  $A$  by

$$\overline{ab} \cong \overline{cd} \quad \text{iff} \quad (a, b) \cong (c, d),$$

where  $\overline{ab}$  (in this entry) denotes the closed line segment with endpoints  $a$  and  $b$ .

It is obvious that the congruence relation defined on line segments of  $A$  is an equivalence relation. Next, one defines a congruence relation on triangles in  $A$ :  $\triangle abc \cong \triangle pqr$  if their sides are congruent:

1.  $\overline{ab} \cong \overline{pq}$ ,
2.  $\overline{bc} \cong \overline{qr}$ , and
3.  $\overline{ca} \cong \overline{rp}$ .

With this definition, Axiom 5 above can be restated as: given a triangle  $\triangle abc$ , such that  $\overline{ab}$  is congruent to a given line segment  $\overline{pq}$ . Then there is exactly one point  $r$  on a chosen side of the line  $\overleftrightarrow{pq}$  such that  $\triangle abc \cong \triangle pqr$ . Not surprisingly, the congruence relation on triangles is also an equivalence relation.

The last major congruence relation in an ordered geometry to be defined is on angles:  $\angle abc$  is *congruent to*  $\angle pqr$  if there are

1. a point  $a_1$  on  $\overrightarrow{ba}$ ,
2. a point  $c_1$  on  $\overrightarrow{bc}$ ,
3. a point  $p_1$  on  $\overrightarrow{qp}$ , and

4. a point  $r_1$  on  $\overrightarrow{qr}$

such that  $\triangle a_1bc_1 \cong \triangle p_1qr_1$ .

It is customary to also write  $\angle abc \cong \angle pqr$  to mean that  $\angle abc$  is congruent to  $\angle pqr$ . Clearly for any points  $x \in \overrightarrow{ba}$  and  $y \in \overrightarrow{bc}$ , we have  $\angle xby \cong \angle abc$ , so that  $\cong$  is reflexive.  $\cong$  is also symmetric and transitive (as the properties are inherited from the congruence relation on triangles). Therefore, the congruence relation on angles also defines an equivalence relation.

## References

- [1] D. Hilbert, *Foundations of Geometry*, Open Court Publishing Co. (1971)
- [2] K. Borsuk and W. Szmielew, *Foundations of Geometry*, North-Holland Publishing Co. Amsterdam (1960)
- [3] M. J. Greenberg, *Euclidean and Non-Euclidean Geometries, Development and History*, W. H. Freeman and Company, San Francisco (1974)